

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No 211. Vol. 18.]

LONDON, MARCH, 1922.

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.

WHERE PRIVATE PROPERTY DOES NOT REIGN

Socialism stands for a society of equals in which the distinctions between rich and poor, exploiters and exploited, no longer exist. Opponents of this revolutionary conception assure us frequently that no such form of society has ever existed, or ever will; that there always have been rich and poor, and always will be, and so on. The following is an attempt to show this statement to be false by depicting the social conditions obtaining amongst the native races of the interior of Africa prior to the European invasion. This invasion having taken place (so far as the countries known as Kenya and Uganda are concerned) during the past generation only, living evidence of previous conditions still exists. It takes the form of customs not yet entirely abandoned, of institutions not yet completely destroyed, and, above all, of the wonderful memories of the old men of the tribes, memories which, of necessity, are enhanced and sharpened by the absence of any literature of native origin.

The evidence above described has been the subject of much investigation on the part of Government officials, missionaries, and travellers in the course of their occupations, some of which has found expression in book form. To this the present writer is much indebted; but the key to the understanding of native life was supplied to him by one (Lewis H. Morgan) who actually had very little knowledge of Africa; for the obvious reason that it had hardly been opened up at the time he wrote his master-work, "Ancient Society." This speaks volumes for the thoroughness with which Morgan dug to the foundations of barbaric society.

He discovered that among the American Indians the clan (or gens) was the central institution of society, the pivot on which turned the customs and beliefs of the people. He further showed that the same condition had obtained in ancient Greece and Rome before the development of political society, that is, society founded on economic classes; and also among the barbaric races of Northern Europe and Western Asia who subsequently came under the sway of the above Empires. The case is the same in Africa!

The essential feature of the clan is kinship, *i.e.*, its members are supposed to be descended from a common ancestor more or less remote. Being of the same blood, they may not intermarry. Each member of the clan must find his or her mate among the members of the other clans, the children ultimately becoming members of their fathers' clan. This occurs at the age of puberty, when the rite of circumcision is practised amid great ceremonial and rejoicing. Henceforth they are regarded as adults eligible for marriage. The young men at this age are trained as warriors. Their function is to protect the flocks and herds (which constitute the tangible wealth of the clans), and occasionally, when considered necessary, to undertake raiding expeditions on hostile tribes to augment this wealth.

At this age the young men and women enjoy a considerable amount of sexual freedom, which, as might be expected, gives bourgeois, who are establishing themselves there, a horrible shock and provides them with ample material for the propaganda of

measures, such as forced labour, etc., which convert the men into wages-slaves and the women into whores. Infanticide appears to be practised before marriage, but this latter state is seldom long delayed, whereupon children become an important object in life. In fact, barbaric sentiment with regard to the younger generation, only equalled by its respect for the old, surpasses anything the present writer has seen expressed among the civilised races.

The first-born child marks yet another change in the status of its father, who thereupon commences to take an active part in the administration of tribal affairs. He serves at this stage an apprenticeship, as it were, in the art of judging cases such as are brought from time to time before the council of elders, the supreme *judicial* authority of the tribe. A man becomes an elder upon the circumcision of the first-born. He thus enters upon the final stage of his career. Those dying before reaching this stage are exposed for the wild beasts to devour; the elders, however, are accorded burial and their spirits become the guardians of the tribe. This brings us to another aspect of native life, *i.e.*, its religious aspect. It is difficult, however, to say just where this aspect begins and ends. Unlike the abstract religions that have succeeded it, ancestor worship is an everyday religion. From birth to death the life of the individual is hedged around with superstitious observances to secure the favour of the guardian angels and, through them, of nature, the supreme element in a social order based upon primitive modes of living. As a result there exists a hierarchy of so-called medicine-men, elders who are supposed to have special intimacy with the spiritual forces surrounding the tribe and are expected to exercise their influence for its benefit.

Mr. A. C. Hollis, in his work, "The Nandi," gives a curious instance of a chief medicine-man who was put to death by his tribesmen for being the assumed cause of a serious military disaster. Misfortune, however, of various kinds continued to dog the path of the tribes, who then, with characteristic lack of consequence, attributed this to the murder of the medicine-man!

The medicine-men share with the people at large the selection of the chiefs from among the warriors to direct military affairs, and their advice also guides the people in

the choice of times and seasons for stock movements in the case of pastoral tribes, and planting, etc., for those depending on horticulture. Thus the religious and conservative element dominates and holds together the destinies of the people, as is but natural in a State where economic conditions hardly vary from generation to generation.

Between the different leagues of tribes, or peoples, the mode of life naturally varies. Thus, in the mountain fastnesses, clad in dense forest, dwell the Wandorobo, hunters of the big game (elephant, buffalo, and the like), whose bows and poison-tipped arrows are practically their sole means of production. Out on the open plains the Masai herd their cattle, wandering from place to place according to the rainfall and the growth of grass. Among the lower hills and the valleys formed by the streams, live people like the Kikuyu, cultivating with primitive knives and hoes small patches of ground for grains, legumes, tuberous roots, plantains, etc. But although normally hostile to one another, each people recognises amongst itself the principle of common access to the means of life, *i.e.*, the land. With the hunters and the pastoral nomads this is obvious; but even in the case of the horticultural tribes the same principle applies. The family (normally polygamous) holds from the clan sufficient land for its needs. It is entitled to that, and no more, and if by chance it dies out the land reverts to the clan.

Private property is confined to tools and domestic utensils, weapons and ornaments. These are all in such an immature state of development that it is impossible for them to form means for exploitation through monopoly. Agriculture strictly so-called (*i.e.*, the cultivation of fields by drawn ploughs) not having arisen, the productivity of the individual is too small to make slavery a source of wealth. The slaves would produce little more than they would consume. Hence only the female sex are taken captive in battle, and they are adopted into the captor's family either as daughters or wives.

Cattle occupy a peculiar importance in native economy. Their slaughter for food is practically confined to festivals and sacrifices. Their milk, of course, is used, but their principal function seems to be to serve as equivalents to human beings. Thus, when, by marriage, a man takes a woman

from another clan, he has to compensate that clan, through the father, for the loss, with so many head of cattle. When, again, a man kills another, *of a different clan*, similar compensation must be made.

To kill a member of the same clan as himself is apparently a hopeless crime, for which no compensation can avail. The murderer becomes an outcast for the rest of his life.

After a raid the relatives of any warriors who have been slain receive, again, this same compensation. The herds are so numerous in excess of economic requirements and are distributed so liberally among the families from the heads of the clan downwards, and are, withal, regarded with such an intense sentiment, bordering on (if not actually amounting to) superstition, that they appear as a part of the tribe rather than a form of property.

Thus European civilisation has discovered in Africa a form of society somewhat similar to that examined by Morgan in America, a system in which economic classes do not exist, in which each individual becomes in turn warrior, worker, and counsellor, thus combining in his own person the social functions, the division of which, later in history, formed the basis for the origin of classes.

