

WESTERN CLARION

Official Organ of

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

A Journal of
CURRENT
EVENTS

HISTORY
ECONOMY
of the American
Look at nothing to
will act promptly.
though it be
net, who can
R.

838

Twice a Month

VANCOUVER, B. C., MARCH 1, 1921.

"Left Wing Communism, Infantile Disorder."

By N. Lenin.

THE latest work to hand by Nicolai Lenin, the Russian Premier, is the already much discussed pamphlet "Left Wing" Communism, Infantile Disorder."* It is particularly addressed to the German and British proletarian movement, but is scarcely of less interest to that movement in other countries, even when their special conditions differ considerably from that of the German and British. Lenin's effort is intended as a corrective in these circles, where a religious faith prevails in the universal applicability of certain formulas and principles, or where revolutionary action takes the place of objective reasoning based on the observable facts of any concrete social situation.

I append the table of contents of the pamphlet as giving a more satisfactory indication of the questions raised up than this review will furnish. My intention is mainly to attempt to depict what I conceive to be Lenin's philosophical attitude and method of approach to the problems of the revolutionary movement. As well as I can I shall set up Lenin's attitude and method as a standard to which readers may compare or contrast their own, which comparison, peradventure, may be the shortest way round some of us to see the error of our ways. For all, the standard of judgment or point of view should be of decisive influence on the nature of the conclusions we form upon any matter, and is also mainly responsible for the disagreements amongst us. As with primitive man who imputed to all objects in nature animate and inanimate, life and desires and passions like his own, so human beings may be perforce bound to approach any subject with mental prepossessions. All of which means that if you wish to understand how Lenin arrives at his conclusions you must see through Lenin's eyes, i.e., you must understand his mental attitude and method of approach to the questions he discusses. An understanding of Lenin in that respect is relatively easy when reading his work, if not so easy for an indifferent scribe to set down on paper. Lenin wears his heart on his sleeve in respect of science and philosophy. Lenin is preeminently a philosopher, a student of history and of science and the scientific method. He is a philosopher, not the old sense of the "fixity" of things of classical philosophy, but in the modern scientific sense that sees that the values of life consist in growth and development. In the work I am reviewing his facts and his arguments, pro and con, are laid along, lifted up in the full tide of his philosophy of life, and his scientific objective method is always apparent, even violently so, and to hand. His objective practical mind, conscious of itself as it is, and, while valuing the subjective power of the mind for making useful abstractions and generalizing formulas out of the many concrete things, he has a dogmatic faith in the necessity of getting the facts of every concrete social situation, as they appear in time and place, for an understanding of the nature of the problems, of the revolutionary struggle, and the tactical policies to be adopted. Those who disagree with Lenin's strictures against the "Left" Communists in Germany and Britain, after reading his book, can, I think, only do so on the grounds that they have knowledge and facts at their

command which he has not. So far as his objective logic is concerned, as he understands the facts of the situation, it is masterly.

Lenin is unsparing with his rod of iron on those who permit emotion, or the "purely" intellectual subjective processes of the mind to work out "fixed" universal formulas of action, idols of their own making, to be rigidly followed no matter what the fluid and changing conditions of distinctly different concrete social situations may be. The attractions and dangers of fixed formulas are that they tend to act as substitutes for observation and thought; on the other hand, the objective method entails constant observation and thought and possible change in tactics.

In the active political life of mass movements and the disposition of parties this leads to "daring" tactics and to walking on the thin ice of opportunism. Lenin distinguishes between the compromise of the patriotic Socialists with the bourgeoisie during the war, which was treachery to the working class, and compromise such as the Bolsheviks made in signing the treaty with the Germans at Brest Litovsk in order to preserve the gains of the Russian revolution. He also gives many other instances when, he says, the Bolsheviks compromised with advantage by forming temporary alliances with opposing parties, both before and after the October revolution. Whether the political developments in other countries, and the strength in numbers and understanding of the Communist movement in them, warrant the Communist parties adopting those tactics, as is urged upon them by Lenin, is a matter so gravely in question that the Communist movements in Germany and Britain are split over the matter. In any event, whatever of significance the history of the Russian movement holds for them, the primary deciding factors should be the conditions special to their own countries.

Lenin attacks the "Left" Communists of Germany for their tactics in leaving the old conservative trade unions, their advocacy of "non-participation in parliamentary activities," and of "no compromise," also for making a distinction between "leaders and masses." To Lenin, trades unions, parliaments, compromise and leaders are instruments to be made use of as occasion requires in the interests of the revolution.

Quoting statistics as to the rapid growth of membership in trade unions, he says that they are just the organizations where the masses are to be found and to fear their conservatism "and try to avoid it, to jump over it . . . indicates a lack of confidence in the role of the proletarian vanguard to train, educate and enlighten, to enthuse with new life, the most backward groups and masses of the working class and the peasantry. . . . For the whole of the Communist problem is to be able to convince the backward, to work in their midst and not to set up a barrier between us and them, a barrier of artificial childishly 'Left' slogans." (Emphasis Lenin's.)

Dealing with the question of non-participation in parliaments, and the reason given by the "Lefts," that "parliaments are worn out," he (in part) says: ". . . parliamentarism is historically worn-out" in a world-historical sense, that is to say, the epoch of bourgeois parliaments has come to an end; the epoch of proletarian dictatorship has begun. This is incontestably true. But the scale of the world's

history is reckoned by decades. Ten or twenty years sooner or later . . . from the point of view of world history it is a trifle. But this is just why it is a crying theoretical mistake to refer, in questions of practical politics, to the world-historical scale. How is it possible to say the 'parliament is worn out,' when millions of proletarians not only stand up for parliamentarism generally, but are directly counter-revolutionary? . . . It is evident that the 'Left' in Germany have mistaken their desire, their idea-political attitude, for objective reality. This is the most dangerous error which can be made by revolutionaries." Elsewhere, he says: "They (the 'Left' in general) . . . naively mistake the subjective 'denial' of a reactionary institution for its destruction in reality by the united forces of a whole series of objective factors. . . . Participation in parliamentary elections and struggle on the parliamentary platform is obligatory for the party of the revolutionary proletariat, just for the purpose of educating the backward masses of its own class, just in order to awake and enlighten the undeveloped, down-trodden, ignorant masses. Just so long as you are unable to disperse the bourgeois parliament and other reactionary institutions, you are bound to work inside them, and for the very reason that there are still workmen within them being made fools of. . . ." "Tactics," he says, "should be constructed on a sober and strictly objective consideration of the forces of a given country (and of the countries surrounding it, and of all countries, on a world scale), as well as on an evaluation of the experience of other revolutionary movements. . . ." He points to Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht in Germany, and Z. Hoglund in Sweden, as examples of a truly revolutionary utilization of reactionary parliaments, and sees no reason, with the growth of the revolutionary masses, why a communist faction could not be hammered out in parliament to carry on a stubborn struggle to expose, disperse and overcome the bourgeois-democratic illusions held by the backward masses of the workers and peasantry. In this chapter he gives a short but graphic history of Bolshevik parliamentary activity to illustrate his argument for parliamentary activity; as indeed he does on any phase of Bolshevik activity as it bears on the subject of each chapter, so that the book is valuable for its historical contents and dissertations on the revolutionary struggles in Russia.

