

Socialist Fulcrum

25c

Quarterly journal of the Socialist Party of Canada

FORMERLY FULCRUM

Vol. 10 No. 3 1977

TROTSKYIST MERRY/GO/ROUND

Separatism

Two Worlds

In The News

Ontario Election



Some Aspects of New Zealand

Dissatisfied NDP'er Discovers The S.P.

Report on Radical Labor History Conferences

SOAPBOX

Readers turn on the stand

Technocrats Again?

I have been getting the "Pulch" for several copies, and for this I am very grateful.

I have been drilling wells (water wells) for over 30 years and not many have worked as hard as I have mentally, although I considered myself in my early life as well qualified as an Electrical Engineer and was studied in that line as I am always inventing things needed and essential in our daily economy. It is just by nature you see.

I met Jim Lavigne of Winnipeg and we talked about "Technocracy" and what kind of system you are going to adopt if the "monetary" or "Capitalistic" system collapses, which is indicated to my mind of thinking.

Do you have any system such as a "Emergency Measures Organization" to take over and who are qualified to be in charge and how will it be directed and operated? And how will you prevent the officials in "Office" to take certain advantages? This has been on my mind a lot and I have some ideas of my own naturally but I would like to get some information from your direction on this matter. I am not going to write a long letter today but I would like to know who has been thinking of us enough to have you send me the Pulch, if possible, but that is not too important really, but I am sending a cheque for \$2. and hope that it will suffice for now if in my "capitalistic" ventures I can do better. I am prepared to do all I can for the cause of socialism. The problem like I said as far as I can see is the method that can be developed in the establishment of a socialistic society. It is important to have the system intact in every respect, this I can understand and I am interested to learn about this and prepared to help and draw my share to the stick as far as that goes, nuff for now.

Martin Sundin
Viscount Sask.

Reply:

When Technocrats refer to the "monetary" system, they are not talking about the same thing as Socialists do when referring to capitalism. As was pointed out in PULCH #2 & 3, 1974 in reply to your enquiry at that time:

The supporters of technocracy, like other reformers do not penetrate below surface effects of capitalism. Being blind to the economic foundations they view the visible effects as causes. Preaching moral reform and scarcity in laborer isolation from the rest of the commodity and class ownership masters of capitalism is useless for solving the poverty problem. The

Technocrats have no intention of terminating the capitalist ownership of the means of production because they do not see this as the cause of the bankruptcy of the majority.

Technocracy has claimed to be non-political but in fact is very political. Its collapse theory involves nothing more than a predestined working class disillusionment of other parties with a hysterical swing to the "scientists" and technocrats to take over the governing of capitalism. This to be effected by way of a "Mussolini march or Rally" fashion of election by acclamation. No cessation of the world wage, price, profit system is involved here; no ending of class divide society, but merely a change of government.

The idea that one of capitalism's shrinking market periods will result in the collapse of the system goes back some distance historically. See Marxist scholars, such as Rosa Luxemburg, supported variations of it, though it was never considered by Marx.

Reformist and religious movements have subscribed to versions of it.

The anarcho-syndicalist Socialist labor Party as well as Technocracy warned of it during the dirty thirties. The Technocrats actually named a year when this was supposed to happen. Openly capitalist politicians also get in on the act. Former U.S. treasury secretary William Simon warned of it in a speech to a "Window on Tomorrow" conference sponsored by the Conservative Party in Toronto recently. The Jehovah's Witness religious sect prophesied the end of the world would come in the spring of 1925. The next prediction for this event was 1929. Of course the hierarchic officials of the Watchtower organization did not include themselves in the heralded doomsday nor did they preclude a population socially organized and surviving the debacle. Nor is evidence provided by these organizations that a majority will not have to arise every A.M. several days a week at the signal of an alarm clock, to peddle their life force to a boss, after the new world miraculously appears. The apocalyptic "collapse" theory appears to be more a fond dream of religious politicians part way up the "success" ladder with a covetous eye on a slice of the surplus values produced by the world's workers. Remember, during a depression, much more than 50 per cent of the available labor-power force is profitably employed — exploited by the capitalist class as usual. Joblessness involves a minority. There is an abundance of loot to be shared by the owning class with any new group of Messiahs with novel ideas on keeping the workers proselytized. The de Leonists and the Technocrats are again prophesying collapse.

Class consciousness by the useful majority is a slow process, encompassing generations. A whole new system could not be learned and supported by the majority within a few days after "collapse" to avoid permanent breakdown or dissolution as you imply in your question. "...what kind of system are you going to adopt..." The collapse theory overlooks the fact that the working class, who run this system in addition to producing everything, would not tolerate change to another system without first being aware that the alternative was in their interests and consequently having a desire for it. Since the coming class is parasitically removed, the whole question rests on the useful class and what it knows and wants. This prior accumulation of political knowledge is a slow and painful process. The change in ideas is the revolution for basic change, not mere "collapse" and change of government. This is analogous to the "nature tolerates no vacuum" theory. The working class withdrawal of commitment to capitalism will be the same process as its growing support for Socialism.

As can be seen, no "emergency organization" will be required if the situation is revolution as opposed to mere "collapse" and change of government. (Capitalist conditions are always an emergency for the workers in some degree). When enough Socialist candidates are elected to Parliament to represent the wishes of a clear majority the government will act on its mandate to convert the means of life to the common possession of mankind, in concert with other governments around the world. This will end government over people and establish the classless administration of things and the affairs of society. The administrative details for the new system will be set up in "blue print" form long before the electoral victory. The transition from the partial anarchy of capitalism to the planned order of Socialism can be brief and smooth.

When you say, "It is important to have this system intact..." during the transition, (?) we presume you mean the productive facilities that have been developed by capitalism. Of course, that is a premise of the Socialist philosophy, to use this productive potential in the interests of humanity.

We believe the foregoing has answered your question:

"...and how will you prevent the 'officials' in office to take certain advantages?" That is, Socialists would not be involved in any "emergency program" to consolidate capitalism. On the other hand, pro-capitalist politicians in government are usually expected to enjoy the "plums" of office. Social collapse is irrelevant and fanciful compared to the interests of the working class. The understanding of capitalism for the purpose of supplanting it with world Socialism is relevant.

Spiritual Tolerance

Considering the continual barrage of criticism, I should say it is time you amended your Declaration of Principles. The essential principle of your political stance derives from the natural rejection of materialism to pure materialism.

Even the Communist Party of Canada (Marxist-Leninist) displays more spiritual tolerance than you and thus is situated politically left of you, like or not by terminology.

Hierarchism is but abetted through the measures of slugging matches in the world of Russia.

John McNamara

Reply

Our correspondent may be stretching terms here. The "continual barrage" of criticism of the Object and Declaration of Principles amounted to letters from three individuals during 1976. One of these supported the Object and most of the principles but saw an implication of violence in No. 6 and No. 8. (FUCRUM #1/76).

Another said he agreed with the Object but then identified it with the state capitalism of Russia and China, showing clearly that he did not understand the Object. He disagreed with a "section" of the principles as exemplifying "intolerance" (FUCRUM #2/76). He has since intemperately cut off this source of Socialist ideas by quitting the FUCRUM because the Socialist Party of Canada opposes religion as being a bulwark of capitalist ideas. The third, yourself, also supported the Object, but doubted the possibility of the power of the state being successfully captured, converted and used by the working class to attain its emancipation. (FUCRUM #4/76).

What version of "materialism" is meant here is not positive, but the popular one is probably the one intended. That is the alleged working class desire for unlimited amounts of goods and services, or greed. This is the ancient human nature myth that the capitalist class spends millions of dollars upon to maintain in the heads of the world's workers and has no foundation in fact. Greed and selfishness is no more (nor less) natural than a desire to survive in a capitalist environment of competition and planned scarcity. The natural part of this equation is the biological requirement of food, clothing and shelter, etc. There is no such thing as "pure" Socialism. "Impure" Socialism is probably an allusion to the leftists of the earth, who are generally solid supporters of capitalism. (e.g. the division of society into capitalists and wage-workers). Their pursuit of state capitalism and reforms which prop up this exploitative system in the name of Socialism is the opposite of Socialism. The incompatibility of the two systems, and the need for majority consciousness for Socialism would make degrees of Socialism impossible.