Some bourgeois critics, impatient for an end to this primitive form of communism, do not hesitate to describe it as the enslavement of the people by the chiefs.

Their assertions, however, are based on a very scanty acquaintance with the facts, and are effectively refuted by the painstaking literary efforts of prominent officials such as Sir Alfred Sharpe and Sir Harry Johnston, men whose life-work is the overthrow of this same communism in favour of British capitalist Imperialism, and consequently they are not prejudiced on *its* side.

The chiefs and elders express the unity of the clan. They have no power apart from it. They are its agents in dealing with other clans and with its individual members. Any privileges which may be incidental to their office are in the nature of special rewards for special services. They depend upon the voluntary tribute of the people and not upon any political or economic means of extortion. (Such means are a later innovation of the British Government, anxious to undermine native solidarity.) The chiefs are the creatures of the customs which they enforce; any antagonism between them is fatal

for the chief. As for the so-called subjection of the female sex, this is readily seen to be a form of division of labour dictated by the conditions of social existence. The women till the gardens, look after their houses, prepare the food, and nurse the young; but the bourgeois critic conveniently forgets that the tribes would soon expire if the male sex did not clear and break up the ground, fell the trees and build the houses, and devise and construct the tools and weapons (of iron) with which the ground is tilled and the herds protected from the wild beasts.

Still the defender of capitalism remains unsatisfied. "Even so," he will say, "admitting that society existed without economic classes for hundreds of thousands of years from the days of the ape-man to the dawn of history, granting that in that time it developed speech, discovered the art of making fire, domesticating animals, the use of grains and vegetables, and evolved from promiscuous herds to organised groups, even so, it did not produce the comfort and leisure without which art and science, in a word, civilisation, would not have come into being! To do this the subordination of the ignorant many to the intelligent few was necessary."

This admits that civilisation is based on the servitude of the people; for it is not they who enjoy comfort and leisure, art and science, although they produce these desirable conditions by their labour. They do not even obtain the same security of life as the clansman! But the same onward march of the productive forces which burst asunder the narrow communism of the past is preparing the economic basis of the world-communism of the future, *i.e.*, enough wealth, comfort, leisure, art and science for all!

E. B.

TO PARTY MEMBERS.

A meeting of Party Members, to discuss Propaganda, will be held at the

Builders' Labourers Hall,

84, Blackfriars Road, London, S.E. 1,

on Saturday, March 18th, 1922,

at 5.30 p.m.

DOPE AND ANTI-DOPE.

" . . . Instead of combining to make the public pay an economic price for papers, they " [the newspaper proprietors] " combine to cut wages and then throw at the head of the public not only a commodity at a cost which scarcely covers productions, but also valuable prizes, insurance policies, supplements, etc., etc., etc. The consequence is that many papers cannot pay their way. But what of that? Many papers are not intended to pay their way. If they pave the way for someone to political power, or the peerage, they will have done all that is asked of them.

" It is a curious fact, and one worth pondering deeply, that while the banks during the last year or so have held up credits for industry in general, they have allowed huge overdrafts to newspapers. (I am assuming for a moment that all the tales of woe told by newspaper proprietors are as veracious as they are pathetic.) General trade for the home markets and export have gone to rot. The banks would not finance enterprise to enable cheap textile or other goods to be made for export. But they have financed newspaper proprietors to enable them to produce cheap newspapers. Why? Is it that the bankers believe that the newspapers are necessary to instruct the public as to how it should behave, how it should think, and how it should vote? "

—General Secretary, N.U.J. " *The Journalist*," February, 1922.

Well, well, well! Did you know that, Mr. Worker? Did you know that many papers were not intended to pay their way? Did you know that the bankers have allowed huge overdrafts to the proprietors of newspapers to enable the papers to be sold at a price within reach of the workers?

Of a surety, do the bankers believe it is necessary for the workers to be instructed as to how they should behave, think, and vote.

○ And why? Well, dear worker, so long as you behave along the lines of conduct laid down by the bankers and their class, so long as you vote with them and for them, so long will they be able to maintain their position in society to the detriment of your class.

The things required to satisfy the needs of the world are to-day wrested from nature by one section of society, the working class. The other section, the master class,

appropriate the results of the workers' efforts, the wealth produced, by virtue of the fact that the workers have " behaved " and " voted " in such a way as to enable the masters so to do. Thus the master class determines who shall have, who shall have not, and in what proportion—determine who shall eat and who shall starve.

The remedy? Well, fellow-worker, you *really must* behave, think, and vote differently. You must think for yourself, instead of absorbing the dope dressed up to look like real knowledge. You must vote for your own class, and not that of the banker. You must see to it that your fellow-worker has the real position of the working class laid in front of him, instead of the dope issued by the banker-financed " Press " daily. THE SOCIALIST STANDARD is the instrument for your purpose ready to hand. Bring it to the notice of your mates in the mine, mill, factory, or railroad. Push its sale for all you are worth.

Written by workers for the workers, it is the safe antidote to the poison pushed into the minds of the workers. It cannot, it attempts not, to " pay-the-bill-while-you-are-ill." The STANDARD's only mission in the insurance line is to point the way to the workers by which they can insure against the evils of capitalist society, by ensuring a speedy termination of the system that robs them of the fruits of their labours.

Get on with the job, then—AT ONCE.

H. W. M.

NOW ON SALE.

MANIFESTO

OF

THE SOCIALIST PARTY

OF GREAT BRITAIN.

Sixth Edition—With New Preface.

Explains the Party's position toward the S.D.P., I.L.P., Fabian Society, :: Trade Unions, S.L.P., etc. ::

Price Threepence. Post Free, Fourpence

FROM THE

S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1

THE COMMUNISTS AND THE LABOUR PARTY ALLIANCE.

There has of late been much talk in Communist circles for and against assisting the Labour Party into power at the next election. The position at the moment is that the Communist Party officially favours the idea of getting inside the Labour Party, but that the latter body nationally (and often locally, too) rejects the request for permission to affiliate. There now arises the problem of whether or not the Communists are to support Labour candidates when Lloyd George thinks fit to appeal to the electorate.

In the main the Communists do not pretend to believe that the accession to power of the Labour Party will directly and of itself solve the problems facing the workers. It is true that Malone, the C.P.'s solitary M.P., is of the opinion that the "few divergences between the Communist Party and the Labour Party . . . will soon be settled by affiliation" ("Daily Herald," January 23rd), but probably the majority of the Communists who desire affiliation regard it as a tactical weapon likely to be of value to them, not as an admission that they and the Labour Party have much in common.

This kind of discussion is not new: for generations the question of alliance with capitalist political parties has agitated the minds of sections of the working class. Our attitude is clear and definite enough. We want Socialism, and we are convinced that we should not be bringing it nearer by angling for the support of anti-Socialist bodies, even although it might seem superficially that some gain would accrue.

