

A SOCIALIST ALTERNATIVE FOR CANADA

JOHN W. WARNOCK



TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Introduction	2
II.	The Socialist Analysis of Capitalism	3
III.	The Origins of Socialism	6
IV.	Socialism in Canada	8
V.	Ownership of Natural Resources	11
VI.	Swedish Social Democracy	14
VII.	Subsidizing Private Enterprise	16
VIII.	The Electoral Failure of the NDP	18
IX.	Socialism or Social Democracy	21
X.	The Promise of Socialism	23
XI.	The Need for a New Party	24
XII.	Selected Bibliography	28

FORWARD

The purpose of this essay is to stimulate discussion in Saskatchewan on the future of the socialist left and its relationship to the New Democratic Party. Although I have solicited the views of a number of Waffle supporters in this province and elsewhere, the essay remains a personal statement, and I take full responsibility for its contents. It is important to recognize that this paper does not represent a policy statement by the Saskatchewan Waffle movement; it is only one opinion, and there are many within the present Waffle membership.

Many will quickly notice that the essay omits any significant discussion of imperialism. Obviously, no discussion of capitalism in Canada could ignore such an overwhelming phenomenon. Nevertheless, since 1969 the Waffle movement has concentrated on the question of foreign (primarily American) domination and exploitation of Canada, and public awareness of this central problem is quite extensive. What I have tried to do in this paper is discuss the solution, and in particular the differences between the socialist and the social democratic approaches.

Some have already noted that the examples I have used are drawn from the national CCF and NDP. This was a deliberate choice on my part, an attempt to make the essay supplement the statement the Waffle presented at the 1972 provincial convention of the NDP, "The Blakeney Government -- One Year After." I feel that the 1972 statement contained a fairly good description of the problems faced by our province, criticized the inadequate policies of the present NDP Government, and at the same time outlined a socialist strategy for economic development.

It is hoped that this pamphlet, and the previous statement, will be used during the remainder of the year to foster serious discussion on the future of socialism in Saskatchewan and Canada. Additional copies (including bulk orders) can be obtained from the Saskatchewan Waffle Movement, P.O. Box 3102, Regina, or from me personally at 1401 Egbert Avenue, Saskatoon.

John W. Warnock

June 1973.

I. INTRODUCTION

What is socialism? Who is a socialist? What is the difference between socialism and social democracy? As the Canadian crisis deepens, there is a growing need to discuss these questions.

During the era of the cold war, our political leaders, following the script imported from the United States, argued that capitalism had solved all of its problems. Socialism was said to be outdated and irrelevant.

However, this era is over. By the late 1960's and the early 1970's more and more people were beginning to realize that capitalism has not changed in any fundamental way. We still have all of the old problems — plus some new ones. Capitalism, as a system, continues to perpetuate human suffering both in Canada and throughout the world.

Despite all the social welfare programmes, we still find great inequalities in wealth and income in all capitalist countries. Monopoly control of the economy is even more difficult to deal with due to the rise of the huge international corporations. Everywhere there is a growing concern about pollution and the waste in planned obsolescence. In the most industrialized and economically developed sectors of capitalist economy there is widespread alienation and protest against the dull, routine nature of most of today's jobs. All the institutions in capitalist society remain authoritarian, ruled from the top down by insensitive bureaucracies. Many people feel that the system itself is responsible for the continuation of racism and sexism.

In Canada, we are experiencing increasing hard core unemployment and wasteful non-participation in the labour force. There are gross disparities in the standard of living between geographic regions. We witness the continuing depopulation of rural areas, the overcrowding of cities, the rise of crime, and the increasing use of various escape mechanisms like alcohol and drugs.

Imperialism remains a basic characteristic of capitalism. The war in Indochina is only one example of what is being done throughout the world in order to protect the vested interests in the so-called "free world". At every conference of the United Nations the spokesmen for the underdeveloped countries denounce neo-colonialism: their continued exploitation through foreign investment and unequal trade.

All of this has not escaped Canada. There is a growing sentiment against U.S. and other foreign ownership and control of our economy. Cultural domination has followed in the footsteps of foreign capital. Canada is the only country in the world which does not have an independent trade union movement. We are witnessing the relative deterioration of the Canadian economy as we become more dependent on surrendering our non-renewable energy and other resources to the U.S., Japanese and British industrial empires.

Because of the growing awareness of the exploitative nature of capitalism, there has been an increasing interest in socialist theory and the experiments in socialism in other countries. In Canada we have seen the rise and fall of a wide variety of relatively small socialist groups, calling themselves Communist, Trotskyite, Maoist, syndicalist, New Left Marxist, etc. To date they have been unable to develop beyond their university-based middle-class adherents. None have any support in the Canadian working class.

The Communist Party, once the most important political element in the Canadian trade union movement, has become old and stagnant. Its slavish following of the party line from Moscow has rendered it irrelevant to the needs of the Canadian people.

The only national left-wing party in Canada with any significant popular support is the New Democratic Party. From its beginning as the CCF, it has always had a fairly strong socialist element. Since 1969, this has largely been represented by the Waffle movement, a caucus within the NDP dedicated to converting the party to a socialist position.

In English-speaking Canada the trade union leadership (based in the unions affiliated with the Canadian Labour Congress) rejects socialism for a moderate reform of capitalism. This is in the tradition of British "labourism", and more recently, in the Samuel Gompers' theory of "business unionism", the ideology of the American unions which dominate the CLC.

But in Quebec, the leadership of the three largest trade union federations (the Quebec Federation of Labour, the Confederation of National Trade Unions, and the Quebec Teachers Corporation) has turned to the development of an independent Quebecois theory of socialism, based on Marxism. In May 1972 the Common Front of public employees carried out a general strike, not seen in North America since 1919, a tactic strongly opposed by the leadership of the CLC. This new Quebec militancy is combined with a strong opposition to American imperialism.

There is a debate going on in Saskatchewan today over the future of politics in this province. The debate concerns the role of the NDP and the tactics and strategy for socialists to take. This debate about socialism cannot be meaningful until we begin to understand the basic difference between socialism and social democracy. It is hoped that this essay will contribute to that debate and help to clarify the distinctions.

II THE SOCIALIST ANALYSIS OF CAPITALISM

Any meaningful discussion of socialism must begin with the socialist analysis of capitalism. Obviously, the confines of this essay do not permit an adequate discussion. Nevertheless, several key points must be made.

The system of production and distribution in Canada and throughout much of the world is called capitalism. Under this social system, the development of the economy depends on the accumulation of capital by a

small group of people, the owners of capital. These people make the investment decisions based on the profit motive. But capital does not grow on trees nor does it fall from the sky.

A socialist is one who is opposed to the private creation of capital, the way it is used, and the social class which controls it. Ownership of the means of production is recognized as the key question.

In a capitalist society, workers produce commodities for sale in the market. The worker does not own the means of production. He can only earn his living by selling his labour in the market for a salary or a wage. By 1968, 83% of all Canadians fell into this category. Throughout the history of capitalism, socialists have referred to this class as the proletariat, a term from the Latin used to describe the class of Romans during the Imperial era who owned no private property. (NOTE: One should always distinguish between personal property, such as homes, automobiles, etc., and private property, which is used for production purposes.)

The capitalist enters the market as well. He has money acquired from past enterprises, speculation, mercantile profiteering, banks and other financial interests, or in recent periods often from government handouts. He uses this money to buy the means of production and the labour-power of the worker. The capitalist sells the commodities produced by the labourers. Under this system, he must always receive in the end a greater sum of money than he started with. That is his "profit".

LABOUR AS THE SOURCE OF CAPITAL

Where does the "profit" come from? The workers, through their labour, have transformed raw materials into a finished product. They have created new wealth -- new value to society. But when a worker hires himself out to an employer, he does not acquire any control over his product, and the employer sets the wages and hours of work. "Profit" comes from the fact that there is a difference between the costs of production (mainly labour) and the price of the commodity which the capitalist then sells. If there wasn't this difference -- or "profit" -- then the capitalist system simply would not work. Thus all capital is created by the labour of the working class. It is appropriated (or accumulated) by the capitalist class.

In the present era of monopoly capitalism, it should be noted that the capitalist has been able to maintain a substantial rate of profit. Even with the rise of trade unions, the percentage of the national income which goes to "profit" has not declined. This is due to the fact that the capitalist, through his monopoly controls, is able to pass on higher labour costs to the consumer through higher prices.

But capital can also be accumulated through the market system of exchange. For example, capital can be accumulated through finance: lending money for interest. In this case, capital takes the form of extraction of wealth from the labour of the borrower (in the case of individuals) through the market system, not directly through production.

Farmers are often classified as petit-bourgeois. That is, they still "own" their own means of production, the land. In this case they are different

from those on wages and salaries. As a class, they have strong sentimental ties to private property. A farmer can also become a capitalist when he lives off the labour of others -- either through share cropping or hiring labour directly. There is also the case of corporate farms, "factories in the field," where farm workers from management on down are hired labour, usually working for absentee owners. In some cases, private agri-business joint-stock corporations are directly entering the farming business. However as farm workers unionize, the trend is now back to contract farming, where the corporations do not have to provide farm capital or pay for farm labour.

But the farmer also creates capital through his participation in the market system of exchange. First, the farmer sells his product to the food distributors and the food processing industries. These middlemen are not simply engaged in a non-profit service. They make a "profit" on this exchange. The farmer (along with the wage earner employed by the middlemen) creates capital from his labour, but capital which is extracted from him through the power of the middlemen in the exchange process.