Since leftist organizations support the wages, prices, profit system of capitalism, degrees of leftism, or one party being further left than another (whatever that may mean) does not designate it as being more Socialist. Socialism means the ending of the class division of owners and non-owners of the means of life.

About the "spiritual tolerance" of the Communist Party of Canada (Marxist-Leninist). Marx and Engels insisted in 1848 in the Communist Manifesto that the "Proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority in the interest of the immense majority."

Marx also advised the workers to "...also change yourselves and prepare yourselves for the exercise of political power." (The Cologne Communist Trial).

The Socialist Party of Canada agrees, and one of the methods the workers can use to acquire the knowledge of the system necessary for them to be able to end it is free and open discussion. This is the last thing the Communist Party of Canada (M-L) Maoist desires, both in goal and consequently means to their goal. In their uncompromising idolatry of the state capitalism being developed in China and reformism in advanced capitalist nations they have been known to violently attempt to suppress meetings of other parties whose brand of bolstering capitalist social relations differs slightly from that advocated by their own Messiah. In the few cases of Maoists in discussion with Socialists, the Maoists have shown implacable hostility to the idea of common ownership and democratic control of the means of life. This writer was nearly thrown out of a bookstore in Winnipeg by the Maoist proprietor upon hearing the contention that Marx's conception of Socialism/Communism was not state capitalism. Civility prevailed up to that point because the reason for entering the premises was to purchase a copy of the great man's little red book. Emotional intolerance and name-calling came from a group of young Maoists in the same city later during an evening's discussion. After much ridiculing of the Socialists the Maoists were asked if they supported the Marxist goal of abolition of the wages system, that is, the ending of the capital vs. wage-labor relationship. An embarrassed silence was the reply.

Perhaps you will elaborate on what you mean by "spiritual" tolerance. In reference to "like or not my terminology," it is less a matter of like or dislike than one of adopting a terminology that can be efficiently used to analyze and understand the social source of workers' problems.

Instead of hierarchy (the world capitalist class) being abetted by "alleging matches in the world of reason", it ought to be obvious to date that it is largely the reverse, e.g., the absence of independent discussion by the workers that keeps a world ruling class in existence. The workers are still captives, mainly, of the propaganda spewed out by the world's bosses to preserve their system.

HOBSON'S CHOICE

Dear friends:

Thanks for the literature but I see that you are still at it. I belonged to the Socialist Party over fifty years ago and that was as far as we got then; talk, quibble, talk, over Marx and verse.

Marx had the whole of Europe by the tail as a result of his Manifesto but it came to nothing because he confined himself to a diagnosis of Capitalism and not the building of Socialism.

Lenin made the first success for Socialism because he took Hobson's monetary theory along with Marx and combined the two so that scarce wealth could be distributed equitably.

Why don't you Marx'ists tell the people that Socialism is merely an opinion as to how the wealth of the country should be divided? And since to distribute wealth by means of money, a knowledge of how this is done is necessary to any successful application of Marxian philosophy.

All we reformers can hope for is that you Marxians continue to talk and quibble, stay out of the way so that we can get on with the job. I can't stand your intolerance.

REPLY:

J. B. Davis

"Over 50 years ago" was before 1927 and before the dismemberment of the old or first Socialist Party of Canada which occurred about 1925. One of the members of that Party acquired some of Marx's ideas by talking "over Marx, chapter and verse." Many never did, whether they perused him or not, and remained reformist in their thinking. They later made up some of the sacrificial lamb, "the rank and filers" for the "Communist" Party, the OCF and other left-wing conservative elements. It appears that you are among these.

Reformism has evolved a bit since those years to include the right-wing conservatives and a lot of heavily remunerated experts locked in real mock combat with the escalating problems caused by capitalism.

Marx did not control Europe in 1840 or thereafter nor was that the purpose for which he and Engels wrote the Communist Manifesto. They called on Communist to separate their science from the utopian reformers of their time. They analyzed capitalism and wrote to explain its nature to the world's workers so they could free themselves from wage-slavery and the rest of capitalism's anti-social consequences.

For one who thinks Lenin brought Socialism to Russia by trying to distribute scarce wealth "equitably," (which is capitalism) not distributing abundant wealth according to needs (which would be Socialism) it is understandable that the same individual would see Marx as a leadership opportunist prototype of Lenin. Lenin pulled the wool over the peasants' eyes and started to lead them toward the present promised land (for the Bolsheviks and their heirs), of state capitalism.

We don't tell people Socialism is an opinion, because the evidence shows it to be a science. And we would hardly be noticed among the crowds of prominent academics who are now telling the workers via the bosses' mass media that Socialism is about "...how the wealth of the country should be divided."

If it is true that "... we distribute wealth by means of money..." we wait for new evidence never available to us. Existing proof shows the mass of wealth is owned and controlled by a small minority in all countries. What results from the capitalist productive process is that existing capital is expanded. The majority, the workers, receive wages, barely enough to renew the energy required to produce more for the rich. Which points to the money commodity's function as being a mere medium of exchange and a measure of value of other commodities, required for the profit making economic process.

In addition to Marx never advocating reforms to capitalism as the path to Socialism/Communism, he did not subscribe to the capitalist myth that money is a means of distributing wealth. Socialist society will be moneyless because all people will have free access to what they have socially produced according to their requirements.

Talking is effective political action; just watch the representatives of the capitalist class, most of whom are reformers. The real Marxists do the same, for the workers' cause, while we have no choice but to tolerate your system, for the time being.

Ontario Election

Dear Comrades:

"As you might be aware, we are having an election in Ontario on June 9th. The other day a person dropped the enclosed pamphlet at our door. It is the 'Communist' answer to the ills of the capitalist society. I thought you might be interested in it ... At least it will provide you with a chuckle or two."

(Second letter) "Just a little note to let you in on another aspect of our election tomorrow. If you got a laugh out of the... 'Communist' Party's answers for capitalism's ills, this pamphlet for the Liberal Party will make you fall off your chair with laughter. The way they explain the NDP Party to the electorate you would think they (the NDP) were the 'Communist' Party of the Soviet Union. We know that the reformist platform of the NDP has nothing whatever to do with Socialism. What seems foolish about the Liberals' view are the gross distortions of the NDP, but more distorted is the explanation of Socialism to the electorate. I am not foolish enough to think the parties of capitalism would want to give a clear view of Socialism to the people ... here is the pamphlet and you can judge for yourself." J. R.

All Capitalist Parties

The contents of the pamphlets, aside from rightist fantasizing by the Liberals, and gleanings from the press revealed that all the political organizations in the election accepted the present class ownership of the means of life. The essence of their platform was to deliver profits to the owners, that is expand capital, while trying to conceal or explain away the anti-social contradictions to the working class. They took for granted all the economic and political arrangements of capitalism.

- # The Liberals, Tories, "Communists" and NDP were against Quebec separatism and in favor of a "united Canada." (Nationalism). (Quebec Separatism favors its own national capitalism).
- # All were in favor of state (capitalist) medicine. Some for less than exists. Some for more.
- # All were in favor of governments "creating" more jobs. (More wage-slavery).
- # All were in favor of taxation, more or less. (Necessary for capitalism).
- # All were against inflation. (Inflation hurts some capitalists, benefits others).
- # All parties favored a minimum wage, but the NDP wanted this raised to \$4.00 per hour. The "Communists" with no chance of forming a government, wanted a minimum wage of \$4.50 per hour. (Controlled poverty).

They all urged reforms to this system and they all tried to look different from each other. The emancipation of the propertiless majority from wage bondage to capital; which is the solution to their problems, was unmentionable. G.

There seems to be a growing element within the NDP that are dissatisfied with mere socialist window dressing while the Party busies itself with the affairs of capitalism. Many of these linger in political limbo. Others, disillusioned from reformist illusions disappear into hopeless oblivion. Here is one who decided to do something about it. He has since joined the S.P.C.

Letter to N.D.P.

Dear Secretary:

This is to inform you that I wish to terminate my membership in the New Democratic Party which will be effective at the above date.

