



A Voice of the WORLD SOCIALIST PARTY (USA)
Volume I, Number 1 Grand Rapids, May 1986 Twenty-five cents.

EDITORIAL.

To Our Readers,

In your hands is the first issue of the WORLD SOCIALIST REVIEW. The articles that appear in this journal have been written by members of the WORLD SOCIALIST MOVEMENT. Not all of the articles that appear, or that will be appearing in future issues, will be finely phrased. But, what we lack in refinement of style we shall make good by our deep sincerity and by the correctness and truthfulness of our principles.

We shall for the present, content ourselves with issuing the WORLD SOCIALIST REVIEW four times a year. This could, however, change. We will notify our readers if we increase or decrease the number of issues we plan to put out each year.

We do regret to inform our readers that if they want subscriptions, they will have to pay a slightly higher price of .30¢ per issue. We deeply regret this, but the high price of postage forces us to charge more to defray the cost of sending each issue to your home.

Finally, let us state that we would very much like to hear from you. We shall be pleased to consider any articles submitted to us for publication in this journal. However, please do not be disappointed if what you submit does not appear or if it gets slightly edited. We have a very hard job of deciding what is to appear and what is not to appear. Also, because this journal is an official voice of the WSP, all articles do have to represent the platform of the WSP. Hence, the need for editing. We also would like to encourage our readers to send us suggestions on how to improve our journal, to voice their criticisms of the journal or any of its articles, to comment on something they liked and to ask questions about the World Socialist Party and its principles.

Rich
(co-editor)

II.

B A S I C S O F W O R L D S O C I A L I S M

Membership in the World Socialist Party of the United States requires an understanding of and agreement with what we consider to be the basics of scientific socialism. We have always been convinced that a world-wide system based upon production for use, rather than for sale on a market, requires that a majority of the population be socialist in attitude. Events since the establishment of the World Socialist Movement have, we maintain, proved the validity of this judgement. In our opinion, if you agree, generally, with the following statements, you are a socialist and belong with us.

1. Capitalism, even with reforms, cannot function in the interests of the working class. Capitalism, by its nature, requires continual "reforms"; yet reforms cannot alter the basic relationship of wage-labor and capital and would not be considered, to begin with, if their legislation would lead to disturbing this relationship. Reforms, in other words, are designed to make capitalism more palatable to the working class by holding out the false hope of an improvement in their condition. To whatever extent they afford improvement, reforms benefit the capitalist class, not the working class.

2. To establish socialism the working class must first gain control of the powers of government through their political organization. It is by virtue of its control of state power that the capitalist class is able to perpetuate its system. State power gives control of the main avenues of education and propaganda—either directly or indirectly—and of the armed forces that frequently and efficiently crush ill-conceived working class attempts at violent opposition. The one way it is possible in a highly developed capitalism to oust the capitalist class from its ownership and control over the means of production and distribution is to first strip it of its control over the state. Once this is accomplished the state will be converted from a government over people to an administration of the affairs of man. The World Socialist Party of the United States advocates the ballot, and no other method, as a means of abolishing capitalism.

3. Members of the World Socialist Party do not support—either directly or indirectly—members of any other political party. It is always possible, even if difficult in some instances, to vote for world socialism by writing in the name of the Party and a member for a particular legislative office. Our main task, however, is to make socialists and not to advocate use of the ballot for anything else short of socialism.

4. The World Socialist Party rejects the theory of leadership. Neither individual "great" personalities nor "revolutionary vanguards" can bring the world one day closer to socialism. The emancipation of the working class "must be the work of the working class, itself." Educators to explain socialism, yes! Administrators to carry out the will of the majority of the membership, yes! But leaders or "vanguards" never!

continued on next page.....

III.

B A S I C S C O N T ' D

5. There is an irreconcilable conflict between scientific socialism and religion. Socialists reject religion for two main reasons: (a) Religion divides the universe into spiritual and physical realms and all religions offer their adherents relief from their earthly problems through some form of appeal to the spiritual. Socialists see the cause of the problems that wrack mankind as material and political. We see the solution as one involving material and political, not spiritual means. (b) Religions ally themselves with the institutions of class society. Particular religious organizations and leaders may, and frequently do, rebel against what they deem injustice, even suffering imprisonment and worse for their efforts. But they seek their solutions within the framework of the system socialists aim to abolish. One cannot understand the development of social evolution by resorting to religious ideas.