A farmer also creates capital when he purchases necessary farm supplies like machinery, pesticides, fuel, feed, etc. Take one example: the purchase of a tractor. The capitalist makes a "profit" on the manufacture of the tractor, extracted from his production workers. But he also makes a "profit" on the distribution. By his ability to set prices, he can siphon off wealth from the labour of the farmer. Again, capital is extracted from the farmer in the exchange process.

Socialists have always insisted that this is a system of exploitation. It is exploitation because it is the transfer of wealth from the working class to the capitalist class, the small group of individuals who own the means of production. It is a transfer of wealth from the great majority to the small minority. Thus all capital has its source in class exploitation.

CAPITALISTS IN CANADA

In Canada the capitalist class is very small. According to Statistics Canada, in 1968 only 10.3% of income earners in Canada held one or more shares of stock. The top 1% of all income earners in Canada in that year held 42% of all Canadian stocks. In contrast, the bottom 50% of all income earners held only 9.8% of total stock holdings. There were 1311 individuals who held stock worth \$1.2 billion, or 9% of the total, more stocks than owned by the bottom 4 million income earners in Canada.

However, this is only part of the story. In Canada there is a double form of exploitation. Our economy is preponderantly owned by foreign capitalists. Thus the wealth created by Canadian workers is appropriated by a foreign capitalist class. That is imperialism.

The fact of extensive foreign ownership of the Canadian economy is often cited as the reason for the very small capitalist class in Canada. However, the high concentration of ownership of capital in the hands of a few is a general characteristic of all capitalist countries. For example, the 1956 report of the New York Stock Exchange revealed that the corporate stock

holdings of the Rockefeller and Mellon families exceeded \$3 billion each, and the du Pont family \$4 billion. In that year the market value of the holdings of the Rockefeller family in Standard Oil of New Jersey alone was twice the market value of all the stock holdings of all American wage earners. "Peoples' Capitalism" is clearly a myth, created for obvious reasons.

Because capital has its source in the exploitation of labour, socialists have always insisted that capitalism as a system had to be replaced. The system could not be reformed.

III THE ORIGINS OF SOCIALISM

The earliest developments of modern socialism could be found in the world-wide peasant revolts against landlords. In the 14th century in Europe these were wide-spread -- and were crushed by the ruling class. In Germany in the 16th century the peasants again revolted, only to be massacred by the Princes urged on by Martin Luther. These movements advocated democratic, communist societies, where all private property was to be held in common. The peasants wanted to re-create the communist ideal of the early Christians. Their descendants are found today in the Hutterite colonies in Western Canada.

In the 13th Century, St. Thomas Aquinas, utilizing the labour theory of value described in the previous section of this paper, concluded that private property was "theft" from producers. In 1516 St. Thomas More wrote **Utopia**, a scathing indictment of the exploitation of the common man, setting forth an ideal communist society.

Jean Jacques Rousseau, the famous 18th century liberal, concluded that the horrible plight of the common man was due to the introduction of private ownership of the means of production, that government was a fraud imposed on the poor by the rich, and predicted that in all societies the basic conflict would continue to be a class conflict between the rich, who owned private property, and the poor, who did not.

Rousseau's theme was expanded upon by the utopian socialists: Henri de Saint-Simon, Charles Fourier and Robert Owen. By the 19th century movements were springing up all across Europe opposing capitalism and advocating various forms of socialism. In 1840, Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, the anarchist opponent of Marx, published his widely read book, **What is Property**, and answered that "it is theft".

The most common solution advocated by these early socialists was a return to a peaceful, co-operative society, with an emphasis on rural agricultural communities and the destruction of the oppressive state. But this was the period of the rise of capitalism, and this new system of production was creating a new exploited class, the industrial proletariat. At this time Karl Marx and Frederick Engels came on the scene with their analysis of capitalism and a call for a socialist alternative.

The Marxist analysis of capitalism was a synthesis of the ideas of the early socialists, the French historians, the German philosophers, and the English classical political economists. The labour theory of value and the concept of capital as the extraction of surplus value from the working class were extensions of the ideas of the English liberal, David Ricardo.

What Marx and Engels did was integrate these insights into a comprehensive theory of the development of history and the evolution of capitalism as a system. There is no space to review these theories here. They are adequately dealt with in a number of the suggested readings at the end of this essay. What Marx and Engels recognized, however, was that in all post-primitive societies, whether based on slavery, feudalism, oriental despotism, peasant-landlord mercantilism, or capitalism, there has been conflict between the ruling class and the producing class. As long as class exploitation remained there would be revolts by the producers and repression by the ruling class of owners.

WORKERS INTERNATIONALS

The First International Working Men's Association (founded in 1864) accepted the Marxist analysis, calling for the "emancipation of the working class" and the "abolition of all class rule." In 1868 it advocated the socialization of the means of production through the use of the state. In spite of the presence of a large anarchist group supporting Proudhon, the Italian followers of Mazzini, and the reformers following Owen, it supported public ownership of all land. International ideological conflict led to its breakup in 1876.

The second attempt to have workers trade unions and political parties co-operate on an international basis began in 1890. By this time the industrialization process in Europe had developed to such an extent that in 1896 they resolved to exclude all anarchists and only to invite representatives of parties and trade unions who were committed to replacing capitalism with socialism and who recognized the value of legislation and electoral activity. The Second International collapsed when the European Social Democratic parties broke with the International's position and supported their national capitalist parties in the disastrous world imperialist war.

At the end of the first world war, the Bolshevik revolution in Russia was greeted with enthusiasm by working class movements throughout the world. This, they believed, was the beginning of the end of capitalism. The new Union of Soviet Socialist Republics would provide a model for all future socialist states.

The Third International began in 1919, based in Moscow. At the Second World Congress of the Third International the famous Twenty-One Conditions were adopted. These called for rigorous discipline of all member parties under the direction of Moscow. The success of the revolution in the USSR, and the failure of the working class to achieve socialism in Western Europe, led to the myth of the infallibility of the Soviet Union. But in reality the practice of subordinating the workers' struggles in all countries to the interests of one country was a repudiation of Marxist theory which holds

that the historical process of capitalism develops unevenly throughout the world, and thus creates different conditions in different countries.

For the European Social Democratic Parties, all claiming to be Marxist, the creation of the Third International under the direction of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union created a dilemma. Should they or should they not join? Many of them split over the issue. In Europe the Communist Parties were created, members of the Third International; the socialist and social democratic parties re-organized in a new Second International.

IV SOCIALISM IN CANADA

The early struggles for socialism in Europe were reflected in similar developments in Canada. The Marxist tradition appeared in 1894 in the form of the Socialist Labour Party, an importation from the United States. It was followed by the Socialist Party of Canada, founded in 1904, a Marxist party led mainly by British immigrants. Both of these parties failed, primarily because they opposed any links with the trade union movement, which they denounced as "reformist". Ironically, from the beginning of the First International Marx co-operated with all trade union movements and non-Marxist workers political parties, recognizing that this was an essential part of building a socialist workers movement.

The other major socialist party was the Social Democratic Party, first formed in British Columbia in 1907. It sought to form links with organized labour. In 1911 it became a national party. Its platform called for the replacement of capitalism by socialism and based its theory in the social analysis of Marx and Engels. Its supporters were largely non-British new Canadians, and its leaders were Scandinavian and Ukrainian.

The other main working class tradition in Canada is "labourism." This was originally an import from the British experience of reform social democracy.

The tradition of "labourism" was strong in the Canadian Trades and Labour Congress, a federation of American craft unions. Their goal was to elect workers to Parliament and provincial legislatures. Down to the first world war, they worked through the two major parties, and the leadership of the TLC was openly identified as either Liberal or Conservative. Due to the rising radicalization of the trade union movement in Canada, and the development of industrial unions, the TLC was forced to support the independent labour parties on the provincial level, and the Canadian Labour Party.

At the founding convention of the CLP in 1918, delegates from the Social-Democratic Party introduced a resolution calling for "a recognition of the class struggle with its immediate aim the abolition of the Capitalist system and the establishment of the Co-operative Commonwealth." This resolution was overwhelmingly rejected. In its place, the convention adopted a platform calling for a more equitable distribution of the wealth created by labour.

THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CANADA

The success of the Bolshevik revolution in Russia was also a tremendous inspiration to the politically aware sections of the Canadian working class. It led to the formation of the Workers Party in 1919, later to be known as the Communist Party of Canada. This new party was an amalgamation of most of the followers of the Socialist Party of Canada, the Social Democratic Party of Canada, the tiny Revolutionary Socialist Party of Canada, and some of the leaders of the One Big Union.

The Communist Party of Canada joined the Moscow dominated Third International. At its founding convention in 1922, they adopted as their basic programme a policy advanced by the American Communists, Earl Browder and William Z. Foster. This called for the abandonment of attempts to create an independent, radical Canadian trade union movement (along the lines of the One Big Union) and to instead "bore from within" in the AFL craft unions of the Trades and Labour Congress.

For the Communist Party of Canada, organizing within the trade union movement was their main thrust. Electoral politics were definitely a secondary phenomenon. However, between 1925 and 1930 the U.S. unions carried out a great purge of all known Marxist supporters. So by the 1930's the Communist Party began to organize the unemployed and the unorganized into new radical Canadian unions affiliated with the Workers Unity League. With the rise of fascism in Europe, in 1934 the Third International adopted a united front policy, and Communist parties were to once again seek co-operation with socialist, social democrat and bourgeois parties. Following this line, the Communist Party of Canada abandoned the WUL and forced the unions they controlled to join with the American unions of the Congress of Industrial Organization (C.I.O.).