In regard to the "Left" slogan of "down with the leaders," Lenin gives several pages of serious consideration to it, including with it an explanation why he thinks it is necessary, even after the revolution, for a length of time determined by the disappearance of the corrupting influence of petit-bourgeois ideas, for a Communist party to act as the political vanguard of the proletarian masses. This party leadership question, however, is I think with us in Canada, a remote one. In one passage he makes fun of the slogan as it relates to individual leaders as follows: "It is especially comical that instead of old leaders who have a common-sense viewpoint on ordinary matters, new leaders are put forth (concealed under the slogan of 'down with leaders') who prattle supernatural nonsense and spread confusion."

(Continued on page 4.)

The S. P. of C. and the Third International

AFFILIATION with the Third International (The Present Economy opens in a new and improved Single copies old and much discussed question Capitalist Productive onus is upon those desiring affili- Chapters, "Capital," in the Parties tactics to produce (cloth bound), \$1.00; 15¢. (1) In telling us how affilia- Socialism, Utopian, Socialist Party of Canada or 15¢; 25¢ copies, \$3.25. in Canada; (2) increase our Slave of the Farm, take us more revolutionary, and \$1.50. the present conditions warrant a

Manifesto, S. P. of C.
Copies of the position of Local Winnipeg No. 3 Red European question, it is necessary to correct false (1) of those within our ranks remind them that there is room within the Socialist movement for analysis and criticism of parties and individuals, without the assumption that he who dares to criticize is a traitor to the movement. Reminding them also that there is a vital difference between the critic and the individual who uses his knowledge for personal gain. The charge of moral cowardice is another feature that can be avoided; (2) the false impressions that are being circulated by the "kept press" regarding our decision of non-affiliation (as they are also using the decisions that have been reached by the many political working-class organizations in Europe) namely, as propaganda against the Bolsheviks, against whom much ink has been used in fabricating stories and misrepresenting facts. The Socialist movement can solve its own differences without the advice of the capitalist press and without the need of its assistance, either in "explaining" our philosophy, or distorting the differences arising from tactics.

The working-class movement the world over is undoubtedly stimulated by the measure of success that has been attained by the Russian workers, and differences that with regard to tactics in gaining control, are far from being in opposition to the Bolsheviks, or antagonistic to the Third International, but arise out of the differences in the class-consciousness of the workers in other lands, in relation to the power of their capitalist masters.

The first clause in the conditions for affiliation says: "The dictatorship of the proletariat must not be spoken of simply as a well learnt formula, etc." What does this mean? The dictatorship of the proletariat must be propagated as an object to be obtained, notwithstanding that in the highly organized and industrialized countries, when the workers gain control, the period necessary in the elimination of the capitalist class may be of a short duration! A passing phase, and not a long drawn out struggle compared to the common ownership and the democratic control of the means of wealth production and distribution. If this is so, then how illogical it is, to teach the dictatorship of the proletariat, or speak of it, not merely as a well learnt formula.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is a phrase that is used in two ways: first, as a dictatorship of the workers as a vast majority, and, secondly, a dictatorship of a small minority who belong to a small party controlling in the interests of the workers. As used by some "Reds" it implies that by direct action on the part of a small but class-conscious minority it is possible to gain control in a highly developed capitalist state, with its army and navy and its perfected instruments of coercion. This shows the need for a clear understanding of the meaning of words and constantly repeating the meaning implied.

That the tactics of the Third International are highly colored by pre-revolutionary Russian conditions is clearly shown, whether as applied to the agrarian programme or the advocacy of militant demonstrations of the masses in the cities. The success of the movement in Russia has produced the idea that similar methods are inevitable to the emancipation of the workers in different parts of the world, irrespective of the conditions that may prevail. This is to be regretted, for it thereby predicts that every country must go through identically the same phases in every detail. This of course can be denied when we remember the case of Hungary and the establishment of Soviet rule there, even although

it was overthrown later by force of the allied powers.

While the Third International urges the use of parliamentary action, yet it is considered of secondary importance to the development of mass-action in the form of insurrections, strikes, and open civil war. The position of the S. P. of C., being a political party, educational in character, is that it uses the parliamentary institutions existing, for educational purposes, development of class-consciousness, etc. This position has been maintained by the realization that the means that will be adopted by the workers in their emancipation will depend upon the measure of class-consciousness combined with the intensity of their conditions. There is yet much spade work to be done by a Socialist organization, in the making of Socialists, in the spreading of knowledge, as the best means of protecting the Russian revolution, and in changing the system under which we live.

While the Third International has laid down the ruling of rupture with reformism, centrism, social pacificism, etc., and the need of such a clause presupposes advances to organizations of doubtful revolutionary character, yet the Executive Committee of the Third International have allowed non-revolutionary bodies to affiliate. The late John Reed in an article printed by the "Workers Dreadnought" January 1st, tells us that the last convention of the Third International had delegates from all parts of the world. It reads as follows:—

"German Spartacists, Spanish Syndicalists, American I. W. W., Hungarian Soviet and Red Army Leaders, British Shop-Stewards, and Clyde Workers Committees, Dutch Transport Workers, Hindu, Korean, Chinese and Persian Insurrectionists, Irishmen, Sinn Feiners and Communist,—Argentinian Dockers, Australian Wobblies. All these people were not clear on Communism, they had violently divergent ideas about the dictatorship of the proletariat, parliamentarism, the need for a political party, but they were welcomed as brothers in revolution as the best fighters of the working-class, as comrades that were willing to die for the overthrow of capitalism."

What a mixture of ideas. And the problem is, having strict rules and regulations, how is it possible to bind such a conglomeration of ideas into a cohesive force. The mixture of ideas presupposes breadth and latitude in rules and regulations, which, if not allowed, a condition will arise to further splits and confusion, or another Second International.

To fully elaborate upon all the objections to affiliation would take both time and space. So, for the present we will condense same into the form of resolutions that have been passed by Winnipeg Local No. 3:

REASONS FOR NON-AFFILIATION WITH THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL OF MOSCOW.

- (1) The Dictatorship of the Proletariat should not be advocated as an object, when in highly developed capitalist countries its duration may be short-lived.
- (2) That the Third International Executive Committee have allowed non-revolutionary bodies to affiliate.
- (3) That the tactics laid down as a whole are largely Russian in character, drawn up for the specific purpose of dealing with countries that are in open civil war. This condition does not apply to either the U. S. A. or Canada.
- (4) That to support all liberation movements in the colonies, is a policy of bourgeois nationalism, and is not the business of Revolutionary Socialism.
- (5) To adopt tactics, advocating rupture with reformism, centrism, social pacificism, etc., are unnecessary to a party based on the fundamental knowledge of the Revolutionary Class Struggle, which the Socialist Party of Canada has been engaged in propagating since its inception. The adoption of this feature in tactics presupposes the Third International has appealed to organizations of doubtful revolutionary character, and thereby have acted in contradiction to their own clause.
- (6) That the struggle for political power in Canada centres around the education of the masses in

which parliamentary action should be used.

(7) That any minority action would be illegal, necessarily resulting in an underground organization, in which avenues such as the use of parliamentary action, in elections, open forum meetings, use of the mails, would be denied us, therefore limiting our educational facilities in reaching the masses.

(8) That world tactics to overthrow world imperialism in which latitude would be given, to the varying political and economic conditions prevailing in each country, could only result from a well organized cohesive body, representative of delegates elected from the revolutionary organizations of the different countries, with a thorough knowledge of the conditions prevailing.

(9) That the agrarian programme is not compatible with highly developed countries where the Socialization of the land may be accomplished simultaneously with the socialization of industry.

WINNIPEG LOCAL No. 3

LETTER.