6. The system of society in Russia, China, and all of the other so-called socialist or communist countries is state capitalism. Goods and services, in those countries, as in avowedly capitalist lands, are produced for sale on a market with view to profit and not, primarily, for use. The placing of industry under the control of the state in no way alters the basic relationships of wage-labor and capital. The working class remains a class of wage slaves. The class that controls the state remains a parasitical, surplus-value eating class.

7. Trade unionism is the means by which wage workers organize to "bargain collectively" in order that they might sell their labor-power at the best possible price, and to try to improve working conditions. The unorganized have no economic weapon with which to resist the attempts of capital to beat down their standards. But unions must work within the framework of capitalism. They are useful, then, to but a limited extent. They can do nothing toward lessening unemployment, for example. In fact, they encourage employers to introduce more efficient methods in order to overcome added costs of higher wages and thereby hasten and increase unemployment. More and more the tendency of industry is toward a greater mass of production with fewer employees. Unions must, by their very nature, encourage such development although they are also known, occasionally, to resist this natural trend through what employers like to call "featherbedding." As Marx put it: instead of the conservative motto "a fair day's pay for a fair day's work," the worker ought to inscribe upon their banner "abolition of the wages system."

If you agree, generally, with the above sentiments you belong with us. Can we hear from you?

BE SURE YOU GET YOUR SOCIALIST PAPERS!

SOCIALIST STANDARD (Great Britain)	12 issues \$8.50
WORLD SOCIALIST (International)	2 yearly \$2.50
WORLD SOCIALIST REVIEW (USA)	4 issues \$1.20

To obtain subscriptions write to;

Rich

P.O. Box 382

Marne, MI 49435

W.S.P. of U.S.

P.O. BOX 405

BOSTON, MA 02272

This article
was taken
from the-

Official journal of the Socialist Party of Great Britain

Marx's Conception of Socialism

MARX USUALLY REFERRED to the society he aimed to see established by the working class as "communist society". Precisely because he believed that "communist society" would be the outcome of the struggle and movement of the working class against its capitalist conditions of existence, Marx always refused to give any detailed picture of what he expected it to be like: that was something for the working class to work out for itself. Nevertheless scattered throughout his writings, published and unpublished, are references to what he believed would have to be the basic features of the new society the working class would establish in place of capitalism.

Voluntary Association

It must be emphasized that nowhere did Marx distinguish between "socialist society" and "communist society". As far as he, and Engels, were concerned these two words meant the same, being alternative names for the society they thought the working class would establish in place of capitalism, a practice which will be followed in this article. As a matter of fact besides *communist* Marx employed four other words to describe future society: *associated*, *socialised*, *collective* and *co-operative*. All these words convey a similar meaning and bring out the contrast with capitalist society where not only the ownership and control of production but life generally is private, isolated and atomized. Of these the word Marx used most frequently — almost more frequently than *communist* — was *association*. Marx wrote of future society as "an association which will exclude classes and their antagonism" (pp. p. 197) and as "an association, in which the free development of each is the condition for the free development of all" (CM, p. 82). In Volume III of *Capital* Marx writes three or four times of production in future society being controlled by the "associated producers" (pp. 428, 430-1 and 800). *Association* was a word used in working class circles in England to mean a voluntary union of workers to overcome the effects of competition. This was Marx's sense too: in future society the producers would voluntarily co-operate to further their own common interest; they would cease to be "the working class" and become a classless community.

No Coercive State

In these circumstances the State as an instrument of political rule over people would have no place. Such a social organ of coercion was, in Marx's view, only needed in class-divided societies as an instrument of class rule and to contain class struggles. As he put it, in socialist society "there will be no more political power properly so-called since political power is precisely the official expression of antagonism in civil society" (pp. p. 197) and "the public power will lose its political character. Political power, properly so called, is merely

the organised power of one class for oppressing another" (CM, p. 81).

Socialist society would indeed need a central administration but this would not be a "State" or "government" in that it would not have at its disposal any means of coercing people, but would be concerned purely with administering social affairs under democratic control. Marx endorsed the proposal of Saint Simon and other early critics of capitalism for "the conversion of the functions of the State into a mere superintendence of production" (CM, p. 98), and also declared that "freedom consists in converting the state from an organ superimposed upon society into one completely subordinate to it" (CGP, p. 32). In other words, once Socialism had been established and classes abolished, the coercive and undemocratic features of the State machine would have been removed, leaving only purely administrative functions mainly in the field of the planning and organization of production.

