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**What about education?**

...I'm a Senior High School Student in Grade 11 at North Peace Sec. School. I learned of the Socialist Party of Canada in CANADIAN DIMENSIONS which was shown to me by a fellow NDP member. I joined the NDP just this summer during the Federal Election. I have as yet, however, not been thrilled by what it has done. I now sit on the Publicity Committee for the North Peace Constituency Association. As you can see, I am basically still perpetuating the capitalist philosophy. I am interested though in learning more about "true" socialism...

I have found many of your ideas very comprehensible and have been passing (them) on to friends. The amazing thing is, these people, active unionists and NDPers agree with you but like many people people are still very hesitant about learning or investigating your Party further...

So far, in the study of your literature I have seen no mention of the Education System. Our school system, as it now stands, is definitely geared to turning out wage earners (capitalists). Am I correct? In a society such as the one proposed by you surely you must recognize the need for some variety of a system to increase the class consciousness. Would the proposal then be the creation of a Schooling System which allows for expansion of the mind rather than the pocketbook?...This would have to be a censored system. In fact, would not the entire society be a censored one? The picture I got was that the True Socialist Society would neither recognize or require policing of any type.

I question the validity of some of your arguments at the risk of seeming pessimistic towards your Party - the society which you are aiming at seems like a PIE-IN-THE-SKY...

I have my reservations about the Socialist Party but I can nevertheless see many of your arguments and suggestions as being very well thought out and interesting enough for me to want to pursue further...

Thanks for the time,

D.S. Fort St. John

**Reply**

Unfortunately space requirements necessitated cutting to the wallent points of a very interesting letter.

To understand the difference between the school system today from what it will be in socialist society it is necessary to understand what are the factors that make the school system what it is today and likewise what the new factors of socialist society will do to education in the future. A most useful tool in this analysis is Marx’s Materialist Concept of History. Briefly, when men come together they enter into certain relationships, involuntary of their wills, in the production of their food clothing and shelter. It is from the sum total of these relationships that arise ethics, morality, laws and social institutions. It follows that the school system of today is but a reflection of the capitalist mode of production. It is therefore to be expected that from a system of capital ownership of the means of production operated through wage labor for sales and profits would give rise to a school system that would train potential wage slaves (not capitalists) to conform and submit to such an arrangement. Of course, as capitalism changes there is a pressure to change the school system to suit capitalism’s new productive needs. Being a system of contradictions capitalism naturally reflects these contradictions within the school system. For example - The lower productivity and distribution, of non-working owners and wage slave non-owning workers gives rise to an indoctrination of conformity and self denial (Ironically there is also a contradiction here is the capitalist’s sales pitch to "buy more, buy now" while at the same time appealing "work for less")

If the Materialist Concept is correct there is little left to prove. It follows naturally in a socialist society where production will be communally owned and run for the sole reason of satisfying human needs the school system will naturally be but a reflection of that productive mode, just as it is a reflection of the capitalist mode today. Therefore, where the end aim of production is human satisfaction (not sale or profit) such an aim will naturally reflect in a true education system aimed at human happiness in leisure and creativity.

Censorship? There must be a reason for the effort of censorship and under capitalism there is plenty of reason for it. The competition of capitalist nation against capitalist nation, one group of capitalists often have a vested interest in keeping information from their competitors. Likewise, the capitalist class are interested in hiding the method by which they gain their wealth from the working class. This gives rise to censorship. The overt kind that occurs in time of crisis where some publications are actually banned. The always existing covert kind that ignores certain embarrassing factors. Distortions in economics, anthropology and sociology, and disguising the class struggle with some "middle class" nonsense (middle of what) with almost no acknowledgement of the real existing classes. To substantiate your allegation that socialism will re-
quirc some form of ownership, it would be necessary to illustrate one group or class that could by keeping information from the rest. Not to mention a degree of ignorance, on the part of the rest through which they would tolerate it. But common ownership and production for use with free access cannot, result in anything but a classless society. So, where is this privileged class with a motive to gain advantage over others to productivity? Without logical analysis to reach such a conclusion it must be assumed that it comes from the imagination. It is not necessary to look far to find the source of this imagination.

So far, the capitalist censorship machine has been very adept at intellectually defrauding the workers by pointing to these ownership evils in what they so dishonestly choose to call 'socialist' Russia and China in spite of all the evidence that these are but variations of capitalism. (It is rather ironic that despite their business competition this is one bit of brainwashing upon which the ruling class of all nations stand united against the working class). There has been plenty of evidence provided by socialists to show all this is a form of decision of religion which caused workers into accepting little or nothing now for something in 'the sky' after they were dead. Later it came to emphasize political parties with lofty ideals and no idea how to achieve these ideals or parties that oppose certain evils with no idea of the cause of those evils. Thus it is Political parties that oppose war but wish to keep capitalism a competition that causes war are PIE-IN-THE-SKY. Parties that want to abolish poverty but at the same time keep the capitalist system are PIE-IN-THE-SKY. Parties that want food, clothing and shelter to be produced to satisfy human needs and at the same time produced for sale are PIE-IN-THE-SKY. Parties that want a socially harmonious school system in an anti-social capitalist society are PIE-IN-THE-SKY. Parties that claim they want socialism but spend all their efforts tinkering and dabbling in futile attempts to improve capitalism are PIE-IN-THE-SKY. This then sums up the socialist reply to the queries in the socialist society education will be a reflection of the socially owned and motivated productive force. There will be no motive for censorship in a classless society. The correspondent is left to figure out for herself which political parties really have a program of PIE-IN-THE-SKY.

Theoretical Point?