Comrade Editor:

In 1917, when from tortured Russia the news came that the working class there had accomplished the overthrow of their masters, we of the S. P. of C. were thrilled. We drank deep in the wine of our Russian comrades' achievement, and since, as each successive assault of enraged capitalism failed to shake the wall of proletarian knowledge and courage, we have gloried in that failure.

That was the psychological effect of the Russian revolution, and the value to the struggling workers of the world cannot be overestimated.

Nevertheless, we must not allow enthusiasm to outstrip reason, and in this proposal to join the Third International, Comrade Editor, we are falling into the error against which Comrade Lenin has warned us, namely, copying the Bolsheviks. At any rate, the sponsors of this proposal seem to have accepted a dictum which reads: "If it is good enough for the Bolsheviks, it must be good enough for the S. P. of C."

Comrade Kaplan, in his letter opening the discussion, places before your readers three main objections to joining, and then proceeds to sweep them airily aside, thus: "Sooner or later it will be necessary to proclaim the internal solidarity of the international movement."

Now, I might ask, since when have the spokesmen or press of the S. P. of C. ceased to proclaim an identity of interests and ideas with the Marxists of the world?

Further, there are groups affiliated with the Third International whose ideas and interests are diametrically opposed to the interests of the working class. From the article entitled "The World Congress of the Communist International," by the late John Reed, we find the congress was composed of German Spartacists, Spanish Syndicalists, American I. W. W., Hungarian Soviet and Red Army leaders, British Shop Stewards, Clyde Workers Committees, Dutch Transport Workers, Hindu, Korean, Chinese and Persian insurrectionists, Argentine Dockers, Australian I. W. W.

All these people were not clear on Communism. They had violently divergent ideas about the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, Parliamentarism, the need for a political party, but they were welcomed as brothers in revolution, as the best fighters of the working class, as comrades who were willing to die for the overthrow of capitalism.

Even the Communist balks at some of the above as comrades. The Glasgow Communist Group in its platform suspends its support of the Third International until such time as that body repudiates its "wobbling" on the question of Parliamentary Action, Workers' Committees, Industrial Unions, and other reformist or reactionary measures for which the group will not stand.

The logical result therefore, once we become affiliated with the Third International, is to unite forces with the very elements which have fought in the past. This is a step in a retrograde direction, and one which would give comfort to the...

Reparations

THE Council of Reparation is tardily following the world along the lightless path of progress. It has, at long last, discovered the old truism but homely axiom: that "all that glitters yellow ain't gold." The index of that discovery is the now historic '42 year instalment. Time was when we entertained the opinion that the partly and gifted gentlemen of the Council would have "arrived" sooner. Well, perhaps three weary years is none too long for the completion of such a task—from their point of view. Now that the trusted nut is broken, we fear, in due time—the elderly ones will make an interesting discovery: that the kernel will not be so luscious as was anticipated. Indeed, one might almost imagine our Solons are faintly apprehensive of an eventuation. So nearly are they approaching reality. And, in spite of many disappointments, still have hopes—even of the capitalists. (I sigh to think what unkindly remarks this may occasion.) Nevertheless, this 42 years scheme is the best device the circumstances will allow. For, if it were possible for the capitalist class to act together, to individual and international differences for yet a longer, it might play Falstaff to bounteous fate. Oh, fateful "if." In this verdancy of "original sin" how hardly can we escape the law.

Reparations are to be paid at all, clearly they not be paid in gold. Payment then, must be in commodities. And with a 50 per cent. (or more) decrease in German exchange, what a mighty volume of commodities is connoted in the new bill of reparation. But commodities, unlike parliamentary theory, are not of the fabric of the summer atmosphere. They require the solid substitution of natural resources. And if world resources in such amount are to pass into the "Fatherland," truly, the "hunnish Hun," in defeat (?) will place a heavy yoke of dominion upon our democratic situation. Furthermore, if "German sausage" is to enter the world market in volume, as indicated by reparations, surely must allied industry perish, the ownership thereof. How then?

By dilution. That is the new Christ of capitalist salvation. Let such and such amount be carefully filtered into German domain, and let it return to the market,—manufactured with the speed of madness, beloved of capital,—in accordance with formulae of absorption. Then, presto, is the returned. The juicy fruits of exploitation, that have accrued to the "unspeakable" Prussian, are now sorted into channels of allied (principally British) violence; home industries are not disrupted by being over-supply; the "free" workers are kept a class just on the bread line, yet above the pernicious influence of "red agitation," labor misrepresentators may indulge in the gymnastics of arm and democracy, childlike, may sweetly slumber under the shadow of the Jack and the soaring eagle. But alack, the forementioned, original misfortune of capital that it cannot move in its own defence, except on a percentage. Shakespeare and Holy Willie, it puts the first quon on the shakedown—invariably. And it is now being that if "money talks," accumulated percentages rends the earth with its violence. For the peroration of profit, the warring nations were forced the quicksands of unlimited credit: in reaction, limited credit is now forcing capital to the same sacrifice of profit. For credit is not liquid; it is not the virility of real wealth. It is a draft on tomorrow, a mortgage on future production, and increases the continuance of slaves in their slavery. Wage-slavery is entirely dependent on market expansion, yet, conversely, the market cannot expand, because productivity and machinery have diminished the purchasing power of wage slavery. Hence, when the stakes are greater than available resources, there can be but the bursting of the bubble.

That is the position of society today King David has overdrawn his account on the social ledger, and can only pay with a cheque.

At the conclusion of the great war, every nation had a burden intolerable, a debt of unheard-of magnitude. But it must pay that debt,—if capital-

ist society is to continue its existence. It is the endeavor to lay the foundation for repayments to retain and control the promised—or visioned—wealth for which the war was fought; that is the cause of the psychical acrobatics of the Economic Council. To pay, every nation must secure a vaster market. Production must be speeded up, output per unit increased, mass value lessened, to the end that more commodities be sent out than are taken in.

But restriction placed on German entrepreneurs boomerang on the allies; they react on allied business. For the market of the world is the nations of the world themselves, and if expansion to the utmost limit is required, the utmost limit of individual capacity is implied. In totality, eventually, they can only send abroad to each other exactly what they import from each other. They cannot all export more, and import less. They may redistribute the market of the world, but they cannot increase the market of the world. And in proportion as competition cheapens production, increases productive capacity, and reduces wages, in just that proportion is the effective market diminished. And furthermore, in the same manner as the competition of individual capitalist groups eliminates the less effective and smaller capitalists, so the competition of giant imperialisms, for world dominion, completely dissolves the political individuality of the small nations transforming them into hand-maidens, and servitors of imperial profit.

The scheme of reparation involves the vassalage of Central Europe. But to bind Central Europe to the chariot wheels of allied high finance is an impossibility, because it delimits the profit by which alone capital exists. And the further ad valorem on German exports would act as the E. P. D. did in Britain—put a brake on production. To restore Central Europe means the restoration of its commerce, the par evaluation of its exchange. In turn this implies freedom of world resources and the cancellation of war spoils and obligations. But to renounce those things, the objective of the world war—is to denounce capital.

The plain fact is, that just as industrial capital displaced the old trading merchant, so now Imperial finance is supplanting the industrial capitalist. But that is the closing act of capitalist society. For society can dispense with finance, but not with industry. It can live without gold, but not without goods, and if the production of necessities is thus strangled in the grip of finance, society, out of its dire necessity will find a means, swift and effective, of loosening that grip. So far as the ruling class is concerned, history is written in vain. Like the Bourbons it learns nothing. It thinks it is a law unto itself. Nevertheless, its end is in sight. The economic of the machine moves steadily on to its climax, dispassionately irresistible as the flowing tide in the wake of its necessity.