I can no longer support the policies of the Party. I consider your policy of a mixed economy (part "free" enterprise, part state ownership) to be a mistake. State ownership is not Socialism anyway. The only way to solve the problems of

Since leftist organizations support the wages, prices, profit system of capitalism, degrees of leftism, or one party being further left than another (whatever that may mean) does not designate it as being more Socialist. Socialism means the ending of the class division of owners and non-owners of the means of life.

About the "spiritual tolerance" of the Communist Party of Canada (Marxist-Leninist). Marx and Engels insisted in 1848 in the Communist Manifesto that the proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority in the interest of the immense majority.

Marx also advised the workers to "... also change yourselves and prepare yourselves for the exercise of political power." (The Cologne Communist Trial).

The Socialist Party of Canada agrees, and one of the methods the workers can use to acquire the knowledge of the system necessary for them to be able to end it is free and open discussion. This is the last thing the Communist Party of Canada (M-L) Marxist desires, both in goal and consequently means to their goal. In their uncompromising idolatry of the state capitalism being developed in China and reformism in advanced capitalist nations they have been known to violently attempt to suppress meetings of other parties whose brand of bolstering capitalist social relations differs slightly from that advocated by their own Messiah. In the few cases of Maoists in discussion with Socialists, the Maoists have shown implacable hostility to the idea of common ownership and democratic control of the means of life. This writer was nearly thrown out of a bookstore in Winnipeg by the Maoist proprietor upon hearing the contention that Marx's conception of Socialism/Communism was not state capitalism. Civility prevailed up to that point because the reason for entering the premises was to purchase a copy of the great man's little red book. Emotional intolerance and shouting came from a group of young Maoists in the same city later during an evening's discussion. After much ridiculing of the Socialists the Maoists were asked if they supported the Marxist goal of abolition of the wages system, that is, the ending of the capital vs. wage-labor relationship. An embarrassed silence was the reply.

Perhaps you will elaborate on what you mean by "spiritual" tolerance. In reference to "like or not my terminology" it is less a matter of like or dislike than one of adopting a terminology that can be efficiently used to analyze and understand the social source of workers' problems.

Instead of hierarchy (the world capitalist class) being abetted by "slugging matches in the world of reason", it ought to be obvious to date that it is largely the reverse, e.g., the absence of independent discussion by the workers that keeps the world ruling class in existence. The workers are still captives, mainly, of the propaganda peddled out by the world's bosses to preserve their system.

HOBSON'S CHOICE

Dear friends:

Thanks for the literature but I see that you are still at it. I belonged to the Socialist Party over fifty years ago and that was as far as we got then; talk, quibble, talk, over Marx chapter and verse.

Marx had the whole of Europe by the tail as a result of his Manifesto but it came to nothing because he confined himself to a diagnosis of Capitalism and not the building of Socialism.

Lenin made the first success for Socialism because he took Hobson's monetary theory along with Marx and combined the two so that scarce wealth could be distributed equitably.

Why don't you Marxists tell the people that Socialism is merely an opinion as to how the wealth of the country should be divided? And since we distribute wealth by means of money, a knowledge of how this is done is necessary to any successful application of Marxian philosophy.

All we reformers can hope for is that you Marxians continue to talk and quibble, stay out of the way so that we can get on with the job. I can't stand your intolerance.

J. H. Dowler

REPLY:

"Over 50 years ago" was before 1927 and before the dismemberment of the old or first Socialist Party of Canada which occurred about 1925. Many of the members of that Party acquired some of Marx's ideas by talking "over Marx, chapter and verse." Many never did, whether they perused Marx or not, and remained reformist in their thinking. They later made up some of the sacrificial lambs, "the rank and filers" for the "Communist" Party, the CUP and other left-wing conservative movements. It appears that you are among these.

Reformism has evolved a bit since those years to include the right-wing conservatives and a host of heavily remunerated experts locked in real or mock combat with the escalating problems spawned by capitalism.

Marx did not control Europe in 1840 or thereafter, nor was that the purpose for which he and Engels wrote the Communist Manifesto. They called it Communist to separate their science from the utopian reformers of their time. They analyzed capitalism and wrote to explain its nature to the world's workers so they could free themselves from wage-slavery and the rest of capitalism's anti-social consequences.

For one who thinks Lenin brought Socialism to Russia by trying to distribute scarce wealth "equitably," (which is capitalism) not distributing abundant wealth according to needs (which would be Socialism) it is understandable that the same individual would see Marx as a leadership-opportunist prototype of Lenin. Lenin pulled the wool over the peasants' eyes and started to lead them toward the present promised land (for the Bolsheviks and their heirs), of state capitalism.

We don't tell people Socialism is an opinion, because the evidence shows it to be a science. And we would hardly be noticed among the crowds of prominent academics who are now telling the workers via the business mass media that Socialism is about "how the wealth of the country should be divided."

If it is true that "... we distribute wealth by means of money..." we wait for new evidence never available to us. Existing proof shows the mass of wealth is owned and controlled by a small minority in all countries. What results from the capitalist productive process is that existing capital is expanded. The majority, the workers, receive wages; barely enough to renew the energy required to produce more for the rich. Which points to the money commodity's function as being a mere medium of exchange and a measure of value of other commodities, required for the profit making economic process.

In addition to Marx never advocating reforms to capitalism as the path to Socialism/Communism, he did not subscribe to the capitalist myth that money is a means of distributing wealth. Socialist society will be moneyless because all people will have free access to what they have socially produced according to their requirements.

Talking is effective political action; just watch the representatives of the capitalist class, most of whom are reformers. The real Marxists do the same, for the workers' cause, while we have no choice but to tolerate your system, for the time being.

Ontario Election

Dear Comrades:

"As you might be aware, we are having an election in Ontario on June 9th. The other day a person dropped the enclosed pamphlet at our door. It is the 'Communist' answer to the ills of the capitalist society. I thought you might be interested in it ... At least it will provide you with a chuckle or two."

(Second letter) "Just a little note to let you in on another aspect of our election tomorrow. If you got a laugh out of the... 'Communist' Party's answers for capitalism's ills, this pamphlet for the Liberal Party will make you fall off your chair with laughter. The way they explain the NDP Party to the electorate you would think they (the NDP) were the 'Communist' Party of the Soviet Union. We know that the reformist platform of the NDP has nothing whatever to do with Socialism. What seems foolish about the Liberals' view are the gross distortions of the NDP, but more distorted is the explanation of Socialism to the electorate. I am not foolish enough to think the parties of capitalism would want to give a clear view of Socialism to the people ... here is the pamphlet and you can judge for yourself." J. R.

All Capitalist Parties

The contents of the pamphlets, aside from rightist fantasizing by the Liberals, and gleanings from the press revealed that all the political organizations in the election accepted the present class ownership of the means of life. The essence of their platforms was to deliver profits to the owners, that is expand capital, while trying to conceal or explain away the anti-social contradictions to the working class. They took for granted all the economic and political arrangements of capitalism.

- # The Liberals, Tories, 'Communists' and NDP were against Quebec separation and in favor of a "united Canada." (Nationalism). (Quebec Separatism favors its own national capitalism).
- # All were in favor of state (capitalist) medicine. Some for less than exists. Some for more.
- # All were in favor of governments "creating" more jobs. (More wage-slavery).
- # All were in favor of taxation, more or less. (Necessary for capitalism).
- # All were against inflation. (Inflation hurts some capitalists, benefits others).
- # All parties favored a minimum wage, but the NDP wanted this raised to \$4.00 per hour. The 'Communists' with no chance of forming a government, wanted a minimum wage of \$4.50 per hour. (Controlled poverty).

They all urged reforms to this system and they all tried to look different from each other. The emancipation of the propertiless majority from wage bondage to capital; which is the solution to their problems, was unmentionable.

There seems to be a growing element within the NDP that are dissatisfied with mere socialist window dressing while the Party busies itself with the affairs of capitalism. Many of them linger in political limbo. Others, disillusioned from reformist illusions disappear into hopeless oblivion. Here is one who decided to do something about it. He has since joined the S.P.C.

Letter to N.D.P.

Dear Secretary:

This is to inform you that I wish to terminate my membership in the New Democratic Party which will be effective at the above date.