Dear Comrades:

In an article entitled "Railway Profits" (FULCHULL 7-4, 1974) it is stated that if farmers, workers, and the NDP 'would like to see hungry people fed, and make a living for themselves too, they will have to stop producing food for sale, and start producing solely for use.' This is a ridiculous statement. Neither farmers nor anyone else can just 'start producing for use.' Shortly after they tried it they would find themselves in dire straits. Socialists, of course, know what the writer means. Indeed, it is later indicated that the means of production'...will have to be commonly owned and democratically controlled....' But most of FULCHULL's readers are non-socialists and being exposed to the gigantic capitalistic brainwashing machine it is most easy for them to misinterpret the most carefully written piece. In the case of this article it is difficult not to envision large numbers of the uninstructed concluding that common ownership and democratic control arrives when farmers etc. start producing for free use. What saves all those utopian idealists who want to start little pick and shovel communes within capitalism.

PIE-IN-THE-SKY is an oxymoron. At first it was used as a form of derision of religion which caused workers into accepting little or nothing now for something in 'the sky' after they were dead. Later it came to emphasize political parties with lofty ideals and no idea how to achieve these ideals or parties that oppose certain evils with no idea of the cause of those evils. Thus it is Political parties that oppose war but wish to keep capitalism a competition that causes war are PIE-IN-THE-SKY. Parties that want to abolish poverty but at the same time keep the capitalist system are PIE-IN-THE-SKY. Parties that want food, clothing and shelter to be produced to satisfy human needs and at the same time produced for sale are PIE-IN-THE-SKY. Parties that want a socially harmonious school system in an anti-social capitalist society are PIE-IN-THE-SKY. Parties that claim they want socialism but spend all their efforts tinkering and dabbling in futile attempts to improve capitalism are PIE-IN-THE-SKY. This then sums up the socialist reply to the queries in the socialist society education will be a reflection of the socially owned and motivated productive force. There will be no motive for censorship in a classless society. The correspondent is left to figure out for herself which political parties really have a program of PIE-IN-THE-SKY.

So, for many people, careless writing turns socialist theory upside down. How much clearer to have said, "If it is desirable that hungry people be fed then majority action is necessary to remove the barriers to them being fed. A social order based upon sale-distribution and capital wage labour production. The replacement must be a social order of free distribution arising from free democratic cooperation in a socially owned productive apparatus - SOCIALISM. Writers should make it clear that no matter what are men's good will or good intentions it is impossible for them to produce solely for free use within the framework of today's society. Likewise the structure of socialist society will make it impossible to produce for sale and make production for use the only possible way of conducting human affairs. Care should always be taken to avoid having socialist materialism distorted into utopian idealism.

Yours for socialism,

Larry Tickner

Reply

Of course the first remark referred to by Com. Tickner is a ridiculous statement, when looked at out of context with the rest of the article which qualifies it both before and after. It was made as such a way by the writer of the article for impact and he would never have left it along
Gold and Poverty

I note that in less than a month’s time: Americans will be able legally to buy gold again. 2,000,000 tons of this universal equivalent let loose on the World’s market may have the effect of reversing inflation trends, i.e. diminishing market price of gold and inversely increasing the “value” content of the universal dollar unit. However it is not this factor alone that may lead into a general depression of prices of commodities (including labor-power) and thus onto the dreaded “depression” conditions now so openly being fore-cast by the mightiest of the leaders of nations. Already in industry generally there are all the classic signs of stagnation: car manufacturing, beef farming, electronics etc., growing unemployment. Nor does it need a falling price of gold to underline the coming universal crunch. In 1929 gold prices had not risen. Thems had remained stable relatively during the previous 50 years. But in no way had this fact interfered with the trade cycle as familiar to our epoch. Nor did this much publicised and greatly admired fact prevent the outbreak of 2 major World Wars.

In the enclosed news item we read where Burns, chairman of the U.S. Fed. Res. Board is urging “Congress to postpone for at least 6 months the proposed lifting of the 40 year old ban on Americans holding gold”. Well, he already acknowledges that for 40 years the free citizens of U.S. have not been able to purchase nor to own gold — (except wedding, engagement and other such personal items), and the influence of this over the whole surface and for a long time has been just about nil. At that time (1933) Pres. Roosevelt raised the price of gold (per fine oz.) from 21 dollars to 35 dollars believing this would thereby raise prices and thus ease the U.S. out of the slump. But no, the slump was only ended when the U.S. was plunged deeply into the mightiest war in human history. So Chairman Burns and his pleas for an extended 6 months delay before removing this 40 year ban is rather pathetic even from the viewpoint of his own class interests. 40 years is really 80 times 6 months and to what ends? Clearly with inflation or gold standard conditions of commerce and trading, the end result for both classes, slaves and bosses, remains constant.

C. Peter Fury
Socialist Party of Australia

To sum up: It is not the high or low price of gold, or the high prices of commodities or low wages that causes poverty. It is the class ownership of the means of life. The solution is still common ownership and democratic control of the means of life.
The Socialist Party of Canada differs from Leftist parties in the same way that it differs from Rightist parties. They all support capitalism. The Socialist Party of Canada supports only socialism. Capitalism means the wages-money-prices-profit society of private or state ownership of the means of production and distribution by the capitalist classes. Other parties, from extreme right to extreme left, support and take for granted the continued existence of the social division of wage-labor vs. capital of non-owners vs. owners, in other words, the employer-employee relationship. The Socialist Party of Canada subscribes to Marx's Materialist Conception of History.

**HOW DOES THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA DIFFER FROM LEFTIST OR SO-CALLED WORKERS’ PARTIES?**

All other parties try to improve conditions for the workers by tinkering with effects and trying to work within the master-slave relationship. They have a static view of history and social change and they have the same view of history. Bosses and workers always existed and always will. In their eyes, 'Socialism' is merely an improved capitalism, with all the economic and political institutions of the system remaining, including a working class with its unavoidable problems.