The discussion only interests us in so far as it serves to expose the danger to the working class of following those who advocate such a course.

What is strikingly new is the claim for this idea that it has had its origin in Russia, as one of the lessons of the Revolution there. W. Paul, who for years in the S.L.P., opposed alliance with the reactionary Labour Party as a principle (although in practice joint demonstrations, etc., did take place), now that he is in the Communist Party has seen the "Light from the East" and stands forth as a convert. Lenin has taught him what his own knowledge and experience could not.

The object aimed at is, to gain the sympathy of the rank and file, discredit the

present leaders, and then capture or disrupt the party. In addition, Paul has in mind the urgency of removing the Coalition in order to save the Bolshevik Government. The Bolsheviks, fully aware at last of the futility of expecting revolution in Western Europe or America, and equally aware that they will only with difficulty maintain themselves in power in face of internal and external pressure, seek to gain relief by aiding their alleged enemies of the Labour Party to gain a Parliamentary majority.

John S. Clarke, in the "Worker" (November 26th), opposes the view point of W. Paul. He deals very successfully both with the lack of tactical value of this move, and with its history. His main arguments are that it is not new, having been tried before in this country with unfortunate results, and that the possibility is that the Bolsheviks themselves, far from having originated it, actually learned it here.

"As a political tactic it has had an interesting history and by no means successful one. Not to carry the reader too far back we see it operating in the year 1841. The Whigs and the Chartists met together in that year on the 21st January to try and arrange a 'bloc.' Three months later at a parliamentary by-election (Nottingham), the Chartists actively supported the Tory candidate, Mr. Walter, in order to deal a blow at the Whig Government."

The Chartist paper, the "Northern Star," commented as follows, says Clarke:

"It is better at all times to submit to a real despotism than to a government of perfidious, treacherous and pretended friends. We are the natural enemies of Whiggism and Toryism, but, being unable to destroy both factions, we advise you to destroy the one faction by making a tool of the other."

In 1921, eighty years after, we find the Communist Party seeking to destroy one "natural enemy" (the Coalition) by making a tool of another (the Labour Party). What 1922 will bring forth the Lord only knows.

The Chartists alternately supported Whigs and Tories, sometimes neither, and sometimes both together. In the "Northern Star," on June 12th, 1841, were two leading articles advising opposite policies. We now have the Communist Party actively opposing some Labour candidates (e.g., MacDonald at Woolwich) and taking up a non-committal attitude towards others (Naylor at Walworth).

"Chartism collapsed in 1848. The Social Democratic Federation was not born until 1885. In 1908 it changed its name to Social Democratic

Party, a distinction without the least scrap of difference. In 1911 it was joined by a few Clarion Scouts and I.L. Pers., and changed its name again to British Socialist Party.

Each of these political parties (if they can be writ as different parties) was practically dominated by the same personalities—Hyndman, Quelch, Lee, Hunter-Watts, Belfort Bax, Dan Irving, Tom Kennedy, Jack Jones, and Will Thorne. Each party practised the 'tactic' inherited from the Chartist.

The S.D.F., after seeking in vain for an alliance with the Liberals, went to the Tories, and fought the 1885 Election on their money, with the avowed object of splitting the Liberal vote. This very nearly brought the party to an unhonoured end, the only good that could have come to the workers out of the transaction.

This policy of political bargaining went on, with varying success in the shape of Parliamentary honours for the auctioneers of working-class votes, until in 1903 the Scottish, and in 1904 the London, branches left in disgust to form the S.L.P. and S.P.G.B. respectively. Old readers of this journal will remember that our pages between 1904 and 1914 contained ample evidence of the persistence of the S.D.F.'s peculiar conception of working-class antagonism to capitalist political organisations. It changed its name to S.D.P. without discarding its errors, and in 1910 another attempt was made to form a "bloc" with the Liberals, who, however, like the Labour Party now, were indifferent if not actively hostile.

In 1901 the S.D.F. withdrew from the Labour Party (then the Labour Representation Committee), and for twelve years remained outside, supporting first one and then the other of the capitalist parties. It incidentally carried on a guerilla warfare with the I.L.P. rather in the nature of a squabble for the spoils attaching to the disposal of the corpse of working-class independence.

The S.D.F. stuck tight to the alliance idea, and in 1913 had decided to re-affiliate with the Labour Party, when the war came. The inevitable then took place, and the B.S.P. went all out for the murder of the workers at their masters' behest.

In due time another split took place: Hyndman and the jingo group called themselves the National Socialist Party, while the others, still the B.S.P., first worked the I.L.P., and later affiliated again with the Labour Party. Both sections kept their belief in the use of helping one enemy to

fight another. The N.S.P., reverting to its old name, S.D.F., is now again urging that the Labour Party should link up with any party which will endeavour to oust the Coalition.

The B.S.P. eventually formed the bulk of the membership of the Communist Party, and that body—having re-discovered the "tactic"—proclaims amid great flourish of trumpets that if only they can help the Labour Party, to help the Liberals, to turn out Lloyd George, the Russian Revolution will be saved and all will be well. They are urged by the Bolsheviki to this course as the last word in political strategy, but, as Clarke points out, many exiles from Russia towards the end of last century were studying the English political world, and at a later date many of those now prominent in the Bolsheviki Party, including Litvino Rothstein, Tchicherine, and Petrov, were members of the S.D.F. or B.S.P. This, then, was where they picked up the idea, which "was conveyed to Russia, where the masses are not more, but less, advanced than they are here (*vide* Lenin), and where it is alleged to have been successful in the hands of a party of 'iron discipline,' which is due, to quote Lenin again, 'to a great many historic peculiarities of Russia.' In the process of time it arrives back to the land of its birth, where it succeeded in sowing only distrust and dissension and is dished out to British revolutionaries as 'Lenin's revolutionary strategy' and 'the adroit tactic of the Bolsheviki' in the pious hope that the reiteration of such alluring phrases will convince the unsuspecting that they are marrying a comely damsel of tender years, whereas in truth they are being saddled with a withered-up, prehistoric hag."

The foregoing brief history of the "tactic" is commended to the notice of those who think that the Socialist Revolution can be achieved by some energetic political wire-pulling, and by cunning manœuvring of the votes of the "masses." In a game of that kind the ruling class and their hirelings know all there is to be known. They have been at it for centuries, and if the outcome of it is to be somebody's funeral, it won't be theirs. The result of this fooling will be what it has always been, suffering and disillusionment for the unfortunate workers who are taken in by it.

The antecedents as well as the present

activities of the "intelligent minority," who, as the Communist Party, are to shepherd the mere untutored workers, are sufficient to justify describing them as in the main blind leaders of the blind. Under the guise of revolutionaty discipline, that party shows just the same slavish hero-worship and ignorant chatter of revolution as typified the S.D.F. at its worst. A recent incident will serve to illustrate this internal rottenness of the "Burlesque Bolsheviki." At a meeting of the London District Council (October 8th) the delegates were asked to rise to their feet as a token of respect when "Lord" McManus entered the room, and with hardly an exception the request was immediately complied with!