THE CO-OPERATIVE COMMONWEALTH FEDERATION

For people in Saskatchewan, the Communist Party was never a real alternative. It was an industrial working-class party in a province with almost no industrial work force. The farmers looked towards alternative parties -- ones which were more amenable to a class of independent commodity producers.

The Co-operative Commonwealth Federation grew out of the world depression, when the failure of capitalism was most pronounced. The party was founded by individuals and groups which were primarily "middle-class." As Leo Zakuta points out in **A Protest Movement Becalmed**, the leadership of the party were Protestant clergymen, teachers, college professors, lawyers, small businessmen, and well-paid staff employees of the big American trade unions. The CCF did not draw its leadership from the working class, and in this sense it was quite different from the Communist Party.

What labour representation there was at the founding convention was largely from the Independent Labour Parties, reflecting the British reformist tradition. A.R. Mosher of the Canadian Brotherhood of Railway

Employees was the only prominent labour leader at the CCF founding convention. His union never affiliated with the CCF, nor did any other. At its 1933 convention, the Trades and Labour Congress passed a resolution in favour of socialism, but they never officially endorsed the CCF. In 1943 the Canadian Congress of Labour endorsed the CCF, only to repudiate it the following year.

However, there were many socialists who joined the CCF. Many of the prairie farmers were driven to this position by the depression and the drought, which made "ownership" of land a bad joke. The British Columbia wing of the party was always socialist, with a strong representation of Marxists. But it should be remembered that B.C. was the only province where the CCF had a strong base in the trade union movement. Many socialists joined the party hoping to find a distinctively Canadian approach to our problems, those who did not want to be put in the position of taking dictation from American, British, or Russian trade unionists or politicians.

The Calgary Programme, adopted in 1932, set the stage for the formation of the CCF. The stated purpose was to establish in Canada "a Co-operative Commonwealth in which the basic principle regulating production, distribution and exchange, will be the supply of human needs instead of making profits." This requires "the socialization of our economic life." These were the basic principles, those often found in the more radical platforms of the Independent Labour Parties. After this, the Calgary programme went on to outline the "provisional programme of the federation."

Most of us with a history of participation in the CCF and the NDP know that the Regina Manifesto was drafted by Frank Underhill, a Toronto Professor, one of the founders of the League for Social Reconstruction (after 1940 he became a supporter of the Liberal Party). It was approved by the National Council of the CCF and adopted almost intact by the Regina Convention.

This does not mean that it was accepted as it was drafted without opposition. A group of socialists fought for twenty-four hours at the convention to make it more radical. The B.C. wing of the party denounced it as "revisionist" and decried the fact that "bourgeois elements" had assumed a leadership position in the party. Members of the United Farmers of Canada, Saskatchewan section, objected to the convention's domination by "eastern university professors." They resented the efforts of people like Dr. Eugene Forsey (now a Liberal Senator) to scuttle the use-lease system of land tenure.

Nevertheless, socialists took some comfort in the Manifesto, particularly the opening paragraphs which outlined the general principles of the party. They hoped that the transitional electoral programme which followed could be made more socialist.

The Regina Manifesto states: "We aim to replace the present capitalist system, with its inherent injustice and inhumanity, by a social order from which the domination and exploitation of one class by another will be eliminated . . ." All socialists could support this stand. This was re-inforced

by the last paragraph of the Manifesto which states that "no CCF Government will rest content until it has eradicated capitalism . . ." That was not the thinking of the Fabian professors.

The Manifesto went on to state that the evils of capitalism "can be removed only in a planned and socialized economy in which our natural resources and the principal means of production and distribution are owned, controlled and operated by the people." Socialists recognized this as a necessary prerequisite to the creation of a humane and democratic society.

As Walter Young has pointed out in **The Anatomy of a Party: The National CCF**, the party was from the beginning under the control of a small handful of people who were not socialists but social democrats, the most important of whom was David Lewis. This group believed that the Regina Manifesto was too radical. For them, the transitional electoral programme outlined in the Manifesto quickly became the ultimate goal. In 1956 they succeeded in getting the party to adopt the Winnipeg Declaration replacing the Regina Manifesto. The new policy statement accepted capitalism and sought only to reform it through social welfare legislation. The Winnipeg Declaration formally rejected any socialist theory of class conflict and exploitation, and following liberal ideology, spoke only of various "economic groups" in Canada.

In 1961 the leadership of the CCF arranged a merger with the leadership of the Canadian Labour Congress, and the result was the formation of the New Democratic Party. The present trade union leadership, reflecting the ideology of business unionism imported from the United States via their "international" unions, rejects socialism. Thus, the NDP today is even further removed from socialism than the CCF after 1956.

It is quite evident that there is a great deal of confusion in Canada as to the basic differences between socialism and social democracy. For members of the NDP, this confusion is perpetrated by the party leaders who often call themselves "socialists" or "democratic socialists" when speaking to NDP meetings. In order to help clarify the difference, I have selected three relevant examples which follow.

V OWNERSHIP OF NATURAL RESOURCES

From the beginning, socialists have insisted that natural resources belong to the people as a whole. Therefore, their development and use must be limited to public ownership. Only through public ownership can it be certain that their development will benefit the people as a whole.

Actually, social ownership of natural resources is not a very new or radical position. In the middle ages, the universal Christian Church held that the Earth and its resources were created by God for the use of all mankind. Traditional European (and British) law held that natural resources were owned and controlled by the Crown on behalf of all the people. This was an outgrowth of the natural law theory. Only with the coming of capital-

ism do we see the introduction of the principle of private ownership, development and profiting from the exploitation of natural resources.

Aside from the statement of general principles at the beginning, the Regina Manifesto contained no specifics on the question of public ownership of natural resources. The detailed programme mentions (only in passing) that the CCF will be "restoring to the community its natural resources." In a floor debate at the 1933 Regina convention, delegates voted to overrule the trade unionists from B.C. who insisted that no compensation should be paid to private capitalists exploiting mineral and petroleum resources. The leadership at the convention was also successful in defeating the Saskatchewan farmers' proposal for the nationalization of land.

The same was not true of the Saskatchewan CCF. From 1933 through the victorious election in 1944, the party platform pledged "the social ownership of all resources and public utilities." Long before the formation of the CCF, this principle had been urged by the Saskatchewan Grain Growers' Association, the Farmers' Union, the United Farmers of Canada (Saskatchewan Section), and the Progressive Party. It was only common sense.

The original platform of the CCF in Saskatchewan included a programme for nationalization of land, based on perpetual "use-hold" on land titles and homes. The party dropped this from their platform in 1936 after a strong attack by the Liberal and Conservative parties and the daily press. With hindsight we can see that this was a disaster for Saskatchewan. The result of "private" ownership of land (mostly by financial institutions) has been the decimation of rural Saskatchewan, the abandonment of small towns and our steadily declining population.

A policy supporting public ownership and development of natural resources has been too radical for the New Democratic Party. Resolutions of this nature have regularly been introduced at federal NDP conventions, but they have always been rigorously opposed by the party leadership and subsequently defeated.

THE CASE OF INCO

We can illustrate the present position of the party on this basic issue by looking at the stand that they took during the 1972 federal election on the question of the International Nickel Company.

The International Nickel Company (INCO) was formed in 1902 by J.P. Morgan, owner of the United States Steel Corporation. In 1916, in order to avoid U.S. anti-trust action and to take advantages of lower taxes, INCO was incorporated as a "Canadian" corporation.

Historically, this company has dominated world production of nickel outside the Communist Bloc. In 1960 INCO provided 75% of this market; today, this has declined to "only" 54%. Not too long ago, INCO's Canadian operations at Sudbury, Ontario and Thompson, Manitoba provided 80% of the U.S. supply. Because of this dominant position, INCO has been able to set the world price for nickel, which has varied recently from \$.77 a

pound in 1965 to \$1.33 a pound in 1970.

The NDP has always had a special interest in INCO, primarily because of the strength of the party in Sudbury and Thompson and because of the presence there of the United Steelworkers of America, a union with close ties to the party. In 1972 INCO was singled out for attack by David Lewis as one of the biggest "corporate welfare bums". The campaign book, **Louder Voices**, devoted an entire chapter to INCO and Sudbury.

There is no question that INCO has been exploiting its workers and the Canadian people. Between 1966 and 1971 they reported net earnings of \$1.581 billion, and paid federal taxes at an average rate of only 17.2%. In 1971 INCO reported net earnings of \$210 million and a clear profit of \$94.2 million. Yet it paid no taxes to the federal government. In fact, it received an income tax credit of \$2.8 million. Between 1966 and 1971 the federal government has allowed INCO to defer taxes of \$170.2 million. At best this is an interest-free loan from the Canadian taxpayers; most likely it will never be paid.

The federal government grants INCO huge depreciation and depletion allowances. In 1971 these totalled \$203.3 million. INCO has used these subsidies from the Canadian taxpayers to finance expansion in Guatemala, New Caledonia, and Indonesia, making the company less dependent on Canadian sources and labour. At the end of 1971, INCO began laying off thousands of workers at Sudbury and Thompson.

INCO has been a disaster to Sudbury and the miners. Because of the tax laws brought in by the Conservative Government in Ontario, assets of mining companies are exempt from municipal taxation. Every year the INCO operation in Sudbury pours out 1,870,000 tons of sulfur dioxide (SO₂) on the surrounding countryside, killing all plant life, making the soil sterile, fouling the water supply, and causing sickness in human beings.

