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3. THE CAPITALIST MODE OF PRODUCTION.

In the course of the Middle Ages handcrafts developed more and more in Europe, division of labor and specialisation of work, weaving for instance being split up into wool weavers, linen weavers, and flax weavers, and several processes connected with weaving, such as cloth trimming, became separate trades. Skill increased and the competitive tools of production were considerably improved. At that time commerce developed, mainly in consequence of the increasing wealth and the corresponding improvements in transport, particularly the advance of shipbuilding.

Four hundred years ago handcrafts were still at its peak for three or four centuries of commerce. The over-seas route to India, this fairyland full of incomparable treasure, was found, and America with its inestimable store of gold and silver was discovered. A flood of wealth which European adventurers had amassed in the newly discovered countries by commerce, fraud, and robbery, was poured out over Europe. The lion's share of this wealth fell to the merchants, who were in a position to equip ships and man them with a numerous, powerful crew, whose members were as dear as were their provisions.

In the same time also developed the modern state, the centralised state of officialdom and militarism, first of all in the form of absolute monarchism. This state had to meet the requirements of the expanding capitalist class, just as it needed their support. The modern state, the state of a developed productive commodities, does not obtain its strength from personal services of the civil and military administration, but from its financial income. The proceeds had, therefore, every reason to protect and to favour those who brought money into the country, i.e., the merchants, the capitalists. In return for this protection the capitalists lent money to the monarchs, to the states, made them their debentures, subscribed to their banks, and thus freed the state, in order to serve capitalist interests, to safeguard and extend traffic routes, acquire and maintain colonies abroad, make wars against rival commercial states, and so on.

Our elementary economic principles tell us that the origin of capital lies in theft, that we have not yet observed any other source of capital. The vast amount of wealth of the capitalist nations can be traced back to their colonial policy, that to their plundering of foreign countries; it can be traced back to piracy, smuggling, speculations in traffic and commercial wars. Up to the present century, the history of these nations furnishes us with sufficient examples of how the destruction of the petty concern, were either units for work, cripples, invalids, old men, or men afraid of work, cripples, invalids, old men, or men afraid of work, or were destroyed by the vast capitalistic enterprise. This was also the consequence of the development in the production of commodities. The extension of the
the markets for urban industry had a reflex upon agriculture. In the towns a demand for artificial fruits and vegetables, flowers, dyes, starch, etc., increased, hence agricultural production too became more and more directed to the purpose of selling.

The peasant got money into his hands, but that affected him uncomfortably, for it caused the avarice of his exploiters, the landlords and rentiers. They became sellers of their own product they had not made, for they had never possessed it in the first place. They could not make use of, or the more the better. The more the market extended for the peasant and the merchant, the more their profits grew, the higher the rent and price of the estates was. The landlords were no longer satisfied with the surplus over and above the cost of the peasant's science in producing such a crop. No wonder that the peasants were seized with despair and that many of them, especially after all these years and after all the work they had put in the land, had been cheated, left unheard and home-schooled in the town.

There was great and sudden amnesia of course. As in the towns through the extension of the market, landlords and manufacturers, on a large scale made itself felt, so developed the need for agricultural production on a large scale, but it was now favored to do in the towns, the handymen sought in the country. The handymen, who until then had been a sort of peasant in a large way, tried to extend his farm, and as he knew how to fasten the peasant, he did not have to pay much or no salary to his own supply of laborers; often he did not need fresh workers. The production of the large farms required more capital than was required for less workers than agriculture. Where the handymen gave agriculture in favorable conditions and conditions in which they made agricultural laborers superfluous. But what the handymen was now above all in need of was money which he could propose until then and this he could secure only at the expense of the peasants in his immediate vicinity. He then drove them off their farms if he wished to extend his own, and he suffered no pangs of conscience ever they seemed necessary for gaining their ends. History teaches us most peculiar moral.

What were the crowds of agriculturists without property to do after having fled to the towns as many or having been driven from hearth and home by fraud and violence. They were no longer able to produce for themselves, as they were lacking the means of production from which they had been driven and deceived. Being no longer in a position to take commodities to the market, nothing remained for them but to take themselves there, to sell the only thing of value that had been left to them, their labor power, for a short or long period, that is to say, their services were hired for wages. Some took employment as agricultural laborers, sometimes with the same master that they had been cheated by, others joined the army to assist in the robbing expeditions of their masters who had been cheated by. Others organized themselves to commit larceny and crime. But many, and probably not the worst of them, turned to industrial enterprise.

The introduction of the machine into industry signifies an exorbitant revolution. Through a large capitalist concern obtained its highest and most perfect form, the manufacture. In this time of the social system, which for the first time provided a power quite independent of the elements and entirely manageable, a revolution in the division of labor was caused...
machine in industry possible. The tremendous increase of production caused by the introduction of machinery is accompanied by an enormous increase in the disposal of the products.