Could "Jimmy" Thomas expect or receive more?

Whether these people are good or bad leaders is, however, not the important point. The particular course they are advising has in the past proved disastrous, not only here, but in Germany, France, and everywhere else where working-class organisations have left the safe path of independence for the morass of alliances.

Socialism will be achieved by Socialists; by the deliberate action, that is, of those who, understanding what is at the root of the present evils, know what is necessary for their removal.

The existence of a considerable proportion of convinced Socialists precludes the possibility of swaying the electorate by emotional appeals. Without ignorant emotionalism there is no need, no possibility, of political leadership, whether from a traditional ruling class or from a minority of superior intellects.

Political bargaining exists because Socialist knowledge is lacking. Without such knowledge neither the Communist Party nor anyone else can give you Socialism. Do not, therefore, waste time trying to dragoon the working class into striving for an object which they do not understand;

HELP US TO PROPAGATE
SOCIALISM. H.

Readers who find it difficult or impossible to obtain the SOCIALIST STANDARD through the usual channels should communicate with the Head Office, 17, Mount Pleasant, W.C. 1, when regular delivery will be arranged.

THE KEY TO HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT.

"According to the materialistic conception, the decisive element of history is pre-eminently the production and reproduction of life and its material requirements. This implies, on the one hand, the production of the means of existence (food, clothing, shelter, and the necessary tools); on the other hand, the generation of children, the propagation of the species. The social institutions, under which the people of a certain historical period and of a certain country are living, are dependent on these two forms of production; partly on the development of labour, partly on that of the family. The less labour is developed, and the less abundant the quantity of its production and, therefore, the wealth of society, the more society is seen to be under the domination of sexual ties. However, under this formation based on sexual ties, the productivity of labour is developed more and more. At the same time, private property and exchange, distinctions of wealth, exploitation of the labour power of the others and, by this agency, the foundation of class antagonism, are formed. These new elements of society strive in the course of time to adapt the old state of society to the new conditions, until the impossibility of harmonising these two at last leads to a complete revolution. The old forms of society founded on sexual relations are abolished in the clash with the recently developed social classes. A new society steps into being, crystallised into the State. The units of the latter are no longer sexual, but local groups, a society in which family relations are entirely subordinated to property relations, thereby freely developing those class antagonisms and class struggles that make up the contents of all written history up to the present time."

FREDERICK ENGELS.

Parliament, the executive power of the ruling class, levy rates and taxes upon the owners of this property, in order to defray the cost of the legislative machinery, represented by the various departments of the State, i.e., Home Office, Foreign Office, War Office, Board of Education, etc., etc. The position of the worker is that he receives wages—when fortune favours him with work—which are based upon the cost of living.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the SOCIALIST STANDARD, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free..	..	9s. 0d.
Six Months, post free	1s. 6d.

The Socialist Standard,

SATURDAY



MAR. 4, 1922

AN IMPARTIAL CRITIC.

A story is related of Mark Twain that he once offered to deliver a lecture to the members of a great scientific society upon their own special subject. The secretary of the society suavely pointed out that Mr. Twain's equipment for such a lecture consisted of an entire absence of any knowledge of the subject chosen. "All the better," replied Twain. "I shall be quite impartial in my treatment of the matter." Somehow this failed to satisfy the secretary and the lecture was never delivered.

Undeterred by this example, we still find people willing to deal with subjects, or criticise them, whose only qualification for the purpose is a complete lack of acquaintance with the subject they attempt to discuss.

An instance of this kind occurs in the February issue of the "English Review," where a writer calling himself "Judex" contributes an article entitled "The Lesson of Bolshevism."

"Judex" scorns to burden his article with any facts, evidence, or quotations to support the various statements he makes. This may be a sign of wisdom, for had he attempted to quote any authority for many of his remarks he could at once have been exposed for an imposter, whereas now one may conclude that he is merely ignorant.

He claims that Marxian Socialism has been tried in Russia and been found a failure when he says:

"The orthodox expropriation of the expropriators (according to Marx) has been completely tried."

The most superficial reader of Marx's writings knows that the above statement is not only false, but is in complete contradiction to the whole of Marx's teachings. From the world-renowned "Communist Manifesto" down to the "Civil War in France," Marx showed how human societies have developed from primitive communism to Capitalism, and how Capitalism, when it has passed through the stages of its development, must be followed by Socialism. In the preface to the "Critique of Political Economy" (page 12, Kerr ed.), Marx says:

"No social order ever disappears before all the productive forces for which there is room in it have developed; and new higher relations of production never appear before the material conditions for their existence have matured in the womb of the old society."

Later on, in the preface to "Capital," Marx extends and amplifies this point in the famous, oft-quoted passage where he says:

"One nation can and should learn from others. And even when a society has got upon the right track for the discovery of the natural laws of its movement—and it is the ultimate aim of this work to lay bare the economic law of motion of modern society—it can neither clear by bold leaps, nor remove by legal enactments, the obstacles offered by the successive phases of its normal development. But it can shorten and lessen the birth pangs."

(Page XIX, Sonnenschein Ed.)

These quotations *prove* not only that Marx did not expect a country in a backward condition economically to be able to establish Socialism, but also that he expressly denied such a thing being possible. So far from following Marx, as "Judex" suggests, Lenin has acted in direct opposition to Marx's teaching. To suggest that a country like Russia, still largely feudalistic, with only the beginnings of Capitalism, is "most suitable for applied Socialism," shows a most complete ignorance of Marx, coupled with a boundless recklessness of assertion.

After such a brilliant display of his marvellous intellect, one is not surprised to find such a gem as the following in "Judex's" article:

"In highly industrialised countries such as

England, Germany, Belgium, and even France, Socialism could only function with enormously reduced populations. In Britain certainly 10,000,000 people would have to die or emigrate; in Belgium 2,000,000; in France 5,000,000; because Socialism would imply the elimination of all production of a luxury or surplus character, thereby implying the elimination of an export trade which is the strength of highly industrial people."

Not a tittle of evidence nor a single fact is given to support this bundle of nonsense.

As Socialism will mean the abolition of the idle class of present society—the Capitalist class—who gather all the best of what is produced to themselves to lead lives of barbaric luxury, the first result of the establishment of Socialism will be that a large quantity of wealth will become available for distribution among the producers that was never within their reach under Capitalism. So far from it being necessary to reduce the populations under Socialism, the elimination of the idle thieves will be one factor in making it possible to support far larger numbers than the present system is doing.

"Judex's" complete innocence of the simplest economic facts is shown in the scintillating assertion that "the purest Socialist State must function on capital or credit of some kind." Evidently he has not the faintest conception of what capital is, or upon what credit is based.