Worse yet is the poisoning of INCO employees. The level of sulfur dioxide in the mines and smelters is regularly much higher than the tolerable limit set by the provincial health standards. Employees of the sintering plant get lung cancer -- a considerable number have died. Government standards are simply not enforced. INCO has been a regular imperialist exploiter of Canada.

THE POLICY OF THE NDP

What is the position of the NDP on INCO? Speaking in Thompson on October 12, 1972, David Lewis said "I'm not denying INCO's right to make a profit. I want them to pay their fair share of running the country." This is the only point made in **Louder Voices**. The NDP even fails to demand that the company pay for pollution control.

Speaking in Sudbury on April 10, 1972, David Lewis said that an NDP Government would nationalize INCO if it "continued to misbehave". He explained that by this he meant laying off workers.

He repeated this threat in Timmins, Ontario on September 29, 1972, If INCO were to shut down because of the proposed NDP taxation policy, a

Lewis Government in Ottawa would "put INCO under government control". He noted, however, that this would "not necessarily be permanent". But he would make sure that it kept operating.

The workers seem to be a little ahead of the NDP. In late 1972 the members of Steel Workers Local 6166 in Thompson passed a resolution asking the NDP Government in Manitoba to nationalize their INCO operations. The Schreyer Government remained silent. So did David Lewis.

But social democratic governments are not, in principle, opposed to nationalization -- only nationalization of profitable operations. They support nationalization of public utilities for the same reasons that private enterprise supported the Conservative Party's creation of Ontario Hydro: to get a cheap basic service. They are also in favour of nationalizing unprofitable but necessary operations, such as the coal mines in Great Britain or Nova Scotia.

As a general principle, all the NDP is interested in is better management of capitalism. INCO workers may be abused by INCO, but they are not exploited by the system. The NDP does not admit that the people of Canada are exploited by the fact that Canadian nickel is utilized for the private profit of the Morgan-Rockefeller interests who own INCO, and by the imperialist U.S. government in its war machine. In reality, there is no difference between the position of David Lewis and any other socially aware capitalist.

VI SWEDISH SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

For a second example, let us take a look at Sweden. Many people in the New Democratic Party hold up Sweden as an ideal model to follow. This is certainly true of David Lewis. During the last federal campaign he cited Sweden as an example of his brand of "socialism", where public ownership is not necessary, where the "market economy" guarantees efficiency, and where the government has a voice in the direction of investment.

In Sweden today, the economy is 90% private owned, around 4% is co-operatively owned, and the remaining 6% is state owned, primarily public utilities. There is a greater degree of public ownership in Great Britain, France or Italy. There is even more public ownership in Canada!

The Social Democratic Party has been in power in Sweden for over 35 years. What have they accomplished? Sweden has the best-known social welfare system. They have repatriated the economy, once characterized by foreign ownership and control. These are significant accomplishments, but they are not socialism.

A government commission of inquiry in the late 1960's revealed that Sweden is characterized by a high degree of economic concentration and monopoly power. Fifty large private firms employ 47% of all industrial workers and produce over one-half of all goods.

CONCENTRATED WEALTH

More significant is the concentration of ownership. The famous "fifteen families" are the dominant powers. And of these, five families (the Wallenbergs, Wehtjes, Johnssons, Bonniers and Bostroms) are the czars of corporate capitalism. These five families control the Swedish economy through corporate ownership and links with the three key banks and insurance companies.

The best-known Swedish family is the Wallenbergs. About 50 companies have a Wallenberg as Chairman of the Board of Directors, and members of the family are directors of many more corporations. It is estimated that this one family controls about one-third of Sweden's financial market and about one-third of Sweden's export economy. There is no more powerful private empire in any country in the Western World. Relatively speaking, they make the Rockefeller family look like small-town merchants.

The Social Democratic Party is very sensitive about the fact of ownership and control of the country by a few powerful families. A few years ago the youth wing of the Social Democratic Party produced a film revealing how the public housing programme, financed by the Social Democratic Government, was increasing the wealth of the "fifteen families". The film was banned by the Social Democratic Government.

How does the Swedish economy work? It is based on private investment by huge corporations. There is little anti-trust legislation and what exists is not enforced. There are no formal controls over business except a national system of directing private investment through incentives.

Sweden has the highest income tax rate in the world. The average Swedish worker, earning \$8000 a year, pays a 41.4% rate of income tax and a 17% sales tax on everything he buys. This is because there are almost no corporation taxes. As the **Financial Post** noted in an editorial on August 26, 1972 attacking David Lewis' tax proposals, corporation taxes in Sweden make up only 5% of national revenue, the lowest of any western country.

At the same time, there are tax discriminations which favour corporation executives. The taxation system permits them to avoid income taxes through fat expense accounts. They receive non-taxable income in the form of company cars, rent subsidies, vacations with wives and families, and trips abroad. It is widely known that Swedish corporation executives are building up tax-free accounts in Swiss banks.

But while Sweden has "cradle to the grave" social security, and a highly successful unemployment and job retraining system, the Social Democrats have not done much to break down the class system during their 35 years of office. There is still widespread inequalities in income, not to mention wealth. In Sweden the upper 10% earns 27% of all income. In Canada, under Liberal and Conservative Governments, the upper 10% receives only 25% of total income.

Another example would be admission to University. In the past, university education was limited to the upper classes; today, a university education is the best method for breaking out of the lower income bracket. In Sweden

according to a recent study, only 15% of college freshmen come from working-class backgrounds. And in industrial Sweden, this is very significant. Canada does much better than that. Even Great Britain — the personification of aristocratic private schools and universities — does better today.

THE COMMITMENT TO CAPITALISM

For an insight into what is going on in Sweden today, Canadians might read Gunnar Adler-Karlsson's book, now in English translation as **Reclaiming the Canadian Economy; A Swedish Approach through Functional Socialism** (Toronto: House of Anansi, 1970, \$1.75 in paperback). The author is a Swedish economist and long-time adviser to the Social Democratic Government.

Adler-Karlsson states quite frankly that Sweden is not a socialist society. This is because the Social Democratic Party recognizes "the advantages of retaining private initiative and the drive for innovation". This is the essence of capitalist ideology: the belief that economic progress can only come through the mobilization of capital by the few private entrepreneurs. And in Sweden, this means domination by a few monopoly capitalists with a minimum of social or public control.

The book also makes one important point which should be of interest to both socialists and social democrats in Canada. Adler-Karlsson notes that "the least important part of the socialist movement in Sweden is the co-operative movement." The co-operative movement in Sweden has failed to provide an alternative to capitalist enterprise. But this is also true of every other western country. What history clearly demonstrates is that the only way to deal with private corporate power is through state power. And of course, what we are referring to here is a state under the control of the producing class, not the capitalist class.

Thus, by no stretch of the imagination can Sweden be classified as a socialist country. It is one of the best examples of a managed capitalist society. All the inadequacies of the social democratic approach are seen in Sweden. What people are looking for is a **qualitatively different** society, but this has never been promised by social democracy. Sweden, the social democratic utopia, is still characterized by a powerful ruling class of monopoly capitalists, social class differentiations, authoritarianism, and general alienation, all found in any capitalist society.

VII SUBSIDIZING PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

The third example which allows a differentiation between socialism and social democracy is the question of using public funds raised through taxation to subsidize private enterprise. Today, this is a normal government operation in all capitalist societies. The theory of laissez-faire or "free enterprise" was abandoned long ago. In Canada, from the earliest times, governments have made a regular practice of using the public treasury to finance private business operations. The Canadian Pacific Railroad

is only the best-known example.

For the socialist, this practice is one of class exploitation. Taxes are leveled on all people who have an income. The state then transfers the revenue (in the form of capital) to the capitalist class, which uses it to make higher profits.

This form of capital creation is very useful in industrially underdeveloped countries. Where there are few workers employed directly in industry, the state can act as the intermediary, extracting surplus value from all individuals, regardless of their form of livelihood.

In Canada this practice is made all the more insidious by the regressive nature of the Canadian taxation system. As the Carter Royal Commission on Taxation demonstrated, the lower one is in the hierarchy of incomes, the greater the percentage of one's income that goes for taxes. For example, Canada is the only country in the western world which has a federal sales tax (12%). This tax falls equally on all Canadians, regardless of income.

THE POSITION OF THE NDP

During the 1972 federal election campaign, David Lewis received a great deal of press coverage for his attack on "corporate welfare bums". He must receive credit for explaining to the general public the many ways in which the government subsidizes private enterprise: through tax concessions, depreciation and depletion allowances, and various grants and loans. But what did he offer as an alternative?

The answer to this can be garnered through an examination of the key campaign speeches he made on this subject, and the book authored by the NDP: **Louder Voices: The Corporate Welfare Bums** (Toronto: James Lewis & Samuel, \$1.95).

The NDP launched a concerted attack on the grant programmes of the Department of Regional Economic Expansion (DREE). But they only attacked the way it was administered, not the programme itself. For example, in a speech in North Battleford on September 27, 1972, Mr. Lewis stated that the NDP agreed with the programme of encouraging development through government grants, but he attacked it for the lack of co-ordination and the fact that there was no certainty that jobs were actually being created. The government, according to Mr. Lewis, should also acquire some equity in the private companies in return for cash subsidies.