In the same measure in which the outputs of tradition are transformed and increased, in the same measure in which the market for particular industries is widened, by that same degree is the market for labor contracts being widened. The number of trades and places where handicraft is still alive is still in existence is still deemed acceptable and necessary. The factory problems and the days of handicraft are passing away.

But what holds good for handicraft applies also, if not in equal measure, to peasant farming. Wherever agriculture, whether on a small or large scale, is not performed by the owner of the land, the tenant or the laborer, the production for sale, not for use, the large enterprise even if not more capable possessing from the beginning the same advantage over the petty enterprise which the capitalist has over the handicraftsman, namely, a better understanding and control of the market. The large landlord or his tenant possessed of capital is able to induce for the increase of this that is, the peasant, and is also in the position to use better implementational tools, better breeding and stock raising, better terms of payment, better machinery, etc. The technical and commercial superiority of the large-scale agriculture in Europe has during the last two decades been more or less restricted owing to the agricultural conditions and laws which proved a great hindrance to European agriculture on a large scale to petty agricultural enterprises. First of all, because it required itself principally in the raising of cattle, a branch of agriculture in which the technical supremacy of the large enterprise over petty agriculture is most pronounced. In the large enterprise careful prevention of all kinds of diseases is easier within the rigid control of the owner of the farm. Secondly, the large enterprise suffers more from the conditions of the peasant's poverty, with a view to the market, whilst the petty enterprise consumes a great portion of its own proceeds and has its money invested in the market rather than the large enterprise.

But these favourable conditions for petty enterprise can be only temporary. Foreign competition does not remain restricted to corn, growing; it extends also to the development of cattle rearing, and production for self consumption with the peasant desires and becomes absorbed by the assimilation of commodities, the production for sale.

It is principally the development of the railway and taxation system, which favours the emigration of the communities in agriculture. Through the railways the peasant identifies himself with the large-scale enterprise of the world. The taxes force him to go to the market as he is unable to pay the railway working a certain quantity of tax, to sell everything. The higher the price, the more the peasant depends upon the market, the more his production becomes production of commodities, and the more he is affected by the competition of the large enterprise. To no class of our population is the increase of the taxes so disastrous as to the petty peasant.

Military conscription to-day for the most indirect cause, for the increase of the taxes is extended to the whole population. Yet the same people, the large landlords, who pose themselves as the friends of the peasant, are the most active supporters of militarism. To the landowners militarism offers only advantages, it provides them with deliveries of horses, guns and horse carriages which can be best employed by the large enterprises. The landowner militarism offers numerous highly paid positions as officers. Militarism deprives the peasant of his horses and his guns and hands him with heavy taxes and drives him on the roads to the industrial centers. Yet the military conscription of the large enterprises at home and by the banana farming of foreign countries.

The ruling classes see the possessory and the social system. They fail to see that one of these parties is driven upon the other and crushes it by its increasing weight.

To be continued.
ET TU BRUTE.

After Belf-—Lafargue! "Writing to 'Justice,' our comrades favor the Socialists of the two worlds unite ''in heart and voice with English Socialists in celebrating the electoral victory of the working class of Great Britain. Its victory is the victory of International Socialism. "This Trade Unions understand at last, in order to accelerate their lot and to benefit by the wealth which they alone produce, the workers must form themselves into a class party for the purpose of expropriating the expropriated capitalist class from political and economic power." Which is precisely what they do not understand. As Lafargue himself unwillingly admits, "the movement is confused, uncertain, unconscious. And it is unconscious and confused because the Trade Unions do not understand the necessity for the formation of a class party for the purpose of expropriating the capitalist class."

How, therefore, Lafargue can hail the electoral victories of a confused, uncertain and unconscious movement as victories for International Socialism we shall understand, while to talk of "the cool energy of the British working class that no effort will weary and no defeat discourage," is to attribute to us virtues which are certainly not the common or peculiar characteristics of the British working class. We fear that Comrade Lafargue has allowed his kindly May-day desire to say something nice and appetizing to lead him to express himself in terms indicative of the idea that his acquaintance with English conditions is unhappily superficial—a notion which, knowing Lafargue's high standing in the intellectual world, is unheeded by the mass of laborites, but doenestied with his increasingly valuable contributions to Socialist thought, we are loth to entertain. We cannot agree that the election of the nominees of the Labour Representation Committee were working-class victories. We have shown them to have been achieved partly in alliance with capitalist Liberalism, and wholly by a class-uncious vote. Does our comrade believe that because Trade Unions stimulated, into political activity by certain legal decisions having the effect of endangering the financial reserves of their organizations, have entered into a loose association for the purpose of recovering a position they had thought themselves secure in, that therefore they have done anything to a definite class basis insipid to the political expression of capitalist interests? Why, every indication gives a flat denial to the supposition. Their leaders dare not formulate a program that would emphasize the antagonism of interest and dare not even if they desired it, proceed in such a fashion as would bring them into sharp conflict with the capitalist party, because the membership of their organizations have not yet withdrawn their allegiance from those capitalist parties. These leaders, some of whom at times profess 'Socialism' frankly drop their Socialism to secure the support of the L.R.C. Committee on the ground that to urge Socialism would alienate the Trade Unions who are not Conservative! And, so they proceed with the protection of the working class along the tortuous and unprofitable path of reform legislation, which, as our Comrade Lafargue will not be inclined to dispute, is not calculated to effect that social change among the workers which it is the sole purpose of the Socialist propaganda to facilitate, but it is, on the contrary, more likely to result in confusion and impotency, because the consciousness of the working class is diverted to the consideration of innumerable issues. We used only add here a quotation from a speech by one who is regarded as among the most advanced thinkers, directing this new pseudo-socialist organisation, which Lafargue recommends so favorably. He remarks: "The assumption that the Trade Unions of Great Britain are still far from recognizing, that their ideal is the fair wage for a fair day's work, is still far from being in proportion to the development of capitalist production." Thus: "For years the Association he represented had been trying to organize the working class for the High Wycombe Strike, and was so discouraged by the apparent impotence of the poor tradesmen that he would not have tried it."