It is this direct contradiction between the necessity of world capital for greater production, and the necessity of individual capital for less production, that now involves the world in crisis and stagnation. It is this contradiction that compels Imperialism to sacrifice immediate gain for future interest. But the sacrifice of the present for the future carries with it the sacrifice of the lesser interests, the smaller capitals, the struggling business. It means the centralizing of capital—of the means of production—into a few all-powerful combines, the reduction of the social life standard, the lessening of the number of actual producers, and at the same time the increase of the parasitical hangers on. And generally, it means that the proletariat, in the very near future, will be confronted with the alternative of war for the profit of the master class—or, the taking of the means of production for society.

What Europe is now,—a broken, bankrupt and dismembered hulk, staggering in the throes of unrecognized revolution, suppressed and bound by every device of reactionary and political domination, is an object lesson of import as dread to our masters as it is bitter to suffering Europe. The black night that has fallen there must react here and work out the conditions, accelerated by local reactions, whence another flag can flutter over the "greatest democ-

cracy on earth." To save themselves the American capitalists will act. They will stick at nothing to preserve their "rights"—and they will act promptly. Their one way of escape—temporary though it be—is war. How that challenge will be met, who can say? R.

THE S. P. OF C. AND THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL

(Continued from page 2)

Again, Comrade Kaplan says: "The nature of the crisis of such an avowal at this crisis, would be the Communist Party, repression." What crisis, in so far as the working class are concerned? The only crisis to understand at present is the scarcity of jobs. The same error appears in clause 3 of the "Theses" where it states that the class struggle is entering a new phase of civil war.

The facts are well known. The workers here and in America are voting for capitalism, supporting capitalist institutions and accepting wage reductions with scarcely a murmur.

Finally, in clause 3 of the "Theses" we are told that we must "create everywhere a parallel illegal apparatus."

N. Lenin is very emphatic regarding this illegal apparatus. In section 12 of the "Theses" (Note*) it says: "For all countries, even for the most free, 'legal' and 'peaceful' ones in the sense of a lesser acuteness in the class struggle, the period has arrived when it has become absolutely necessary for every Communist Party to undertake systematically both legal and illegal political and illegal organization." Quite a different attitude toward the activities of the S. P. of C.

As Comrade Kaplan says: "The only support of the Communist Party is the support of the proletariat, and to say that the only support we are in a position to give them is the making of Socialists within our sphere of influence, and in my opinion, joining the Third International is one way of delaying that."

So let us cease basking in the sunshine of our Russian Comrades victory and get on with the business of educating our class to an understanding of Marxian Socialism.

CHARLES STEWART.

*Editors Note: This is a quotation, not from the "Theses" outlining the conditions of affiliation to the Third International, but from section 12 of "The Fundamental Tasks of the Communist International," by N. Lenin, adopted by the Second Congress of the Third International.

SOVIET NEWS ITEMS

Moscow, Jan. 16th (Rosta Vienna).—The funeral of the well-known Russian chemist Karpov may have caused the counter-revolutionaries to believe that Lenin was dead, because about 10 years ago Lenin used the pseudonym of Karpov.

HERE AND NOW.

Following \$1 each—Wm. J. Harper, J. Patton, Harry Johnston, Tom Erwin, D. Lewis, S. Griffith, O. Erickson, Joe Naylor, D. and S. Smith, F. K. Morris, N. Booth, R. F. Mackenzie, Dr. Curry, D. G. S. Thomson, J. V. Hull, A. Baig, P. T. Leckie, Jim Lott, Geo. Wallack, J. E. Belhumeur, A. J. Hoicka, G. Gerard, J. Bone.

Following \$2 each—Sid Earp, F. J. Connett, J. H. Greaves, A. T. Rowell.

J. Sinclear, \$7.20; Wm. Hoare, \$4.

Above Clarion subscriptions received from 19th to 23rd February, inclusive, —total, \$42.20.

Western Clarion

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

Published twice a month by the Socialist Party of Canada 401 Pacific Street East, Vancouver, B. C. Phone Highland 3638

Editor Ewen MacLeod

Subscription:

Canada, 20 issues \$1.00
Foreign, 12 issues \$1.00

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

VANCOUVER, B. C., MARCH 1, 1921.

STATUTES OF INTERNATIONAL AFFILIATION.

question of Third International affiliation discussion among our members brings to us enquiries, much comment, and general evidence of widespread interest. In some of the discussion is still proceeding, in some the discussion has reached the conclusion of the eight points, while in others it appears to have hardily emerged from the initial stages. Local Vancouver members have exhaustively examined the terms of affiliation clause by clause, reaching the end of the "Theses" at their last meeting. Local Winnipeg No. 3 appear to have concluded their argument as their contribution, published in another column in this issue will show. We hope to be able to publish the views of the minority section of local Winnipeg on this question, and shall do so as soon as we will send their point of view on the question which they have not yet done. We do not know how far the discussion has proceeded in Victoria and Edmonton. Calgary appear to be through their discussion on the question that some of our members are able to contribute to the discussion.

Calgary, Alta., February 10th, 1921

Editor, Clarion:
Would like information on following points, either editorially or through your contributors.

- (1) The number of conditions for affiliation with the Third International as submitted to French, German and Latvian parties was 21. The "Clarion" published 18. What are the others?
- (2) What provision is there for the enforcement of conditions other than the submission of programmes to congress? Or are they on the other hand a series of recommendations to be carried out as our inclinations suggest and circumstances permit?
- (3) What need for or advantage is there in affiliation with any European party? In what way as a matter of organization does it enable us to work more efficiently?
- (4) Is it possible to affiliate accepting some conditions under protest until next congress permits further discussion of them?
- (5) What is the Fourth International? Has it issued any statement on principles and tactics? What parties so far have combined to form its nucleus?
- (6) Re condition 8. What is an "oppressed nationality"?
- (7) In what way can conditions 4 and 5 relating to propaganda in army and rural districts be realized or treated as other than recommendations?
- (8) How are we to discuss the acceptance of "illegal work" in the columns of the "Clarion"? I ask because I want to know.

F. W. THOMPSON.

In answer to question No. 1, we quote the following from "Statutes and Conditions of Affiliation of the Communist International," as adopted at the Second Congress of the Third International. This is published by the Communist Party of Great Britain.

19.—All those parties which have joined the Communist International, as well as those which have expressed a desire to do so, are

obliged, as rapidly as possible, and in no case later than four months after the Second Congress of the Communist International, to convene a special congress in order to discuss these conditions. In addition to this, the Executive Committee of these parties should take care to acquaint all the local organizations with the regulations of the Second Congress.

20.—All those parties which at the present time are willing to join the Third International, but have so far not changed their tactics in any radical manner, should, prior to joining the Third International, take care that not less than two-thirds of their committee members and of all their central institutions consist of comrades who have made an open and definite declaration, prior to the convening of the Second Congress, as to their desire that the party should affiliate to the Third International. Exceptions are permitted only with the approval of the Executive Committee of the Third International. The Executive Committee has the right to make an exception also for the representatives of the "centre," as mentioned in paragraph 7.

21.—Those members of the party who reject the conditions and the theses of the Third International are liable to be excluded from the party. This applies particularly to delegates at the Special Congress of the Party.

These extra conditions are addressed to parties like the Independents of Germany and the French Socialist Party, lately weaned from the Second International.

Question 2.—We cannot here place any interpretation upon the clauses in the "Theses." However, we hope to be able to publish in the next "Clarion" issue the "Statutes of the Communist International," which outline the basis of representation of parties affiliated with the Third International.