I can no longer support the policies of the Party. I consider your policy of a mixed economy (part "free" enterprise, part state ownership) to be a mistake. State ownership is not Socialism anyway. The only way to solve the problems of

When you were in office your "rent control" allowed the landlords to increase rents by 10.6 per cent which has had the net result of increasing my rent by \$50.00 per month. This anarchy persists whether the party making up the government pretends to be a friend of the workers or not. Any party which pretends this but which condones the division of society into owners and non owners of the means of life is an enemy of the workers. The interest of the workers is the gaining of freedom from wage-slavery - not tinkering with the system that exploits them.

I have suffered through a depression and two wars. My father was injured in the first world war and my mother died prematurely, now another depression is developing. I have been a member of the British Labor Party and other Social Democrat Parties since 1908 and just now realized the futility of being a member and working for policies for what amounts to another capitalist party.

J. Ayre

an ex-N.D.P.er advises his ex-union

Secretary, Local 510, UAW, Montreal

Dear Friend,

Fraternal greetings from an ex-member.

I would like to say a few unusual words about separatism in Quebec. A great propaganda effort is being waged in Anglo Canada on this subject. As I see the situation, a group of French speaking capitalists are fighting over who will exploit the working class of Quebec. To begin with, there is no shortage of evidence to show that an independent Quebec would still be capitalist in its social structure. An instance is Rene Levesque himself while visiting Paris five years ago, said that an independent Quebec would remain essentially a capitalist country and welcome foreign investments. (Western Producer, June 22/72).

The next reality to establish is that the owning minority is the class that dominates society. This is the case where both classes speak the same language, as in most countries, or where

each mainly speaks a different language as in Quebec. The owning class, through its media, doesn't customarily like to reveal this, but at times it slips out inadvertently. Such an instance is a Montreal reporter, Peter Hadekel, who wrote - "they (the English speaking capitalists) have exercised control over the province through their predominance in business and the economy." (Victoria Times, April 13/77). If French speaking capitalists succeeded in dominating Quebec, through separatism, what reason is there to think the French speaking workers would not have the same problems as afflict them now?

Pierre Trudeau, in his book - "Federalism and the French Canadians" did not have nice words for the section of French speaking Quebec capitalists who wanted control and the profits all for themselves. He called them "...the rising bourgeoisie..." who were beginning "to see Marxist terminology." This of course to rally the victims of English dominated capitalism to help put alternative French speaking masters in the driver's seat. Trudeau said that if these Francophones win independence for Quebec, they "...will be kings and sorcerers. They will have legal authority. They will also be able to transfer the title to property and to declare that from now on foreign industries will belong to the tribal bourgeoisie." I say to the Quebec workers, a plague on both their houses (English and French speaking capitalists).

The workers of Quebec should organize themselves politically and put an end to capitalism. No amount of reforms to capitalism (including state control of industry) can remove the causes of unemployment, bad housing and the degradation of the working class. The solution is to completely abolish capitalism, not by violence but by political organization and the abolition of the wage-slave system. In other words, replace capitalism with Socialism, a world society of common ownership and democratic control, with free access by all and voluntary work. This is what the motto, "from each according to ability, to each according to need," means.

Please contact me if you require further information.

Yours Fraternaly,

Part 5 of series

christianity and socialism

Belief in the efficacy of prayer

PRAYER GIVES many people relief, just as swearing helps to soothe and comfort others; while some prefer chain smoking or alcohol to drown their sorrows.

Apart from solace, prayers bestows on those who say them, a kind of assurance somewhat similar to wishful thinking. In asking for help for yourself, prayer may be a form of auto-suggestion.

The priests, as would be expected were not slow to capitalise on prayers. They have persuaded many a poor man to part with his savings, as well as the rich to give large sums of money to the church (the business institution of the priests) to have prayers said for them.

The priests are professional prayer sayers; they often learn Latin (one of the chief languages of God) for that purpose. How God can understand millions of prayers uttered at the same time in several different languages.

Continued on P. 14

TROTSKYIST Merry-go-round

It is one thing to read Trotskyist literature, about the, "workers' state," and voting for the NDP as a slow, painful way of discovering that Social Democratic parties are not the answer to working class problems. It was quite another matter to confront a Trotskyist in the flesh.

The mention of Leon Trotsky being in command of the Bolshevik government forces that gunned down 8,000 workers during the Kronstadt revolt for free soviets for candidates of all parties had little visible effect on him. This should have been a clue of things to come, in the unfolding discussion. He apparently knew little of the exploits of his alleged and erstwhile mentor.

Next came a scorning of the ballot (though the Trotskyist organizations in Canada and other industrialized nations put up candidates and urge workers to vote for labor parties). Guns were said to be the only way to gain control of the state to smash it (and at another stage of the conversation to establish a workers' state). The capitalist class would never allow a majority of the workers to gain control of parliament for the purpose of establishing Socialism. Violence would be used to stop them. (Unless the workers were voting for Trotskyist leaders).

When it was mentioned that the capitalist class controls overpowering means of violence, through the state, such as nuclear weapons, he replied: "That's what the struggle is about — paring down three multi-national corporations by liberating the workers of third world countries from their control."

When it was pointed out that Marx and Engels saw the futility of violence in the late 19th century, and that they advocated the ballot in countries with the franchise, he didn't believe it. At the suggestion that the capitalist class spends more on deceiving the workers than it does on means of violent repression, he disagreed.

He said Allende failed to establish Socialism because the workers of Chile used the ballot instead of guns. The assertion that Allende's election program was not for Socialism was shouted down in repeated denials.

The USA, Russia and China were said to be imperialist powers, but the US was worse because of its multi-national corporations. (Having all businesses encompassed in one giant, state boss presumably is not so bad).

Angola was said to be a workers' state. At the suggestion that illiterate peasants or newly evolved workers of emerging capitalist countries were not likely to possess what workers in advan-

ced nations had not acquired yet, (Socialist knowledge) we were accused of not giving native people enough credit for intelligence. This is opposite to the original Leninist view (and Trotsky was just another Bolshevik) that the workers anywhere are not capable of learning beyond trade union consciousness for the next 1,000 years.

Emotions were ascending. We stated that the social system in Angola was capitalist, that wealth assumed the form of commodities for sale, not products for free distribution, according to needs. We said there was a working class in that country, working for wages, as in all other countries. "Give them time," he shouted. "They've only started."

We said that the Angolan (workers' state) government co-operated with U.S. businessmen to break strikes in the U.S. economy, and to discipline the Angolan workers toward higher productivity, (information supplied by Labor Challenge, a Trotskyist periodical). This was met by glib disbelief. (Subsequent checking revealed the issue of Labor Challenge to be March 15/76, and the name of the firm is "Diamag," an international consortium involving Portugal, U.S.A., South Africa, Belgium and England).

Vietnam was also claimed as a workers' state. It was recalled that the U.S. promised to supply billions of dollars after the war was over for reconstruction in Vietnam. He replied that the U.S. must have known it was going to lose the war, it just made that offer as a bargaining lever. We mentioned a Viet Cong election program for capitalism (published in the Western Socialist in 1970). More disbelief.

Mindful of the bushels of leftist publications on hand, agitating for national liberation for workers and peasants in third world countries, we asked the Trotskyist representative if he could show us just one leftist or Trot piece of literature which advocates Socialism, (a wageless, moneyless, profitless, classless, stateless world of common ownership and democratic control, where each produced voluntarily according to ability and consumed freely according to needs). He said he didn't happen to have one on his person at the time.

He accused the Socialist Party of Canada of alienating itself from, or standing aloof from the struggles of the natives, peasants and workers in backward areas to improve their conditions.

Another pertinent point about the capitalist nature of society in "Communist" countries that stuck in our mind was the military alliances between Vietnamese "Communist" forces and those of

another small "Communist" state in South-East Asia over a group of oil rich islands. Exemplifying normal relations between any group of capitalist powers. Our opponent had not heard about this. (Looking back over our sources we find the other "Communist" country to have been Cambodia. The islands were in the Gulf of Thailand and the battle lasted 6 days; Victoria Times, June 15/75). The same report said that possibility of oil in the area made possession of the islands more desirable.