Capital is wealth used for the purpose of producing a profit. Profit is a portion of that wealth produced by the worker, but robbed from him under the present system. Hence capital is wealth used for the purpose of robbery. Clearly, when the system of robbery is abolished, capital will disappear. Production will then be carried on for use; wealth will be used to promote the well-being of all.

Will sympathisers of the Party in

GLASGOW

desirous of forming a Branch in that district communicate with

H. J. WATSON,

5; Elliot St., Glasgow.

LIFE-LIKE PORTRAITS OF MARX & ENGELS.

Handsome Cabinet Photographs suitable for framing. Price 1/6 the pair. Postage 3d. extra. To be had from S.P.G.B., 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1.

MASS PRODUCTION.

How it affects the Workers.

It is hardly possible nowadays to pick up a newspaper or magazine that does not contain articles on bad trade, excessive taxation, and unemployment. In some of these articles the writers try to show that bad trade is largely caused by high taxes; while others insist that high wages and low output is the chief cause. Some writers combine the two, and represent the capitalist as a helpless victim being squeezed dry between the Government and the workers.

Those who understand Socialism, know that periods of bad trade are the result of modern methods of production, that outstrip the demand for commodities all over the capitalist world, and that bad trade will recur periodically, or will continue as a chronic social complaint so long as trade governs the production of wealth. Once we understand this clearly it is easy to see the futility of all the reforms suggested by writers who do not appear to understand the nature of the problem. In certain cases the fact that they argue that taxes should be lightened for the capitalist; that he is justified in reducing wages, in demanding greater efficiency and longer hours, arouses at once the suspicion that such writers are either capitalists themselves or are in the pay of capitalists.

One writer in the "Sunday Pictorial" (22/1/22), Mr. J. Ellis Barker, puts the case from the capitalist standpoint and tries to prove that the workers' interests are identical with capitalist interests. That the capitalist cannot extend his business and employ more workers because the Government takes in taxation the necessary capital. This is one of the stock arguments of the anti-wasters, but everybody should know that there is no shortage of capital wherever there is a promise of dividends. The shortage is in the effective demand for commodities, and if the capitalists were relieved of the whole burden of taxation employment would not increase unless the effective demand were increased.

Moreover, the money taken in taxes by the Government is either spent in wages—to Civil servants, etc.—or in purchase of goods, the manufacturers of which employ workers. These workers spend their wages on commodities placed on the market by other manufacturers. Thus, not only is the

demand for goods increased, but the number of unemployed is diminished by Government expenditure. From the workers' standpoint, therefore, Government expenditure, coming on top of ordinary capitalist outlay, is all to the good. This is easily seen, without going into the purpose and object of government, when we remember how unemployment figures fell during the war and wages rose in many industries. During the war Government expenditure reached the highest level ever known.

Mr. Barker argues that the lack of capital forces capitalists to act along certain lines: in bad times, and faced with the competition of countries less heavily taxed, they must either sell at a loss or close their factories. In good times they raise prices and thus pass the burden on to the masses. He says:—

"In good times income tax and super-tax are paid by the masses as a whole in increased prices, while in bad times unbearably high taxes lead to general unemployment and distress. The poorest pay income tax and super-tax, estate duty and succession duty in their bread and their boots, in their coal and their rent, and sometimes in unemployment and distress. It is chiefly in their interest that taxation should be as low as possible."

Here, the exponent of capitalist economics, in his eagerness to clear the capitalist of blame for bad times, unconsciously exposes the rottenness of the system he is trying to defend. What do the workers get out of the system? In bad times they suffer from unemployment and distress and in good times they suffer from increased prices.

A Socialist knows that the workers suffer acute distress in periods of bad trade and are forced to study the strictest economy in the best of times in order to live on their wages, but he has yet to learn that while in this condition they can pay any of the taxes enumerated by Mr. Barker. Whilst wages are based on the cost of living they rise or fall generally, over a given period, as the prices of necessities rise or fall, and the worker never gets much more out of industry, even when he is lucky enough to be always at work, than the necessities of life required to keep him fit and to support his family.

The cost of living is the mean level around which the industrial war takes place. Supply and demand plays its part, but nearly always on the side of the masters, because

there are nearly always more workers than jobs. Represented by leaders who do not understand the economic laws of the capitalist system nor how to direct the workers in times of crisis, the latter are always at a disadvantage in disputes over wages.

Mr. Barker's unsolicited and unconscious admission that the workers suffer whether trade is good or bad is true in substance, though based on a fallacy. Let us examine his proposed remedy and see how much that is worth.

There follows half a column of statistics on the comparative values of English and American production, a few cheap sneers about workers who restrict output, and a piously-expressed opinion that no one wants to see the old evils of sweating restored, and then he openly advocates mass production as a remedy for bad trade and unemployment. He says:—

"It is clear that we can treble British production, and with British production our national wealth and national income, by improving our industrial methods."

Now, mass production means not only the adoption of labour-saving machinery and devices, but production in such vast quantities that waste is eliminated. In mass production capitalists reduce their wages bill for the production of a given quantity of wealth to the lowest level yet reached. Factories worked on this principle in America turn out commodities in such vast quantities that they are forced to close down for weeks at a stretch, or discharge thousands of workers, until the surplus is sold. The very company cited by Mr. Barker as a shining example of mass production prosperity has given him the lie. In 1920 the Ford Company employed 52,000 persons to make 100,000 cars a month. In 1921 they employed 32,000 persons to make 87,000 cars per month, and had to close down owing to over-production. What became of the 20,000 workers not wanted—and what happens as mass production becomes more general? The answer is obvious, yet Mr. Barker further outrages common-sense by stating in black type that

"There is no fear of over-production," and following this in italics:

"There is an unlimited demand throughout the world for cheap goods."

Ford cars are cheap. Why did the Ford factory close down and reduce the number

of its employees if the demand is unlimited?

When Mr. Barker writes about unlimited demand, he is writing unlimited nonsense, because there is no such thing. Production and demand, or production and consumption, may be likened to a tank with water continually running in from a tap and out through a waste pipe. If two gallons flow in every minute and during the same time only one gallon can pass the waste, the flow will have to be stopped periodically or the tank will overflow. In filling the social tank with commodities, however, human labour functions. Human labour-power is the worker's only commodity; he lives by the sale of it and starves if he cannot sell it. Unable to take out of the tank more than the value of their wages, or go on producing when demands fall off, and a constantly diminishing number of workers are required. Mr. Barker gives figures that credits the American worker with producing as much as three British workers. According to his reasoning, unemployment in America should be less severe than in this country. Is it? Everybody knows that the number of unemployed in the United States is treble the number of British unemployed.

