

WESTERN CLARION

A Journal of
CURRENT
EVENTS

Official Organ of
THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

HISTORY
ECONOMICS
PHILOSOPHY

No. 841 Twice a Month VANCOUVER, B. C., APRIL 16, 1921 FIVE CENTS

Concerning the Exploitation of the Farmer.

FARMER'S LETTER.

Youngstown, Alta.,
March 14th, 1921.

Editor, "Western Clarion."

Dear Comrade,—I wish to ask you a question which I wish you would publish in the "Clarion" so that the ordinary farmer can understand it.

Marx says that all commodities exchange at their value, and that all exploitation takes place at the point of production. Now assuming this to be true, then where is the farmer exploited? Of course we understand where the laborer is exploited, and can show how, but this question as to the farmer being exploited at the point of production is cloudy to a good many, even to some of the propagandists who have visited us; they seem to give some kind of an explanation but they have not made it clear.

Taking the explanation of Marx, that all exploitation takes place at the point of production, and that all commodities exchange at their value, taking that theory for granted then, where and how is a farmer exploited—where? Supposing the case of a farmer who owns his farm and machinery, and is doing all his own work, and he raises 1000 bushels of wheat; he naturally has the full product of his labor and consequently is not exploited as yet. Now if all commodities exchange at their value, then when he sells his wheat at its value he is not exploited at either one of these points; now if he is not exploited as yet then where is he exploited, and how is he exploited at the point of production?

P.S.—Please make this explanation as clear as possible, as there are a good many of the Comrades here who cannot give any explanation at all on this question.

I will now give you an idea how I see it, and I wish you would send me a typed letter in which you would give me corrections on my explanation. You can publish my questions above and also answer the same in the "Clarion," but as I am continually arguing on the Socialist movement, it becomes necessary that I should be in a position to give a thorough explanation, so I am going to tell you how I have tried to make this clear. Of course I have not openly explained or tried to explain this question, but in arguing with comrades who have studied more or less of social philosophy, I have explained the question as follows:

Taking for granted that all exploitation takes place at the point of production, then the farmer owning his farm and machinery is exploited by the parasites by the assistance of nature at the point of production owing to the fact that his occupation is very uncertain, e.g., the farmer works his land and machine himself, and owing to the elements of the weather he receives no returns. (Now this would seem that he had performed unnecessary labor, but this is not the case as the labor was necessary to produce a crop, but, owing to the fact that he had no control of nature and could not have been conscious of the fact that the weather was not going to be favorable to crop raising.)

Now under the present situation he must stand the loss of his labor individually, and it is here where the parasites such as lawyers, judges, sheriffs, bailiffs, and collectors, etc., get in their work. So that when the farmer gets paid for his labor by nature, then he sells his commodities at their value and turns the proceeds of such a sale over to

the parasites; this is where and when the farmer is exploited at the point of production (not by nature but by the parasites, assisted by nature). This explanation is not quite satisfactory to me, because it seems to me that the parasites are robbing the farmers, owing to the fact that he received no value for his product from the parasites, but neither does labor get any value for the surplus labor power expended by them. Now in case you see any flaws in my explanation, I wish to have them made clear to me. Please refer my letter to the teacher of the economic class at Vancouver, as I should like his explanation on this question. Hoping to receive an early answer, I remain,

Your comrade,

H. A. WIERTZ.

"GEORDIE" EXPLAINS

It would appear that the farming community is discontented, and, in particular, that the small farmer has troubles of his own. This latter person loudly insists that he is being robbed and ordinary observation would seem to indicate that something is happening to him which has that effect.

It is notoriously true that his condition is worse than that of any town laborer who worked so assiduously or who had the good fortune to be employed so continuously. Many of him are of the opinion that co-operation, tariff adjustment, extension of government control and credit, or some other form of political thimble-ripping will ameliorate these conditions. For these reasons farmers' associations and political parties are being formed. I am not at present concerned with this aspect of the question, except to say that it is to be expected that a class having such well defined interests would seek to express itself politically. What I am interested in is the fact that in a country such as this in which the class of small farmers is so numerous the Socialist movement has had to take an interest in the farmer question; has attempted to explain that question in the light of Socialist doctrines, and has conducted a certain amount of propaganda in the farming districts.

Now, as appears from a letter published in this issue a certain amount of confusion has been caused by the fact that much of this propaganda is based upon certain premises which, to my mind, are fallacious. It has been represented that the farmer is in some sense a wage-laborer or is to be classed with the wage-laborer and, as such, that he is exploited at the "point of production." It is further maintained that this is the only way in which he can be exploited, seeing that commodities exchange at their values.

Now, if the term "exploitation" be understood to cover any means by which the ruling class appropriates the surplus value produced by others, then we may admit that the farmer is exploited, but not in the same manner as the worker, seeing that he is quite obviously not a wage-laborer. Whatever may be the similarity in his condition he is not in the same economic position. He does not sell his labor-power for wages. On the other hand, he owns the land he works (the fact that he has a mortgage proves he is its legal owner); he finds his own capital; he employs labor (intermittently perhaps), and he sells his product in the (more or less) open market.

The small farmer is, therefore, an "independent small producer" (Marx) and, if he is to be classed with others at all, must be classed with that welter of small contractors, petty business men and what-not which ekes out an existence on the fringes of the capitalist class.

As to the second point, it is simply not true that commodities individually exchange at value. Speaking generally, such a thing is impossible. Theoretically, it would be a contradiction of the law of value and, in practice, the facts are against any such assumption.

Commodities are bought and sold at prices which fluctuate about what Marx calls the "price of production," that is to say, the expenses of production plus the average rate of profit. The effect of this is that in those industries, such as agriculture, which have a low composition of capital, the price of production and, consequently, the market price of the product is below value. On the other hand, in those industries which have a high composition of capital, such as the manufacture of machinery, transportation, etc., the product is sold above its value. A capital of "high composition" is one which employs a high proportion of constant to variable capital, and vice-versa for one of "low composition." All of which is to the effect that the farmer sells his product below its value and pays prices above value for what he buys.

The position of the farmer, however, is much worse than this. The price of production includes the average rate of profit and, as we shall see, the small farmer does not get this, not to speak of rent which, being a form of surplus profit arising under favorable circumstances, I shall, for the present, neglect.

The small farmer, in most cases is working at the margin of cultivation, on "no rent" land and his capital is limited by reason of his poverty.

On this point Marx observes that:

"Each line of business develops . . . a normal size of capital, which the mass of producers must be able to command. . . . Whatever exceeds this, can form extra profits; whatever is below this does not get the average profit."
—"Capital," vol. iii., page 791).

Again on page 784 he says, speaking of differences in land:

"It is a mistaken assumption that the land in colonies, and in new countries generally, which can export cereals at cheaper prices, must for that reason be necessarily of a greater natural fertility. The cereals are not only sold below their value in such cases, but below their price of production, namely below the price of production determined by the rate of profit in the older countries."

And again, page 936:

"For the small farmer the limit of exploitation is not set by the average profit of capital, if he is a small capitalist, nor by the necessity of making a rent, if he is a landowner. Nothing appears as an absolute limit for him, as a small capitalist, but the wages which he pays to himself, after deducting his actual costs. So long as the price of the product covers these wages, he will cultivate his land, and will do so often to the physical minimum of his wages."

One more quotation along this line from page 807:

"In the case of colonists and of independent small producers in general, who have no command at all over capital or at least command it only at a high rate of interest, that part of
(Continued on page 2)

Marx's Method

IN the minds of those slaves who recognize their slavery and have some idea of how to break its shackles, the name of Karl Marx calls forth such ideas of authority and correctness as does none other. This is because his analysis of capitalism, his conclusions as to its development and outcome fit in with the stern irrefragable facts of their lives. They see it work. These manipulators of objective spades and spanners have arrived at a test for truth, what the foolosophers and conscientious word-jugglers have diligently striven for but never attained through centuries of attempts to crawl into their own heads. They ask an outrageously practical question: "Will it work?" And Marx's analysis does work; so the working stiffs like it.

But what enabled Karl Marx to develop a system of political and economic thought that really works? Some thoroughly good scientific Socialists have succeeded so far in their effort to make Socialism perfect Greek to the stiff as to say that the root of the Socialist philosophy is the "Hegelian dialectic." This is a false notion that has sprung from Engel's conscientious payment of the "unendurable debt of honor" to the Hegelian school. What's more, it no more explains the roots of the Socialist philosophy—even to a high-brow—than does the supposition of a Creator explain creation. It simply imposes the Moses-ship of modern thinking on the shoulders of poor Hegel a monstrosity of which he is quite innocent.