Common Ownership

Natural resources and the man-made instruments of production would be held in common: Marx speaks of "a community of free individuals, carrying on their work with the means of production in common" (Vol. I, p. 78) and, in his *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, of "the co-operative society based on the common ownership of the means of production" (p. 22) and of "the material conditions of production" being "the co-operative property of the workers themselves" (p. 25). It is significant that Marx never defined communist society in terms of the ownership and control of the means of production by the State, but rather in terms of ownership and control by a voluntary association of the producers themselves. He did not equate what is now called "nationalisation" with Socialism.

Planned Production

Another feature of communist society, in Marx's view, would be consciously planned production. He writes of a society "in which producers regulate their production according to a preconceived plan" (Vol. III, p. 256) and of "production by freely associated men . . . consciously regulated by them in accordance with a settled plan" (Vol. I, p. 80).

Conscious planning, conscious control over the material conditions of life, was for Marx clearly the essence of Socialism. In the 1840's, when he used to express himself philosophically, Marx was continually emphasising this point. This was what he meant when he said that real history would not begin till Socialism had been established; human beings were not behaving as human beings so long as they were controlled by blind historical and economic forces, ultimately of their own creation but unrecognized as such; Socialism would allow men to consciously regulate their relationship with Nature; only such a consciously planned society was

a truly human society, a society compatible with human nature.

But Marx's approach to planning in Socialism was not just philosophical. It was practical too. He was well aware that to regulate "production according to a preconceived plan" would be a huge organizational task. Indeed, that it would be, if you like, the economic problem of Socialism. Matching production with social wants would in the first instance be a huge statistical exercise. Marx emphasised that for this sort of reason "book-keeping" would be more necessary in Socialism than under capitalism — not that he envisages the books in socialist society being kept in money. Socialist society, he felt, would use some direct measure of labour-time for its statistics and planning (Vol. III, pp. 184 and 830). Calculations would have to be made of how much labour-time would be needed to produce particular items of wealth; the real social (as opposed to monetary market) demand for the various items of wealth would also have to be calculated; and all the figures put together to construct a definite plan for the allocation of resources and labour to the various different branches of production.

In a number of places Marx compares how capitalism and Socialism would tackle the same problems, for instance a long-term project which would not bear fruit in the form of finished products for some years but which in the meantime would have to be allocated labour and resources. Under capitalism, said Marx, this creates monetary problems and upsets; but in Socialism it is only a question of "preconceived" planning, of making allowances for this beforehand (Vol. II, pp. 315 and 358). Similarly with miscalculations, say over-producing: under capitalism (where overproduction means in relation to market demand) this causes a crisis and a drop in production; in Socialism (where overproduction would be in relation to real social demand) there would be no problem: it could be corrected in the next plan (Vol. II, pp. 468-9).

In his *Critique of the Gotha Programme* (p. 22) and in Volume III of *Capital* (p. 854) Marx lists the various major uses to which the social product would have to be put in a socialist society:

- 1) Replacing the means of production (raw materials, wear and tear of machinery, etc.) used up in producing the social product.
- 2) Expanding the means of production so as to be able to produce a larger social product.
- 3) A small surplus as a reserve to provide against accidents and natural disasters (and planning miscalculations, we might add).
- 4) The individual consumption of the actual producers.
- 5) The individual consumption of those unable to work: the young, the old, the sick.
- 6) Social consumption: schools, hospitals, parks, libraries, etc.
- 7) Social administration not connected with production.

This is obvious of course but it is as well to spell it out so as to show that Marx did discuss some of the practical problems of totally planned production.