To sum up, let every worker understand once for all the real meaning and significance of labour-power as a commodity. Let him realise that his wages can seldom rise above what it costs to maintain himself and his family. That wages are more likely to fall below that level as competition increases; he, therefore, only deludes himself when he imagines that high or low taxes affect him in the long run. The inevitable consequences of mass production are increased unemployment and lower wages. Mass production is the latest and most callous form of capitalism; it manufactures cheap and shoddy goods to feed and clothe its overworked and poverty-stricken slaves. It drives the slaves to despair through long periods of unemployment and dread of the sack. Mass production is not a thing of the future; it is with us now in all its hideousness, and promise of worse to come. May it startle the workers of all lands out of their lethargy, strip the scales from their eyes, and force them to examine the claims of the Socialist; for only then will they understand that they are slaves, why they are slaves, and how they can be free. F. F.

CAPITAL'S STRANGLE-HOLD.

In an article published in the review of the International Federation of Trade Unions a flood of light is thrown upon the question of the capitalists holding up production. It appears that the International Labour Office, acting upon the instructions of its governing body, instituted an enquiry as a result of a meeting held at Genoa in June, 1920. At this meeting a representative of the employers' group said:

"The cost of living has increased in every country to an alarming extent; this phenomenon is due to many causes, but under-production is certainly one of these causes. Under-production is in its turn a result of several causes, some of which (scarcity of raw material, lack of shipping, disorganisation of land transport, etc.), are not within the scope of this body; but it would be interesting to consider whether and to what extent conditions of labour (such as the adoption of the 8-hour day, the frequency of strikes and lock-outs too, if you like, opposition to methods of remuneration proportionate to individual or collective production, etc.) have influenced production."

After some discussion on this point, it was finally agreed to, that the enquiry should be of a general character and not exclusively confined to the conditions of labour.

The enquiry was entrusted to Professor Milhaud, of the University of Geneva, and the first volume of the "Enquiry on Production—General Report" is now to hand, and forms the basis of the article, "An Enquiry into the Causes of the Decrease in Production," from which we quote.

There are two lengthy quotations from well-known capitalist representatives, such as M. Millerand and Mr. Herbert Hoover, the American organiser, both of whom during 1919 and 1920 delivered speeches in which they called upon the workers for increased efforts towards greater production. Of course, neither of these gentlemen called upon the capitalist class to produce more, they apparently being well aware of the fact that it was useless, since the capitalists not only do not work, but have no intention of so doing.

Then follows several lengthy extracts from the report, showing the fluctuation of prices during December, 1919, and June, 1921, concerning such "products of primary importance" as silk, cotton, cast iron, wool, etc., which, reaching their highest price point in May, 1920, fell considerably between that date and June, 1921.

We insert this point because what follows shows that the writer of the article in question must have favoured the demand for increased production, for in commenting upon the great fall in prices, he (or she) asks as follows:

"Was not this fall in prices just the very remedy of which the whole world was in need? Was not the general high level of prices the scourge under which the world had been groaning? Was not the return to normal prices the factor from which increased production was to be expected?"

How the workers were to benefit by the great fall in prices, he does not show; in fact, although the attempt might have been made, it must have proved a failure.

When the markets of the world are glutted with the wealth produced by the working class, and a fall in prices takes place, it follows that the labour market is subject to the operation of the same factors as operate in the other markets, for besides producing a larger army of unemployed and thus increasing the competition for jobs, a decline in the cost of living cheapens the cost of producing the commodity labour-power, and consequently its price (wages) tends to fall.

The main point of the article to which we draw attention is, that with the fall in prices the writer seems very disagreeably surprised to find that something else had happened, and with an air of injured innocence he laments:

"The fall in prices gave rise to a crisis in production such as the world had not yet witnessed."

Strange! For it was then discovered that this crisis brought forth a universal restriction of production, a huge systematic plan all over the world to hold up the production of wealth and thus maintain high prices. This was not the policy of the wicked workers in the Trade Unions, who, we are very often told, are guilty of slowing down and "Ca' Canny." On the contrary, it was the capitalists who, when faced with falling markets, decided upon restricting output.

Under the heading of systematic restriction the article gives several examples taken from Professor Milhaud's report, as follows:

"In the first place there is the restriction of the production of Rubber, in which movement the Rubber Growers Association took the initiative, in its circular issued on September 24th 1920, the result of which was a reduction in production amounting to 30 per cent.

"The situation with regard to cotton has been exactly the same. In December, 1920, the production of Japan was already reduced by 40 per cent., and further reductions were contemplated. In Egypt it was the public authorities themselves who took the initiative. The provincial councils unanimously decided to restrict the cultivation of cotton for 1921. In accordance with this decision the Sultan signed a decree on December 7th ordering that the area under cotton should be reduced by two-thirds and prohibiting the cultivation of cotton in upper Egypt except in the parts irrigated by the Nile."

"The American Cotton Growers Association succeeded in bringing about the largest percentage of reduction on record in the production of cotton. This Association boasted of the firm and vigorous attitude of the bankers of the whole of the cotton-growing districts, who refused to grant the necessary advances and credits to enable the cultivation of enough cotton to ensure a normal crop."

The "Cotton News" of June 1st, 1921, refers, furthermore, to the radical restriction of the use of artificial manures in the old cotton-growing States along the east bank of the Mississippi,

"which means to say that the growth and ripening of the new crop will be impeded and, furthermore, that the crop, already greatly restricted as regards the area under cultivation, will be seriously handicapped during the growing season. That applies even in those cases where the climatic conditions would be otherwise favourable."

"A similar policy has been applied by the International Federation of Linen Manufacturers, comprising the linen manufacturers of France, England, Holland, Belgium, Ireland, and Denmark, who declared at their meeting held at Brussels on November 18th, 1920, that the most important consideration was to restrict production and stabilise the market."

Many more examples of this kind are given, showing to what an extent the capitalists have their grip on the world's resources. Figures are also given concerning the amount of unemployment in various countries.

R. REYNOLDS.

£1,000 FUND.

Already acknowledged	£725 17 9½
Donations:—	
E. Boden, S. Africa	50 0 0
"W.H."	1 0 0
"B.B."	0 12 6
Will Dixon	0 7 0
A. Lyle	0 2 0
Mrs. Cohen	2 0 0
Stamp Books:—	
Walthamstow Br., 84	0 12 0
E. London Br., 77	1 0 0
Islington Br.	1 0 0
Delegate Meeting Collection	0 8 6

TOTAL .. £782 19 9½

OLD ANARCHY WRIT NEW.

"Socialism and Personal Liberty." By Robert Dell (Leonard Parsons, 4s. 6d. net.)