Scientific Socialism is the outcome of a certain set of conditions. Its political nature proceeds from the class struggle; its scientific nature from the growth of modern science. We are looking at the scientific side. The scientists used to crawl into their heads, too, to find out the qualities of matter, just as the modern sky-pilots do to find out the qualities of men. And when they looked into their heads instead of out of them, they came to some very astonishing conclusions, as might be expected. We'll take some historically interesting examples. The old chemists or alchemists who tried to learn things by examining their own consciousness more than they did the things, decided that everything in the world was made up of four elements, fire, air, earth and water. They called the fire element phlogiston, and discussed it very learnedly as became their position. When a thing burned the phlogiston flew out; this accounted for the flame and the increase in weight. But some things such as zinc get heavier when they are burned; so the "scientists" had to say that in some things the phlogiston weighed less than nothing, and consequently its separation increased the weight of the thing burnt. Altogether they were fairly well muddled over the matter. But along came a sort of rebel chemist, Priestly (some loyal Britishers with hearts of oak and heads to match burnt his house and library because he thought the Frenchies did well in giving Louis XVI, a sure cure for dandruff). He did something very nasty and radical—he started to do less thinking about things and more looking at them. The result was that in 1774 he discovered a new gas, oxygen, and that when things burn they unite with this gas from the air, the combination usually disappearing as a gas, making the weight of the ash less, but sometimes staying right on the spot making the weight more. Phlogiston, the fire-spirit, hung his tail between his legs and crept back, back into the heads of the metaphysical scientists so far as to never come out again. Chemists in general started to do less thinking about things and more looking at them; the result is the modern science of chemistry, a science whose conclusions work. The foundation of every other science is similar. The branch of biology that deals with cells was put on a solid working basis by Virchow in 1858, when he smashed the old speculative notion that cells develop out of a formative mother liquid, and showed that each cell develops out of another cell; he did this by watching things. Wallace and Darwin gave the old philosophic idea of evolution a scientific working basis not by mere specula-

tion, but by systematizing facts. Scyell put physical geography on its feet when he showed that the earth's formations are not altogether the results of monstrous accidents, but of the everyday forces we see around us; he did this by observing things.

One could give examples of every established science. But the purpose is only to indicate the basis of scientific method. Scientists do not juggle with words; they observe and classify facts; the results simply have to fit in with the facts. What man has discovered has been by dint of observation, not by any God-given peculiarity of speculation. This method of thinking is called by the lovers of long words, the pragmatic or empirical method. It might quite as pragmatically and empirically be called common horse sense.

It is Marx's method. When Marx developed a science of economic and political thought, he did not go into his own consciousness to discover the internal verities of humanity. He followed the method of every other science; he observed and classified facts. And insofar as his observation was wide and his classification careful enough, his conclusions necessarily fitted in with the facts and worked. In his work he has painstakingly avoided word-juggling and zealously striven to build all on uncertain facts. His theory of surplus value is founded on the unmistakable phenomena of the labor process. He was a close student of blue books and all manner of statistical analyses. In political theory the one important addition that he made to the Communist Manifesto of 1848 is an observation that he made of a new fact—the Paris Commune of 1871.

As a thinker he set himself to solve certain problems. To solve them he used a method that every school child recognizes as invaluable, but that foolosophers generally disregard. It is to state the problem as accurately as possible and then develop the terms in it—to translate the terms in the problems that are really but symbols of facts, into the facts that they symbolize.

The expansion of the terms of a problem is a method also used by the metaphysicians—but in doing so they carefully avoid expanding the terms into facts, they expand them into more terms. As David Hume says: "It is usual for men to use words for ideas and to talk instead of think in their reasoning." There is a very nice school of bourgeois essayists who can thus "prove" any conclusion they desire by the simple but learned method of juggling with the derivations of words.

Proletarian twiddlewaddle is somewhat less scholarly. Instead of derivation it uses revolutionary watchwords and sectarian shibboleths. Proletarians have actually been known to employ the Biblical, honest-to-God, parson-like method of taking a text from their bible, "Workers of the world, unite!" and from it build up the entire tactics of world revolution. On the other hand, Lenin strictly follows the Marxian method of observing facts instead of juggling our ideals and desires; his conclusions have fitted in very well with the facts; he is practical, pragmatic. Take him in tactics: "We in Russia have convinced ourselves by long, painful and bloody experience, of the truth that it is impossible to build up revolutionary tactics solely on revolutionary dispositions and moods. Tactics 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." (Left Wing Com., Infantile Disorder). The Bolsheviks take very much after him: the Kerensky government issued some beautiful words saying certain letters should be dropped from the alphabet; but they were not dropped until the Red Guard went into the presses and confiscated them.

We have the shibboleth worshipper with us everywhere. He pleads for "democracy" no matter how much it prove itself "damn mockery." He howls

for dictatorship though there be none to dictate. He urges parliamentary action. He leads us to the promised land with a cloudy day and a pillar by night of "Direct Action" without troubling to state the characteristic of the action, or the precise object against which it is directed.

But in this year of grace 1921, it is perhaps better to busy ourselves not in biting at those with whom we sublimely disagree; but rather to acquire our fellow slaves with the method of scientific thought. How would this system of expanding the terms of a problem into the terms that they symbolize affect the solution of our daily problems? Take that one about "the right to work." It shows that "right" means "privilege" and that to work under capitalism is to be exploited, then it clearly follows that "the right to work" means "the privilege of being exploited." Its ethical emphasis is surely solved, its very real privilege stated in matter of fact terms. Or again take that one: "Capital and labor cannot get along without each other." Expand the term "capital" and "labor" into terms that express their real relation: "The exploiters and the exploited cannot exist as such without each other." It is evident truth; but the realization of the latter form might bring forth different actions than the realization of its former form. But there is a common use by the sons of toil of this method of stating their problems more realistically, might tend to seriously injure the glorious institutions of modern civilization. So let's quit.

CONCERNING THE EXPLOITATION OF THE FARMER.

(Continued from page 1)

the product which stands in place of wages (his revenue Of course, he tries to sell (his product) as high as possible; but even a sale below value and below the capitalist price of production still appears to him as a profit unless this profit is claimed beforehand by debts, mortgages, etc."

It appears, then, that what the farmer gets is wages. These are apt to be low, for several reasons. First on account of the somewhat low standard of living which obtains, largely due, no doubt, to that prevailing in the country of origin of many settlers. Secondly, to the fact that the farmer's wife and family assist in the farm work. And thirdly, to the fact that the farmer raises some part, at least, of his own sustenance.

There are, further, other reasons why the small farmer is poor. The various corporations which sell him things he must have, such as railroad transportation, elevator service, machinery, fuel, binder twine and such like, are possessed of more or less complete monopolies in their several lines. These monopolies, fortified by advantageous tariff rates, enable them to sell their commodities at prices not only above their value but well above price of production. They can, and do, charge all the traffic will bear, realizing in the process enormous surpluses.

Now, in spite of all these apparent contradictions the law of value holds good. Total prices cannot exceed (normally) total values and, by the same token, total profits cannot be greater than the total of surplus values. If, therefore, one section of the capitalist class is able to grab all the profit, other sections must do without, and it would appear that the small farmer and his congeners are the unfortunates, who go shy.

All of this goes to show why it is that the farmer is so susceptible to reform propaganda, but it also proves that, so long as the capitalist system lasts, by virtue of the economic laws governing that system, the farmer has nothing to hope for in the way of a substantial improvement in his condition.

C. M. O'BRIEN DEFENCE FUND
Previously acknowledged, \$94.35. J. Costello, \$1.50; John Nelson, \$2. Total to and including 12th April, \$97.85.

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

The discussion upon the terms of affiliation to the Third International has, up to the last issue of the "Clarion," consisted of a critical analysis of the 18 points in so far as they applied to the country. It has remained for A. Kohn, who is a member of the Party, though he was employed as an organizer for Local Winnipeg, to take part in the discussion, not in the manner of other contributors, but in a spirit of hostility to the Bolshevik Party, the Soviets, and above all the Dictatorship of the Proletariat.

To do this he has resorted to mis-statements and to misconstruing of excerpts from the writings of prominent Bolsheviks. According to him the call of the Third International utterly ignored the necessity of Socialist education preceding action, yet we find that the terms of affiliation demand the daily dissemination of Communist propaganda. He then quotes Lenin on tactics, and denounces this teaching as unsound, basing his judgment on parliamentary elections in England and in Winnipeg elections in which "after the war" patriotism and the newly granted female franchise played quite a part. Of course Lenin has only had the experience of a revolution and is thus limited as compared with Kohn. Dealing with the Dictatorship of the proletariat he says "Why all this stress upon a phrase that has become popular since the Russian revolution, it, as Radek says, it only applies to backward countries." Radek does not say so, but on the contrary says the opposite.