Questions 3 and 7 we leave to our contributors, and concerning question 4, we must refer Comrade Thompson to the "Theses."

Question 5.—The "Fourth" International simply comprises the effort to revive the Second. The Congress of the Second International held in Geneva, last July, requested the British Labor Party to approach "other Socialist parties" with a view to re-establishing the Second International. The British Labor Party is now fulfilling that function. They are sending out documents signed by Arthur Henderson (Labor Party), J. H. Thomas (Trades Union Congress), H. Gosling (Trades Union Congress) and J. Ramsey MacDonald (British International Secretary). We understand that the main supporting parties are the British Labor Party and the German Social Democratic Party. Their statements on principles and tactics are tinged with a little post-war grief and professions of good intentions. Generally speaking they but confirm our often repeated opinion of the Second International, which we hardly need to re-affirm now.

Question 6.—An "oppressed nationality" is instanced by G. Zinoviev in "Pressing Questions of the International Labor Movement" as Ireland, India, Egypt.

Question 8.—We leave this question to the sagacity of Comrade Thompson.

VANCOUVER "SMOKER."

On the night of the 11th February (and the morning of the 12th) the male members of Local Vancouver suspended for a night the serious analysis of events and world problems, and devoted themselves to bright enjoyment of cheerful song and story, and they incidentally, in the process, consumed a magnificent quantity of beer—72 gallons to be precise—the "nearest" they could get.

Many strange faces were seen in the hall, and while this was the first "smoker" held since the dull dog days of a few years ago, all hands voted it an enjoyable evening, and accordingly a successful event.

Songs, recitations and instrumental items were heartily appreciated, and the perfect arrangements of Comrade Earp and his committee brought forth warm approval from all. The Clarion Maintenance Fund was not forgotten, the surplus over expenditure being \$26.65, which has been received for the maintenance of the "family-journal,"

"LEFT WING COMMUNISM," AN INFANTILE DISORDER.

(Continued from page 1)

Table of Contents.

- 1.—In what sense can we speak of the international significance of the Russian Revolution?
- 2.—One of the principal conditions of the success of the Bolsheviki.
- 3.—The chief stages in the history of Bolshevism.
- 4.—Who were the enemies within the working class movement in the struggle against whom Bolshevism grew, gained strength, and became betrayed?
- 5.—Left Communism in Germany: leaders, party classes, masses.
- 6.—Should revolutionaries work in reactionary trade-unions?
- 7.—Should we participate in bourgeois parliaments?
- 8.—No Compromise?
- 9.—Left Communism in Great Britain.
- 10.—Some conclusions.

Appendix.

- 1.—The split of German Communist party.
- 2.—Communists and Independents in Germany.
- 3.—Turati and company in Italy.
- 4.—Incorrect conclusions drawn from certain premises.

5.—Letter from Wijnkoop.
P.S. Reader—The Honorable Editor, he strikes in a pugilistic tone: "This is not a review of Lenin's book!!" And on second thoughts thought, "neither it is." Gramercy! So much there is in the book of disputable matter now held under straitment in the Party, that to use it, I could hardly escape the charge of partizan abuse of a review. Go then! Buy, beg, borrow or steal thou the book, and thyself review it.

*Note:—"Left-Wing Communism, An Infantile Disorder." By Nicolai Lenin. 117 pages. Paper cover. Published by Marxian Educational Society, 541 Jos Campden Avenue, Detroit, Mich., U.S.A. Price (American) 50 cents.

PLATFORM

Socialist Party of Canada

We, the Socialist Party of Canada, affirm our allegiance and support of the principles and program 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 increasing stream of profits, and to the worker, an ever increasing measure of misery and degradation.

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

The irrepressible 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 organizing the Socialist workers for the purpose of attaining 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.

Farmer's Forum

THE FARMERS' WHEAT POOL.

CAPITALISM is still active, ever changing the general outlook, and continually driving certain factors to the fore, forcing conditions upon society that command the attention of serious thought in order to find a solution.

The tumble in grain prices has cast a gloom over thousands of farm homes. Farmers claim title to the most progressive force in Canada today, yet we find them still marching to the same old tune of endeavoring to eradicate the disease by leaving the patient to die.

The crafty politicians connected with the farmers' movements are weaving a web to trap the hay seeds that drop through the sieves of discontent. Lift the embargo on cattle; abolish the tariff, and pool our wheat, says the elected manipulator, and save the farmers from ruin. Look back upon the good old days when Cobden and Bright brought prosperity to the British people by adopting free trade. Yes but whom were the people? The corn laws of Cobden's time protected the landlords by way of rent extracted from tenants owing in a measure to the high price received for corn. British woolen manufacturers were competing on the world's markets with Flemish woolen factory operators. Labor power had to be bought, and the value of labor power is determined by the food, clothing and shelter required to reproduce the laborer's energy. British employers had to pay sufficient in wages to buy high priced corn. In order to conquer the woolen market the British capitalists must have a system of free trade. Imported corn free would be cheaper than the home product, hence the reason for the agitation to abolish the corn laws. The profit-hungry got busy and dangled bread before the wage workers, like the carrot before the donkey, asking them to vote for the big loaf. Voting for the big loaf carried, and wages were reduced, lowering the value of the factory product when the British capitalists were enabled to oust their Flemish competitors from the world's market. Great prosperity for the manufacturers, and more misery for the fooled worker. The tariff question is a matter between various capitalist groups, and has nothing to do with hearing whatever on the average farmer or wage worker.

United Farmers are much perplexed at the state of grain prices, and are bent on the proposal of a wheat pool. Capitalism is based upon the ownership of the means of production and distribution, and by virtue of this ownership they control the government and state institutions. Farmers will find it difficult to solve anything, so long as capitalism is in the saddle.

Supposing farmers exclusively agree to take the responsibility of the disposal of 1921 crop. What are the obstacles?

Our banking institutions are capitalistic, from which farmers must draw credit in order to do business. The nation will not be behind the farmers unless something can be gained politically for the present rulers. Nations that will be most likely to buy from the farmers' pool will be Germany, Austria, Italy, Poland and perhaps Greece. Those nations are all practically bankrupt. Canada gave a credit of \$20,000,000 to Roumania and Canada has not been able to collect the interest, never mind the principal. The "North West Farmer," Feb. 5th, 1921, gives the following schedule of the value of European money in Canada in cents.

	Present	Normal
French franc	8.32	19.3
Belgian franc	8.73	19.3
Swiss franc	18.05	19.3
Italian lira	4.28	19.3
Greek drachma	9.40	19.3
Norwegian crown	22.58	27.0
Danish crown	23.05	27.0
Swedish crown	25.00	26.8
Austrian crown	.40	20.5
German mark	2.08	23.8
Spanish peseta	15.70	19.5
Dutch guilder	38.00	40.0

When we consider the above list and note the exchange rate of the money of our prospective customers, to whom can the farmers look for the

price of their wheat. Our Canadian capitalist can say we will pay you for the wheat sold in Canada to meet the requirements of the nation, but the wheat you sell to Europe is your business, not ours. Farmers will be responsible for their own contracts, and capitalists will stand off in the event of the failure of the wheat buying nations to pay.

What about England? We could sell the major portion of the 1921 wheat crop to the mother country. Yes, that may be so, but our mother country has hatched out more chickens than she is able to cover, and we have no guarantee of her solvency.

The Bank of England is paying her obligations practically in paper, on the authority of the British government.