This theme is repeated in **Louder Voices**: "I support the idea of assistance to industry to maintain employment or to create jobs in disadvantaged areas of the country. In this case, my criticism relates to the nature of the programmes, their lack of plan and their meagre results (p.11)." He adds that if the grant programmes "do not deliver, or at least do not come close to the target, they must be scrapped (p.105)."

On September 23, 1972, David Lewis wrote in the **Toronto Star** that "the NDP is strongly in favour of assisting industry, particularly in the disadvantaged areas of Canada to maintain or create jobs." J.V. Clyne, Chairman of the Board of MacMillan Bloedel Ltd., pointed out that the NDP

Governments in Manitoba and Saskatchewan have maintained grants to private enterprise on the provincial level. In **Louder Voices**, the NDP argues that "free enterprise has a role in our society. But its role must be in accord with the objectives of our people. Only where this role contributes to our well-being should we give encouragement through the use of public funds (p.111)."

OPPOSITION TO SOCIAL OWNERSHIP

Would there be any role for Crown Corporations? In **Louder Voices** the NDP says that "the government must dare to go it alone in cases where private capital is unwilling to move in without large-scale handouts from the public treasury (p.113)." But during the campaign, Mr. Lewis made it very clear that he is opposed to using Crown Corporations as a basis for public, social development. "Government ownership brings inefficiency to industrial operations which must be market-oriented," he argued. At the University of Western Ontario on October 25, 1972, he referred to nationalization of private enterprise as "an abstraction," unnecessary to an NDP government. In reply to a question, he stated that the party was not even committed to nationalizing the CPR -- merely studying the question and considering the possibility.

One of the most amazing claims that Mr. Lewis regularly made in the campaign was his assertion that the present "rip off" of the general public is not the fault of the corporations, but the Liberal and Conservative parties which gave them those concessions. Therefore, we do not have to confront the power of private wealth -- only the political parties.

This is all the more astonishing when one remembers the source of the title for the NDP's campaign book, **Louder Voices**. In a television interview on December 28, 1971, Pierre Elliott Trudeau was asked why his Government's "tax reforms" were so watered-down from the original proposals of the Carter Royal Commission on Taxation and even Edgar Benson's White Paper. The Prime Minister confessed that this was due to the pressure of the "vested interests". He concluded that "in a participatory democracy there will always be some whose voice is louder than others." Certainly, it is clear to everyone what happened in this case: the powerful corporate interests were able to get their way on the tax legislation through their control of the Liberal Party. Sovereign power did not rest in the Trudeau Government, but in private wealth.

VIII THE ELECTORAL FAILURE OF THE NDP

To date, the electorate of Canada has not responded to the social democratic alternative presented to them by the CCF and the NDP. But this does not mean that this will never be the case. The experience in Sweden shows that monopoly capitalism can get along quite well with social democracy.

On the other hand, many social democrats in Canada have argued that

possession of national office is not necessary. All that is important is that one or the other of the two "old" parties adopt the progressive ideas of the social democrats and translate them into legislation. Now after the 1972 federal election, this group has achieved its aim: the NDP holds the balance of power in Parliament. All Canadians await the major new innovations that are supposed to come with this development.

In 1961, when the New Democratic Party was formed, the leaders predicted that it would not be long before they became the official opposition and then the government. After all, in Great Britain, New Zealand and Australia, the social-democratic parties had been elected to office on the back of a strong trade union movement, formally linked with the party. Couldn't this happen in Canada?

In the 1972 federal election, the NDP expected a major breakthrough. They predicted a minimum of 41 seats and were hoping to get 60. They received far less. Furthermore, their popular vote increased from 17.4% in 1968 (considered at the time as their rock-bottom low) to only 17.8% in 1972. That was below the 18% that the party achieved in 1965 under the leadership of T.C. Douglas.

The electorate was ready to repudiate P.E. Trudeau and the Liberal Party. But most of the disaffected in English-speaking Canada voted for the Conservatives, in spite of their dull, millionaire leader and their numerous right-wing candidates. In Quebec, they supported the Creditistes.

In spite of David Lewis' attack on the "corporate welfare bums," reporters noted across Canada that there was widespread boredom through the campaign. The voter turn-out was low. Spoiled ballots were higher than ever before. The common complaint made in the televised man-in-the-street interview was that "there was no choice."

THE CLASS BASIS OF THE NDP

Clifford Scotton, Federal Secretary of the NDP, explained the failure of the party at a press conference on October 31. "We do not get the votes of the poor. They vote Liberal. We are a middle-class party, and we aimed our campaign at them."

This was the strategy. Emphasis was put on the taxation issue, demanding that the big corporations pay their "fair share." This was an attempt to woo the people in the middle income bracket, those who pay the most income taxes in Canada. The party refused to make socialism or Canadian independence a major campaign theme. In reality, it was a traditional populist campaign, in the past usually associated with the Social Credit Party. But it was unsuccessful. These voters shifted to the Conservatives. The working class found that none of the parties supported their interests.

After the election, the Gallup Poll of Canada released the results of their survey of October 20-21, 1972. The results revealed the failure of the NDP to attract the working class vote.

possession of national office is not necessary. All that is important is that one or the other of the two "old" parties adopt the progressive ideas of the social democrats and translate them into legislation. Now after the 1972 federal election, this group has achieved its aim: the NDP holds the balance of power in Parliament. All Canadians await the major new innovations that are supposed to come with this development.

In 1961, when the New Democratic Party was formed, the leaders predicted that it would not be long before they became the official opposition and then the government. After all, in Great Britain, New Zealand and Australia, the social-democratic parties had been elected to office on the back of a strong trade union movement, formally linked with the party. Couldn't this happen in Canada?

In the 1972 federal election, the NDP expected a major breakthrough. They predicted a minimum of 41 seats and were hoping to get 60. They received far less. Furthermore, their popular vote increased from 17.4% in 1968 (considered at the time as their rock-bottom low) to only 17.8% in 1972. That was below the 18% that the party achieved in 1965 under the leadership of T.C. Douglas.

The electorate was ready to repudiate P.E. Trudeau and the Liberal Party. But most of the disaffected in English-speaking Canada voted for the Conservatives, in spite of their dull, millionaire leader and their numerous right-wing candidates. In Quebec, they supported the Creditistes.

In spite of David Lewis' attack on the "corporate welfare bums," reporters noted across Canada that there was widespread boredom through the campaign. The voter turn-out was low. Spoiled ballots were higher than ever before. The common complaint made in the televised man-in-the-street interview was that "there was no choice."

THE CLASS BASIS OF THE NDP

Clifford Scotton, Federal Secretary of the NDP, explained the failure of the party at a press conference on October 31. "We do not get the votes of the poor. They vote Liberal. We are a middle-class party, and we aimed our campaign at them."

This was the strategy. Emphasis was put on the taxation issue, demanding that the big corporations pay their "fair share." This was an attempt to woo the people in the middle income bracket, those who pay the most income taxes in Canada. The party refused to make socialism or Canadian independence a major campaign theme. In reality, it was a traditional populist campaign, in the past usually associated with the Social Credit Party. But it was unsuccessful. These voters shifted to the Conservatives. The working class found that none of the parties supported their interests.

After the election, the Gallup Poll of Canada released the results of their survey of October 20-21, 1972. The results revealed the failure of the NDP to attract the working class vote.

1972 VOTER PREFERENCE

	Union Labour	Non-Union Labour	Farmers
Liberals	34%	44%	26%
Conservatives	29%	32%	47%
NDP	29%	17%	10%
Other	8%	7%	17%

	Executives & Professionals	White Collar Workers
Liberals	46%	47%
Conservatives	31%	26%
NDP	20%	19%
Other	3%	8%

The shifts in voting support between 1968 and 1972 are also of interest. There was almost no change in trade union and non-union labour support for the NDP. Their support among farmers dropped by 5%. Their biggest increase was among executives and professionals (up from 11% in 1968) and among white collar workers (up from 13% in 1968). Among those with university degrees (in Canada, a privileged class), the NDP vote increased from 9% to 23%.

The same trend was evident from voter classification according to economic income. Support for the NDP from people earning less than \$8000 stayed almost the same. The big increase (from 16% to 23%) came in those who made over \$8000 a year.

Throughout most of Canada's history, the major socio-political conflict has been between the capitalist class (both domestic and foreign) and the petit bourgeois class (farmers, fishermen, craft-workers, retailers, independent salesmen and rentiers). From the Parti Rouge and the Clear Grits through Social Credit and the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, the protest parties have represented this large Canadian social class.

But the important point is that this situation has dramatically changed. As Marx predicted, during the development of monopoly capitalism this class would be decimated -- proletarianized. By 1968, this class had been reduced to only 10.9% of total income earners. In that same year, over 83% of the work force consisted of those earning income from wages and salaries.

The protest parties in Canada (including the NDP) have not adjusted to the change in social class. Furthermore, it is quite evident from the performance of the NDP as the government in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and now British Columbia, that the party will not change. It remains a social democratic "middle class" party. It has no intentions of becoming a labour party, let alone a socialist party. The purge of the Waffle in Ontario in 1972 indicates that it will not even tolerate a strong socialist faction within it.

IX SOCIALISM OR SOCIAL DEMOCRACY

Today there are wide varieties of socialism, social democracy and Marxism reflected in political parties and movements around the world. Since there is so much confusion on this subject, it might be useful to take a brief look at some of the differences.

THE COMMUNIST PARTIES

Most of the well-established Communist Parties in the advanced industrialized countries were formed after the Bolshevik revolution and have affiliated with the Third International. In theory, they support a completely socialist society with the working class in power. In the past they have differed with socialist parties over how to achieve this goal, believing that armed struggle and revolution were necessary.