Kohn then inserts an excerpt from Radek's "Development of Socialism from Science to Practice," and emphasizes certain words for the express purpose of twisting the meaning of the paragraph.

He then says: "Here we have the dictatorship denoted as unnecessary in the advanced countries, and by such a prominent Bolshevik official of the Third International as Radek." If the "Clarion" readers will strike out the emphasis he has placed under certain words, and instead emphasize the words "Were otherwise" at the beginning of the sentence, the distortion becomes apparent.

Then again: "Why make as your object and instead upon propagating a condition which must, in the very nature of emancipation be a brief transitional stage?"

Why not preach brotherly love, instead of telling the workers that as by force they are held in subjection, so by force must they maintain themselves against reaction, until the last spark of bourgeois reaction is crushed?

The idea of the Proletarian Dictatorship seems crude and uncomfortable to some of our revolutionary (1) Marxists, who no doubt pray for the transition to take place whilst they are away for a week end holiday.

The same opposition is noted in his reference to the Soviets. They are apparently not perfect. They may even be captured by reactionaries. True! He cannot say that they are not functioning, because they are in existence as State organs in the only country in which the revolution has taken place.

His doubt as to whether Soviets, or Workers' Councils, are really necessary, is shown by his statement below in reference to the hostility of Political Democracy:

"Further, this attitude of hostility to political democracy is backed up by reference to the failure of parliamentary action, which up till now has not been Socialist parliamentary action, but the action of workers supporting their enemies!"

I heard the same argument put forward by J. R. Clynes, M.P., one of the most reactionary of the so-called labor M.P.'s, in defense of the parliamentary institutions during the debate on Direct Action as a means of forcing the Nationalization of Mines, March, 1920. Any freak organization or reform party can put up that defence of the parliamentary institutions.

There is, however, a difference between Kohn's capture of political power by way of parliament, and Communist parliamentary activity for the purpose

of exposing its uselessness to the workers, as outlined in the programme of the Third International.

His ability in piecing together clippings from papers, quoting portions of statements, and generally twisting the same to suit his purpose, might be all right in the occupation of an A. J. Andrews, but it has no place in the working class movement.

I would suggest to Kohn that those in Russia are working as well as theorizing, working against odds which are not lessened by criticisms such he has delivered during the past two years.

To come to Comrade Harrington's article: He says we must face the facts. That is true, and though he may put forward the contention that my first argument "would go a long way towards having our application rejected, should we apply," the fact still remains that one cannot apply terms to conditions which are non-existent.

Concerning the position of the Party, Comrade Harrington says: "Still, as a matter of actual fact Marxism, as we interpret and expound it, is a method of understanding social institutions, their development or decay, and therefore if our position was sound in the past, it must be equally so as long as we maintain it, theoretically or practically."

Marxism, as I understand it, is something more than the foregoing. It is also the application of the foregoing for the purpose of organizing the working class for the capture of political power.

If the explanation of social phenomena comprised Marxism, then the Rand school of Social Science, of the Plebs League, or organizations of that character, could carry on all the work necessary in that sphere.

As a political party we are out to organize the workers in order to conquer the Powers of State. Inasmuch as the Party officially is not an advocate of parliamentarism, we are necessarily forced, if we intend to function, into the organized masses of workers in order that our work may bear fruit.

The relevancy of my objection to his argument against clause 2, in which he questions the utility and states that the bitter struggles would hamper, and in the end nullify our educational work, is questioned.

If a demonstration of the superiority of one concept over another is not relevant to educational work, to what is it relevant?

In Comrade Harrington's review of "The Communist Bulletin," he introduces a thesis from that on "Trades Unionism and the Communist International," adopted at the Second Congress, in opposition to clause 2 of the terms. As a matter of fact the thesis simply outlines what the experience and practice of the industrial struggle has already taught us, and is an explanation of tactics in connection with clauses 2 and 9.

"Recent events in local history" are not restricted to taxpayers refusing to increase appropriations. The action of Mayors and Councils in Vancouver and Winnipeg during the strike of 1919, impress the workers more than that of the taxpayers.

To come to clause 8: If quotations from statements of prominent members of the Third International can be used to define certain clauses, if the quotation from Lenin is to be accepted, there is then no occasion for Comrade Harrington to emphasize all colonial liberation movements.

There is a vast difference between the Quebec and Boer secessionist movements and those in the other dependencies. There is no threat to vested interests in the above mentioned, whilst it is very much in evidence in the case of the revolting colonies. In this connection the Manifesto of the Third International also has this to say:

"On the other hand, in contrast with the yellow International of the social-patriots, the Proletarian Communist International will support the plundered colonial peoples in their fight against Imperialism, in order to hasten the final collapse of the Imperialistic world system."

I must take exception to the method used in analysing tactics. Quoting me as follows: "Every success of a revolting colony against an Imperialist State weakens the power of that State," Comrade Harrington says: "Historically we find the reverse is true. To take but one example—Britain's loss of the American colonies left her in a more powerful position than at any period in her history, and so far as dealing with revolution at home goes the loss would no doubt leave her weak, and these same causes might give her ample means to crush a revolution at home."

To parallel the loss of a revolting colony prior to the Industrial Revolution to a similar happening at the high tide of capitalist imperialism, is to stretch the Marxian method to its limits.

That the loss of the American colonies improved Britain's power is extremely debatable. America was a market for textiles and that market was closed for some considerable time. Dealing with the machine breaking riots in 1779 Hammond says in "The Skilled Laborer": "Trade was depressed in consequence of the war with America, and the new factories and the jennies that turned a number of spindles were looked on as partly responsible for the want of work."

It was the Industrial Revolution which made Britain the most powerful State of the 19th century and not the loss of colonies.

The loss of colonies by revolt at this stage of capitalist development, means a loss of surplus values. State power necessarily develops and decays in proportion to the rise and fall of surplus wealth accruing to the ruling class.

The loss of Ireland, India or Egypt would not only mean the loss of a market, if that did result, but would mean the loss of interest upon investments in the shape of foodstuffs, raw material, etc.

Apart from the fall in revenue, which directly affects State Power, the adverse economic situation created by such a happening tends to imperil the State from within.

I find nothing in any of the terms applicable to the country to which I could object. If the Bolsheviks are Marxists, and we don't dispute it, then they are Marxists with a wider range of knowledge of tactics than most. They have experienced revolution. If we are Marxists our place is with them.

J. KAVANAGH.

OUR SOCIALISM

Stephen Decatur's lines: "Our country: in her intercourse with foreign nations may she always to be in the right; but our country right or wrong," have become famous amongst those who proclaim that America's policy, whatever that may be, should in all cases predominate, in any international question of importance.

Likewise the class struggle carried on in Canada, by that class in society which is struggling to liberate itself from wage slavery, namely the working class, has been proclaimed by wise sages to be the private and personal property of the Socialist Party of Canada: The contention being that its position on the class struggle is the only correct one, and the tactics set down by its members, the most revolutionary methods advisable to adopt in this struggle.

Instances of this egotism may be found in most of the articles against affiliation with the Third International, which to date have appeared in the "Western Clarion." Let us for example refer to a letter of Comrade Charles Stewart, in the issue of March 1st: "So let us cease basking in the sunshine of our Russian comrades' victory, and get on with the business of educating the working class to an understanding of Marxian Socialism." The inference in this article is that those who are basking in the sunshine of Russian communism, are hindering the work necessary to pursue from day to day

(Continued on page 5)

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 2888

Editor Ewan MacLeod

Subscription:
Canada, 20 issues \$1.00
Foreign, 16 issues \$1.00

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

VANCOUVER, B. C., APRIL 16, 1921

THE MINERS' OUTLOOK.

COMBINATIONS of workmen first assumed a local form. Following upon the industrial revolution and the development, extension and national cohesion of capitalist industry, the association of workmen in their field of employment laid the framework of their protective organizations.

The essential characteristic of all wage workers is that they depend for their livelihood on the sale of their labor-power which, in common with all other commodities has a price. Since the price of the commodity labor power takes the form of wages, it follows that industrial disputes—quarrels between wage worker and master—are in the main, questions concerning wages or the amount to be paid to wage workers by those who obtain their livelihood from the sale through private ownership of the products of labor.