We insisted that the so-called liberation or improvements for workers pushed by Bolshevik types does not bring freedom from wage slavery in backward countries. In many cases the new rulers are more extreme taskmasters than the old, western imperialists, utilizing a dictatorial, single party political system of state capitalism. And often allied to the absolutism of Russia or China. When one recalls the brutality, genocide, terror and forced labor camps of the early Russian regime and how the Trotskyists regard Russia as a degenerated proletarian state or some such, the picture can be repulsive.

In the history of capitalism nationalism has always been a cloak concealing some ruling class. It is the ultimate obscenity for these pretenders to label the new regimes as "Socialist."

Back to Viet Nam. Checking back we noticed that the U.S. aid offered came through a Hong Kong news release in 1970:

The United States had indicated its willingness to help in the difficult task of reconstruction in both North and South Vietnam... This in addition to aid from the U.N. and other Western nations and — Hanoi seems to be preparing public opinion, at home and abroad, for an improved climate between the two countries.

With Viet Nam being a "workers' state", of course the U.S. would unhesitatingly invest in that country for future profits, just as Henry Ford and other U.S. tycoons did in Russia's early state capitalist years. The term, "workers' state", is just a clever pseudonym for a normal capitalist state. Where there is a state, there is class divided society. Where there is a working class there is invariably the other side of the equation, the capitalist class, occupying the only social position possible for it, the one of dominance over its hirelings. Socialism would end class division and the reason for the coercive state. It is obvious that in Viet Nam, with the capital-wage labor relationship ascendant, capitalism is the order of the day.

No wonder all parties in the British Columbia legislature, left and right, when the NDP was in office, voted for financial aid to Viet Nam.

Our opponent accentuated his accusation that the SRC was ignoring the real struggle for the poor peasants and natives of the third world. (If we had thought of it, and if he had paused long

enough for us to say it, we could have pointed out that all the openly capitalist parties offer the same kind of aid to these areas as he does). 'You're only textbook Marxian' he taunted with a smile. The continuous patter and attempted belittling of the Socialist Party appeared to be a face saving "I won the argument" maneuver. We suggested he come back some time for an emotional exchange of ideas.

In Canada the Trotskyists' general program of reforms to capitalism is barely discernable from that of, say, the Progressive Conservative Party. Present Tory leader Joe Clark, might be horrified to hear that according to Trotskyist reasoning his program is paramount to "practical Marxism". Better to quote a member of our British Companion Party: "nineteenth century romanticists."

in the news

CONSERVATIVE NDP

The recent B.C. NDP convention reinforces the conclusion that this country's Social Democrats are little more than a radical conservative movement.

If the goal of the OCP-NDP had ever been a system where all people consciously control their social affairs then their periodical conclaves would never see "... such a smooth manipulation of a convention..." by the Party brass, to use the approving description of a rightist news columnist.

The methods of a political organization usually reflect its objective. And the objective of the NDP is to tinker with, but to leave intact, the present hierarchical society of haves and have-nots. This priority demands a Party structure of leaders and followers, or those "who know" versus the rank and filers.

When members of the deprived majority, such as some NDP convention delegates, think freedom is the right to demonstrate against social evils instead of possession of the knowledge to abolish them, they are trapped in a web of political ignorance. When they are captured by a parochial inference that democracy has been served when they are subdued by "their own" RCMP but not if censured by "foreign" Pinkerton guards, they are prime sheep for any glib shepherd. If many of the 50,000 workers ordered back to the treadmill in 1975 by former Premier and grand, strike breaker Dave Barrett had ignored his dictum, some equal authoritarianism of the violent kind could have been witnessed.

The crusading privates of the NDP army are in "good hands" when one from their upper echelon

Continued on P. 11

The consolidation or the splitting of nations cannot be understood without knowing why the human species is presently segregated into national units.

SEPARATISM

The productive potential of world capitalism with its rapid transit and communications has long made the geo-political nation obsolete in terms of social administration. The global village idea is in irreversible confrontation with customs lineups and border guards.

The nation had its genesis in the original cleavage of man into owners and non-owners of property in the means of life. Proprietorship in the first version of civilization was principally founded on chattel slaves. In early civilization, the absence of social interest demanded a forceful executive to avoid total chaos and ensure the acquisitive process for the first ruling class.

A persuasive regulatory body to democratize the varying prerogatives of the slave owners, as a whole, evolved in parallel. The armed co-ordinative club, known as the state, was born. Allegiance to a socially organized group for individual good during the initial 88.9 per cent or the pre-civilized portion of man's existence has been the sine qua non of his persistence to the first stage of a higher productive mode and class division. Organized struggle was against nature, not against others within the social unit. Society was of necessity equalitarian and administration naturally representative of the needs of all. Revolution was unknown. But, since the breakup of tribal society a scant 7,000 to 10,000 years ago, a legal-violent instrument has been required to ensure the dominance of whichever master class the existing productive mode made possible.

The underdogs of this last accumulative system cannot be brought off with such simplistic explanations as "you are biologically inferior" or, "you are designated by God to be a peasant," as were the slaves of antiquity and medieval times. During the centuries of ancient and feudal overlordship the timeless primitive predilection toward tribal cohesion was only submerged. When the new capitalist ruling class required a phony social loyalty to disguise its narrow purloining position, the admirable tendency for social solidarity in the human make-up was available to be prostituted.

Movements expressing secessionist economic interests have blossomed periodically in both eastern and western provinces.

All slaves produced surpluses of wealth for their masters in return for their keep. The modern industrial producer can only superficially appear to be on a par with his boss as he exchanges a

commodity for room, board, clothing, education and recreation in the form of a money wage. This seemingly story permeates every crevice. Hence when the minority beneficiaries of one nation fall out with those of another over trade routes, sources of materials, the resultant blood bath is misrepresented as involving the interest of all members of the nations involved. The party political machinations and the dictums of the mouthpieces in single party dictatorships are likewise proclaimed to be in the social interest.

It follows that when the profit requirements of a fraction of the upper strata come into conflict with the rules of the rest of their class to the extent of no compromise, a movement is launched for administrative separation from old boundaries to form a separate nation or amalgamate with another country where the commercial climate is more in harmony with theirs. Like their larger international cousins, inter-national disputes must be exonerated from any upper class caliginous domination. For those who perceive at least a social ladder, a theory of what's good for General Bullmoose is good for everybody is circulated.

THE ONLY THING THE WORKER TRADES IS A MARKETABLE SKILL.

When a hardware merchant in Sarnia, or a dry goods peddler in Saskatoon grumble about excessive wholesale prices charged by eastern manufacturers, they pine for lower tariffs against outside competitors that reduce protective for Ontario factories and lower costs to themselves. The grain producers of the prairies, the cattle kings in Calgary, the lumber barons and mining giants of B.C. and blocks of capital in the Maritimes have been or are at odds with the national government rule book which favors the industrialists of the central provinces. Movements expressing secessionist economic interests have blossomed periodically in both eastern and western provinces. Invariably the propaganda is predicated on a non-existent classlessness. It is "our" exports or "our" trade.

The only thing the workers trades is marketable skill. For the industrial captains own marketable goods and services far beyond the going price for human energy. These accruals are divided as rent, interest and profits according to the equities of the various owners. The worker is a real outside alien.

While real class schism is hidden by the patriotic cloak of the total national capital, false differences are manufactured or irrelevancies exaggerated to compartmentalize workers as allies of the warring groups of their masters. With Quebec separatism, for instance, caucasians who speak French are regarded as a different "race" from caucasians who speak English.

WITH AIN IS COMING, AND IN THE MIDDLE OF FIGHTING LAND

After the 1970s, the separatist movement in Quebec has become a major force in the political life of the province. The separatist movement is a movement for the independence of Quebec from Canada. It is a movement for the independence of Quebec from Canada. It is a movement for the independence of Quebec from Canada.

Separatism is a movement for the independence of Quebec from Canada. It is a movement for the independence of Quebec from Canada. It is a movement for the independence of Quebec from Canada. It is a movement for the independence of Quebec from Canada. It is a movement for the independence of Quebec from Canada.

The separatist movement is a movement for the independence of Quebec from Canada. It is a movement for the independence of Quebec from Canada. It is a movement for the independence of Quebec from Canada. It is a movement for the independence of Quebec from Canada. It is a movement for the independence of Quebec from Canada.