C. H. Norman, in an article written on the "Hidden Causes of the Financial Crisis," says that the Bank of England reserve fell from a ratio of 52.4 per cent to its liabilities, to a ratio of 9.6 per cent in December 15th, 1920. British Government securities have also depreciated to \$1,750,000,000. Figures to hand show that our dear old mother country, in order to protect her chickens, must spend at the present rate annually a sum equal to \$160,000,000 in Mesopotamia, \$45,000,000 in Palestine, \$45,000,000 in Egypt, \$30,000,000 in Constantinople, \$250,000,000 on the Rhine, and \$110,000,000 in Ireland. The British national debt is \$40,000,000,000. Her annual expenditure, according to British reports, \$4,500,000,000; population 47,000,000. Five per cent war loans have dropped from 92 1/4 to 81 1/2 during the year 1920. It looks as if our mother country is in the jackpot.

Now, Mr. Farmer, I don't like to be too pessimistic, but when the financial map is considered, do not then be surprised if you only receive the initial instalment on the sale of your pooled wheat and have to fiddle for the balance.

Socialism is present day society's solution, and farmers should study the Socialist philosophy, which reveals the secret of modern slavery and protects farmers and other workers from being in the position of the donkey and the carrot, or the wage worker and the big loaf.

GEO. FATON.

Physical Force

THERE are those who consider that force, and force alone, will solve the many and various problems that are generally lumped together under the heading of the Unemployment problem. And they are to be found among the bourgeoisie to a greater extent than among the proletariat.

These innocents are apparently quite unaware of the fact that economy is the social dynamo, and force simply the lever by means of which new economies clear old ones from the path of progress. They also fail to realize that force is only truly efficient when used in harmony with economic progress. When used against progressive movements force does but expose the fact that the prevailing order is not a "natural" order in the sense that it is an order which naturally commends itself as being in harmony with the prevailing mode of production and the general well-being of society as a whole.

An order which must use force may only be considered "natural" (ambiguous term) from the viewpoint that it is, on account of the temporary weakness of the progressives, the only possible order for the time being.

This assertion, that force is only truly efficient when used in harmony with social progress, may be disputed by many on the grounds that force has been and is being used effectively by those whose interests were and are of an anti-social nature. This is true. But it must not be forgotten that this tactic, while temporarily bringing the desired results, also points as clearly as only object lessons can point to the anti-social nature of the order which demands it. Its ultimate deficiency, therefore, must be considered as being greater than its immediate efficacy.

This, however, by no means implies that the use of force against progress, in the shape for example of the Proletarian Revolution, is simply a result of bourgeois stupidity. With many of the bourgeoisie it is. But others there may be who realize the ultimate futility of such methods, and still use them. A

proletarian paraphraser of Omar Khayyam's "Rub-aiyat," explaining the quandary of the bourgeois charity mongers, summed up the matter very neatly in the following lines.

"Think not they give because to give is good;
They give because they must. What can they do?"

Our tender hearted Liberals would do well to consider those lines. The bourgeoisie does not descend to the use of lies, perjury, imprisonment, torture, and bloody murder, because to do so is good in itself. It descends to these methods, or rather has always lived on the moral plane, such methods, because, in order to uphold what it can only consider the best of all possible systems, it must use such methods.

The wide-eyed astonishment with which the Liberals and Social Pacifists receive the news of the serving out of machine guns to the police; of the organization of citizens' revolver clubs by the Chambers of Commerce; or of the donation of money for target practise expenses, by a Rotary Club to a police force—as happened recently in Seattle as a result of a meeting called for the purpose of discussing ways and means of "dealing with" (more ambiguity) Unemployment problems—this wide-eyed astonishment is simply an indication of the child-like simplicity and ignorance in political matters of the Liberals and Social Pacifists, whose chief function at this juncture seems to be that of deluding the backward section of the Proletariat with the ridiculous idea of the "conciliation of the classes."

To the Marxist, however, such news neither causes astonishment or dismay. Rather does he accept it as merely one more proof of the soundness of his theory, the theory of social progress through class struggles. He knows that the ever-increasing productivity of labor has resulted, and still results, in an ever-increasing stream of surplus value—profits—for the Master, for he knows, none but things the price of labor-power is based, not on its utility, but on its base of Production. He knows that the economic and political power of the Master class is to dominate the masses in direct proportion to the surplus value created, and that he knows that the bourgeoisie is not bridgeable, and that the classes are not bridged, but destroyed, utterly and completely.

The Marxist, however, does not become brave with the bravery of hysteria when he sees or hears of these blue steel promises of the struggle to come. He knows that an intelligent minority can do much for the masses behind it. He knows that human foresight, will and courage, can work wonders, if the time is ripe. He is a canny warrior, is this Marxist of ours. As far as it lies within his power to do so, he will choose his own time, conditions, and methods. And he is not altogether helpless in this respect, as a study of the revolutions of the past shows well.

So just at present he refuses to become excited about Citizens' Revolver Clubs, preferring to use them as object lessons in the field of propaganda. That they will prove more effective for that purpose than for the purpose for which they are intended by the law-abiding bourgeoisie is more than likely. The Marxist, therefore, considers intensive propaganda and organization to be the order of the day. Propaganda, to the end that an ever-increasing army of rebellious slaves may clearly understand the true nature of the task ahead. Organization, to the end that the blind forces of social progress may be bent to the unconquerable will of the aroused and conscious masses. Realizing that these very forces are themselves mutely prodding his fellows forward in the direction he wishes them to take, he struggles on with considerable assurance toward the position from which he will be able to say, as Engels said:

"Kindly fire the first shot, gentlemen of the bourgeoisie."

D. B.

Materialist Conception of History

FOR BEGINNERS

LESSON 10.

IN the civilized countries of the ancient world, of which Rome was the greatest in extent and power, the workers, as a general rule, were chattel slaves. These slaves like those of recent times, —e.g., in South America, did not sell themselves for the day or hour like the modern wage-slave, but were sold for life. The modern workman sells himself piecemeal. The chattel slave had a guarantee of existence, however miserable. The master had an interest in maintaining his property, just as the owner takes care of his horse, to feed and shelter him. The modern worker has no guarantee of existence. He has become the property not of an individual, but of the capitalist class. In a later lesson we will compare the conditions of the various slaves, chattel, serf, and wage-slave.

"Adams' European History," dealing with the fall of the Roman Empire, says:

"The decay of Rome was economic, the universal use of slaves, which is a very wasteful means of production, and the scarcity of laborers, with difficulty of keeping the land cultivated, the right of the master to sell his slave, was forbidden, and the slaves were given access to little pieces of land, which they were required to cultivate, turning slaves into serfs. The state did not do this in order to improve the condition of the slave, the sole object was to keep up the supply."

"Origin of the Family," points out that the general poverty, because population had been reduced by sheep and the decay of the land, forced them into serfdom and serfdom. "Slaves did not pay for their freedom, they were given it as a gratuitous sting."

"The Roman Empire," says: "The Roman Empire had been the property of the owners had been themselves with favored body-guards and an army of slaves and field workers. After the collapse of the Empire many of these had been freed, yet still felt the need of a master, remained near the ancestral castle, in which a baron or a lord lived as absolute ruler, knowing no authority but his own, holding a high court of justice in his hall, issuing laws and levying taxes on passing caravans, or ransom for prisoners, sometimes obtained in fair war, sometimes by falling on peaceful travelers. The distinctive feature of feudalism was just this unbridled rule of a military leader and landowner."

Another writer says: "The increased population caused by the barbarians' invasions rendered Roman and German slavery unprofitable and necessitated the substitution of a more productive system."