As early as 1829 the Grand General Union of the United Kingdom endeavored to include in its ranks all male cotton-spinners. In 1880, the National Association for the Protection of Labor was formed in Lancashire to include all wage workers. These combinations dissolved within a few years from their commencement. In 1832 the Builders' Union, with which was associated Robert Owen, gained prominence as a workmen's organization by its militancy, incurring the utmost animosity of the employers who in their employment departments required applicants to renounce membership in the Builders' Union. The Grand National Consolidated Trade Union of Great Britain and Ireland was a federation, formed in 1834 of many branches of industry not previously organized. In its programme was included the general strike which, however, due to sectional and local disputes, and to undeveloped means of communication and transportation, failed to mature. Its members, not unlike the members of our unions of today, were persecuted, discriminated against, imprisoned.

The crisis period of 1836-39 led to an increased interest in political agitation on the part of wage-workers. The Chartist movement, which demanded universal suffrage, equal electoral districts, vote by ballot, annual parliaments, abolition of the property qualification for parliament members and payment of members, gained adherents from wage workers and small traders and manufacturers. Already Adam Smith had laid down the tenets, "individual liberty and freedom of economic intercourse." The workers were excluded from the franchise, extended in 1832, and the small traders who suffered in a measure also, with them formed an alliance. The Petition of the Chartists was thrown out by Parliament in 1839, and there followed riot and bloodshed consequent upon the use of the military to enforce the prohibition of public meetings.

Chartism, although in its early stages, and during the time of its alliance with the Anti-Corn Law League it had been divided into two sections, one middle-class and the other wage-worker, ultimately became distinctly of a working-class character, and had its separation from the interests of the bourgeoisie, whose interests were aligned against the land owners, with the repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846. The repeal of the Corn Laws meant a re-

duced cost of workers' subsistence, and with the removal of import barriers the British workshop became the hive of world industry and the world its market.

So there grew side by side the model British working man and the traditional liberal party. The market for goods extended and the British manufacturer's hold upon it increased with the cheapness of his developing productive processes. Employment for wage workers was plentiful. The manufacturing class held it to their interest that harmony as between worker and employer should replace the bitter hatreds of previous periods. A better "understanding" of the relationships between master and man would tend to cement that bond in ties of industrial friendship. Labor should learn that its interests were identical with those of capital. Labor should be appeased in its most modest demands. Reform became the Liberal watchword.

But in the meantime, with the growth of industrialism, the rise of towns, the establishment of communities and districts identified with purely industrial pursuits, railway extension, etc., combinations of workmen engaged in production were built up and grew into unions of increasing strength and membership. Quite naturally perhaps, in an industrial, manufacturing community, a union of engineers first came to the front. Engineers, carpenters, tailors, miners, cotton operatives, etc., the several great units of employment in industrial life formed themselves into unions, associations, protective organizations. The formation of trades councils and the development of the trade union movement up to the point of the national congress marked the appearance of cohesive national trade union activity and organizational endeavor.

Governmental obstacles and the legal code constituted barriers in the way of trade union development. This tended to direct the workers' attention to political activity. In 1848, following upon the further extension of the franchise, working men candidates appeared for election to parliament. In 1874 thirteen trade union candidates were entered and two elected. A measure of contentment followed certain legal adjustments whereby picketing became possible and the trade union treasury had official legal protection.

With developing industry and its socialization and sub-division, alongside of the skilled trades there inevitably developed numerous unskilled employments engaging the labor of many thousands of railway workers, dockers, sailors and firemen, general laborers, etc. These unions necessarily took on the form of craft organizations, even though their distinctive feature was lack of skill, but as organizations of unskilled workers they served to infuse energy in the pursuit of the industrial struggle into the unions of skilled workers burdened with traditional usage and older concepts of craft privilege.

Today in Great Britain there is once more demonstrated the truth of the Socialist contention that the modern industrial process conflicts with the usages of capitalist supervision. It is inevitable that there should develop side by side with the increasingly inter-related and concentrated productive industries, organizations of workmen who form combinations to strengthen their resistance to capitalist oppression. And as the conflict of interests between wage worker and master becomes sharper it must manifest itself more and more frequently. Already twice within twelve months the British Miners' Federation has effected a nation wide strike that has to a considerable extent paralyzed industry and dislocated production. We are not well enough informed as to details to be able to confidently forecast immediate results in the present strike. In general we know that when conditions affect the workers employed in interlocking industries, more or less equally, those workers will take joint action. In the present case we cheerfully note the long stride made in the miners' consciousness. It is evident that they are beginning to recognize the mines as their masters' property, in which they themselves have no concern other than as a means through which they may expend their energy for wages. The mine owners, with the help-

ful aid of Mr. Lloyd George, are engaged in strengthening that impression.

Literature Price List

- 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 2nd Chapters, "Capital," Vol. 1, Marx). Single copies (cloth bound), \$1.00; 5 copies, \$3.75.
- 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 \$2.00
- Evolution of Man. (Prof. Huxley). Single copies, 20c; 25 copies, \$3.75.
- The Nature and Uses of Sabotage (Prof. T. Veblen). Single copies 5 cents, 25 copies \$1.
- The Criminal Court Judge, and The Odd Trick (E. B. Rex). Single copies, 5 cents; per 25 copies, 75c.
- Ancient Society (Louis H Morgan), \$2 15
- Value, Price and Profit (Marx)—Single copies, 15c; 25 copies, \$3.25.
- Introduction to Sociology (Arthur M. Lewis), \$1.75.
- Civil War in France (Marx) 35c
- Life and Death (Dr. E. Teichmann) 9c
- History of the Paris Commune (Lissagaray) \$1.50
- Class Struggle (Kautsky), cloth, 90 cents; paper, 35 cents.
- Puritanism (Meilly), cloth, 90 cents.
- Origin of Species (Darwin), cloth, \$1.
- The Protection of Labor in Soviet Russia (Kaplan), per copy, 15 cents.
- Savage Survivals (Moore), cloth, \$1.
- Law of Biogenesis (Moore), cloth, 90 cents.
- Social Studies (Lafargue), 90 cents.
- The State and Revolution (Lenin) 25c
- Germs of Mind in Plants (R. H. France) 90c
- Economic Causes of War (Leckie), single copies, 25c; 10 copies or more, 20c each.
- Labor Laws of Soviet Russia. Revised and enlarged 35c
- A. B. C. of Evolution (McCabe) \$1.15
- Conditions of the Working Class in England in 1844 (Engels) \$1.75
- Evolution of the Idea of God (Grant Allen) 55c
- Make all moneys payable to E. MacLeod, 401 Pender Street East, Vancouver, B. C. Add discount on cheques.

(All above post free).

All above literature can be obtained at the same prices, post paid, from—J. Sanderson, Box 1763, Winnipeg, Man.

HERE AND NOW.

Following \$1 each—D. A. Reed, T. Twelvetree, L. Acrea, B. E. Polinko, J. Kavanagh, R. S. Lugrin, L. G. Atkins, A. Zelinder, A. B. Shaaf, J. G. Lowe, Laycock Stores, W. Thompson, F. Archibald, W. A. P., J. H. Greaves, R. Wotherspoon, H. T. Johnson, H. Barr, R. Inglis, J. Dolstra, D. Hearn, W. Abernethy.

R. Rigby, \$2; J. McCluskey; I. M. Iverson, \$5; J. Cartwright, \$2; J. T. Stott, \$2; E. Falk, \$2; J. Sanderson, \$3; collected at Empress Theatre by Local No. 1, \$21. Above, total "Clarion" subscriptions received from 29th March to 12th April, inclusive—total, \$61.

CLARION MAINTENANCE FUND

Following \$1 each; H. Montvel, J. T. Stott, John Nelson, J. Carson, W. Erwin, R. Inglis, J. Dolstra. Collected at Empress Theatre by Local No. 1, \$1.50. Above, total C. M. F. contributions received from 29th March to 12th April, inclusive—total, \$8.50.

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

(Continued from page 3)

in the furtherance of the struggle here, and that only by following the business of the Socialist Party of Canada in educating the working class along Socialist Party of Canada's lines, do we render material aid to the revolutionary struggle. No explanation is given, Comrade Stewart merely clubs the idea of basking in the sunshine of our Russian comrades' victory. The fact remains that those who advocate affiliation with the Third International are not attempting to bask in the sunshine, but are endeavoring to bring a little sunshine into the Socialist Party of Canada; possibly this ray of sunshine may clear the rancor and discord within the Party, which has to date resulted in different definitions on its function being given by each individual member of the Party. Some members state that it is merely a Marxian school for the education of the working class, others on the other hand contend it is a political organization, while others chip in and agree that it is our Party, and it is always in the right. The truth, however, is that if each statement made, written or uttered, should be compared, there would be found nothing but contradiction after contradiction.

Thus Comrade Stewart wishes us to believe, in his article, that the Socialist Party of Canada did give, is giving, and will continue to give its whole-hearted support to the Bolshevik Party, which is now in power in Soviet Russia.