Abolition of the Market

Socialist society, as Marx repeatedly made clear, would be a non-market society, with all that that implied:

no money, no buying and selling, no wages, etc. In fact it was his view that proper planning and the market are incompatible: either production is regulated by a conscious previously worked-out plan or it is regulated, directly or indirectly, by the market. When Marx talked about men under capitalism being dominated by blind forces, which were in the end their own creations, it was precisely blind market forces he mainly had in mind. For him capitalism was essentially a market economy in which the allocation of labour and resources to the various branches of production was determined by what he called "the law of value". Although production under capitalism was not consciously controlled, it was not completely anarchic: some sort of order was imposed by the fact that goods exchanged in definite proportions, related both to the amount of socially necessary labour-time spent in producing them and to the average rate of profit on invested capital. Under capitalism it was the averaging of the rate of profit on the capital invested in the different branches that regulated production. But this was an unplanned hit-and-miss process which was only accurate in the long run; in the short run it led to alternating periods of boom and slump, labour shortage and mass unemployment, high profits and low profits. The assertion by society of conscious control over production, and the allocation of resources to the various branches of production in accordance with a previously settled plan, necessarily meant for Marx the disappearance not only of production for profit, but also of the whole mechanism of the market (including the labour market, and so of the wages system), of production for the market ("commodity-production"), of buying and selling ("exchange") and of money.

The *Communist Manifesto* specifically speaks of "the Communistic abolition of buying and selling" (p. 72) and of the abolition not only of capital (wealth used to produce other wealth with a view to profit) but of wage labour too (p. 73). In Volume I Marx speaks of "directly associated labour, a form of production that is entirely inconsistent with the production of commodities . . ." (p. 94) and in Volume III of things being different "if production were collective and no longer possessed the form of commodity production . . ." (p. 451). Also, in Volume II, Marx in comparing how Socialism and capitalism would deal with a particular problem twice says there would be no money to complicate matters in socialist society: "If we conceive society as being not capitalistic but communistic, there will be no money-capital at all in the first place . . ." (p. 315) and "in the case of socialized production the money-capital is eliminated" (p. 358). In other words, in Socialism it is solely a question of planning and organisation. Marx also advised trade unionists to adopt the revolutionary watchword "Abolition of the Wages System" (VPP, p. 78) and, in his *Critique of the Gotha Programme*, stated "within the co-operative society based on the common ownership of the means of production, the producers do not exchange their products" (pp. 22-3) for the simple reason that their work would then be social not individual and applied as part of a definite plan. What they produce belongs to them collectively, i.e. to society, as soon as it is produced; socialist society then allocates, again in accord-

ance with a plan, the social product to various previously-agreed uses.

Distribution of Consumer Goods

One of these uses must be individual consumption. How did Marx think this would be organised? Here again Marx took a realistic view. Eventually, he said, the principle "from each according to his ability, to each according to his needs" would apply (CGP, p. 24). In other words, there would be no social restrictions on individual consumption, every member of society being free to take from the common stock of consumer goods according to their individual need. But Marx knew that this presupposed a higher level of productivity than prevailed in his day (he was writing in 1875). In the meantime, while the productive forces were being expanded, individual consumption would unavoidably have to be restricted. How? Marx made the simple point that how wealth would be allocated for individual consumption in communist society would depend on what and how much there was to allocate: "The mode of this distribution will vary with the productive organisation of the community, and the degree of historical development attained by the producers" (Vol. I, p. 78). This was another obvious point, but on three or four occasions Marx went further and referred to a specific method of regulating distribution: by "labour-time vouchers". The basic idea of such a system is that each producer would be given a certificate recording how much time he had spent at work; this would entitle him to draw from the common store of wealth set aside for individual consumption an equivalent amount of consumer goods, likewise measured in labour-time. This, as Marx himself recognised, was only one of many possible systems Socialist society could democratically agree on for allocating wealth for individual consumption in the temporary conditions of relative scarcity here assumed — realistically for 1875 — to exist. As long as the total number of vouchers issued matched the total amount of wealth set aside for individual consumption, society could adopt any criteria it chose for deciding how many vouchers particular individuals, or groups of individuals, should have; this need bear no relationship at all to how many hours an individual may or may not have worked. Similarly, the "pseudo-prices" given to particular goods to be distributed need bear not relation to the amount of labour-time spent on producing them. Marx himself described some of the defects of the labour-time voucher system, but also made the point that any voucher system of allocating goods for individual consumption would suffer from anomalies, being forced on socialist society by the not-yet-developed-enough productive forces in what Marx called "the first phase of communist society".