As Trade Unions said that if the principle of the working class party on the Reform and the same for also good for the employees. As workers they wanted to see as strong a combination amongst the working class as could be formed. If the employers wanted to conserve the interests of free capital, the only possible way to do it was to prevent unfair cutthroat competition. The only way he could do it that was to combine with his big employers, and again they might come to understand the situation better. The Association for International Socialism, reported in the Society Circular for April, 1906.

MAI 1st, 1906.

The two days, the world over, the advance guard of the army of the revolution which is to break the chains of the private possessors of the means of life to dominate and keep in subservience the workers who alone manipulate those means in the process of production, will meet in demonstration of their determination. On this day, in every country where capitalism has entered into its development, the world wide struggle of the workers against the employers makes itself felt. We have shown them to have been achieved partly in alliance with capitalist Liberalism, and wholly by a class-uncious vote. Does our comrade believe that because Trade Unions stimulated, into political activity by certain legal decisions having the effect of endangering the financial reserves of their organizations, have entered into a loose association for the purpose of recovering a position they had thought themselves secure in, that therefore they have done anything to a definite class basis insipid to the political expression of capitalist interests? Why, every indication gives a flat denial to the supposition. Their leaders dare not formulate a program that would emphasize the antagonism of interest and dare not even if they desired it, proceed in such a fashion as would bring them into sharp conflict with the capitalist party, because the membership of their organizations have not yet withdrawn their allegiance from those capitalist parties. These leaders, some of whom at times profess 'Socialism' frankly drop their Socialism to secure the support of the L.R.C. Committee on the ground that to urge Socialism would alienate the Trade Unions who are not Conservative! And, so they proceed with the protection of the working class along the tortuous and unprofitable path of reform legislation, which, as our Comrade Lafargue will not be inclined to dispute, is not calculated to effect that social change among the workers which it is the sole purpose of the Socialist propaganda to facilitate, but it is, on the contrary, more likely to result in confusion and impotency, because the consciousness of the working class is diverted to the consideration of innumerable issues. We used only add here a quotation from a speech by one who is regarded as among the most advanced thinkers, directing this new pseudo-socialist organisation, which Lafargue recommends so favorably. He remarks: "The assumption that the Trade Unions of Great Britain are still far from recognizing, that their ideal is the fair wage for a fair day's work, is still far from being in proportion to the development of capitalist production." Thus: "For years the Association he represented had been trying to organize the working class for the High Wycombe Strike, and was so discouraged by the apparent impotence of the poor tradesmen that he would not have tried it."

As Trade Unions said that if the principle of the working class party on the Reform and the same for also good for the employees. As workers they wanted to see as strong a combination amongst the working class as could be formed. If the employers wanted to conserve the interests of free capital, the only possible way to do it was to prevent unfair cutthroat competition. The only way he could do it that was to combine with his big employers, and again they might come to understand the situation better. The Association for International Socialism, reported in the Society Circular for April, 1906.

THAT BLESSED WORD—UNITY!

With Easter comes the Annual Conferences of the bodies which, with one exception for the saving of words, call themselves Socialists, and with the conferences come also the customary demands, appeals, and entreaties for unity. And, indeed, there is no real reason why these bodies should not unite, seeing that in practice they do not differ. It is true the S.D.F. say they could not join the L.R.C. if it were ever so, because the L.R.C. is a non-Socialist body and an alliance might involve them in non-Socialist action. But as the S.D.F. is continually taking, not only non-Socialist, but anti-Socialist, action, this is an inexcusable position.

True again the L.R.C., say that they cannot join with the S.D.F. because the S.D.F. will not join the L.R.C.—a sort of argumentative circle which seems to carry the day.

True again neither S.D.F. nor L.R.C. will join with the Fabian Society because George Bernard Shaw, who is the leading member of the S.D.F., makes it clear that "the name under which he resides, nor would they, presumably, join that other occult body, the workers' cycling association, whose numerous members may also be members of Liberal or Tory