From 1970, the separatist movement in Quebec has become a major force in the political life of the province. The separatist movement is a movement for the independence of Quebec from Canada. It is a movement for the independence of Quebec from Canada. It is a movement for the independence of Quebec from Canada.

In the last, Trudeau tried to convince those in the south end of the province that their minority opposition could be better satisfied within Confederation. An example:

All I ask our present ruling classes is that they stop being so preoccupied with the hypothetical power an independent Quebec might have, and start using the power the real Quebec does have a bit more often and a bit more wisely.

As it has transpired, they have desecrated and purchased separatism to achieve their avaricious ends. The trip to New York by their chief executive seems to have dampened their fervor in relation to U.S. firms appropriating in Quebec. Uncle Sam is still tall in the saddle in habitat land.

The tender concern the moneyed separatists have for the welfare of their Francophone workers is limited to the potential profits from future labor power. The alleged freedom is a one-way street. Like capitalists anywhere, if the wishes of people conflict with the business aims of the secessionists, that's too bad for the people. Take the case of the Labrador Eskimos. During the Separatists' avaricious squabble with Newfoundland, in attempting to acquire most of Labrador, they flatly refused to countenance the desire of thousands of Eskimos to stay within Confederation.

The idea of Separatism has caused many small entrepreneurs (French and English speaking) to flee to Vermont and Florida. This just means that the rules of the Separatists might cramp their money-

making style too much. In U.S. territories and possessions, they enjoy greater entry into the core of the language world. Providing they have the 10% of some of these territories from the workers' movement and leaders of these territories workers will not be "bored" and in the interest of the labor.

In the territories, French signs are common. The separatist organizations are not always seen as a force back in the territories. Some of the people in the territories with separatist views and French as a second language are equally as opposed by the separatist organizations. The separatist organizations are not always seen as a force back in the territories. Some of the people in the territories with separatist views and French as a second language are equally as opposed by the separatist organizations. The separatist organizations are not always seen as a force back in the territories. Some of the people in the territories with separatist views and French as a second language are equally as opposed by the separatist organizations.

...a place where we people have a great deal of money and the surrounding world, and we people have very little or none of either.

Another in the same issue of Maclean's perhaps has thought the language "racist" with that all the English speaking people in Quebec are capitalists and all the French speaking are exploited workers. He quoted Claude Ryan in Le Devoir that 75% of Quebec's anglophone population earn the average provincial income or below. He said further:

What good does it do these people (the workers) to know that the Molsons and the McMullins are also Quebec anglophones? Can we use their names as collateral for a bank loan or as a down payment for a house?

The workers will have the freedom to discuss their unemployment... in French.

This helps to nullify the Party Quebecois story of English language domination. In any language the domination of the capitalist class is the fact of the matter. But the pay check multitude while it may no longer venerate the political personalities or media still mauling the old story, continue to submerge their identity in the bosses' aura of nationalism.

The recent federal by-elections indicate the anglophone workers again put their faith in the governing Liberals, to keep the nation whole, despite their wrong opinions that the government is causing their escalating poverty problems. In the meantime, the Quebec francophone workers who support separation have begun another round of disillusionment. Firstly, the separatist capitalists seem to be discovering that they won't get their way against the federalist capitalists. The P.Q. government has already been forced into compromises. Secondly the supposed changed economic order which would free francophone workers from poverty and oppression is actually no change at

Two Conferences in Portland

10th Annual Pacific Northwest Labour History Association

April 14-16 1977

This conference, as the name implies, concerned itself mainly with trade union history in the Pacific Northwest. There were some very informative talks on IWW history and the unionization of farm workers up to the present with considerable emphasis on the efforts of Caesar Chavez in this area. Although most of the speakers were either university academics or trade union officials there was a visible expression of dissatisfaction with trade union reaction and corruption with a note that there are beginning to be increasing differences between rank and file and union officials as to the role of politics.

SEPARATISM (concluded)

all, but reforms to the existing division in society. Even in an minor a matter as reform, Premier Levesque has been dictating to his Party at its recent convention - as the daily newspaper reports have indicated.

To put it briefly, in the "new economic order" brought about by the Party Quebecois, the workers will have the freedom to discuss their unemployment, poverty and other problems in French.

IN THE NEWS (continued)

forbids the Socialist Party of Canada from advertising in their paper, "The Democrat." The officer's actual words were "...we only print advertisements from left-wing groups."

Ah yes. Protecting the innocent lambs.

BUT WE THOUGHT

Michael Harrington, chairman of the democratic socialist organizing committee in the U.S., managed to slip across the border to attend the NDP convention for a day. He apologized to the fathering of his Canadian counterparts for coming from a "...backward, undeveloped country." He praised the NDP for its social programs and said its record "makes us weep."

The extent to which the CCF/NDP's repair work on the wages, prices, profit system under a Social-

Radical Social Science in the Northwest

May 4-6 1977

This conference was mostly initiated by university academics with "radical" views. A sampling of speech topics are: Radical Criminology, Socialist Feminism, Radical Social Work, Left Radical Imperialism. While there were some of the varying homages sometimes experienced in Canada there was a strong flavor of isolation with perhaps an occasional burst of interest emanating from some of the speakers.

It might be thought that a Socialist has no place in such company. True enough the dominating theme of both conferences was reformist capitalism (albeit sometimes fraudulently hidden behind socialist terminology) with some leftist strategy. However, through both conferences gems of working class knowledge could be gleaned, along with some promotion of class consciousness. The gem of the lot was a feature address by Sam Jones, State University Professor of Economics, Ureg Bond. Bond delivered a straight Marxist analysis of capitalism today, unclouded by any of the usual leftist corruption. However the important reason for Socialists to attend conferences, such as these, is that such conferences attract a number of people who have come to a number of socialist conclusions on their own. Knowing of no genuine stone-rock to which to attach themselves (The World Socialist Party of the U.S. is numerically very weak in the west) they turn up at conferences such as these as there seems to be nowhere else to go.

Consequently some contacts can be made at these conferences. But it is not only where socialism is numerically weak -- What the hell! Socialism is numerically weak everywhere. Therefore at any conference, where there is the slightest chance of developing a grain of socialist thought, socialists should hover around, speak if they get a chance, pass out leaflets, whatever, and make contacts.

Larry Tietner

ist pseudonym has beclouded working class comprehension of the capitalist cause of their problems could make real Socialist weep too. Is the case of Harrington, the shepherd might be just as lost as the sheep. He used the occasion to divulge that he had campaigned for Jimmy Carter in the U.S. election, as did thousands of other "ordinary people."

Continued on P. 13

Milking in New Zealand

"Everywhere (except) in New Zealand the farmer may count on adequate rainfall — with mild winters and genial summers" (1). About 1800 Kilometers in length which runs roughly North-South and thereby catches all the moisture laden Trades and Anti-trade winds which blow in from boundless oceans and across its comparatively narrow width. N.Z. lies in the temperate regions of the S.W. Pacific Ocean almost on the Longitude 180° and consists of two main islands sensibly named North and South Islands.

N.Z. climatically, geographically and socially seems limited to remain chiefly a primary producing and exporting economy. Its comparatively small land mass and corresponding small population (2 - 3 million) at the "other end" of a commodity producing world, allows little or no room for competitive development of major heavy secondary industries unrelated to rural production.

THE SILENT N.Z. REVOLUTION

During the 1928-31 period the present writer, as a school leaver, was of a team of 3 who hand milked 18 cows twice daily. The labor time required for this totalled about 4 hours per day. 9 cows milked per man hour.

Three years later found me working on a different farm. The first one, along with other similar farms, as an entity, was swept away — absorbed into a larger more visible unit. Again, as one of a team of three, we twice daily, machine milked a herd of 100 dairy cows. In those depression days, of cheap labor power (and selling below its value,) — \$1 to \$1.50 per week, per farm hand, with bedding blankets and rations, in exchange for 14 hours 6 day working week with a mere 8 hrs. work on Sunday. This milking rate was considered to be highly efficient. And so it was relative to "A" period.

We were machining 11 cows an hour under cleaner and more comfortable conditions for both men and beast.