When Marx mentions labour-time vouchers in *Capital* he always made it quite clear that he was only assuming such a system as an example: "merely for the sake of a parallel with the production of commodities" (Vol. I, p. 78) or that the producers "may, for all it matters, . . ." (Vol. II, p. 358) receive labour-time vouchers. He also emphasised that these vouchers would not be money in its proper sense: "Owen's 'labour-money' . . . is no more 'money' than a ticket to the theatre" (Vol. I, p. 94)

and "these vouchers are not money. They do not circulate" (Vol. II, p. 358). (See also his discussion of so called "labour-money" in *The Critique of Political Economy*, pp. 83-6.)

Marx's point here is that the vouchers would merely be pieces of paper entitling people to take such and such an amount of consumer goods; they would not be tokens for gold like today's paper money; once handed over they would be cancelled and so could not circulate. Besides, they would be issued as part of the overall plan for the production and distribution of wealth. Finally, we repeat, any voucher system, whether on a labour-time or some other basis, was seen by Marx only as a temporary measure while the productive forces were developed as rapidly as possible to the level where they would permit socialist society to go over to free access according to individual need.

This is why this is now only an academic problem. The further development of the forces of production since Marx's day has meant that the system he always said was the final aim of Socialism — free access to consumer goods according to individual need — could now be introduced almost immediately. Socialism was established. The problem Marx envisaged labour-time vouchers as a possible solution to no longer really exists.

Conclusion

We have seen, then, that Marx held that future communist society would be a classless community, without any coercive State machine, based on the common ownership of the means of production, with planning to serve human welfare completely replacing production for profit, the market economy, money and the wages system — even in the early stages when it might not prove possible to implement the principle "from each according to his ability, to each according to his need", which, however, always remained for Marx the aim. Marx, and Engels, never drew any distinction between "socialist" and "communist" society, using these (and other) terms interchangeably. He did, however, believe that this society would only be established after a "period of . . . revolutionary transformation" (CGP, p. 32) of a number of years duration during which the working class would be using its control of political power to dispossess the capitalists and bring all the means of production under democratic social control — but to go into this in detail would require another article.

A.L.B.

References :

- CGP. *Critique of the Gotha Programme*. Marx-Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol II Moscow, 1958.
- CM. *Communist Manifesto*, Moscow, 1954.
- GI. *German Ideology*, Part One, ed. by C. J. Arthur, Lawrence and Wishart, 1970.
- PP. *Poverty of Philosophy*, Moscow, n.d.
- Vol I. *Capital*, Vol I, Moscow, 1961.
- Vol. II. *Capital*, Vol II, Moscow, 1957.
- Vol III. *Capital*, Vol III, Moscow, 1959.
- VPP. *Value, Price and Profit*, Peking, 1969.
- Critique of Political Economy*, Lawrence and Wishart, 1971.

**THE
WORKING
CLASS
JOE MEETS
THE BOSS**

3-79-1

HEY JOE, WORK FASTER!
I PAY YOU \$50 A DAY!

WHERE DO
YOU GET THE
MONEY TO
PAY ME?

I SELL THE
PRODUCTS
YOU MAKE!

HOW MANY
PRODUCTS
DO I MAKE
IN A DAY?

\$250
WORTH!

YOU MEAN
I'M PAYING
YOU \$200
TO TELL ME
TO WORK
FASTER!!

YEH, BUT
I OWN THE
MACHINES!

YEH, BUT HOW
DID YOU GET
THE MACHINES?

I SOLD PRODUCTS
AND BOUGHT THEM!

AND WHO MADE
THOSE PRODUCTS?

LISTEN JOE, I'M
LOOKING FOR A
NICE YOUNG MAN
FOR MANAGEMENT
AND I THINK

VIII.

WHAT IS WORLD SOCIALISM?

It is a sad but true fact that many people do not know what socialism is. What is even sadder is that many people who claim to be socialists do not even know. Therefore, this short article will try to explain what basically socialism is and what it is not.

A good place to start is with the explanation of what socialism is not. Socialism is not the state capitalism that is oppressing the workers in the USSR, China, Yugoslavia, Poland or any other country that claims to be socialist. You see, these countries have wages, money and a state. These things will not exist in socialism. Socialism is also not the nationalization of industries that Sweden, Great Britain and others have set up. They too have money, wages and a state just like every other capitalist nation. To get to the fact, socialism has never been tried anywhere on the face of the earth. We could go into a more lengthy explanation of why the above systems are not socialism. However, we will let the following explanation of socialism do the talking.