The Socialist Party of Canada on the other hand agrees with Marx. Nothing much can be done by and for the workers until the cause of their problems, capitalism, has been eliminated. Capitalist class ownership and control must be ended. Then working class problems can start to be solved. This means establishing common ownership and democratic control of the means of life, by and in the interests of the people of the earth. It means a money-less, wage-less system of free access and voluntary work motivated by conscious self-interest involving social responsibility. This means the employer-employee relationship has ended, there is no more capital vs. wage-labor. There is no more state, with its coercive forces for protecting capitalist property against the workers but instead an "administration of things" a coordination of the affairs of society, where people are socially equal. Other ideological points upon which leftists agree with their Rightist partners but disagree with the Socialist Party of Canada are:

**Patriotism** - Socialists and Marx agree: the workers have no country, they own nothing relevant to the means of production except their labor-power. All other parties cover up the class division and voluntary work motivated by conscious self-interest involving social responsibility. The Socialist Party of Canada supports instead an "administration of things" a coordination of the affairs of society, where people are socially equal.

**State Ownership - Control** - Marx and Engels emphasized this institution of a class divided society that is the State. It can have nothing to do with social ownership. Engels explained in "Socialism, Utopian and Scientific," that "...neither conversion into stock companies nor state ownership removes the nature of capital from the power of production... The modern State, whatever its form, is essentially a capitalist machine; it is the State of the capita-
list; the ideal total capitalist. The more numerous the productive powers are which it
imposes on men, the nearer it is to that ideal,
total capitalism; all the more gradually does it
expands.
LEXINGTON: - Leftists and Rightists merge two
conflicting concepts of this word into another
of the many hazy falsehoods necessary to keep
capitalism alive: (1) leadership is allegedly
classless administration of present society.
(2) leadership is dictatorship, e.g. politicians
in the vanguard of blind followers. These
counterproductive mentalities amalgamate into the phony
idea that working class consciousness, "follow
the leader," habits which cater to the class
interests of capital are democratic and in the
social interest. Marx and Engels and the SPC
on the other hand insist that:
So that the masses may understand what is to be done, long and per-
stantial work is required. (Class struggles in France) And:
"The proletarian movement in the self-mo-ning,
independent movement of the
working majority in the interest of the immense
majority." (Communist Manifesto)
PROFIT - This word may at first appear to be
reasonable, but is important in helping to
reveal the class-divided nature of present
society. Slavery is a misunderstood word on the
part of non-Socialists, left or right. It is
used in such situations as when a job is diffi-
cult or poorly paid, or poorly in social prestige.
Another way of using it is when describing the
forced labor wages of Nisiana and China, and this
is closer in its actual meaning. This concept
is also associated with the chattel slavery of
ancient society, the kind thatGreek "democracy" was built on.
This was the firm known to man. Here the slaves were the "chattels" or
the personal property of the masters. In the second form, as characterized feudalism, the slaves
were tied to the land, the land was the property
of the masters. The wage-slaves of today, who
are free to move from one capital-seeking group
of masters to another, usually do not regard
themselves as involuntary workers at all, des-
pite the fact they are property in the life of the
earth's capitalists and the workers
while useful lives are dedicated by capitalism's
will, produce profits for the business or go with-
out.
Whether a job is difficult or easy, highly paid or low, the fact that the world's
workers are forced by poverty and political ignor-
ance to produce surplus values for another
class of owners, is in order to survive themselves
beneath them as slaves, wage-slaves.
PAYOFF - Another myth of capitalism that left-
ists confuse with rightsists is that profits are
necessary and in the social interest. Conse-
quently, there are "good" profits and "bad"
profits, large and small, fair and unfair accor-
ding to variations in the ideology of the Leftist com-
plainers or the Rightist defenders. Profits are
made by "buying cheap and selling dear" (value
"munching up" as added to the taxable value of goods
and services). Hence exploitation also becomes a
classless thing and the ridiculous conclusion is
reached that capitalists exploit other capital-
ists. The intent is to keep the workers confused.
As Marx penetrated the economics of this system
he discovered that profit is realized through
selling commodities at their value on the average.
Profit, along with rain and interest, comes from the
surplus values that capitalists appropriate from
the productive process, used mainly for the
investments in machinery and for labor-power
and raw materials. However, used machinery, or
converted materials produce no new or surplus
values, so the only source of the boss's surplus
is unpaid labor or surplus labor. The invariable
condition of the employer-employee contract is
that the willer of labor-power must hand over to
the owners, labor or values, above and beyond the
cost of his own maintenance (wages). If the
owners have no prospect of reaching this uneared
surplus they refuse to buy the worker's labor
power and the factory or mine shuts down. Gen-
erally, the "profit" or surplus value is contained
in every commodity that is produced, and is fil-
ched from the workers at the point of production.
MONEY - Money, is also democratized or idealized
by the parties of left and right, along with other
institutions of exploitation. Money is seen as an imperfect means of distributing wealth
to society, and if one tries to analyze it from a casual look at the pieces of paper that circulate
among buyers and sellers it is easy to settle for
the following phony conclusion. While money
existed in former slave societies, it did not form
an integral part of their economics as it does in
capitalism. Take the owners for instance, of a
chair manufacturing plant. They possess 1,000,000
chairs as a result of a year's efforts by their
wage-slaves. They can't eat them and they only
need a few to sit on. In order to realize the
rubbed portion of wealth contained in these
chairs they must exchange them for some other
commodity, a special commodity that functions
as a medium for and equivalent of all others. That
special commodity is money (gold) evolved into
tokens or currency. With the chairs converted
into money, these members of the owning class can
replace their used machinery and materials or
expand them, and indulge in luxurious living.
Distribution of wealth to society" of course is
equal. The working class is maintained in fit
working condition, which means they are kept sure
or basic in a condition of poverty, and the
capital of the business expands.
The anti-capitalist nature of the CCY-WMF was
noticed in the first paragraph of its Regina
Manifesto back in 1903 which caged for a
"co-operative Commonwealth in which the principle
regulating production, distribution and exchange
would be the supplying of human needs and not the
money, wages profit system for all they are
stating an impossible contradiction. It is like
saying they will operate slavery for the slaves.
And when they go to the government for aid, they
are delivering the workers even more firmly into
the hands of value of elective masters. Since the
state evolved out of and has no ruling body to serve all the masters in the first
class divided society. It is the centralized authority for the current ruling class.