In what was perhaps the finest novel of the 19th century, George Meredith wrote an aphorism, "Our new thoughts have thrilled dead bosoms." This aphorism at once springs to the mind on reading Mr. Dell's book. The old Anarchist fallacies that were pulverised years ago are trotted out as new and profound truths. Moreover, to the anger, no doubt, of Anarchists, he hails the Guild Socialists as the discoverers of ideas that are nearly a century old in the Anarchist armoury. Thus he gives the Guild Socialists credit for the statement that "a human being as an individual is fundamentally incapable of being represented" (p. 39). As a matter of fact, this fallacy is as old as Sterner, though the latter certainly followed the idea to a logical conclusion, which the Guild Socialists do not. Mr. G. D. H. Cole is quoted as saying that:—

"He can be represented only in relation to some particular purpose or group of purposes" (*ibid.*)

As this is the only possible meaning to representation, Mr. Cole gives away his whole case, though Mr. Dell fails to see this glaring fact.

The objections he raises against the "State" are simply those of Bakunian, and have formed part of the Anarchist propaganda for over half a century. Mr. Dell, however, admits one or two facts that Anarchists deny. Thus he says:—

"In any form of society there will have to be regulations in collective production" (p. 32).

and on page 33:—

"Socialism—the socialisation or collective ownership of the means of production—is now the only alternative to private monopoly."

After placing himself in a dilemma by his contradictory attitudes, Mr. Dell flounders further in his attempts to reconcile the oppositions of his case. A few years ago he supported the Syndicalists, who, in their crude ignorance, claimed that the various means of production should belong to those operating them, as: "The Mines to the Miners," "The Railways to the Railwaymen," etc. One enthusiast suggested that they should carry their list to a logical conclusion by adding such items as "The Sewers to the Scavengers," "The Prisons to the Convicts," "The Asylums to the Insane," etc; but his suggestions were not received with any enthusiasm.

Mr. Dell now realises that there are many difficulties in the Syndicalist case, and he finds partial salvation in Guild "Socialism." But his dread of democracy is so great that he wishes to combine certain features of both Syndicalism and Guild "Socialism." While Mr. Cole would have collective ownership of the means of production, with management and operation of the various industries by the different Guilds, Mr. Dell prefers that—except for certain collective services as railways, banks, posts, mines, etc.—the workers in the various industries should have absolute ownership of their particular branch. The idiocy of this proposal should be apparent to a child. Food is of immensely greater importance to the members of society than railways. Yet the production and distribution of food is left in the "absolute ownership" of a particular group, while the railways are to be collectively owned! And this although he had previously admitted that "collective ownership of the means of production is now the only alternative to private monopoly."

The fear of democracy carries Mr. Dell into other contradictions. A long chapter is devoted to "The Dictatorship of the Proletariat," where he opposes both Marxian Socialism and the system established in Russia by the Bolsheviks. What does Mr. Dell offer as an alternative? This:—

"But democracy is impossible except in small areas where the elector can always be in close touch with his representatives, and no real control of representatives is possible without the right of recall, which can be efficiently exercised only in small areas. Democracy, therefore, involves decentralisation. *Direct election should be restricted to small areas—the commune or ward—and the representatives so elected should send delegates to the provincial or national bodies*" (p. 39. Italics ours).

To the questions that at once spring forward, "Why is democracy only possible in small areas?" "Why cannot the right of recall be exercised in large areas?" no answers are given—and for the best of reasons. There are none that would bear a moment's examination. But the cream of the joke is that this scheme of Mr. Dell's is what operates in Russia, and which he condemns there.

We have criticised this anti-Socialist system before, and have shown that it is ruled by oligarchy, and is deliberately designed to prevent the members of society having control over the national executives.

With all its faults, the Parliamentary system in England and France, that Mr. Dell condemns, does give this power to the electors if they care to exercise it.

Other contradictions and fallacies abound in this book, but we have no room to deal with them all. One other example, however, is worth noting. On page 64 he says that "an extraordinary ignorance of Marxism is general in England," and quotes a writer in the "Times" as an example. He then says (p. 65): "Everybody has not time to read 'Das Kapital,' which is not easy reading," and he suggests that the "Times" writer might, at least, have read the "Civil War in France." We know from experience that it is the common practise for journalists and others to criticise and condemn Marx before they have read his works, but this reads suspiciously like an apology for Mr. Dell himself, for in the section on pages 144-150 he not only confuses price and value, but displays a complete ignorance of Marx's discovery of the base of value in social labour-time, when he (Mr. Dell) is dealing with two articles produced by two individuals. His other absurdities of money, wages, competition, employment of one person by another for private gain, etc., all being necessary under Socialism, shows how a lack of knowledge of Marxism may cause a writer to flounder among endless contradictions. Still, his taste in drama is exquisite. He believes Charlie Chaplin is a great artist. J. F.

OUR COURAGEOUS MASTERS.

The Press is an organ of capitalist propaganda and attempts to mould working-class ideas to suit the interests of the capitalist class. Yet this Press often contains the antidote to this propaganda. If members of the working class were to read the reports of company meetings, for instance, the work of the Socialist would be rendered easier; for in these reports we often get the real point of view of the capitalist.

"Labour leaders," stump orators of the "Economic Study Club," and other anti-Socialist organisations, all are assuring the worker of the identity of his interests with those of his employer; they exhort the worker to pull together with his employer in a spirit of brotherly co-operation for the solution of the difficulties which adversely affect them both, depriving the employer of

the "fair" return on his capital and the worker of his wages.

The reading by workers of such reports as that of the London County Westminster and Parr's Bank, published in "Sunday Times" (5/2/22), would do much to counteract this sort of twaddle.

The Chairman (Mr. Leaf), in his opening remarks, said: "And we have won some peace, for the moment at least, in those labour disputes which, to the mind of the social philosopher twelve months ago, presented the gloomiest point of a gloomy horizon." This "peace" upon which Mr. Leaf is congratulating himself and his colleagues, has been brought about, as many workers know from personal experience, by the wholesale defeats of the working class in industry after industry. Moulders, miners, and ship-joiners have been forced, after months of struggle, to submit to sweeping wage reductions. Others, foreseeing defeat, have submitted to reductions in wages and extension of hours without a struggle.

Then Mr. Leaf goes on to remark upon the miners' lock-out. "The outstanding event of the year in our internal economy has been the great coal stoppage. That *happily* (italic mine) ended, not in a complete victory for either side, but in an agreement to set on foot a system of profit-sharing which constitutes, I suppose, the greatest experiment in partnership between capital and labour that the world has yet seen." Representatives of the Miners' Federation of Great Britain and representatives of the Mining Association recently met and after discussion issued an official statement ("Daily Herald," 9/2/22), in which we read: "It was found that the wages of the workmen are unprecedentedly low in many districts, more particularly in the exporting areas. In seven out of the thirteen areas scheduled in the agreement, wages have been brought down to the minimum. . . ." The "Daily Herald" quotes the Executive of the Miners' Federation to the effect that "the men have suffered drastic reductions in wages, that have brought them far below the pre-war standard of living. . . ." When Mr. Leaf speaks of the happy ending of the conflict he is evidently not looking at it from the point of view of the miner.