When the Roman Empire fell, the Empire of Charlemagne rose, but it was not a united government that could be maintained, because of the difficulty of communication from one place to another. The result was, that each locality was thrown upon its own resources to supply, not only what it needed in the way of goods, but also what it needed in the way of government. This economic condition gave local independence to the Count or Baron, and the establishment of feudalism with its form of political organization. The social chaos made central government impossible. When Charlemagne conquered the enemies of Rome after the fall of the Empire, he identified himself with Christianity and finally went to Rome, was crowned by Pope Leo III.; he acknowledged the spiritual supremacy of the church. This was the beginning of the Holy Roman Empire, which led to the contests in after years between Emperors and Popes for the sovereignty of Europe. The linking with Charlemagne changed the church from its anti-militarism to militarism, which led to some of the bloodiest persecutions ever recorded in history.

The papal indulgences stimulated the military spirit, and for two centuries it proclaimed war with the unbeliever and represented the battle field as

the sure road to heaven. I may point out that Emperor Constantine in the year 312, six years after his accession to the throne, realized the Empire was on the verge of collapse. He turned Christian to win the wealthy and influential priests to his side, and get control of the Christian organization. The church was turned from a revolutionary movement into a pillar of wealth and exploitation. "This ambitious Emperor," the historian says, "a baffling combination of good and evil qualities, who founded Constantinople, the murderer of his own wife and son, was keen enough to see the decaying of Rome and the rising force of Christianity, turned Christian, loaded the church with privileges. He authorized the Christian bishops to constitute themselves as arbiters in civil matters, he exempted the church from taxation and yielded portions of the imperial domain. At first the church was a republic, there was little or no distinction between clergy and laymen. A committee of presbyters or elders with a bishop for chairman, administered the affairs of the Christian community. The Bishops began to monopolize the theological discussions and met together at various councils to discuss discipline and dogmas. Rome became the headquarters of the new organization. Christianity was now incorporated, and gradually the elders were turned into priests. The church delegates decided by a free for all fight that Jesus and God was one, at the Council of Nicea in the year 325. In 381, the council of Constantinople, in another fight, pounded the Holy Ghost into these two to make the trinity. The church came into the possession of lands by the congregations transferring their titles for protection and receiving these lands back in trust for their lifetime. Gradually the people became the serfs of the church. In the year 475 Bishop Salvianus denounced this practice as robbery, but in the 8th century this robbery had become a universally established custom in the dealings between the church and the peasants. Just as the German chiefs, after the downfall of Rome had stolen the land of their followers, so the church stole the land and wealth of its unprotected members. The church property had been originally considered the patrimony of the poor, but the church appropriated the greater part of the fund. Emperor Charlemagne attempted to reintroduce the portion for the poor, but after his death the church came forth with forged documents which pretended to show that the wealth of the church was originally intended for the clergy and that by "poor" was meant only priests that had taken the vow of poverty.

Engels also deals with this robbery in his "Origin of the Family." We will strike up against the church all through history, because it controlled a good deal of the land upon which the serfs were exploited.

Feudalism was inaugurated in England by William the Conqueror, who invaded the country in 1066. The feudal era lasted from the 10th to the 14th century. Feudalism had spread into all lands conquered by the Teuton tribes, before it reached England. William of Normandy introduced it into England in its perfection. He as conqueror, claimed the right to all the land and gave to whomsoever he pleased estates, on condition of receiving in return—military service or money. The Normans' first thought was building castles, which became the Barons' residences. The typical feudal castle was an enormous building, either round or square, without ornaments or architectural style, and generally built on a hill. It was pierced by a few loop holes from which arrows could be shot, and had a single gate opening on a moat which could only be crossed by a draw-bridge. It was crowned with a battlement where pitch or melted lead could be thrown on the heads of attackers.

Kropotkin, in "Mutual Aid," says: "The chief of a tribe was elected and only had authority in battles, but as progress in industry advanced in trades and callings, these were handed down from father to son, so those chosen as chiefs or judges evolved

in family descent. The Norman families of Europe held this position. The chiefs' house became the place of defence just like the Baron's castle."

Herbert Spencer says: "Baron in the Roman language means, a strong man, doughty warrior; this indicates the military character of feudalism."

The military duties in defence of the feudal communities interfered with the agricultural pursuits of the community, therefore they paid in kind, and inaugurated a standing army. Previous to this settled state, William the Conqueror raised an army by the soldiers receiving an equal share of the spoils.

When Pope Innocent III. wanted to raise an army against the Albigensis in the 12th century it was only necessary for them to be promised a division of the spoils.

William the Conqueror took a census of the country and its economic condition, which is tabulated in the Domesday Book, to ascertain the capabilities of the country in regard to military defence and for taxation. The Manor system that prevailed when William the Conqueror took control, had developed to the stage where feudalism begins—William putting his Norman barons in the place of the Manor Lords. Before going further we might as well give a summary of the previous economic condition of England.

The Roman invasion, in Julius Caesar's reign, B. C. 55, was for the purpose of obtaining slaves for the Roman market and ravaging the fertile plains making the inhabitants pay tribute to Rome. Under Roman rule trade prospered through the development of the natural resources. "Roman writers," De Gibbon says, "speak of the rich natural products in minerals, especially tin, and its numerous flocks and herds of cattle. In the middle of the 3rd century there were 59 cities and 10,000,000 of a population, a figure which it did not again reach until the 19th century."

When the Romans left Britain in 410 A.D. trade and towns decayed and England became a battleground of various continental tribes; the Jutes 449, Saxons 447. After this mixture of race became settled, they were disturbed by the invasions of the Danes, who were forced through the barrenness of the cold north to improve their conditions, and became pirates and sea rovers through economic necessity. Although Egbert became Lord of the Saxons in 827 it was not until Edgar's reign, 958-975, that England became united, but internal strife prevented any great growth of trade and commerce. The separate communities endeavored to supply their own wants. As salt was largely required to salt their meat for winter, and it could not be universally procured, local markets arose on the boundary line, marked by a boundary stone, the origin of the market cross. There the various communities used to barter with one another.

The population was mostly agricultural, and a landless man was outside the pale of social life. The tribes which made up the English nation at this time held land in common. Each tribe cleared land and, separated by a fixed boundary mark, each member had a house and a common share in the land. The land was of three kinds.

1st—The forest or waste lands, for rough pasture, and uncultivated.

2nd) Pasture land, sometimes enclosed and sometimes open, in which each man looked after his own hay and stacked it for winter; this was divided up into allotments for each member.

3rd—The arable land was also divided into allotments for each markman.

To settle any dispute relating to the division of the land, they met in a common council. This was a democratic institution based on the economic methods of production. Then there arose the Manor system, which is believed to have been gained by the lord of the manor giving protection against invasions of other tribes. The lord owning the land, the people carried on agriculture collectively, but instead of a democratic community of government, it became autocratic. The land was divided up in

parts, giving the members a share of the good and bad land. They pastured their cattle on the commons, and employed a common swine herd or shepherd for their pigs and sheep. De Gibbon says: "The manor system paved the way for feudalism, the lord of the manor taking the artisans of the village around the manor under his protection from the invasions of the Danes, so when William the Conqueror arrived he had little trouble in reorganizing the system into continental feudalism, giving the manor to the Norman lords who helped him to conquer the country."

Therefore feudalism was ushered into England. The people were neither lordless nor landless; they worked so many days on their own land and so many days on the lord's land. There were however, free men, believed to have evolved from the system of charging money rent instead of rent in kind. That is, instead of the serf paying rent by laboring on the lord's land he paid it with money. The landlord did this because he received the same amount in rent although it was perhaps a bad harvest; therefore some serfs became free.