WORKERS' POWER - PROLETARIAN GOVERNMENT -

Socialist parties split hairs quite fine. They oppose the NDP type of mixed state and private capitalism, but promote another type under another name, while claiming to be more advanced than the NDP. As always, they presume the continued existence of the two classes, which of course entails the slave status of one and the dominator of the other. They would have the workers participating in industrial management, overlooking the fact that they are there now. The hair splitting comes in their insistence that worker managers do not represent the workers now. But how can worker managers manage for the workers when there is still a capitalist class? When the workers are still subjected, the slave vs. master status quo remains. This is just a new fraud to get worker votes to put the leaders of new capitalist parties in office, running the system in place of present executives for the workers. The only real interest of the workers is emancipation from wage slavery.

The SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA agrees with Marx that the emancipation of the working class requires "...the abolition of wage-labor, of capital and their mutual relations." (Class Struggles in France) Along with Hegels, Marx entertained no such contradiction as workers power (in office) or proletarian government. In place of the old bourgeois society, they said, "With the classes and class antagonism, we shall have an association, in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all". (Communist Manifesto).

SOCIALIST SOCIETY

It follows that with the difference between the SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA and the parties of the left being one of understanding and not understanding capitalism, that the SCP's conception of Socialist society is also different, and for the very reason.

Therefore, the Socialist Party of Canada cannot agree with leftist and rightist that Socialist society would consist of the economic foundation of capitalism left intact, with its state machine of oppression all used in an attempt to run capitalism for everybody. Marx revealed wages, profits, money, profits, fractions and classes as all being the paraphernalia of class divided, profit motivated society. They along with bourgeois moral forces, "social welfare", poverty, wealth, differing standards of consumption, crime, alcoholism, waste, pollution, alienation, etc., could not exist in a free society.

The capitalist mode of production has developed and integrated the earth economically. The new system which evolved out of it will have to be brought upon the present world division of labor but not a more world government or glorified "United Nations". With the ending of class domination, national frontiers will disappear.

The reality of one economic world will harmonize with one social world. The present socially generated means of production will harmonize with the proposed social ownership of it.

This of course means that the economic organizations and administrative bodies of class rule will have to be replaced with new ones. Institutions geared to class-based democracy. In place of competitive governments over people, world society would have an administration system over things and under all the people.

For Marx's slogan, "From each according to his capacity, to each according to his need" to be realized, the whole of humanity, without distinction of race or sex, would come to consider that is used to make and distribute goods and services.

Common ownership means free access production for the use of all. It means that humanity will provide for itself, to enhance itself voluntarily, with enlightened self-interest in mind. This includes the love of creative work, the requirement of consumption, the urge to help others or need for cooperation, and social responsibility.

IT WON'T WORK

but rightists might say, "Now are you going to force people to work when they don't have to?"

In addition to not knowing that leisure is a product of forced labor and alienation, they have no scientific concept of freedom - self interest, as opposed to selfishness. Some leftists might say, "Well, that sounds very nice, but it is utopia - impossible, or such an idea is pre-nature. The workers are not yet ready for this. In the meantime we should help them now." The emphasis is removed from educating the workers as to the capitalist sources of their problems by leftists, and in placed instead of trying to ameliorate these problems within wage-slavery. This is but another example of the dividing line, the chasm between left-center and right on one side, and Socialism on the other. The left-center-right spectrum unconsciously seems to depress capitalist with its classes and therefore leaders and led, with its involuntary or wage-slave labor, with its relatively passive producing class which must be pitied and propped with doles in its necessary poverty. The knowledge, the class consciousness or political awareness of their immediate and continuing servile position in capitalism that is required by the world's workers to achieve their emancipation - this is not included in the political comprehension of the prevailing extreme left - extreme right aura.

CAPITALISM'S ENTINTEGRATING PRESSURE

While most workers, influenced by bourgeois propaganda, left and right, mistakenly regard the system as being humanitarian and permanent, they never escape being hurt by its various environment and of course never stop questioning. Leftist organizations serve the bosses, with an endless list of exceptions. But safety valves that are harmful to the ruling class. By disturbing or destroying the meaning of Socialism, they help to sustain the ideology of Socialism.
ENERGY: What is the Real Crisis?

A one day seminar held at Victoria Nov. 22, 1979 entitled "Energy and sex" was just another of a long line of similar seminars and meetings dating back to 1970. A measure of their success can be judged by the diminishing attendance and the angrier categories.

1. Operating Your Car Economically.
2. Conservation of Energy in Housing.
4. Inter-Country Co-operation.
5. Reporting.

It also indicates the socialist (or nationalist) tendency to get some knowledge through the back door of conservatism, reformism and constitutionalism, as a means of social control. Yet, in spite of it all, some fragments of socialist understanding are passing on and the socialist can pick up some small seeds of information.