We have seen how the workers have fared. How have the masters weathered

the storm of the past year? Mr. Leaf remarked at the opening of his speech, and repeated later on, that "the past year had been one of courage in facing losses." . . . "Finally agriculture, our most important industry, though it has had a very bad year, seems also to have touched bottom. The farmers have borne their losses very well out of accumulated profits in the past; and, with large reductions of wages, are probably able to make both ends meet."

Brave fellows! The losses that they have so courageously borne have only been relative losses after all. The losses of last year are offset against the profits of previous years, part of which had been reserved against the contingency of loss, the balance being very much on the profit side, for the losses have "been borne very well." The bank, whose shareholders Mr. Leaf is addressing, has put aside half a million pounds against future contingencies. Certainly not a bad foundation for future courage. The miners do not seem to have done quite so well out of their share of the profits under the system mentioned by Mr. Leaf. Thriftless chaps, no doubt!

In this speech of Mr. Leaf's we have the real point of view of the capitalist. The end of a conflict which plunged the miners into deeper poverty is described as happy. "Large reductions in wages" enable the capitalist to "make ends meet" and are therefore a subject for congratulation. The workers' loss is the capitalists' gain.

In the last quotation Mr. Leaf also shows how little the capitalist believes in the economic fallacies propagated by his agents and apologists. The workers have been told that if they accept reductions in wages the capitalist will be able to lower the price of his commodities, thus enabling him to compete more successfully with his foreign rivals and so lead to increased employment. This view is widely accepted among the working class, and has been, I believe, to some extent responsible for the tame manner in which wage reductions have been accepted. Mr. Leaf certainly only speaks of practically the whole capitalist class, for hardly a section of the working class have not suffered reductions of wages during the past year.

The truth of the matter is that the market conditions had already compelled the

capitalists to either reduce prices or curtail production. They then take advantage of the excessive supply of labour-power to beat down wages and thus recoup their losses.

The workers, by applying their energy to nature-given material, produce the wealth of the world. But as the means of production are the private property of capitalists, the products are also theirs. The workers receive in return for their labour-power, on the average, but sufficient to maintain themselves in the state of efficiency required and to reproduce the next generation of wage-labourers. The surplus, and with the continued application of science to industry this is constantly growing, is divided among the master class in the shape of rent, interest, and profit. Increases in wages, other things remaining the same, mean decreases in the surplus appropriated by the capitalist, and, *vice versa*, decreases in wages mean increases in the surplus appropriated by the capitalists.

The remarks quoted from Mr. Leaf's speech bear out this contention. Therefore, when Mr. Leaf proposes a co-partnership or "profit-sharing" scheme, we can form an idea whom the scheme will benefit. And, as a matter of fact, all profit-sharing and co-partnership schemes, are but devices for extracting more surplus value from the workers. The invitations of the capitalists and their agents to the workers to recognise an identity of interests and to co-operate with their employers are invitations to the workers to permit themselves quietly, and therefore more effectively, to be fleeced.

Not by a false friendship and co-operation with the capitalists will the workers emancipate themselves from the necessity of toiling for long hours in order to secure a miserable existence, but by recognising the fundamental antagonism between their masters' interests and their own and organising politically to overthrow the master class by capturing the weapon by means of which the master class enslave the workers, viz., political power. Then will the way be clear to inaugurate, not a co-operation wherein one of the participants can live in luxury on the proceeds, while the other is forced to eke out his share of the "profits" with doles from the Guardians, but a co-operative commonwealth in which the principle of production and distribution shall be "From each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs."

SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain**BRANCH DIRECTORY.**

BATTERSEA.—Communications to A. Jones, 3 Matthew-st., Letchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets Mondays, 8.30, at 16 Creek-st., York-rd.

BIRMINGHAM.—Communications to L. Vinetsky, 11 Upper Dean-st., Birmingham. Branch meets A.E.U. Institute, Spical-st., every Saturday.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.

EAST LONDON.—Communications to A. Jacobs, Sec., 78 Eric-st., Mile-end, E.8. Branch meets first and third Mondays in month at 141 Bow-rd.

EDMONTON.—Communications to the Sec., 142 Bulwer-rd., Edmonton, N.18.

HACKNEY.—Communications to the Sec., 78 Greenwood-rd., E.8. Branch meets Fridays, 7.30, at the Sigdon-rd. Schools, opposite Hackney Downs Stn.

HANLEY.—Branch meets Mondays, Working Men's Club, Glass-st. Communications to Sec., T. Travis, 27, Arthur Street, Cobridge, Staffs.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144 Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Communications to W. Baker, 35 Alma-st., Kentish Town, N.W.

MANCHESTER AND DISTRICT.—Communications to Sec., 11 Davis-st, Longsight, M/C. Branch meets 2nd and 4th Sundays, at 8 p.m.

N.W. LONDON.—Branch meets Monday at 7, at 107, Charlotte Street, W.1. Communications to Sec., 17, Mount Pleasant, W.C.1. Discussion after branch business.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Communications to Sec., J. Bird, 5 Wellington-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.

TOOTING.—Communications to Sec., 3, Lyveden-rd., Tooting, S.W.17. Branch meets Fridays, at Parochial Hall, Church-lane, Tooting, at 8 p.m.

TOTTENHAM.—Sec., F. W. Godfrey, 19, Beechfield-rd., Finsbury Pk., N.4. Branch meets Saturdays 8.30 at Earlsmead Schools, Broad-lane, Tottenham. Discussion after branch business. Public invited.

WALTHAMSTOW.—Communications to Sec., 11 Carlton-rd., Walthamstow, E.17. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.

WATFORD.—A. Lawson, Sec., 107 Kensington-avenue, Watford.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167 Romford-rd., Stratford. Communications to P. Hallard, 22 Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN.—Branch meets Fridays at 8.30 at Brook Hall, Brook-rd., Mayes-rd., N.22.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS**LONDON DISTRICT.****Sundays:**

Clapham Common, 8 p.m.
Edmonton, Silver Street, 11.30 a.m.
Finsbury Park, 8 p.m.
Stratford, Vicarage-lane, 7.30 p.m.
Tooting Broadway, Garrett-lane, 11.30 a.m.
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 7.30 p.m.
Victoria Park, 8.30 p.m.
Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's-hill, 7.30 p.m.

Mondays:

Highbury Corner, 8 p.m.

Tuesdays:

Tooting, Church-lane, 8 p.m.

Thursdays:

Dalston, Queen's-road, 8.30 p.m.
Wimbledon Broadway, 8 p.m.

Fridays:

Tottenham, Junction Clyde-road and Phillip-lane, 8 p.m.

Saturdays:

Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's-hill, 8 p.m.
Tooting, Undine-street, 8 p.m.

**THE SOCIALIST PARTY
OF GREAT BRITAIN.****OBJECT.**

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

Declaration of Principles.**THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain****HOLDS—**

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 labour alone wealth is produced.

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.

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.

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.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

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 organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

That the SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.