Would Comrade Stewart please trouble himself, for our enlightenment, to state what assistance the Party has given. Assistance? Yes! Assistance by individual members to load munitions and railroad supplies on the docks of Vancouver for Kolchak, the counter revolutionist. Of course, the excuse will be given, that it was merely the economic struggle which compelled them to do so. Yet, I as one, am bound to think that not all was done on those docks to prevent this destructive work from going forward.

If the already conscious longshoremen could not, by proper guidance, from a Party calling itself revolutionary, prevent this outrage, then at least I must give credit to the one man who was sufficiently class conscious to quit his job. This man was J. S. Woodsworth. Assistance? Yes! by continually spreading the lies that Soviet Russia is building up the Third International for its own little comfort, and that Soviet Russia is the controlling power of the International, thereby giving aid and comfort to the Second International, and its Mother, the League of Nations, as for instance the statement of the Winnipeg comrades that: "The tactics are largely Russian in character and do not apply to this country."

Marx never feared to openly condemn those parties which in principle and tactics were opposed to the International Association of Workingmen. No side issue counted in this vital question. Today Comrade Stewart and in fact Local No. 3 in general, desire to avoid the question of affiliation by saying that if assistance to Soviet Russia is the object it is being, and will be, given irrespective of, and entirely independent of the Communist International. This idea is very self-complimentary indeed.

May I, however, suggest that Soviet Russia is aiding the workers, and therefore the parties, of the other non-revolutionary countries, and thus is aiding the Socialist Party of Canada? May I point out that Soviet Russia is fighting our battles? May I explain that the actual economic benefits derived by the Social Revolution to date count as nil when compared with the value and benefits derived in the work accomplished in destroying capitalist power?

Do you know that Soviet Russia pulled the workers of Europe and America out of the mire, where they had been thrown by the Second International, and left to perish by the Socialist pacifist and theoretician parties? Do you understand the three years of Communist battle waged by Russia and the results: Capitalism in Europe virtually tottering and

the workers looking towards Soviet Russia beacon-light? Finally, do you value the yeoman work of the Soviet Republics in the pioneer struggle of establishing the first successful communist state? Aid to Soviet Russia? I am afraid, Comrade Stewart and colleagues, your letter contains in this respect a great fallacy. Actually by affiliating with the Communist International we are not aiding the Communist Party of Russia, for the two are two distinct and separate bodies, but we are taking a step forward in the **Class Struggle of Canada**, and thereby assisting the workers, not of Russia, not entirely of Canada, but the **Workers of the World!**

Comrade Stewart in his next article should avoid such sophisms, but on the main they are not his. They are the inconsistencies of a Party which has never yet taken a step to formulate a policy in its advocacy of revolutionary action. They are the inconsistencies of men of the old world, who refuse to take note of the present trend of events, and are content to live in the happy memories of the last century.

To save a few sages the trouble of replying to this last sentence, permit me to quote F. J. McNey, in the issue of February 15th... "This discussion... will have beneficial effects no matter what the verdict may be, inasmuch as it will help to clear up **certain vague points, and misconceptions.**" Incidentally, Comrade McNey, unknowingly as much as states that even should the verdict on affiliation be in the affirmative, it will have "beneficial effects." Very good; for in view of this, I have great hopes for Comrade McNey.

Comrade McNey has evidently read only a few phrases in the organ of the Communist International, which phrases he has accidentally switched in here and there in his article, which makes it a supposed statement directly from the magazine, that "all the Communist parties in all countries are yellow and rotten right through," or else I may possibly, if this fails, be obliged to go to the other extreme of reasoning about Comrade McNey's methods. On the other hand, he says, "That the Communists of Russia on the average are well grounded on the fundamental principles of scientific Socialism, but they are not infallible. They are liable to make mistakes once in a while **as the rest of us.**" So the Communist Party of Russia is evidently not entirely guilty, in fact there is still hope for it. Furthermore, the Socialist Party of Canada, is according to this authority, just as liable to commit mistakes. This will bear for future comparison. In fact if we go a few lines further we will find that he himself makes an unpardonable but I hope not an intentional mistake. He states that: "The left wing Communist Parties that are now clamoring for affiliation with the Third International, never knew there was anything the matter with the Second International, until Lenin pointed it out in the last two or three years." As a matter of fact, a division in the Second International occurred immediately on the outbreak of war. The Second International first came in for denunciation at the Zimmerwald Convention, September, 1915, next at the Kienthal Conference held six months later, and since then, a general policy of war was carried on by left wing groups against the old International with a clear issue in sight; the formation of a new International. It was the Russian revolution of March, 1917, which brought the final and decisive crisis in the old International. Thus it is plainly seen that Comrade McNey is entirely wrong in the above contention.

The article in many ways coincides with Stewart's position dealt with above, but before leaving the matter, I wish to point out that he, like the other defenders of the Party, declares the Socialist Party of Canada to be fully correct past, present and future. He does not even mention one objection to what he styles as the "eighteen demands" but furthermore, he charges Comrade Kaplan with intimidation and falsehood, in trying to gain his end. I admit the Socialist Party of Canada has principles in view: I contend, however, that it has no programme for realizing these principles. If by saying that, I am stating a falsehood I am intimidating the Party, then I certainly must be guilty, and should be condemned, but in this article, and in those

which will follow later (*) I hope to prove my contentions. What, Comrade McNey, has cowardice to do with intimidating "others into making fools of themselves" by "acting contrary to the dictates of their own intelligence and judgment, by calling them cowards?" He states in the third last paragraph that: "It is the privilege of any member of the Socialist Party of Canada to advocate affiliation." It is not my fault, if others, because I avail myself of this privilege, can be intimidated into making fools of themselves; it is because of the loose convictions of these intelligent (?) defenders of the Party. Men of strong convictions, intelligent men, are not afraid of intimidation, they are strong enough to stand arguments.

FRED W. KAPLAN.

(*) Editors Note: Comrade Kaplan asks for space for two further articles.

"ACTIONISTS" AND REVOLUTIONISTS

Calgary, Alta.

We are told in a recent article in the "Clarion" that what is required now is more "action" and less talking. This, by a critic of Jack Harrington, apropos affiliation with the Third International. As one who has been doing, is doing, and intends to keep on doing, a considerable amount of talking under the auspices of "The Socialist Party of Canada," I would say to Harrington's critic, along with the other "actionists," that more **action** and less **acting** would be of far more help, at the present time, in the enlightenment of our class to the end that it take upon itself to be rid of capitalism, than all the diatribes in the world.

Wherever Socialist locals are found, or, for that matter, in O. B. U. locals, or even in towns where neither exists, the "actionists" are always very much in evidence. At first contact with these comrades, and on hearing their constant use of the word "action," the impression is made that here, surely, is the revolution beginning to move; that in these "actionists" we have the vanguard of the movement. Enquiry, however, into the "action" carried on or proposed by these enthusiasts, quickly disposes of any hope that may have been generated as to the nearness of our emancipation through their efforts.

The S. P. of C., according to most of them, is out of date; it is a party of Marxian phrase-mongers, which, while supporting the Russian revolution, yet hesitates, and is woefully afraid to go the whole distance, by joining the Third International. Another way of denouncing the S. P. of C., used by these comrades, is to refer to those who have had the temerity adversely to criticize the conditions laid down for affiliation with the Third International, as "Kautskian."

Samuel Johnson's saying that "Patriotism is the last refuge of the scoundrel," might well be used as the basis for another: "Kautskian" is the first and last retort to his antagonist of the ignoramus unable to meet the argument of an opponent in the class struggle.

Ask the "actionist" what he means; ask him what kind of action he proposes; and he will answer "action." Read his articles where he speaks of "action"; try to find out what kind of action he means and you will come right back to the word "action." With all of them talking is sneered at. Action it never was, is not now, nor will it ever be. Talking, indeed, is almost, with them synonymous with "in-action." The action of the "actionists" of course varies in different parts of the country. In some places where the prohibition act is not rigorously enforced, the "action" consists for the most part of swilling beer or playing pool, and so on, condemning ruthlessly mere "talking," and loudly advocating "action" the while. "Action" first, "action" second, "action" all the time. Always "action."

A group of "actionists," somewhere in Eastern Canada, makes allegations against the S. P. of C. in general, and against Jack Harrington in particular, quite in the Kautskian strain. Harrington is Kautskian to the core. Now, Harrington needs no defence from me; but the charges against him would, at least, be worthy of discussion were they made by one who had spent but a fraction of the

(Continued on page 6)

time that Harrington has spent in Canada in elucidating the class struggle to the working class. Instead of this being the case, we have the slanderous attack being made in an anonymous sheet labelled "The Communist Bulletin," printed in a hole in the ground, by a group of people who apparently fear even to attach their names.