Most participants in these seminars for genuine environmental and ecological organizations, in Canada and the U.S. in the "red old days" of the Social Credit government they became the fact that the health department's pollution control branch merely engaged in the business of granting licenses to pollute. Back in those days the B.C.P.P. was a major brick of modern pollution. But in 1970 the B.C.P.P. became the New Democratic government and the ecologists and environmentalists had a champion in the whistle. Now happy are they after more than two years of the B.C.P.P. being involved in the castrorations of administering the needs of capitalism. In a little more than one year of the pollution control branch's engineers resigned saying, "I am expelled as the means of public funds and human resources that exist on the pollution control branch... a great deal is being done to establish this great bureaucratic governmental agency known as the pollution control branch but very little is being done about pollution." And recently from a public hearing.

Washington Chuck Revenant alleged that the New Democratic government (presently Liberal) according to the leftist are "moderate" and the Social Credit government (presently Liberal) while they are not. The Social Credit Party of Canada is nothing but the well known Spohr-Schmitz enterprise. It is not true that the anti-socialist elements of burning groups are both correct.

The SEISD (S.D. and the Committee on Energy) or other organizations are the few independent organizations to monitor capitalism. The only organized effort against the environmental conditions of the system is a positive way to combat the ideological foundation that this system rests on. We are raising our own consciousness to become the socialists of our own times, and the socialist organizations are to be a part of this class struggle, aimed at changing all class structure by making the society of class division.

... ...

So why all the talk? Governments are normally don't go to great expense to put on these lengthy "seminars" just to satisfy a few icons who are already pledged to their cause and not be attracted anyway. Like an inebriate only a bit above.

Back in 1970 at a large environmental seminar at Victoria University a close came out as to what the capitalist class have in mind. At that seminar Jack Tar and John Zander came out with the statement that if we are to save the environment we are going to have to take a lower standard of living. As might be expected, this went over like a lead balloon, especially since there was a socialist present ready to point a noble in that balloon. The S.D.P. member showed his skepticism about people with incomes of over $20,000 a year, telling others with incomes of less than $5,000 a year that we have to take a lower standard of living. One can only guess how much these two spokesmen of capitalism lowered their standard of living. American has subsequently become provost-like liberal leader and Father is doing "four year therapies" to a T.V. commercials that we want to earn. The B.C. businessmen who are living on a pension is in order here, for a cut back in all consumption inevitably means more electrical consumption.

Since then capitalism's spokesmen have not been so blatant in their approach but there is no reason to think they have changed their aims. They are merely dressing them up in different clothes. Now they refer to it as "altering living patterns."

There is nothing unusual about capitalism's success in improving the capitalistic position at the expense of the workers but one notes an increase in its increased intensity within the Western Marketing Manager of Shell Canada, Patty Singh, urges a cut back in oil consumption. Those on the surface appears as pretty unsuitable. Again why the flag? All it appears that the Canadian capital is as a whole is in for a bit of a bad time. In about three years it is expected...
The program that the working classes can be expected to be increasingly inculcated with was long in coming. Vice Premier General, Bryce Hulseby, shortly was administrating society for its "good and best" and arrogating a new role among capitalists. The forces of capitalism were very high to the purposes of capitalism was evidenced by their enthusiasm that these measures would need the "DECREASED BALANCE OF PAYMENTS."

As already as said, in spite of the nature form of these seminars, sometimes some valuable information in the forthcoming. Ecologists are frequently prone to tell how the per capita consumption of energy in Canada is five times the world average. It seems they would like everyone to share their guilt feelings. But they are bound to tell only small part of the figured. At this seminar the cut was somewhat cut out of the bag to bring them closer. Office of Energy Conservation, Ottawa. He said that the figure is somewhat deceptive because Canada is a net exporter of energy. Further, he said that from this same conclusion can be drawn. Two-thirds of the per capita human energy consumption can be assigned to homes, battleships, and bombs etc. True some of it can also be assigned to things that could be considered as socially useful such as roads and hospitals. But what of the one third one direct consumption.

Economy crisis probably paralleled with a depression, and a great pressure on the working class. For socialists there is the context of a society where energy potential would not be wasted, but rather will be put in the perspective of human need rather than a favorable balance of payments, and without the mentalism of bombs, battleships and battleships. Larry White

Opposition from the Right

and from the Left

Len Slammed

A late editor

Sir:

Len Wallace's article in the "Toronto Star" last week seems to be in the same sense as the one I have just read in the "Vancouver Sun." The two articles seem to be written by the same person. However, I must say that I disagree with the观点 expressed by Mr. Wallace. First of all, I believe that the socialists are the ones who are being deprived. They are the ones who have to suffer from the policies of the capitalist system. Secondly, the socialist unions are the ones who are responsible for the high unemployment. They are the ones who have to suffer from the policies of the capitalist system.

I am sure that you agree with me in this matter.

Yours sincerely,

Len Slammed
A one day seminar held at Victoria Nov. 23, 1974 entitled Energy and You was just another of a long line of similar seminars and meetings dating back to 1970. A measure of their success can be judged by the diminishing attendance and the worsened content. 1. Operating Your Car Economically: 2. Conserving Energy in Housing. 3. Shopping Guidelines in Saving Energy. 4. Public Transportation Possibilities. 5. Recycling. It also indicates the socialists concern in attempting to get some knowledge through the barricades of conservatism, reformism and a censorship disguised as intellectualism. Yet, in spite of it all, some fragments of socialist understanding are passed on and the socialist can pick up some small sands of information.