However, time, as ever, keeps moving on. A Second World War came and went. Changing world trading patterns emerged as the result of very interesting complex world events, until:

"In the early post war years N.Z. exported 90% of its dairy produce to Gt. Britain. The first (abortive) British attempt to enter the E.E.C. in 1963 gave N.Z. a godawful shock — but the method of industry management meant it was able to react effectively — (and now) only one-third of N.Z.'s goods go to Britain." (2)

This cutting down of the traditional markets for N.Z. farming exports from 90% to a mere 33 roused the lively interest of Marxist students here as to just HOW the N.Z. rural capitalists intended to cope and how successfully so.

To begin with, the now familiar pattern of concentration and accumulation of land and capital into the hands of a reducing number of owners has been going on in N.Z. as elsewhere. The onward march of capitalism is irresistible. The number of farmers has been rationalised back from 70,000 in the 1930's to less than 20,000 today. — The typical kiwi cow cocky now milks 110 dairy cows, (2) apparently single handed because of the prohibitive hired labor costs. 37 cows milked per man hour — Again apparently in about 3 hours per milking twice per day. These figures are impressive when compared with (a) and (b).

But even these are already redundant — out of date — old hat. We have notice of an exceptional case history of N.Z. farming revolution which dictates the general trend to which N.Z. and all other farmers must soon conform or go out of business or "Individuals sometimes provide lessons that have a broad application — Peter Campbell bought himself a dairy farm (in N.Z.) Most Australians inherit them, like barmophilis," humorously adds journalist John Lawley. (2) "The Campbell turned 31 years of age he'd built up his own herd, milking 230, (no that's not a misprint, inserts journalist Lawley) cows each day by himself" (2) — again evidently twice daily with milking taking about 6 hours total. Average of 77 cows milked per man hour. And quite likely more hygienically and comfortably than ever before in the history of N.Z. dairy farming.

The picture now emerging becomes clearer:

Date	Cows Milked	Man Hours	Average No. Per Man Hour	Remarks	Increase In Labor Productivity On 1929-31 Basis Of 1
1928-31	18	4	3	Hand Milked	1
1932-31	100	9	11	Machine Milked	3.7
1977	110	3	37	Typical N.Z. Modern Average Rate	12.3
1977	230	3	77	"Individuals Sometimes Provide A Broad Application For The Future"	26

In less than 50 years labor productivity in N.Z. has multiplied by 26 in some areas. Of course this resolution can be kept moving along only on the basis of increasing masses of effectively functioning constant capital per employee. And here we come to the famous Marxian law of

TENDENCY OF FALLING RATE OF PROFIT

"Campbell took up a 40 ha Crown Land Lease worth \$80,000 — which had never produced more than 12,300 kg. of butter fat a year — Campbell would need to produce over 14,000 kg. (a year) to cover costs and capital repayments which totalled \$21,000 a year. He was allowing himself a \$3,000 salary" (2). A quote from Campbell concludes this news item; says he, "You just need a bit of common sense (to succeed) and you've got to want to work." Plus, of course a Crown Land Lease worth \$80,000 together with all the other forms of constant capital necessary to build up and to maintain the lead in this area of commodity production. For all this increasing productivity of labor, capitalists are obliged to run faster and still faster just to stand still.

But slumber not, Peter Campbell, neither be deceived by the widely publicised bosonnas of praise for your prevailing, admirable but ephemeral achievements. For sure, sooner than you believe, you'll be outclassed and outdated as were stages A, B and C and this by the same forces that drive you on today.

The N.Z. farmer in righteous horror has an implacable hatred of Socialism (scientific), but profits tremendously from "Socialism", (National Socialism, i.e. State, regional and industry controls; N.Z. Dairy Boards, Crown Land Leases, production co-operatives, Reserve Bank loans and etc.)

Marx informs us the increase in production of material wealth per man hour, or rising productivity of labor "...is determined by various circumstances, among others, by the average amount of skill of the workmen, the state of science and the degree of its practical application, the social organisation of production, the extent and capabilities of the means of production and by physical conditions." (3) Consciously, or only to some degree consciously, or not at all consciously, the N.Z. master class complies with Marx in all this.

So be assured, ye socialists of N.Z. your prevailing ruling class is navigating a course true to the Pole star of its historic destiny. It is keeping up with the steering along a parallel course with World Capitalism. It is providing, as Marx predicted, the preconditions, technically, materially and economically, for Socialism (scientific). They have solved half of the social problems, the great problem of production. It now remains for the working class, (N.Z. and world-wide), to solve the remaining half of the same social problem; i.e. democratically politi-

cally and in full awareness, to abolish capitalism and to replace this with the historically evolving alternative.

- (1) Encyclopedia Britannica
- (2) "The Australian", a Sydney based newspaper, dated 20th March, 1977, Journalist John Lapaley.
- (3) Marx "Capital" Vol. 1, Chap. 1.

C. Peter Purry
Melbourne, Australia.

IN THE NEWS (concluded)

"We believed that he (Carter) represented the ordinary folks; that Gerald Ford represented corporate business," he said. "But since Carter's election he has been almost totally occupied with trying to get the confidence of business." But really Carter does not have to try. He campaigned on a platform of running capitalism, and business approved. Socialists knew this, but not Harrington or the average Social Democrat, it seems.

A similar mistake was made by U.S. leftists in a previous election. Voting for what they assumed to be a step-at-a-time lesser evil they chose Johnson to stop Goldwater from ordering the bombing of North Vietnam. So Johnson reneged on his promise and carried out Goldwater's promise. Leftists have yet to learn that lesser evils are inseparable from greater ones and that governing politicians have little choice. They must carry out what the profit system demands, including the breaking of strikes if necessary.

THE LUCKY PEOPLE

Former NDP resources minister, Bob Williams seems to be a faker who knows it. With the announcement by the present Sacred administration in B.C. that government shares in state owned corporations are to be offered to the "public" via a new company, he rushed into 3 column print to say that Premier Bennett is trying to "...turn them over to a rich minority."

If these firms are not presently owned in course by the rich minority it seems that "welfare bums" should be able to cash in their alleged equities. The fact they do not should be adequate evidence of the old nationalization fraud. The capitalist proselitizers of the media just loved it.

THE PRIORITY OF PROPERTY

Another news item described degrees of punishment for murder in the city of Houston, Texas. Houston competes with New York and Chicago for the top homicide rate in the nation. The item was a review of a book by anthropologist, Prof. Henry P. Lundsgaard. Lundsgaard felt that the "presumed

[illegible]

(Item in the Victoria "Daily Colonist", June 12th, tells us that a West Valley estate has "warmed" \$4.74 million since he died just over a year ago.

OPULENT NOISE POLLUTION SOLUTION

Which helps to show that while individuals of the capitalist class may have problems, they are not quite the same as those that plague the workers.

Meanwhile, the dynamic element in the production of surplus values, the dispossessed class who work, are still finding capitalist conditions boring and frustrating. "Industrial" relations expert, John Crisp, confirmed this on May 19th back in 1973. He said young people don't mind work -- its just their jobs. Or, to put it another way, they wouldn't mind making a contribution to society (which would include themselves) in conditions of creativity and social responsibility.

[illegible]

A 1974 release in Vancouver, said that 4 former prisoners would return to prison for 6 weeks to earn \$4 for per hour at work for which they were paid \$10 a day when they were free. They are among 46 workers being paid by the state (the Dominion) via Canada Mortgage to produce and maintain plates.

CHRISTIANITY (continued)

One would have thought that in a computer age, press-button machines would be employed to say prayers by the million. Perhaps the radio in some way approaches this idea. Some sort of automatic prayer-sayer would be especially useful in war-time, asking day and night for assistance and victory; or does the ruling class no longer believe in the usefulness of evoking God's assistance?

In the first world war the Germans made great use of the motto "Gott mit uns". After being so badly let down, they were very reluctant to ask God's assistance in the second world war; perhaps knowing that Jehovah was the God of the Jews, they dared not expect much sympathy from him. The Christian clergy of the allies jubilantly declared that is why they lost. The old dictum is still true, that "God is on the side of the big battalions, so one must trust in the Lord and keep one's powder dry."

Some legislation has evolved, some trust has been put in committees and propaganda, and the most reliable of God's help is thought to be his military strategy. History has taught this in the past, it is not taught the future.