Recently, several stool pigeons have been exposed; Waldie, for instance, in Vancouver—Waldie who was such an "actionist" as to propose the selling of machine guns to Albert Wells, of the "Federationist." The writer would not be surprised in the least, to read of the similar exposure, one of these days of members of the group, or the interests, responsible for the publication of "The Communist Bulletin." Parrot-like, these "actionists" take sentences, paragraphs, and even chapters from Lenin's denunciation of Kautsky, and others in Europe, and hurl them at those who try to apply their reasoning powers to the conditions for affiliation. To these fellows the conditions are of no moment. They have been drawn up in Moscow, so there's an end of the matter. To them it does not matter that we are able now to get out propaganda, restricted only by the number who prefer "action" to talking,—who would rather "thwart" propaganda than "talk" propaganda.

The form that organization shall take is a matter of grave concern to the "actionists": whether we shall "organize" the working class into an industrial union, a geographical union, or a political party. Only last year the O. B. U. was rent asunder by just such petty squabbling. From these people you would gather that the working class was standing patiently outside the headquarters, just waiting until the discussion was over, anxious for instructions where and how the next move was to be made, and what it was, whether to demand smaller holes in doughnuts or march straight on Ottawa,—but ready to make it. According to the terms laid down by the Third International, we are required to fill all offices in labor unions with Communists; and of course, if done, that would be very good indeed; fine. Still, a good way in which to start out an such a venture might be to have a Communist Party made up of Communists to begin with, from which to draw supplies. Contact with the working class throughout the country, and observation of the interests, habits, and ideas of this class, shows very clearly that the number of Communists, so far, is exceeding small, and that should all the posts in the unions be vacant tomorrow, and we be offered the chance to fill them, we would not have enough.

Of course, many will not agree with this; those, for instance, who can see in labor churches, open forums, Dominion Labor Parties, etc., support for the militant proletariat,—and not only support, but auxiliaries and recruits as well. Alas! that it should be left to us, to the S. P. of C., to bid them "Awake from daydreams to this real night." For, after all; Gopher City it not Petrograd; nor will thinking make it so.

One of the outstanding features of the "actionist's" arguments for affiliation with the Third International is his insistence on the formation of an illegal organization. We are instructed to do so in clause 3 of the 18 points, so to think of doing anything other must be reactionary; one cannot be a real Communist, or a Communist at all, unless he accepts all that comes from Moscow, without reservation—even the slightest.

Let me quote Comrade Lenin on the point. "Inexperienced revolutionaries often think that legal means of struggle are opportunist, for the bourgeoisie often (especially in 'peaceful' non-revolutionary times) use such legal means to deceive and fool the workers. On the other hand, they think that illegal means in the struggle are revolutionary. This is not true. What is true is that the opportunists and traitors of the working class are those parties and leaders who are unable, or who do not want to apply illegal means to the struggle."

Again Lenin adds: "But those who cannot coordinate illegal forms of the struggle with legal ones are very poor revolutionaries." Good; Lenin agrees in this with the S. P. of C. It is nice and, to say the least, encouraging, to have our stand

corroborated by such an one as Comrade Lenin. The conditions brought about by the recent war gave us the opportunity to find out who was who, and who wasn't in the class struggle. The master class of this country, following in the wake of its brethren elsewhere, decreed that Socialist literature must not be sold and, under various pains and penalties must not be discovered in anyone's possession. Now the S. P. of C. was in the habit of selling the literature thus suppressed. Being a "legal" organization and, of course, saturated with "bourgeois ideology" on the matter of legal procedure (as claimed by some of the "actionists," when we point out the absurdity at the moment of illegal organizations); it follows that the S. P. of C. would quite naturally submit quietly to the decree. But did it? I don't think it is necessary for me to point out just what happened. Possibly most of the "actionists" are not aware of what took place; these gallant comrades who now make so much noise and proclaim aloud their ferocity were unheard of and unheard during the period of the war. The "actionists" were inactive. It was the S. P. of C., that poor Kautskian party, that carried on the propaganda, sold the literature, and proved itself both willing and able to continue the work of the class war under no matter what trying conditions.

However, conditions are now somewhat different, and we are able at the moment to get out our propaganda without more than the usual hindrances, in fact, the S. P. of C. is the only organization in Canada that is doing it. From the platform we give undiluted Marxian Socialism. Some of the "actionists" don't like that name, but we can't help that; those are Marxian Socialists who now dictate the affairs of Russia. We get the literature of the class struggle, we have large and attentive audiences, and we find even among the farmers—far removed from industrial centres, the farmers who have in every country formed the back-bone of reaction against the industrial proletariat, we find, even here, an ever-growing class consciousness asserting itself. I speak of the attitude of the farmers from experience, having spent the winter among them, living with them and talking to them individually and collectively, holding two or three meetings a week, and in some districts one each night. Of course it was no doubt a waste of time to go ploughing through prairie snows to talk to farmers. It would have been better, perhaps, had we left the farmers alone, ignorant of the class struggle, recking nothing of their position in society,—alone with their private property concepts, and devoted our own efforts to work more patently savouring of "action."

Will our comrades of this extreme virility who are so profuse in their use of the word action, and who are contemptuous of "mere" propaganda and talking, just be kind enough to tell us what form the illegal organization will, must, or should take? A hint will be no better, perhaps, than a nod, but at least let us have it. Even if lost on us it still might help some one. It is possible, as I have said, quite openly to propagate the class struggle, nor is there anything touching on the conflict of interests between capitalist and wage slave which we do not explain from the public platform. Obviously then the illegal organization would not increase or intensify our propaganda in this field. We sell, unhindered, literature which gives the scientific explanation of the class struggle. I say scientific simply in order that it might not be understood that we teach the working class, either by word of mouth or by pamphlet, that Jesus was a Socialist, that the sermon on the mount is "it," that Socialism is justice, or anything of that sort. There is no sound literature dealing with the class struggle which we could sell, that we do not sell. Therefore, since admittedly, our being illegal would not help us in this department of propaganda, in what department, or in what way, would it be of advantage? True, we may be prevented at any time from doing these things. One of these days I may be pinched for preaching Bolshevism to the staid, conservative "Boys of the Bulldog breed." But then, what difference would an illegal organization make in the matter? Ah! there's the rub! What does it matter how much propaganda is restricted or what does it matter how few are reached by education along class lines,—would we not be true Communists? Could we not then say, with bated breath, "Sh—h! We belong to the Third International; our headquarters are at Moscow!" So we'd be bound to be

full-fledged Reds, no matter what our activities were,—and more than that even Comrade Lenin could not expect surely. No, no; but will some of these "actionists" just tell us what we can do illegally at the present time, that we cannot do legally except perhaps affiliate with the Third International and declare ourselves illegal, whether the bourgeoisie want us so or not. ACTION is right; it is about time we had some action; here we have a vast army of proletarians quite oblivious of the existence of a class struggle; here we have thousands more, disgruntled with the present administration of the master class, ex-soldiers many of them, infuriated at the heartless sordid treachery of their patriotic exploiters who have thrown them, along with the other packages of labor-power, on the scrap heap; men thirsting for some knowledge of the class war and getting it as fast as the S. P. of C. can hand it out; all this in spite of the "actionists," who have never been other than a stumbling block—a source of scandal—to the revolutionary movement. In spite of these conditions, and despite the fact of a temporary lull in the ferocity of the bourgeoisie and its tactics of suppression, we are asked by these enthusiasts to crawl underground and be revolutionary and happy in the thought that no matter what happens,—we belong to the Third International.

This article does not apply, by any means, to all who have advocated the S. P. of C.'s joining the Third International. For the most part the controversy in the "Clarion" has been carried on cleanly and without mud-slinging. Some of those who have been most strongly in favor of affiliation are very active in the revolutionary movement, such as Comrade Kavanagh; this without any deference to the latter comrade, with whom I disagree on many points. These, however, have not been in my line of attack, and do not come under my fire. I have carefully used the word action in inverted commas when speaking of those to whom I have reference. Summed up, the case is this. The best that we can do now is to achieve as much publicity as possible, the most effective manner in which we can help our Russian comrades is by making more Reds right here; and we can't do that from a cave in the Rocky mountains. The S. P. of C. in its adaptation to war conditions, illegally carried on propaganda, but there was no acting about that. It did the work, and did it thoroughly; it did not pull the cloak of the Third International over itself, and proclaim, "We are now a revolutionary party." No; there was no adoration of heroes, no fetish-worship, the comrades simply got busy and the work was done. I have no objection to offer to the clauses of the Third International, other than the ones referred to, and also, to the one in which we are called upon to support small nations, or colonial independence movements. I have not much objection to the latter, but would like to have some comrade explain in just what manner we could help, for instance, the Irish in their struggle, or the Indians, Egyptians, or Nationalists of Quebec.