Most participate in these seminars for genuine humanitarian and ecological concern about man and the environment. Back in the "bad old days" of the Social Credit Provincial Government they demanded the fact that the Health Department's pollution control branch merely engaged in the business of providing licenses to pollute. Back in those days the N.D.P. were real fire brand critics of pollution. But in 1972 the N.D.P. became the Provincial Government and the ecologists and environmentalists had a champion in the saddle. How happy are they after two years of the N.D.P. being involved in the practicalities of administering the needs of capital? In a little more than one year one of the pollution control branch's engineers resigned saying, "I am appalled at the waste of public funds and human resources that exist on the pollution control branch ... a great deal is being done to establish this great bureaucratic governmental agency known as the pollution control branch but very little is being done about pollution.** And recently fish and wildlife biologist Chuck Newcombe alleged that the branch permits more pollution than it prevented.** Similar, or worse, charges could be levied at the major co-sponsor of these seminars, the federal government (presently Liberal).

So why all the flap? Governments surely don't go to great expense to put on these little side shows just to satisfy a few echos who are either already pledged to their camp or can not be attracted anyway. Like an iceberg only a bit shows.

Back in 1970 at a large environmental seminar at Victoria University a clue came out as to what the capitalist class have in mind. At that seminar both Bob Fortune and David Anderson came out with the statement that if we are to save the environment we are going to have to take a lower standard of living. As might be expected, this went over like a lead balloon, especially since there was a socialist present ready to poke a hole in that balloon. The S.P.C. member showed his cynicism about people with incomes of over $20,000.00 a year, telling others with incomes of less than $8,000.00 a year that 'WE' have to take a lower standard of living. One can only guess how much these two spokesmen of capitalism lowered their standard of living. Anderson has been subsequently become provincial Liberal leader and Fortune is doing "turn your thermostat down" T.V. commercials for the state owned B.C. Hydro. A bit more cynicism is in order here, for a cut back in oil consumption inevitably means more electrical consumption.

Since then Capitalism's spokesmen have not been so blatant in their approach but there is no reason to think they have changed their aims. They are merely dressing up different clothes. Now they refer to it as "altering life patterns."

There is nothing unusual about capitalism's stooges attempting to improve the capitalists' position at the expense of the workers, but one gets an idea of its increased intensity when the Western Marketing Manager of Shell Canada, Barry Sleigh, urges a cut back in oil consumption. This on the surface appears as pretty unselﬁsh. Again why the flap? Well, it appears that the Canadian capitalist as a whole is in for a bit of a bad time. In about three years it is ex-
United at the present rate of consumption, Canada will be importing oil and will remain much for about ten years reaching an intensity of about 25% oil imports by 1985. This must be a matter of some concern to the administrators of Canadian capitalism and no doubt the major factor behind the environment facade. What do they intend to do about it? Will Sleigh’s sources indicate that by initiating a conservation program in the context of all oil for all a small amount for a couple of years? The major sources of this proposed conservation is to come from reduced consumption in motor gasoline (459 million barrels per day by 1980). And where is this to take its effect? Sleigh has it that “These savings presume that the public will accept the trade-offs and major changes in life style.” Verbally, Sleigh said that “Major” was an error and should have read “minor” but there is reason to suspect this was just sugaring the pill. That the architects of the latest seminar were very high on the theory of capitalism was evidenced by their enthusiasm that these measures would also “IMPROVE OUR BALANCE OF PAYMENTS.” The propaganda working class can be expected to be increasingly inundated with was not long in coming. Post Master General, Bryce Mankasey, shortly was admonishing society for its “greed and lust” and urging a new ethical tone. It is not to be thought that capitalism’s spokesmen speak with less of a forked tongue today. Mackasey’s admonishment was shortly followed by an announcement that federal N.P.’s would have their salaries increased by 50%.

As previously said, in spite of the narrow format of these seminars, sometimes some valuable information is forthcoming. Ecologists are frequently prone to tell how the per capita consumption of energy in Canada is five times the world average. It seems they would like everyone to share their guilt feelings, but they do not tell exactly what these figures mean. At this seminar the cat was out of the bag by Livian Kelly, Office of Energy Conservation, Ontario. He said that the figures are deceptive because Canada is a net exporter and further revealed that two thirds of this consumption is indirect. It is unfortunate that socialists do not have more access to figures such as these, or have time to have more access to them. But even from this some conclusions can be drawn. Two thirds of the per capita human Canadian consumption can be assigned to banks, battleships and bombs etc. True some of it can also be assigned to that things that could be considered as socially useful such as roads and hospitals. But what of the one third direct consumption? Even here, a great deal of distortion occurs in the form of planned obsolescence and socially motivated pressure for style consumption, from the FOR SALE motive. It is difficult to draw definite conclusions from this but it does give somewhat of a rule of thumb of what socialists can do. For the supporters of capitalism, the path is on the dictatorship of Big Business. The proof of this can be found in the current economic crisis. The crisis is only CAPITALIST WIDE; there is no unemployment and no inflation in the socialist countries. The two systems are fundamentally different. If they were not this contradiction would not exist.

Len Slammed

A late editor
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Socialist Fulcrum with Len Wallace

It seems that for the past while I have been criticized for not backing up some of my claims with references to the works of Marx, Engels and Lenin. This week, however, I plan to show how Lenin directly distorted Marxist scientific socialism.

Marx and Engels made it quite clear that “No social order ever disappears before all the productive forces for which there is no room within it have developed, and new higher relations of production never arise before the material conditions of their existence have matured, in the womb of the old society.” (Preface to Critique of Political Economy).

Compare this to the Leninist theory that socialism can be built in backward countries such as the Russia of 1917. Engels himself wrote in 1893 that France (already an industrialized country) had not “reached the point which would have made the transition to socialism possible.” (Preface to Italian edition of the Communist Manifesto). Thus, how could backward Russia which was in the initial stage of capitalist development proceed to socialism?