The introduction of money as a medium of exchange one historian has said was the first nail in the coffin of feudalism. That medium became an economic necessity when industry had developed to the extent that barter of goods became a hindrance, therefore the economic factor becomes dominant when we bring the subject down to the last analysis.

Next Lesson: A Continuation of English History
PETER T. LECKIE.

Class Antagonisms

A class antagonism within society, having its basis in the social form of wealth production and class control of the factors in the process of producing and distributing wealth: the factors, machines, material, mind and muscle.

The workers' energy of mind and muscle, the sum of all their efforts, useful and necessary, employed to produce things of need and demand.

The raw materials would continue to be raw and useless for ever and anon unless human effort was expended to bring them within the sphere and influence of wealth production.

The machines or tools are really a sum of past expended labor-power, stored up potentially, and which, released into activity, consume themselves by transforming their worth or values into the products which they assist in producing, conveying no other value than the sum of their worth spread over the total of the products produced in their lifetime.

The sum of the energy of the workers employed—"social energy"—produces values much greater than the amount consumed by the workers in the process of production: as a few shovels of coal into the firebox of an engine will release energy to pull many tons of material over a given distance; hence a surplus of values which is broken up into many allotments, confusing to the workers as they go by: the names of "legitimate profit," "reasonable rent," or "fair interest" (one might as well say a "round circle," a "dead corpse," or a "black negro"). The facts remain, they are values wrung from the bodies of the workers.

The factors, machines and material, at first, considering the process historically, are simple and more or less personal, but as society grows and the circle of economic experience widens, the inventive genius of man becomes greater, these factors then become complex and impersonal, and the process itself involved and interdependent, and as such can only be considered as a whole.

We Socialists consider the "sphere of production" abstractly, to be more or less correct, because it is social, associative, collective; it is in the plane of distribution that anarchy and chaos prevail. And it is the straightening out of this contradiction between collective or social effort in production and individualistic ownership or control of the means and the products produced, that will be our constructive policy.

Meantime the capitalist as a class own and control the factors of wealth production, by virtue of the fact that law says so and custom sanctions; since they are too in possession of the State, the judic-

lary and administrative forces which enact laws and set customs.

The legal code, its constitution laid bare, is simply a series of definitions and regulations of property rights and relations. And the machinery of the State is there to enforce and defend these definitions and regulations by the power of the sword; prison and privation; the fear of hell and the public power of coercion.

The realities are, the workers' energy of mind and muscle; the machines and materials, the process itself are parts of the complete system.

Labor energy assuaged its proper value, the proportion will be found a necessity to socially control and direct the social function of wealth production and distribution to the well-being of all. And the solution of this proposition is the task of our future Socialist legislators.

Capitalistic State control is necessarily static; on the other hand the function and nature of wealth production is dynamic and in line with scientific thought, releasing new energies, stone, bronze, iron, coal, oil and radio-activity. Capitalistic productivity is for profit for the few at the expense of the many.

"Why labor at a loss

For the profit of a boss?

Get ready to labor for your own."

Capitalistic productivity for profit, at this stage of social development, makes it a drag on further progress, if the truths of science and philosophy are to become a benefit to human society.

Monarchs and Popes may have suppressed Reason and Truth in the past; now our so-called educational systems, constitutions, culture, axioms, and maxims are hindering, if not suppressing, progress today. It is painfully evident that the present class control of wealth production and distribution withholds inventions, hinders technological advance, contradictory as it may seem.

Take, for instance, powerful group control of national governments, financial institutions, and railroad interests, preventing the use of automatic couplings in England because of the expense entailed in scrapping the out-of-date hand coupling and installing the new, automatic air appliances of today. Thereby causing tremendous loss of life and limb among railroad workers.

Powerful interests buying up patent rights and withholding them from being exploited: withholding for speculative reasons; and others, certain natural resources.

Religious interests blocking the efforts of still more from introducing modern science and logic into school curriculums. All of which could be multiplied indefinitely, because labor is cheaper and more abundant, while the initial expense in the installation of the most scientific labor-saving devices is so great; the returns in profit too far distant—indeed can not be expressed in terms of their culture at all.

Social labor-power driven by the struggle to live, in operation produces social values, but with the breaking down of the class barriers, the application of all our social knowledge would produce social values estimably greater since the object would be not the greatest good for the greatest number but the greatest good for all. But capitalism can only achieve this whenever it is profitable in terms of their economic culture, which is the greatest barrier confronting mankind.

There is nothing so deep as Ignorance, and nothing so shallow as the tricks employed to keep us in that state.

DONALD STEWART

What Socialism Means

SOCIALISM may be divided into three general classes, Christian, Utopian, and Scientific. In order to successfully understand one form of Socialism we must understand them all and their relationship to one another.

Scientific Socialism is a philosophy based upon a knowledge of economic laws operating throughout the social system. It is also a name given to express a future state of society as distinguished from the present form of capitalist society. Dealing with

Socialism in another sense, it is a movement for disseminating knowledge among the workers with a view to educating them to their class position in society so that they may act intelligently towards the abolition of private ownership of the means of production and distribution.

Socialism founded upon the teachings of Karl Marx is scientific because class means to the requirements of all that go to make a science. In it, there are three fundamental class biases: the materialist conception of history, the class struggle, and the accumulation of indisputable fact.

The term Marxian is applied to the steady Socialism because, owing to its scientific nature and its employment in the class struggle, is a valuable one sure, but the workers.

There are a number of people who call themselves Christians and propound a doctrine derived from the teachings of Christ. They tell us that the members of the church are the children of God and all are equal in His sight. They also assert that if the world were ruled by brotherly love, crime and misery, prevalent in human society, would be at an end, but they entirely overlook the economic factors which bring such things about. This brand of Socialism is not dangerous to a master class. In fact it is quite helpful to such a system of exploitation in so far as it confuses the minds of the workers, and leads them to look to a supreme being for relief, instead of relying upon their own strength.

During the days of the Roman empire, when the great mass of the people were reduced to the condition of slaves, there was no bright outlook as to a more equitable arrangement of society, and the future looked hopeless. The Christian religion with its bright hereafter in heaven for all sufferers on earth, therefore became the accepted faith of the slave. This religion, for a long time, was a thorn in the side of the master class, but was later won over to the State by the action of Constantine, who, in order to further his own ends, became converted.

Utopian Socialism is one of an idealistic nature which endeavors to elevate the whole of society. It is a school of thought which considers material conditions as being the fruit of the human mind, and seeks to remove social antagonisms by truth, justice and understanding. Some Utopians do not think it necessary to abolish capital or wage slavery. Others form local communistic societies in an effort to escape the ill effects of capitalism. In this class may also be listed those who have mapped out a detailed chart of the formation of a future state.

Two of the earliest writers of Utopian theories were Morely and Mably. Morely, in his book "The Code de la Nature," was the first to systematically arrange the Utopian ideas in regard to Communism, as advanced by Plato, Sir Thos. More and others. He stated that the Creator intended that man should dwell in a communistic society because it was the one social form under which the happiness of mankind was secure.

Mably in his work, "Doubts on the Natural Order of Society," says that the private ownership of land was the source of all social evils. This was quite natural at this period when agriculture was the chief means of gaining a livelihood. He advocated the abolition of this form of ownership, and of the institutions which had necessarily arisen therefrom.

The conditions prevailing in France some years prior to the revolution, and the want and misery among the masses, were the natural factors which gave rise to the Utopian doctrine. Francis Noel Babeuf, who was born in the department of the

(Continued on page 8.)