As I. C. B. writes:

"God heard the embittered nations pray and think that this, God that, and God the other thing. 'God that,' said God, 'I've got my work cut out for me.'"

If as Christians tell us, God knows everything, then prayer is merely telling God what he already knows. In which case it is a waste of time to pray. On the other hand, if we try to persuade God to do something he has no intention of doing, then prayer is wicked, because it attempts to alter God's just and inflexible intentions.

Robert Blatchford wrote: — "To pray to God is to insult him. What would a man think if his children knelt and begged for his love or their daily bread? He would think that his children showed a very lowly conception of their father's sense of duty or affection. If he demanded that they do it — he would be a heartless tyrant. And as to praise, I cannot imagine the Creator of the universe wanting men's praise. Does a wise man esteem the praise of fools? Does a strong man value the praise of the weak? Does any man of wisdom and power care for the applause of his inferiors?"

If one analyses the Lord's prayer one finds a curious oddity in this master prayer. "And lead us not into temptation." As if a God would deliberately lead his subjects into temptation; or would he? The author of the Lord's prayer does not seem to put it past him. The Bible on this point says "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God; for God cannot be tempted with evil, neither tempteth he any man." (James 1:13). But if the writer of the Lord's prayer read (Genesis 22:1), which states "And it came to pass after these things that God did tempt Abraham," he would have grounds for his conclusions.

There have probably been more prayers said for the long life of the various monarchs than for anybody else, and these prayers have been incorporated into the words of the various national anthems. Royal families have never been noted for their longevity, so this appears to have made no difference to them. In fact because of the high percentage of assassinations, they are rather shorter lived, despite the prayers.

Since it has never been proved that there is anybody to pray to, the problem is easily disposed of, and there is no need to put anything in its place. If we want this world changed, we have to do something about it and not pray. "Action is the only prayer that's answered."

INFORMATION CENTERS

Socialist Party of Canada
P.O. Box 4280, Stn. A
Victoria, B.C. V8X 5X8

Socialist Party of Canada
P.O. Box 115
Winnipeg, Man. R3C 2G1

Parti Socialiste du Canada
C.P. 244, Pointe-aux-
Trembles, Quebec

Socialist Party of Canada
P.O. Box 1051, Stn. A
Vancouver, B.C. V6C 2P1

Belief in after-life

One of the fundamental ideas of religion is a belief in the persistence of life after death. Man has always been haunted by the thought of his own death, and the thought of his own death has been the source of many of his religious beliefs. The idea of an after-life has been a comfort to many people, and it has been a source of inspiration to many others. It has been a source of hope for many people, and it has been a source of fear for many others. It has been a source of comfort to many people, and it has been a source of inspiration to many others. It has been a source of hope for many people, and it has been a source of fear for many others.

Man has always been haunted by the thought of his own death, and the thought of his own death has been the source of many of his religious beliefs. The idea of an after-life has been a comfort to many people, and it has been a source of inspiration to many others. It has been a source of hope for many people, and it has been a source of fear for many others. It has been a source of comfort to many people, and it has been a source of inspiration to many others. It has been a source of hope for many people, and it has been a source of fear for many others.

Death and dreams were a regular occurrence and always a mystery and thus were very disturbing. The anger of the gods was being constantly aroused, in an environment full of superstition and ignorance. Religion was undergoing its painful evolutionary birth pangs.

But why is it that so many people believe in the future life when we have learned to be more sceptical about religion? We might as well answer that we have learned much about capitalism, but still millions continue to support the very system which enslaves them. Those who accept the "after-life" theory, whether in the ancient Christian mythological form, or its modern spiritual variant, do so because of their belief in the bible and in the existence of God. All our earliest information about survival (if it can be called information) came either directly or indirectly from the bible. Therefore we must consider this profoundly important book from which the idea of after-life, as well as many other equally strange notions stem.

The scriptures promise life after death in several places. In fact everlasting life is the reward for believing. The Old Testament also tells us that it is all up with the grave. "For the living know that they shall die; but the dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward; for the memory of them is forgotten." (Ecclesiastes 9:5) A statement we can completely endorse.

It is curious when one reflects that the aim of religion is to extol the after-life, but the aim of medicine is to postpone as long as possible the individual's attaining it. It would appear from this that the doctor and the priest are in direct conflict over everybody's future.

"Strange is it not? that of the myriads who,
Before us passed the door of darkness through;
Not one returns to tell us the road,
Which to discover, we must travel too.
I sent my soul through the invisible,
Some letters to that after-life to spell;
And by and by my soul returned to me,
And answered 'I myself am heaven and hell.'"
Omar Khayyam.

Next Issue

BELIEF IN HOLY BOOKS

Socialist Party of Canada



OBJECT:

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments of producing and distributing wealth by and in interest of society as a whole.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

The Companion Parties of Socialism hold:

1. That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labor alone wealth is produced.
2. That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle between those who possess but do not produce, and those who produce but do not possess.
3. That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.
4. That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.
5. That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

6. That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organize consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and overthrow of plutocratic privileges.
7. That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interest of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.
8. THE COMPANION PARTIES OF SOCIALISM, therefore, enter the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labor avowedly capitalist, and call upon all members of the working class of these countries to support these principles to the end that a termination may be brought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labor, and the poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrollment in the Party should apply for Application for Membership from the sec'y of nearest local or the Nat'l Hdqrs.

These seven parties adhere to the same Socialist Principles:

LEAGUE OF DEMOCRATIC SOCIALISTS
Gunsriegelstrasse 50, A-100 Vienna, Aus.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF AUSTRALIA
P.O. Box 1440, Melbourne, Box 2291, GPO

SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA
P.O. Box 4280, Stn. A., Victoria, B.C. V8X 3N3

SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN
52 Clapham High St., London SW 4, 7 UN

SOCIALIST PARTY OF NEW ZEALAND
P.O. Box 324, Postal Centre, Wellington, N.Z.

WORLD SOCIALIST PARTY OF IRELAND
9 Pym St., Antrim Rd., Belfast, N. Ireland

WORLD SOCIALIST PARTY OF U.S.
295 Huntington Ave., Boston, Mass. 02115

ENQUIRY FORM

To the Socialist Party of Canada,
P.O. Box 4280, Stn. A, Victoria, B.C.

Please provide the following (underline):

FOLIOLEUM (Socialist Party of Canada) 8 issues	\$2.00
SOCIALISME MONDIAL (French Parti Socialiste du Canada) 4 issues	1.00
WESTERN SOCIALIST 12 issues (World Socialist Party of U.S.)	4.00
SOCIALIST STANDARD 2 issues (Socialist Party of Great Britain)	5.00

Subscription rates in literature at double rate.

I would also like to donate toward socialist activities . . .

Further information about the policies and publications of the Socialist Party of Canada . . . ☐

I am interested in becoming a member . . . ☐

Name . . .

Address . . .

SOCIALIST DIRECTORY

PARTY PUBLICATIONS

QUESTIONS OF THE DAY (S.P.G.B.)	\$1.00
RUSSIA 1917-1967 (S.P.G.B.)	.50
IS LABOUR GOVERNMENT THE WAY TO SOCIALISM (S.P.G.B.)	.50
SOCIALIST PARTY AND WAR (S.P.G.B.)	1.00
SOCIALIST COMMENT (S.P.G.B.)	.50
HUMAN REVOLUTION (S.P.C.)	.50
HISTORICAL MATERIALISM (S.P.G.B.)	1.00
WORLD OF ABUNDANCE (S.P.C.)	.50

CLASSICS OF SOCIALIST SCIENCE

SOCIALISM, UTOPIAN AND SCIENTIFIC (Engels)	\$1.00
CIVIL WAR IN FRANCE (Marx)	1.00
WAGE LABOUR AND CAPITAL (Marx)	1.00
VALUE PRICE AND PROFIT (Marx)	1.00
MUTUAL AID (Kropotkin)	2.00
FOUNDATIONS OF CHRISTIANITY (Kautsky)	1.00
WOMEN UNDER SOCIALISM (Hobell)	1.00
COMMUNIST MANIFESTO (Marx)	.50
CHRISTIANITY AND SOCIALISM (Jarrow)	1.00