To conclude, let it be remembered that the working class of this continent is not yet asking us to lead it out of the house of bondage. The time is here for more extensive propaganda,—that is all, and the action of the revolutionist must be in supplying this to his fellow wage-slaves through every avenue and channel at his command. The time has now arrived when we must rid ourselves of those whose actions consist merely in proclaiming themselves reds; or, in other words, what we most require today is fewer "actionists" and more revolutionists.

Yours for real action,

FRANK CASSIDY.

IMMIGRATION DEPARTMENT AGAIN ACTIVE.

Comrades Joe and Mrs. Mallard of Edmonton Local, on returning from a visit to England, were ordered deported by the Immigration authorities at St. John, N.B., "as undesirable Socialists." The Workers' Defence Committee took immediate legal steps, instituted habeas corpus proceedings. James Law, secretary of the Defence Committee received notification from the Minister of Immigration, Ottawa, on the 12th April, that Mr. and Mrs. Mallard were to be allowed entry to Canada.

Materialist Conception of History

FOR BEGINNERS

LESSON 10.

TOWNS arose through the convenience of their site as ports or trading centres, others around the fortified camps of the invaders or the small havens of fishermen. The town gained Charter of Freedom from the power of the barons by purchase. The chief cause of the willingness of the nobles and kings to grant charters, from the Conquest to Henry 3rd's time, was their lack of money to enable them to carry on the Crusades and to pay ransoms if taken prisoner. Some of the towns received their charter for supplying vessels for the Crusades. The nobles' pecuniary difficulties profited the towns in obtaining their charters. Foreign trade received a stimulus also from the Crusades, and thus helped to develop industry.

Loria says: "The Crusade was put forth as a desire to recapture the holy sepulchre from the heathen, but this is only the view of the superficial historian, who would attribute the phenomenon to the exhortation of Peter the Hermit. The science of history is to find out the deeper interpretation of things, and we find the underlying influence is to be found in the economic conditions of feudalism. It was the conquering impulse to extend their power, precisely as in our day, the instinct of accumulation thrown out of normal employment at home seeks an outlet in overseas enterprise and speculation. The economic character of the Crusades comes out very clearly, if we take the trouble to examine the various phases of the strange enterprise: according to one historian, they were inspired solely by cupidity and the desire for booty. At the time of the 4th Crusade, the Venetians only consented to carry the warriors on the condition they should be richly remunerated and share in half of the booty secured, and as some of the Crusaders were unable to pay the Republic of Venice, the Republic of Venice proposed that they should acquit themselves of the obligation by undertaking a crusade against St. Marc and other Christian towns. It is a significant fact that the Conquest of the Holy Sepulchre—which was to have crowned an enterprise that had apparently no other end in view, was made but an episode in the affair, and finally became an incident in the attempted colonization of Asia on the feudal principle of Europe. No longer did Christians fight against infidels, but also against Christians. Emperor Frederick in 1234 sailed across the sea, more to obtain lordship over Jerusalem than for any particular advantage of Christianity. His purpose was indeed very clear: when he landed in Cyprus he undertook to wage a war against the Christians only. An Italian poet paints a vivid picture in one of his poems of the avarice that actuated the Crusaders."

The invasion of the Turks had blocked the merchants' free access to the Eastern trade routes, the Italians having their source of wealth destroyed. The feudal fighters needing more land to conquer, the church feeling her prestige would be destroyed if the infidels' success was permanent, united and formed a strong combination, and as the Crusaders proceeded, their economic causes became more manifest.

Not only internal wars, but the Crusades had the same effect in weakening feudalism. The strong hand of the Norman kings kept the barons in check for a while in England. In King Stephen's time the barons became again lawless and powerful, they fortified their castles and cast men and women into prison, stealing their wealth. Between 1135 and 1153 there was terrible anarchy and misery. The barons tortured the prisoners by breaking their bones and placing snakes and adders in the cells. The barons lost their power under Henry II, 1154, who introduced a military law by which all free men had free armour to protect the king. This was the origin of the militia. The barons, instead of supplying men had to supply money for the upkeep of the militia. This made it a necessity to grant towns the freedom charters and also to charge

money rent for their land. The civil strife retarded the development of trade, but in the reign of Henry III., trade became prosperous and peaceful.

In the reign of King John, a quarrel arose between him and the Pope over the choosing of a Chancellor. John refused the Pope's nominee, and as John remained obstinate, the whole country was put under an interdict in 1208, forbidding the priest to marry the people or bury them in the church ground, or to read any of the church services, unless the baptismal service and prayers for the dying. For four years no church bells rang, and the people were buried in ditches and meadows without services. John was indifferent, and seized the goods of the bishops and clergy; when the barons withdrew, he seized their castles. The Pope excommunicated John. This had the effect of turning the people against him. Through fear of losing all, he actually gave up the crown to the Pope's legate, and received it back as a vassal of the Pope. In doing this he gave rise to the long struggle between the Pope and the English kings, which lasted more than 300 years.

The development of trade, with its merchant guilds and craft guilds, and their many privileges bought from the king, united the people and barons against their tyrannical king. The town bells called them to meetings of discussion on public affairs. The king's robberies through taxation united the bishops, barons and merchants' guilds, and forced John to sign the Magna Charta, 1215. The support of the traders can be seen in two of the enactments by which they secured to foreign merchants, freedom of journeying and of trade throughout the realm, and the other an uniformity of weights and measures to be enforced throughout the country. It was during this time that Pope Gregory IX, filled the churches with Italian priests and sent over for money to carry on his continental wars. The enormous money to the Papal See through bribes and taxes drained the country, which caused much misery and a feeling of revolt. When Pope Innocent wanted to drive Emperor Conrad out of Sicily, he offered the crown to Henry III.'s son, who was just nine years old. Henry accepted the offer, but Innocent died. His successor, Pope Alexander, made war on Conrad in Henry's name, and at his expense. The king had to confess to parliament that he owed the Pope £90,000. The barons rose in rebellion, and only paid one-third of this debt, making the king sign the Provisions of Oxford, 1258. Thousands were dying of starvation because of a bad harvest.

The Provisions called for three parliaments a year, and the foreigners to be driven from the castles, but the barons were satisfied when they obtained the castles. The king asked the Pope to absolve him from the promise of keeping the Provisions of Oxford. This was granted, and the barons' war of 1264 was the result. Henry renewed the Provisions after three years' civil war.

In 1279, Statute of Mortmain land law was passed, preventing men from pretending giving their land to the church to escape or avoid giving feudal service. King Edward I. called parliament because it was an easier method to obtain grants of money than the old method of asking separately from each baron, or from the clergy, citizens or shire. By summoning two knights from each shire or county, two clergy from each diocese, these members could make promises for the people who chose them, and grant money. Kings never called parliament unless it was an economic necessity.

The civil wars kept the country in confusion, which enabled Henry VIII., 200 years later, to become an absolute monarch, taking possession of the landlord's estates, extorting money from them to fill his treasury.

King Edward I., in 1297, was in Flanders helping the Flemings to fight the French, who were seiz-

ing English wool in Flemish ports. The woollen trade was the economic cause of the 100 years' war with France. The duty on wool was raised to six times what it had been, to carry on the war. Knighted country gentlemen who were paid good fees ordered the counties to send in food supplies, and landholders to bring soldiers for the war. Parliament rebelled, and when they accused the king of levying unjust taxes, Edward owned he had done it for England's honor and appealed to their loyalty to help him. Then they gave their consent to the war.

This war became popular because of the belief that more subjects under the king would help to lighten taxation. The clergy refused to give what was demanded of them by orders of the Pope, but the king forced them to submit by refusing them protection in the law courts until they paid up.

Rogers says: "No wonder the king, knowing the profits of the clergy, insisted on liberal contributions towards public revenue, and the clergy should have striven to obtain the powerful aid of the Pope to escape from these exactions." . . . "The enormous revenue going to the Pope was paid with wool to Flanders and cross exchange to Italy. . . ." "An examination of the commercial relations existing between England and Flanders reveals the economic basis of this alliance. English wool was largely exported to Flanders, and it was consequently indispensable for England to maintain friendly relations with the Flemish towns which formed the principal market for English wool. For this reason English monarchs devoted every effort to maintain friendly relations. This was especially necessary as the war expenses were usually met with the special tax on wool, and this part had to be redeemed by exportation of wool to Flanders."