Lenin, later, had to admit that “The development of the productive forces of Russia has not attained the level that makes socialism possible... They keep harping on this incontrovertible proposition...” (Our Revolution).

But what is the purpose of this vicious attack on socialism and the national liberation movements? Obviously it is not intended to influence people in socialism, or build internal solidarity. Neither is it intended to be a basis of a new society. Lenin had to admit that Russia was too backward for socialism, then how were India and China, which were even more backward, to remedy the situation?

In order for Lenin’s followers to claim that socialism could be built in one country, and a backward country at that, they would have to reject the total concept of historical materialism, one of the cornerstones of Marxian thought.

To Marx, the socialist revolution could only be “the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority in the interest of the immense majority.” (Communist Manifesto). And what did Lenin say? He stated that the workers can only be led by a group of skilled professional revolutionaries. Why? Because “the working class exclusively by its own efforts is able to develop only trade-union consciousness...” (What Is To Be Done?). Marx knew that only a politically conscious majority of workers can build socialism.

“The masses may understand what is to be done; long and persistent work is required.” (Class Struggles in France). Whereas Lenin followed a different view: “If socialism can only be realised when the intellectual development of all the people permits it, then we shall not see socialism for at least five hundred years.” (reported by John Reed).

On question of the role of the State in Marx the “destruction of the State machines” (Eighteenth Brumaire) meant the “destruction of the bureaucratic and military machine” (letter to Kugelmann). The State is “an evil inherited by the proletariat from those worse sides of the proletariat, will have at the earliest possible moment to topple off.” (Civil War in France). This is a far cry from Lenin’s distortion when he wrote that “Marx’s idea is that the working class must break up, smash, the ‘ready-made state machinery’ and not confine itself to laying hold of it.” (State and Revolution).

What shall it be: topple off the state machinery or smash the state altogether? And what of the much talked about “dictatorship of the proletariat?” This was elaborated on by Engels who did not see the dictatorship as a form of government, but rather as the social structure of state power. Obviously Lenin did not share this view.

In fact, Engels saw the democratic republic as “the specific form of the dictatorship of proletariat” (Critique of the Draft of the Erfurt program). Whereas to Lenin the “Democratic Republic coexists nearest the dictatorship of the proletariat” (State and Revolution).

Marx and Engels saw the dictatorship as being based on universal suffrage, democrats from top to bottom. Quite different from Lenin’s view “that Soviet Socialist Democracy is in no way inconsistent with the rule and dictatorship of one person.” (Economic Construction).

Lenin, to enforce his theories, claimed that Marx made a distinction between socialism and communism when in fact neither Marx nor Engels ever made such a distinction. Marx and Engels made it clear that the state was only necessary in a class society of inequality. What happened to Russia? The state is not withering away. In fact, it is stronger than ever.

This article is not long enough to go into all the areas of Leninist distortion. We must realize that the distortions made by Lenin inevitably resulted in Stalinist terror. Terror and violence are not recognized by socialists.

Thus what is our judgment? Lenin was a revolutionist. The development of socialism, Leninists make a travesty of Marxism that can only cause harm to the movement.
State Ownership Or Control

The list of profit-sharing or share-sharing plans promoted by individual companies for their employees is not a short one. The latest to arrive on the scene involves the partially state owned Texasgulf Inc. Principally a multi-national mining and chemical firm with possibly half of its operations in Canada, it owns the Kidd Creek mine near Timmins, Ontario, one of the richest copper mines in the world. Its properties include sulphur plants in Alberta and mining administrations in Toronto, Calgary and Vancouver.

"Effective managerial control," according to the Victoria Times of Oct. 31/74, "rests with the Canada Development Corporation," which is owned by the Canadian government. Established to allow the drift toward U.S. Capitalist ownership of Canada, the CDC made a successful tender offer for 8,200,000 Texasgulf shares a few months ago, thereby Canadianizing 30 per cent of this U.S. based concern. In spite of this "coup" the announcement of the Texasgulf employee stock-sharing plan originated in New York. The credibility canyon about state ownership being beneficial to society must be yawning wide and deep for this enterprise to think it has to resort to sharing ownership directly with its workers too. If one is to believe that the 9 to 5's on the Canadian side share ownership of 30 per cent of the firm in conjunction with the rest of their "fellow Canadians" through "their" government, one might wonder at the over-riding need of a further profit-sharing scheme. An elementary grasp of Marxian economics, and a few moments of grade six arithmetic combined with a trip to the library provided enough expanded information to settle this quandary.

"The initial disbursement of stock," said the announcement from New York, "...will include slightly more than $4,000 shares. With current sale value being $28, each, "this first stage of the program involves stock worth more than $1 million." Texasgulf estimates its employees will receive an additional 50,000 shares during the next five years. Assuming that the present good share prices hold up, this would total $2,300,000 of shares distributed among the employees in the next 5 years. Sounds pretty good, by itself. But that's not the whole story.

The trip to the library revealed that total capitalization of Texasgulf was $697,203,000 in 1973 and probably increased in 1974. (Moody's Industrial Report). The $2,300,000 against $697,203,000 seems to come out to .33 per cent. The total number of employees of this relatively small enterprise is 4,000. Guessing that the master-slave ratio in this firm might be roughly prevalent with that of capitalist society in general, e.g., one real owner to every nine servants, this stock-sharing plan means that 4,000 useful producers will own less than 1/3 of one per cent of the company's 1973 value by the time 1979 rolls around, while an approximately 444 real and absentee owners will monopolize the other 96.67 per cent. By anybody's calculations, this could hardly be called stock-sharing. But a moment's thought in the beginning could have revealed the contradiction inherent in the concept of employees sharing ownership with their exploiters. How could the wages, price profit mechanism of exploitation persist with its rich class and poor class simultaneously with alleged sharing? How could parasitical minority live off the wage-working efforts of a majority against the social equality implications of common ownership? Of course one concept cancels the other out.