There has been a significant change in this original position. After the Moscow Conference of Communist Parties in November 1957, they concluded that socialism could be won through the electoral process. Since then, this has become their major focus; in fact, they have generally opposed revolutionary action in most countries, particularly Latin America. As a part of their electoral strategy, which includes alliances with non-communist parties, they have developed a reform outlook. In some countries the socialist parties take a more left-wing position.

With the revolution in Cuba, and the development of the Sino-Soviet split, there has been a proliferation of smaller communist parties, some taking a pro-Peking line, and others independent or revolutionary lines. The major Communist Parties (including the Canadian Party) still follow the party line emanating from Moscow. Outside the so-called "Communist bloc," the most significant Moscow-line party is in France. The large Italian Communist Party permits a wide degree of internal debate and strongly denounced the Soviet occupation of Czechoslovakia in 1968. The Japanese party has remained neutral in the Sino-Soviet dispute. Most of the Moscow-line parties have a strong base in the trade union movement.

THE SOCIALIST PARTIES

During the 19th century, the left in Europe was represented by socialist parties, linked to trade unions, which recognized Marxism as their theoretical base. Many of these split around 1920 over the question of whether or not to join the Third International.

A number of these parties still exist, independent of the Communist Parties, but committed to replacing capitalism with socialism. In contrast to the traditional (pre-1957) position of the Communist Parties, they have generally believed that socialism could be achieved through trade union and electoral action, rather than requiring armed revolution.

The most significant of these parties are the French Socialist Party, the Italian Socialist Party, and the Japanese Socialist Party. All of these parties have strong ties with trade union movements. They are all opposed by small insignificant social democratic parties.

In recent years, a number of the historic socialist parties have surrendered their Marxist analysis of capitalism and have moved towards a reform style of labour party similar to that in Britain. This would include the

Socialist Party in Austria, the Belgian Socialist Party, and the West German Social Democratic Party.

SOCIAL DEMOCRATIC OR LABOUR PARTIES

In contrast, there has been the development of social democratic parties such as those in Great Britain, the Dominions, and the Scandinavian countries. None of these parties call for the replacement of capitalism with a socialist society. Many have been in power for years and have done almost nothing beyond introducing the welfare state.

The social democratic parties reject the belief that capitalism is inherently exploitative and the theory of social class and class conflict. They argue that monopoly corporations can be controlled through taxation and government regulation. Public ownership is limited to "natural monopolies" and other utilities best run at cost. Furthermore, these parties have traditionally expressed a great distrust of the common people, believing in technocratic rule by elites.

THE CASE OF CHILE

We can see all three left-wing elements in operation in one country, Chile. First, there is the Communist Party, with its base in the trade union movement. It follows the present Moscow line, stressing reformism and electoral politics. It is generally considered to be more conservative than the Socialist Party, led by president Salvador Allende. The Chilean Socialist Party is Marxist in ideology, committed to social ownership of the means of production and distribution.

These two mass parties form the core of the Unidad Popular, the coalition of left-wing parties which elected Allende President in 1970. But there is also a small Social Democratic Party, with middle-class support. It was initially a party to the UP coalition.

Finally, there is the MIR, a revolutionary left-wing party which grew out of support for the Cuban revolution. It has strong student support. It refused to participate in the UP coalition, attacking electoral politics. Instead, it concentrates on direct actions, such as encouraging landless peasants to seize land from their landlords.

After taking office in 1970, President Allende nationalized the banks, the development of all natural resources, and the steel industry. The Allende government is now in the process of obtaining majority ownership and control in the other major areas of manufacturing. The UP coalition is moving in the direction of taking state power from the capitalist class -- of moving towards a socialist society.

Most of the social democrats are supporters of the Christian Democratic Party, which has an ideology and platform similar to that of the New Democratic Party in Canada. They have received strong support from U.S. government and business interests. When Allende began his nationalization policy, they formed an electoral alliance with the right-wing Nationalist Party.

SAVING CAPITALISM

Today, Canada and the rest of the industrialized capitalist world is in the era of monopoly capitalism. This stage of development is characterized

by repeated recession and inflation, with growing structural unemployment. Private enterprise must rely on extensive state intervention to avoid a major depression.

In this period of crisis, there are two forms of state support suitable to the maintenance of capitalism. One is social democracy, which accepts monopoly capitalism, but supports welfare measures. Social democratic governments everywhere have seen their first priority as public support for private enterprise.

The other form of state support is fascism. This was the road taken by most industrialized countries after the 1929 depression. Both are attempts to save capitalism from socialism.

X THE PROMISE OF SOCIALISM

All theories of socialism have held out the promise of a society which would be qualitatively different from capitalist society. Socialism means the repudiation of the capitalist theory of economic man, where the only incentive to action is believed to be greed and where competition to get ahead at the expense of your neighbour is required. It is more than just the liberal ideal of equality of opportunity -- it is based on the moral concept of **equality**, where the worth of every individual is considered to be more important than the differences between human beings. It is the profound belief that a concept of brotherhood cannot be achieved as long as there are significant differences in income, wealth, and status.

In this paper, I have stressed the socialist demand for the public ownership of the means of production. Certainly this is the basic requirement. But socialism is more than just state ownership.

In the present era, state capitalism takes three major forms. First, it is the widespread use of the power of the state to subsidize private enterprise. Second, state capitalism includes publicly-owned enterprises which exist in an economy which is still fundamentally capitalist. Aside from ownership, no one would suggest that there is much of a difference between Air Canada and CP Air, or between Sask Tel and Bell Telephone. If this were all that socialism could offer, workers would be right to declare that it is inadequate.

But state capitalism can even exist in a society where the means of production are socially owned. How is this possible? The key test is how that system operates. Is it democratic in the fullest sense? Does it provide for the full participation and development of the working class within the work place? Does authoritarian rule by a bureaucratic elite still persist?

Another test is the degree to which that society is moving in the direction of equality. Is it moving in the direction of the elimination of material incentives? Is the disparity in income and status between ordinary workers and managers decreasing? If it is not, then it is not socialism. State ownership of the means of production, combined with material incentives and bureaucratic rule, may in fact represent the quintessence of state capitalism.

A socialist society is one in which human alienation has ended. But it is not just alienation from the fruits of one's labour. It is a society where people are no longer alienated from their neighbours. It is a society where racism and sexism have ended. It is a society where the domination of some human beings over others has been ended.

A socialist society is a democratic society, where the government is a peoples' government. This requires significant decentralization of power, as much local control as possible, and direct participation in government by all. Voting for a set of rulers every four years is not socialism. In a socialist society, there will be a breakdown and elimination of hierarchical, centralized bureaucracies, both economic and political. These are pre-requisites for ending alienation.

In a socialist society, the producers have power. In Canada it is quite obvious that they do not have power, even in those provinces under NDP Governments. Reference has previously been made to Chile. In that country the working people, through the UP, are in the process of taking state power. When they achieve this end, they will be on the way to building a socialist society.

No one has a blueprint as to how socialism will develop in Canada. There are no easy solutions. Only through trial and error will a broadly-based socialist movement develop. But one thing is certain: Canadians will be developing their own model, based on their own experience and historic situation. Models which developed in other countries will not be repeated here. It is futile, and a waste of time, to bring in models from other countries and try to make them fit the Canadian situation.

XI THE NEED FOR A NEW PARTY

Today Canada faces two major struggles. One is the struggle for an independent Canada. In the period since World War II, Canada has increasingly fallen under economic and cultural domination of foreign interests, mainly from the United States. In all sectors of Canadian life today there is a struggle to gain sovereign independence, the right of Canadians to control their own affairs. As the crisis of U.S. and world capitalism increases, there will be increasing pressures put on Canada.

The second major struggle is the conflict between labour and capital. The first struggle is intermixed with this, as most large employers in manufacturing, mining and petroleum development in Canada are foreign owned. Our persistent unemployment is due mainly to the fact that our economy is increasingly dependent on the export of primary products, industries which are "capital intensive," employing few workers. Our imports are largely highly-processed manufactured goods.

Linked with these problems is persistent inflation. Under capitalism, where there is a major section of the work force employed by the state, inflation is a normal development. The service workers (in areas where

productivity is necessarily low) are the hardest hit by inflation and the first to have their wages curbed by government incomes policies. They are becoming unionized and militant.

The contradictions in Canada's foreign-controlled capitalist society can only be solved through a planned, socialist society. How are we going to achieve that solution?

THE FAILURE OF THE NDP

It should be clear to all of us who have been a part of the 1969 - 1973 struggle of the Waffle movement within the New Democratic Party that this possible road to socialism has reached a dead end. It is not just the purge of the Ontario Waffle movement. It is the realization that NDP politics of going to conventions and passing resolutions are a futile exercise. When socialist resolutions are passed, they are simply ignored by the leadership. When we have challenged the leadership for office, we have been able to win 35% to 40% of the party members -- not enough to gain control. Furthermore, because of the reformist image of the NDP as "just another political party," we have been unable to convince other socialists that they should join the party and struggle within it.

The NDP has a well-entrenched oligarchical leadership which is strongly opposed to socialism. We know from the last federal election that this party cannot be the vehicle for gaining Canadian independence. We know from the positions of the federal party -- and from the actions of the NDP provincial governments -- that it will not be the party of the working class.

Since the purge in Ontario, the Waffle has been slowly withdrawing from the NDP, all across Canada. In Saskatchewan, the NDP is now only a minor part of the Waffle movement's programmes and actions. Yet there is a danger that the Waffle will become just a Canadian version of the Fabian Society, an intellectual middle-class group cut off from the working people.