To begin with, a socialist society is a stateless, moneyless, classless society based on production to satisfy human needs. A true socialist society has common ownership of the means of production. These means of production will be democratically run and there will be free access to all the goods produced.

How can the above society be brought about? It is the opinion of the World Socialist Party that this free, democratic society can only be brought about when the working class wants and understands socialism. The organization of a socialist party must of course, begin long before a majority of the working class has become socialist. The socialist party is a part of the process of discovering and solidifying socialists. When the majority of the working class wants socialism, they will through democratic elections, capture the state.

When the working class has captured the state, they will have but one option: The state must be immediately dismantled so that the building of the new socialist society can begin.

SO YOU WANT PEACE!

You take part in local demonstrations to keep the United States from getting involved in wars in central America and other areas across the globe. You've even gone to Washington D.C. to show the top politicians you mean business. Fine! But is it really peace you want!

Real peace must bring great changes. For example: there can be no peace while a tiny minority own the means of wealth production and distribution and the rest of us work for them. This sort of arrangement leads inescapably to wars between rival capitalisms and to strikes, lockouts and riots on the home front between capital and labor. It also leads to squalor, poverty, preventable disease, and mass pollution of air, soil and water.

cont'd on next page.....

IX.

P E A C E C O N T ' D

So class ownership of the means of production and distribution of wealth must go! Not at some future date while-in the meantime-state capitalism operated by leaders of the Left, or the Right, takes over. There is no percentage for the majority in that sort of set-up. Don't let them kid you. Nobody, but nobody, can operate the wages system in the interest of those who must work for wages. Changing the name to "socialist" without changing the relationships of man to man is like renaming a leopard "pussycat."

Are you interested in a new and different world? One world with one race-the human race-and no boundaries to keep it apart? If not, don't talk to us of Peace!

LET'S BUILD A MASS PARTY FOR
WORLD SOCIALISM!

LET'S END THE SYSTEM THAT
BREEDS WAR!

S H O R T T A L K S

1. What is the WSP's position on the state?

As socialists, we see the state as the executive committee of the ruling class that makes and breaks the laws through the use of coercive power. While the state does control the armed forces, it does hold somewhat democratic elections which allows for the capture of state power by a socialist majority for the purpose of ensuring a peaceful, democratic revolution. This revolution will dismantle the state with its coercive powers so that a truly democratic administration over things, not people, can be set up. Hence, the establishment of a wageless, classless, stateless society known as; SOCIALISM! Won't you join us in this tremendous struggle for the emancipation of the working class?

2. Why doesn't the WSP ally with other parties for any object?

Because no other political party stands clearly for socialism and socialism alone.

3. What is the WSP's position on war?

The WSP and its companion parties stand in complete opposition to war. Working class interests are not served by war. War is just something that capitalism drive nations into from time to time. War arises from conflicts between nations over markets, strategic locations, resources, etc. While our party is opposed to war, we are not pacifists. A pacifist holds that when a majority of non-socialists reject war, wars will not happen. We claim this to be false. We point to the past wars where pacifists denounced war before it started, only to become the loudest supporters of "their" country's cause when war started. This shows that pacifists are as prone as anyone else to fall for war propoganda and to support and die for their capitalist masters. We would also like to state that war cannot be used to establish socialism.

cont'd on next page.....

SHORT TALKS CONT'D**4. Will capitalism collapse?**

No. Capitalism will do one of two things. It will either stagger from one crisis to another or it will literally blow itself up. It will never collapse on its own. One just has to look at the many depressions capitalism has endured for the proof it will not collapse on its own. How then, does capitalism end? This is a very simple issue, capitalism must be ended by revolution. A socialist revolution.

THE WORLD SOCIALIST PARTY

The World Socialist Party of the United States was founded on July 7, 1916 in the city of Detroit, Michigan. It is one of seven parties belonging to the World Socialist Movement. Together, we have kept burning the vision of a new society. We encourage you to write to one of the following addresses to find out more about socialism. Write to;

W.S.P. of U.S.