Fifteen Year Service Rewards

More details of the alleged sharing plan reveal its laughability quotient. For 20 years a service each servant would receive 50 $286 shares of ownership of the enterprise which exploits him, presuming their 1974 value remained fixed. These would be worth $1,300. and if the dividend rate was extremely high, say 20 per cent, he would receive $260. annually, enough maybe to pay cash for a cheap washing machine, which is a lot more than the free turkey some employees receive at Xmas time, but then they are not being conscious into thinking they are part owners either. In the 20 year interval (if he managed to survive capitalism) and if annual and real taxes hadn't been around $10,000. he would have received around $200,000. worth of food, clothing, shelter, children's schooling, entertainment and other necessities required to maintain the profitability of his class. And if the rate of legal robbery by his bosses in the same period of time was an old-fashioned 10 per cent, that is, equal to his wages, he would have produced $200,000. of surplus values for toss in the seas again illustrating the incompatibility of the modern wage-slave status with any kind of real sharing of the bosses loot. These schemes are but another delusion to assuage the workers into greater loyalty and productivity for the system that uses them. As board chairman of Texasgulf Charles F. Fogarty, believes, "owning a part of the company will give each employee a greater awareness of why profits are so important." And since such an antinomical proportion of the profits go to the handful of real owners, how can they lose? It is apparent whose interests he represents. Regardless of nationality the capitalist class of the earth came the earth. In the sense of productive facilities and resources, the workers are generally left with nothing to offer but their labor power. After the emptiness of all these experiments has been discovered, the Marxist solution remains valid. The world's workers need the political awareness of the general uselessness, to them,
MAOISM: Ideology or State Capitalism

While unfolding events have given rise to increasing acceptance to the socialist position that Russia is a state capitalist - not socialist but few, other than socialists, recognize that China too is capitalist. One of those is Charles Reeve, author of Le Tigne de Papier, Sur le Développement du Capitalisme en Chine 1949-1971 (published by Spartacus, 5 rue Ste-Croix-de-la-Bretagne, Paris, IVe, in 1972).

Reeve shows that nationalisation plus planning is not the equivalent of Socialism. He is not taken in at all by the claim that China cannot be capitalist because the private capitalists have been expropriated (not entirely true in fact) and because production is planned by the State. Following Marx he sees the essence of capitalism as the social relationship of wage-labour and capital - that is, the division of society into a non-owning class forced to sell its labour-power and a class which monopolises the means of production and employs wage-workers to operate them with a view to profit. Reeve quotes Marx to the effect that "capital therefore presupposes wage-labour: wage-labour presupposes capital. They condition each other: each brings the other into existence" (Wage Labour and Capital), and Angel to the effect that the transformation either into joint-stock companies and trusts, or into state ownership, does not do away with the capitalist nature of the productive forces' (Socialism, Utopian and Scientific). Socialism necessarily involves the abolition of the wage system. Given that both wage-labour and the accumulation of capital exist in China, then, China is capitalist. As a result there is a class conflict there between "salariés et les gérants du capital" (wage-workers and managers of capital).

Chinese state capitalism needs to plan its production so as to allow its exports to be competitive on the world market, particularly against the products of the intensive labour of the countries of South East Asia. This means that, as a unit, the Chinese economy is subject to the laws of value of the world market, i.e. that it constitutes a system of social production organised with a view to increasing or at least maintaining the average rate of profit. Reeve sees the main problem that has confronted the Chinese ruling class, which came to power in 1949 as that of extracting a sufficient surplus from, mainly, the peasantry (China was an 85 per cent peasant country in 1949, and so even more backward than Russia in 1917) in order to invest in industrialization.

This is no to say that Chinese society has not been transformed since 1949. The situation which then existed of 10 per cent of landowners owning 70 per cent of the cultivated land has been ended, but land reform of this sort has always been necessary before capitalist industrialization can take off in any country.

Maoism, as an ideology, is examined in Chapter VI of Beliefs in Society by Nigel Harris (originally published as a hardback by Watts in 1968, now reissued by Penguins) who describes it as a "loose combination of agrarian populism and radical nationalism". The small Chinese wage-working class, concentrated in the big towns along the coast, played virtually no part in the coming to power of the Chinese Communist Party in 1949. The "Chinese Revolution" was essentially the conquest of power by a peasant army led by a nationalist intelligentsia mouthing a few Marxist phrases. As Harris points out:

"Mao has revised Marxism to such a degree that it cannot really be considered to be merely a local 'application': the essence has disappeared. What constitutes revolution is not the most advanced urban masses securing their own emancipation by their own efforts, but guerrilla warfare by the least advanced rural groups, operating outside the ordinary social structure over many years, in order to seize power and begin industrialization. A would-be elite, displaced and alienated from the status-quo within a degrading agrarian social structure, fits naturally into Maoism."

Maoism, then is essentially a nationalist, and not at all a socialist or Marxist, theory. As Reeve says, so-called "Marxism" - Leninism is the "ideology of state capitalism". As a variation of this doctrine, so too is Maoism.
TAKE A BIGGER LOOK AT THE IDEAS OF REAL MARXISM. IDEAS WITHOUT WHICH WORKING CLASS EMANCIPATION FROM CAPITALISM WILL BE IMPOSSIBLE.
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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 society as a whole.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

The Socialist Party of Canada holds:

1. That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., lands, 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 of 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 the overthrow of plutocratic privilege.

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 interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

8. THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labor or given to capitalist, and calls upon all members of the working class of this country 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 that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.