We must face the fact that the political culture of Canada is centered in political parties which participate in electoral politics. This is the dominant mode of political action and education. Therefore, I would suggest that the time has now come for the creation of a new socialist party in Canada, and that we should begin in Saskatchewan.

At the same time, we must recognize where the base must come from for a new socialist party. It cannot be in the petit bourgeois class. It cannot be in the rapidly disappearing farm movement. Elements of these groups will, of course, be represented. But to be successful in Canada in the 1970's a socialist party must be based in the working class, those on wages and salaries.

THE CANADIAN UNION MOVEMENT

I would also suggest that a new socialist party will not be successful unless it is linked to the growing struggle for an independent Canadian trade union movement. The American tradition of trade unions has been a disaster for the working people of Canada. There are several reasons for

taking this position.

First, it is illogical to demand Canadian sovereignty for the economy and culture and then to deny the need for it in another sector of our society. Canadian workers must have sovereign rights. They must have the power to strike when they vote to do so, to control their own dues and strike funds, to elect their own officers and organizers, to control their own union property and pensions, to negotiate their own contracts, and to reject contracts they don't want. Take one example. The United Automobile Workers (UAW) claims that it has granted adequate "autonomy" to its Canadian locals. In 1971 the Douglas Aircraft workers in Toronto had their contract negotiated in the United States. When two-thirds of the members of the local voted to reject the proposed contract, they were ordered back to work by the head office of the UAW in Detroit which also cut off their strike fund. That is just another form of imperialism.

There is also the question of union democracy. It is widely recognized that American unions are authoritarian organizations, ruled from the top down by entrenched bureaucracies. One can hope that with the development of Canadian unions this pattern can be broken. Certainly, on this major issue, the Pulp and Paper Workers of Canada are a model to be followed.

Secondly, the trade union movement in Canada is very weak. Only around 30% of all Canadians on wages and salaries are members of trade unions. There has been no serious attempt to organize the unorganized since the 1940's. In order to overcome the wide disparities between the wages of organized and unorganized workers, all Canadians must be organized into trade unions.

The trade union movement in Canada is greatly fragmented with many overlapping jurisdictions, creating a divide-and-rule situation most favourable to big business. There are around 160 different trade unions in Canada today, almost all of them American. Roughly 70% of all organized workers are found in American unions. Amalgamation of these unions in Canada is only possible **after** it takes place in the United States. Thus the American links prevent the development of larger, more powerful unions. Furthermore, the proliferation of unions creates wide differences in wages between workers organized in the existing unions.

Thirdly, there is the general problem of the fight for jobs during this period of competition between capitalist countries. In the United States the AFL-CIO and the big American unions are pushing for legislation which directly threatens the jobs of Canadian workers. Canadian workers all across Canada are beginning to discover that when it comes down to whose job is to be saved, the "international" unions invariably opt for saving the jobs of the American workers. In Saskatchewan we have the example for the potash industry, where the government-sponsored cartel holds production in Canada down to 50% while U.S. production is maintained at 90%. This cartel arrangement meant the loss of jobs for Canadian Steelworkers, but kept jobs for American Steelworkers working in the potash mines in New Mexico. The Canadian branch of the Steelworkers has never protested this cartel. We need the strength of an independent Canadian

trade union movement to carry on the fight for jobs for Canadian workers.

Finally, in addition to the present organizational weakness of the trade union movement in Canada, we must recognize the existing hegemony of the ideology of business unionism and class collaboration. The motto of the AFL-CIO is "Free Enterprise and Free Trade Unions." In Canada, these unions often appear to be the handmaidens of the multi-national corporations. For example, we find these unions supporting the Canadian-American Committee, an organization of American big business dedicated to keeping Canada an economic satellite of the United States.

The American trade unions have always opposed the creation of a socialist society. This has carried over to their Canadian branches. At best, the leaders of the American unions in Canada have been social democrats.

We need only recall the efforts of the present leadership of the Canadian Labour Congress between 1945 and 1950 to expell the "left-wing" from the trade union movement. They were willing tools of U.S. foreign policy. This struggle also revealed how this militant anticommunism served American big business, and how it was a reflection of the general American trade union tradition.

Those who have been active in the NDP over the past four years are well aware of the fact that the well-paid bureaucrats of the large American unions have been the most vociferous opponents of the efforts of the Waffle movement to transform the party into a vehicle dedicated to an independent socialist Canada. Clearly, the links with the American unions are a formidable barrier to the creation of a radical trade union movement in Canada.

CONCLUSION

To build socialism in Canada we need a militant, democratic trade union movement, one dedicated to ending foreign domination and exploitation of Canada. We need a strong movement, organizing all Canadian working people into ten or twelve major unions, as the Confederation of National Trade Unions is trying to do in Quebec. Without such a movement, there will be little success in the movement for an independent socialist Canada.

This is the call for a long-term struggle. There will be no overnight successes. What is required is the traditional commitment of the socialist. However, there are many signs that the Canadian people are beginning to look for a clear alternative. As the crisis of American imperialism in Canada increases, so will the support for the movement for an independent socialist Canada. A socialist party is required as part of that struggle.

XII SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. BRIEF INTRODUCTIONS TO SOCIALISM

- (1) George Lichtheim, **The Origins of Socialism**. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1969. Paperback. A very readable history of the early development of socialism in Europe, down through 1848, by a well-known German social democrat now living in England.
- (2) Wolfgang Abendroth, **A Short History of the European Working Class**. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1972. Paperback. A good introduction to the rise of the trade union movement, the workers internationals, and the socialist parties in Europe by a well-known German Marxist professor.
- (3) Norman Mackenzie, **Socialism: A Short History**. London: Hutchinson's University Library, 1948. Paperback. A classic introduction to socialism by a well-known British professor, from the perspective of a social-democrat.
- (4) Ernest Mandel, **An Introduction to Marxist Economy Theory**. New York: Merit Publishers, 1968. Paperback. The leading theoretician of the Trotskyite Fourth International. A good easy-to-understand introduction.
- (5) Leo Huberman and Paul M. Sweezy, **Introduction to Socialism**. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1968. Paperback. A series of different articles with an introduction by Albert Einstein. From the perspective of the independent Marxists of **Monthly Review** magazine.
- (6) Emile Burns, **An Introduction to Marxism**. New York: International Publishers, 1966. Paperback. An elementary introduction by an American Marxist.
- (7) Roger Garaudy, **Karl Marx: The Evolution of His Thought**. New York: International Publishers, 1967. Paperback. A longer but interesting analysis of Marx's theory and his thoughts on socialist strategy and tactics by a well-known French Marxist.
- (8) David Caute, **The Left in Europe Since 1789**. Toronto. World University Library, 1966. Paperback. A popular introduction to the development of left-wing politics in Europe by a British sociologist.
- (9) Irving M. Zeitlin, **Marxism: A Re-Examination**. Toronto: D. Van Nostrand, Co., 1967. Paperback. An analysis of Marxist theory by an American social scientist.

II. MORE ADVANCED READINGS ON SOCIALISM

- (1) Maurice Dobb, **Studies in the Development of Capitalism**. New York: International Publishers, 1947. Paperback. A highly regarded introductory history of the rise of capitalism by Cambridge University's best-known economic historian and one of England's most prominent Marxist scholars.

- (2) George Lichtheim, **Marxism: An Historical and Critical Study**. New York: Praeger, 1965. Paperback. A wide-ranging overview. An analysis of Marxist theory and its development from the perspective of a social democrat.
- (3) R.N. Carew Hunt, **The Theory and Practice of Communism**. London: Pelican Books, 1963. Rev. ed. Paperback. A widely praised analysis of Marxist theory and its development.
- (4) Paul A. Baran and Paul M. Sweezy, **Monopoly Capital**. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1966. Paperback. This readable analysis of American capitalism is regarded as the most important single literary contribution to the re-awakening of radical thought and action in the United States. By the editors of **Monthly Review Magazine**.
- (5) Oliver C. Cox, **Capitalism as a System**. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1964. Paperback. A very readable analysis of capitalism from a Marxist perspective by one of America's best known black social scientists.
- (6) Ralph Miliband, **The State in Capitalist Society**. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1969. World University Paperback. One of the new modern treatises on the role of the state in supporting capitalism by a well-known British Marxist professor.
- (7) Perry Anderson, et.al. **Towards Socialism**. London: Fontana Library for the New Left Review, 1965. Paperback. A selection of articles on British capitalism and the Labour Party by writers associated with the **New Left Review**.
- (8) Ernest Mandel, **Marxist Economic Theory**. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1968. 2 Volumes, in paperback. A thorough, well-documented history of the rise of capitalism. By a highly respected Belgian Marxist economics professor. A layman should be able to comprehend this book.

III. THE DEVELOPMENT OF SOCIALISM IN CANADA

- (1) Martin Robin, **Radical Politics and Canadian Labour, 1880-1930**. Kingston, Ont.: Queen's University Industrial Relations Centre, 1968. Paperback. A well-researched, detailed study of early trade union and left-wing politics in Canada. Good on labourism v. socialism, the Socialist Party of Canada, and the Canadian Labour Party. The author defends the position of Fabian social democracy.
- (2) C.B. Macpherson, **Democracy in Alberta: Social Credit and the Party System**. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962. Paperback. A very good analysis of populist democracy in the U.F.A. and Social Credit. Especially good on the class composition of the movements. By a University of Toronto socialist professor.
- (3) Seymour Martin Lipset, **Agrarian Socialism; The Cooperative Commonwealth Federation in Saskatchewan**. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Books for Doubleday and Co., second edition, 1968. Paperback. This is

the classic study of the CCF in Saskatchewan by the noted American sociologist, a strong supporter of social democracy.