The enormous revenues exacted from England by the Papal Court and Italian ecclesiastics living on English benefices, from the 13th to the 15th century, was from the sale of English wool to Flanders. The extent of this revenue may be gathered from the fact that a petition against papal appointments to English ecclesiastical vacancies in parliament, 1343, asserted that the Pope's revenue from England alone, was higher than of any prince in Christendom.

This woollen trade inaugurated the scheme to enclose the common lands for sheep farming, and the beginning of the creation of a proletariat class, which we will have occasion to deal with in some future lesson.

In King Edward III.'s reign, the people of Flanders, who had now a large woollen trade with England, wanted protection from Count Louis of France. King Edward was called to help them, and take the title of "King of France."

The knights and barons needed money for their costly armour, and were willing to lease their land for money rent called *feorm*. This was the beginning of the independent farmer; even the king sent commissioners to his estates to raise money by allowing serfs to buy their freedom. Serfs also became free if they escaped to a town, and dwelt one year and one day without being caught.

King Edward III. brought and encouraged Flemish weavers to England, who taught the people to weave. Industry began to flourish and towns grew more numerous. Previously, Henry II. endeavored to stimulate English manufacture by establishing a "cloth fair" in the churchyard at St. Bartholomew. From the time of this Flemish immigration England changed from a purely agricultural country, exporting wool, to the exporting of cloth, the manufacture of which became the basis of England's national wealth.

The increase of weavers, made a scarcity of laborers, and high wages ensued. In 1348 the Black Plague swept over about one half of the population. There was a dearth of labor. The landlords could not find enough laborers, and there was a consequent

rise in wages, which were double that of 1347. The landlords had either to pay the wages or allow his land to lie idle. The landlord's being the ruling class, passed the Statute of Laborers Act, 1349, that they must work for the same wages as prevailed before the plague. The law was evaded, and laborers worked for those who paid highest wages.

The rising factory capitalist also evaded the law, and of course like all legislation which is contrary to economic laws, it was a failure. The landlords were in the difficulty of paying more for labor and tools, and receiving the same for their crops, because of the fewer people in the country to feed. Parliament brought up the old laws which bound a man to work on his lord's estate. The laborer was forbidden to leave the parish in which he was born. Any man who ran away and was caught had his forehead branded with a red hot iron, with the letter F, for "fugitive." Many escaped serfs, also others who had bought their freedom were brought back from the towns. The laborers became rebellious, knowing they could earn more elsewhere.

It was about this time John Wycliff translated the Bible and taught that all men were equal. His new idea was easily planted in the discontented minds. John Ball, the mad priest, was preaching the rights of man, and no doubt this hastened the Peasants' Revolt of 1381. This revolt has been falsely stated to have arisen from the insulting behaviour of the taxgatherer to Tyler's daughter. The comparative economic independence, and the encouragement from Wycliff's poor priests with their rhyme:

"When Adam delved and Eve span,
Who was then the gentleman?"

which voiced the revolutionary ideas of their time, united them against their oppressors. The labor rent was not absolutely obsolete, but the attempt to extort them was the prime cause of the rebellion. The clergy and the landed class made common cause and saw they must hang together against the peasants.

Rogers says ("Work and Wages," p. 260: Period. Wat. Tyler Rebellion): "If the chronicles compiled in the writing rooms of several abbeys had all been preserved or continued (for only a portion of them have come down to us), we should have learned how universal was the panic at that time, and how frequent were complaints like that which comes from St. Albans. The serfs who held the monastery surrounding the Abbey, claimed an audience of the Abbot. They averred that a charter had been granted them long since, in their favor, in which their liberties had been secured, but this had been secreted by the monks, and they demanded that it should be surrendered to them. The Abbot made promises in abundance, and ordered the seal to be affixed to the document required. But when the seal was pressed on the wax, we are told that it could not be pulled away from the impression, and the monk thereupon inferred that the patron saint of the Abbey, the proto-martyr of the British Church in Roman days, was unfavorable to the demand for the emancipation of the serfs. One would like to know the serf's account of this transaction."

"The serf in England had not less than 12 acres of land. His rent was mostly in kind, labor and corn. He had two money payments; one cent November 12th; two cents when he brewed. A quarter of wheat seed at Michaelmas; peck of wheat, four bushels oats, three hens, November 12. At Christmas 1 rooster, 2 hens, 4 cents worth of bread. He had to plough and sow half acre of the lord's land and give his services as he was bidden. He could not marry a son or daughter, sell horse, colt, ox or calf; or cut down an ash or oak tree without the lord's consent.

As long as these dues were paid he was secure from the dispossession of his living; therefore he had no unemployment facing him. He was disabled from migrating to any other habitation than the manor of his settlement. He could not enter religion or become a secular priest unless licensed by his lord. If the serf obtained leave to live away from the manor, he paid a small annual tax. He paid a fine if he married his daughter outside the manor. The fact that woollen cloth is rarely found in the charges of agriculture, especially at a time

when payments in kind are so general, suggests that homespun fabrics were generally available."

Wycliff's followers, the Lollards, were making headway with their teachings. The church, afraid they would take the church lands, and the landlords afraid they would get strong enough to pass land laws, persuaded Henry IV. to pass a law against heresy. This caused the Lollards to revolt. The restlessness of the country was one of the reasons of renewing the war with France. The bishops desired to divert the attention of the people from the Lollards, parliament, and the confiscation of church property. The merchants on the other hand were desirous of opening up new channels for their trade.

King Edward IV. intended to invade France, but turned back when he received an annual pension from the King of France.

Now we are down to the important event, the discovery of America, where we will take up our next lesson.

PETER T. LECKIE.

ECONOMIC CAUSES OF WAR

By PETER T. LECKIE.

NOW READY.

Preface by the author.
132 PAGES.

Per Copy, 25 Cents.
Ten copies up, 20 cents each.
Post Paid.

MANIFESTO

— of the —

SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA
(Fifth Edition)

Per copy 10 cents
Per 25 copies \$2
Post Paid

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-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 cloaked. 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 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.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

LOCAL (CALGARY) EDUCATIONAL CLASSES.

Headquarters at 134a 9th Avenue West
Business Meetings every 2nd and 4th Monday in each month, 8 p.m.
Economic Class every Thursday, 8 p.m.
History Class every Sunday, 8 p.m.
Speaker's Class every Tuesday, 8 p.m.

Text books used in studies are "Socialism, Utopian and Scientific" (History Class), "Value, Price and Profit," and first nine chapters "Capital" (Economic Class). All workers are welcomed to the headquarters at any time.

FORT WILLIAM AND PORT ARTHUR DISTRICT

Study Class (Marxism), every Sunday at 8 p.m., at the Labor Temple, Finlayson Street, Fort William, Ontario. This class is developing, and is likely to evolve into the educational centre among the workers of this district. Those who are interested in the study of history and economics from a Marxian viewpoint, and those who are acquainted with the subjects, and who appreciate the need for the spread of knowledge among the workers, are earnestly invited to step in and help.

LOCAL (VANCOUVER) No. 1

EDUCATIONAL CLASSES

POLITICAL ECONOMY: Every Sunday afternoon, from 3 to 5.

HISTORY: Every Thursday evening, from 8 to 10.

Classes meet at 401 Pender Street East. No fees are asked and no collection is made. All that is required is an earnest interest in the subject taken up. All points raised and all questions asked are fully discussed. Membership in the Socialist Party of Canada is not a condition of membership of these classes.

You are earnestly invited to attend.

LOCAL (WINNIPEG) No. 3—EDUCATIONAL CLASSES.

ECONOMIC CLASS: Every Friday at 8 p.m.

SPEAKERS' CLASS: Every Sunday at 11 a.m.

HISTORY CLASS: Monday Evening, 8 o'clock.
Friday Afternoon, 3 o'clock.

These classes are already well attended, and the number of members is increasing. The classes meet at 530 Main Street, Winnipeg, and all workers are requested to attend.

NOTICE TO MARITIME READERS

All "Clarion" readers in Maritime Provinces are asked to communicate with the undersigned at once. Comrade Chas. Lestor will soon arrive from England, and will speak at all points where arrangements can be made. We shall need funds, and groups of workers in each place. Get busy, collect funds, arrange meetings, and communicate with me regarding date, etc.

ROSCOE A. FILLMORE.
R.R. 1, Oromocto, N. B.

SUBSCRIPTION FORM. WESTERN CLARION

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

Official Organ of the Socialist Party of Canada.
Issued twice-a-month, at 401 Pender Street East,
Vancouver, B. C. Phone: High. 2583.

Rate: 20 Issues for One Dollar (Foreign, 16 issues).
Make all moneys payable to E. MacLeod.

For.....enclosed herewith

send.....issues to:—

Name.....

Address.....