Rich
P.O. Box 382
Marne, MI 49435

P.O. BOX 405
BOSTON, MA 02272

Socialist Party of Great Britain
52 Clapham High St.
London, England
SW4 7UN

Socialist Party of Canada
PO Box 4280, Station A
Victoria, BC, Canada
V8X 3X8

Socialist Party New Zealand
PO Box 1929, Auckland NI

World Socialist Party (Ireland)
41 Donegall Street, Belfast
Ireland

Varldssocialistika Gruppen
C/O Dag Nilsson, Ymergaten
S-753 25 Uppsala, Sweden

Austria: Bund Demokratischer Sozialisten
Gussriegelstrasse 50
A-1100, Vienna, Austria

H A D E N O U G H ?

You know that capitalism is a sick society! But are you ready to throw in the towel after these many years of bombast from 57 varieties of self-styled revolutionaries? Are you looking for a remote desert island to avoid the Leninist-Trotskyist and whatever Bolshevik strategists and tacticians who daily assault your ears and eyes? Have you begun to suspect, with good reason, that the above mentioned are each offering the same old goods with but a change in the decoration of the package? Do they offer you capitalism, administered by the state, under the pseudo-nym; socialism?

Alternatively, there is the other hangup. Are you fed up with the learned irrelevancies of the professed socialist intellectuals who write scholarly treatises in scholarly journals of the "left"? Or the so-called democratic socialists? Do they not offer capitalism, administered by the state, albeit they claim a more benevolent state, in the manner of the Scandinavian countries or Great Britain?

continued on next page.....

ENOUGH? CONT'D

What then is socialism? If you work for wages it is not socialism. If goods and services are sold in the market place with a view for profit it is not socialism. If the world is divided into nations, it is not socialism. If there is any kind of government over people it is not socialism! Unless each man, woman and child in the world has free access to all goods and services it is not socialism.

Investigate the new thing! Establish socialism in the world today! Why settle for less?

*WORLD SOCIALIST PARTY BOOKLIST *

Marx: Communist Manifesto60¢
 Class Struggles in France 1848-1850..... .70¢
 18th Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte..... .70¢
 Value, Price & Profit..... .70¢
 Wage Labour and Capital..... .70¢
 Critique of the Gotha Program..... .70¢
 Civil War in France..... .70¢

Engels:

Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State \$3.55
 Socialism Utopian and Scientific..... .75¢
 Ludwig Feuerbach and the Outcome of Classical German
 Philosophy..... .70¢
 Housing Question..... .75¢

Plekanov:

The Materialist Conception of History.....\$1.20

Lafargue:

The Right to Be Lazy.....\$1.25

Leight:

World Without Wages, Money, Poverty and War\$8.95
 The Futility of Reformation.....\$8.95

Pamphlets:

Questions of the Day.....\$1.00
 Socialist Principles......50¢
 Socialism and Trade Unions......70¢
 Some Aspects of Marxian Economics......70¢
 Ireland-Past, Present and Future......70¢
 Is a Third World War Inevitable......60¢

*All prices include postage costs.

To order the above items write to;

Rich
 P.O. Box 382
 Marne, MI 49435

W.S.P. of U.S.
 P.O. BOX 405
 BOSTON, MA 02272

Immediate cash is needed for insuring that there will be future issues of the World Socialist Review. No sum you can send is too great or too small. Send your donation to the above address.

THE WORLD SOCIALIST PARTY OF THE UNITED STATES

OBJECT

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

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES

The World Socialist Party of the United States holds:

1. That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., lands, factories, railways, etc.), by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class, by whose labor alone wealth is produced.

2. That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

3. That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

4. That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

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

6. That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organize consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of plutocratic privilege.

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

8. THE WORLD SOCIALIST PARTY of the United States, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labor or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon all members of the working class of this country to support these principles to the end that a termination may be brought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labor, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

SCC FORM

I would like to join the Socialist Correspondence Club

My interests are _____

Name and address _____

To our readers,

We would like to invite you to join the Socialist Correspondence Club. The SCC is a sort of penpal club for people from anywhere in the world who are sympathetic to socialist ideas.

If you are interested, all you need to do is fill in the form below and these details will be included on a list which is periodically updated and sent out to all those whose names appear on the list. From then on it is up to those on the list to initiate a correspondence with anyone they choose.

Please send your forms to;

Louise Cox,
Flat 3,
The Mount,
Lower St.,
Haslemere,
Surrey,
GU27 2PD
England