- (4) Charles Lipton, **The Trade Union Movement of Canada, 1827-1959**. Montreal: Canadian Social Publications Ltd., 1968, 2nd ed. Available in paperback from Progress Books in Toronto. A popular history of the trade union movement in Canada written by a former member of the Canadian Communist Party.
- (5) Stuart M. Jamieson, **Times of Trouble: Labour Unrest and Industrial Conflict in Canada, 1900-1966**. Study No. 22, Task Force on Labour Relations. Ottawa: Privy Council Office, 1968. Available in paperback from Information Canada. This is an excellent history of class conflict in Canada, and how capitalists use the state to defend their interests. The political analysis is lacking, reflecting the liberal views of the professor.
- (6) Gad Horowitz, **Canadian Labour in Politics**. University of Toronto Press, 1968. Paperback. A history of the influence of conservative business unionism in Canada, its struggle with the Communist Party its early links with the CCF, and the formation of the NDP. The author is a social democrat, very critical of the Marxist union leaders.
- (7) Irving Abella, **Nationalism, Communism and Canadian Labour; The CIO, The Communist Party, and the Canadian Congress of Labour, 1935-1956**. University of Toronto Press, 1972. Paperback. A new book detailing the role of Marxists in the formation of trade unions in Canada, the question of their relation to American unions, and the left-right battle within the CCL.
- (8) Leo Zakuta, **A Protest Movement Becalmed**. University of Toronto Press, 1964. Hardback only. Based mainly on the history of the Ontario CCF. The author feels that as protest movements moderate, they are absorbed into the North American tradition of two large, relatively conservative parties.
- (9) Walter D. Young, **The Anatomy of a Party: The National CCF, 1932-1961**. University of Toronto Press, 1969. Paperback. The author sees the early CCF as a movement transformed into a political party. It is good in documenting how it was dominated by a handful of key persons, of whom David Lewis was the man in control.
- (10) Tim Buck, **Our Fight for Canada**. Toronto: Progress Books, 1960. Paperback. Selections of writings, revealing the difference between the CCF and the CP. Unfortunately, there are no outside studies available on the Communist Party.
- (11) Tim Buck, **Thirty Years, 1922-1952**. The Story of the Communist Movement in Canada. Toronto: Progress Books, 1952. Unfortunately, out of print. Use library. The only history of the party available. These two books contain useful information not readily available elsewhere.

- (12) John Porter, **The Vertical Mosaic**. University of Toronto Press. 1965. Paperback. Excellent data on the class structure of Canadian society, also showing how the economic elite dominate the government structure. The theory is that of a social democrat.

IV. THE WAFFLE AND THE CONTEMPORARY CANADIAN LEFT

- (1) Dave Godfrey and Mel Watkins, **Gordon to Watkins to You; A Documentary: The Battle for Control of our Economy**. Toronto: New Press, 1970. Paperback. A selection of speeches, extracts from documents, and articles on foreign control of the Canadian economy.
- (2) Kari Levitt, **Silent Surrender; the Multinational Corporation in Canada**. Toronto: Macmillan, 1970. Paperback. A widely-read book on U.S. control of the Canadian economy and its disastrous effects.
- (3) Robin Mathews and James Steele, **The Struggle for Canadian Universities**. Toronto: New Press, 1969. Paperback. A selection of documents on the question of the American takeover of Canadian universities.
- (4) James Laxer. **The Energy Poker Game; the Politics of the Continental Resources Deal**. Toronto. New Press, 1969. Paperback. A short comment on foreign control of the oil industry in Canada and the effects of the sellout of our energy resources to the United States.
- (5) John W. Warnock, **Partner to Behemoth; The Military Policy of a Satellite Canada**. Toronto: New Press, 1970. Paperback. An analysis of Canada's policy of alliance with the United States.
- (6) Ian Lumsden, ed., **Close the 49th Parallel, etc.** Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1970. Paperback. A series of articles by Canadian left-wing academics, most of whom were in the Waffle movement at the time, on the effect of U.S. imperialism in Canada.
- (7) Laurier LaPierre, et.al., **Essays on the Left; Essays in Honour of T.C. Douglas**. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1971. Paperback. A series of essays on the CCF/NDP and Canadian problems, some by individuals associated with the Waffle movement.
- (8) Gary Teeple, ed., **Capitalism and the National Question in Canada**. University of Toronto Press, 1972. Paperback. A new book, highly recommended, presenting the new nationalist, Marxist analysis of the Canadian situation, past and present. Several very good articles on the working class and American unions in Canada.
- (9) Daniel Drache, ed., **Quebec--Only the Beginning: The Manifestos of the Common Front**. Toronto: New Press, 1972. Paperback. An excellent introduction to what is happening in the Quebec trade union movement. The special Quebec branch of Marxism stands in complete contradiction to the ideology of U.S. business unionism dominant in the Canadian Labour Congress.

V. SOCIALIST MAGAZINES & JOURNALS

- (1) **New Left Review**, 7 Carlisle Street, London W1 V 6NL. \$7.50, annual subscription for 6 issues. A scholarly, independent Marxist journal, with articles mainly on contemporary issues and theoretical questions.
- (2) **Science & Society**, 30 East 20th Street, New York, N.Y. 10003. \$6.50, annual subscription for 4 issues. A scholarly Marxist journal, dealing mainly with theoretical and historical issues.
- (3) **Monthly Review**, 116 West 14th Street, New York, N.Y. 10011. \$8.00, annual subscription for 11 issues. The oldest and best-known American Marxist Socialist Magazine written for laymen. It is independent of any organized groups.
- (4) **New Politics**, 507 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017. \$4.50, annual subscription for 4 issues. A journal dealing with contemporary issues with prominence given to labour questions. Independent socialist.
- (5) **Socialist Revolution**, Agenda Publishing Company, 396 Sanchez St., San Francisco, California 94114. \$7.00, annual subscription for 6 issues. A radical American journal, the successor to **Studies on the Left**. Deals primarily with contemporary American issues and theoretical questions.
- (6) **Canadian Dimension**, P.O. Box 1413, Winnipeg 1, Manitoba. \$5.00, annual subscription for 8 issues. A magazine which combines theory with contemporary issues, from a socialist perspective, with a strong emphasis on Western Canada.
- (7) **Last Post**, 420 King Street. West, Room 101, Toronto 135, Ontario. \$4, annual subscription for 8 issues. Canada's only national radical newsmagazine. It is especially good on coverage of events in Quebec.
- (8) **Our Generation**, 3934 rue St. Urbain, Montreal, Quebec. \$5.00 annual subscription for 4 issues. A radical independent journal with good coverage of Quebec. Its perspective is a form of passivism and syndicalism. It began with the Canadian peace movement.
- (9) **Next Year Country**, Box 3446, Regina, Saskatchewan. \$3.00, annual subscription for 6 issues. A socialist newsmagazine, devoted to Saskatchewan issues.
- (10) **This Magazine**, 56 Esplanade St. East, Toronto, Ontario. \$3.00, annual subscription for 6 issues. Formerly **This Magazine is About Schools**, a radical education magazine, it now has a new format with additional stress on the fight for Canadian independence.

VI. WHERE TO BUY BOOKS

Bookstores are notoriously poor in Saskatchewan. Many of these texts can be obtained at the university bookstores on both campuses. They will often make special orders. The Saskatoon News Agency, 148-2nd Avenue North, Saskatoon, 242-2572, also handles individual orders. A great number of socialist books, from varying perspectives, can be obtained from the following publishers:

- (1) Canadian Dimension Reader Service. Check the back cover of the latest issue of the magazine. Emphasis on Canadian questions.
- (2) International Publishers, Suite 1301, 381 Park Ave. South, New York, N.Y. 10016.
- (3) Progress Books, 487 Adelaide St. W., Toronto 2B, Ontario. Also carries International publications.
- (4) Monthly Review Press, 116 West 14th St., New York, N.Y.
- (5) New Left Book Club, 7 Carlisle St., London W1 V 6NL.
- (6) Merit Publishers, 873 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10003.
- (7) China Arts and Crafts, Ltd., 33 East Hastings St., Vancouver 4, B.C.

next year country . . .

... a new magazine of Saskatchewan politics and events which is first and foremost an alternative to the commercial press. It covers the decisions of government and business as they affect Saskatchewan people as well as featuring the history of the province which is left out of textbooks. NYC hopes to be a voice for those groups and organizations of farmers, workers, students and native people that are working for a just and equitable society.

☐ I ENCLOSE \$3 FOR SIX ISSUES OF N.Y.C.
(INSTITUTIONAL RATE \$5.)

☐ I ENCLOSE \$..... AS A SUSTAINING
DONATION FOR N.Y.C.

☐ BACK ISSUES (Copies @ 50c or bulk orders over
10 @ 30c.)

Vol. 1, No. 1copies. Vol. 1, No. 2
copies. Vol. 1, No. 3 copies.

\$..... enclosed/or please bill me.

☐ I WOULD ASSIST IN DISTRIBUTION.

☐ I WOULD ASSIST IN REPORTING.

next year country
P.O. BOX 3446, REGINA

NAME

ADDRESS

.....

NAME

ADDRESS

.....