

livity; for factual experimentation; for the sure insight of intelligence. The spirit of the machine age, in driving—not drifting—us, away from the inert antiquity into a future vibrant and glamorous, with the impulse of awakened consciousness. It is forcing society to a proletarian uniformity. It is compelling thought as never before. It has thrust habit into the background of oblivion as it has already thrust its laborist anachronisms into the discard. "Be careful of labor's institutions." Nonsense. We need worry as little about labor's institutions, as about the nitrogen nodules at the roots of the log-umcs. For just as sure as Capital stands on the verge of a new crises, so, in reflex, we, the proletariat, stand on the verge of a wider and sterner conflict. Out of the clashing storms of that conflict; out of its new constellated facts; out of the square alignment of an Imperialist oligarchy and an utterly dispossessed society; out of crumbling tradition, and the shattering of time soiled institutions, there is, even now, arising a new, dominant, militant, body of activity, nursing neither ancient shibboleth nor quondam desire, but free, with the dissociation of completed disinheritance, to fashion its new organization from the meaningless tumults of the re-conditioning of the social forces; and to fresco them with the knowledge of power, impassioned with the visioning of related reality.

Away with the past and its trammelling. Away with the "class consciousness that eventuates out of habit and sentiment." Away from the nurseries of borrowed psychology. Away from the "definitions of problems in the light of human nature," and the vagaries of "ways and means in the feasibilities" of authority. On to the straight issue, that is born out of the straight conflict. It is the slogan of the new freedom; the citadel against which all antagonism beats in vain. A steadfast beacon, amidst the flickering rush fires of confusion. Socialism is not feeble because it is reactionary, nor deserted because it is false. It is weak, for it is misunderstood: isolated because it is unknown. But a division can never obviate misunderstanding. That is the prime province of class knowledge. As the tense strain and struggle of daily life is deepened and darkness with continual disappointment and infertile endeavor; when existence is toiled in more precarious uncertainty; when the most cherished possessions of life and relief are naked as the towers of antiquity; the colossal chicanery of rule and right must rise insistent, in spite of all duplicity. With that insistency comes the frame of mind irresistible with its intolerable conditions; keen with the unveiled instance of stripped reality. It is no dragging process or Utopia. It is the immediacy of the all compelling economic swelling full blossomed out of its crystallised stagnation; the invincibility of dispossession that must dominantly exist, and the restrictive bonds of Capitalist property right can be set aside—and will be set aside—at once, when the great white light of the class issue floods our consciousness with understanding. Let us be faithful to our Marx, in spirit and in truth. The form will take care of itself. Let us point the lesson, dot the i's, stress our social slavery; emphasise the class struggle; and with unwavering consistency maintain the undesirable fact that our one and only freedom and relief from degradation and life long toil and poverty, is the utter abolition of capitalist society, not by planks and stages, but in sweeping totality; not by paltry reform and habit, but by the invincibility of social understanding.

The mass of the people are ignorant with the un-epithelial sophistries of power. They are steeped in the mire of tradition. They are imbued with the puerilities of barbarism. But they are not fools and dunces. They are the fawns of caste. But they are not the sodden clay of the theocracy. They are brimming over with suppressed life and energy. They are virile with the throbbing hosts of progress. And the moment they are free, the moment the versatility of their bonded capacities are touched with the rising sun of reality, their capacities will unfold the bounty of summer and society will soar, on the wings of its new freedom to a new grandeur of brilliance, that will make the brightest past,

look like a buttering candle. Everywhere and always let us carry the straight message of socialism. Speak it with unflinching tongue. Present it with unambiguous clarity. Preach it with simple fervor, maintain it with unflickering consistency. Then will the trodden masses, in the gathering storms of imperialist oppression, rally round the only party that can explain their miseries and point their remedy; and turn the meaningless rancor against man and institution; against human nature and its distortion, into the conscious weapon of triumphing revolution. Never was the need greater; material more prolific; hope more abundant. On with the class struggle. It is the little wicket beyond the slough of despond that opens on to the smiling ways of life. B.

P.S.—Midriff still safe. It is neither so conspicuous as it might be, or as we could wish it be. Hence we urge, with the liveliest feelings, a policy of "ca' canny." R.

### MARXISM IN SOCIAL THEORY.

(Continued from page 4)

ing antagonisms of the social process—it is like Hegel's dialectic, a conception of history and a method of investigation at the same time. . . . Marx handled this method with unsurpassed mastery; with its aid he formulated the laws of the evolution of Socialism. In his earliest works, 'The Holy Family' (1844) and the 'Poverty of Philosophy' (1847), written when he was formulating his materialistic conception of history, as also in his 'Capital', it is with the dialectic of Hegel that he investigates these laws. Here follows a quotation from 'The Holy Family.'

"Proletariat and Riches (later Marx would have said Capital) are antitheses. As such they constitute a whole; both are manifestations of the world of private property. The question to be considered is the specific position which both occupy in the antithesis. To describe them as two sides of a whole is not a sufficient explanation. Private property, as private property, as riches, is compelled to preserve its own existence, and along with it that of its antithesis, the Proletariat. Private property satisfied in itself is the positive side of the antithesis. The Proletariat, on the other hand, is obliged, as Proletariat, to abolish itself, and along with it private property, its conditioned antithesis, which makes it the Proletariat. It is the negative side of the antithesis, the internal source of unrest, the disintegrated and disintegrating Proletariat. . . . The Proletariat fulfils the judgment which private property by the creation of the Proletariat suspends over itself, just as it fulfils the judgment which wage-labor suspends over itself in creating alien riches and its own condemnation. If the Proletariat triumphs, it does not thereby become the absolute side of society, for it triumphs only by abolishing itself and its opposite. In this way both the Proletariat and its conditioned opposite, private property, are done away with. (The Holy Family)

"The dialectic method is again described in a few sentences on pages 420-421 of the third volume of 'Capital' (German), where we read: 'In so far as the labor process operates merely between man and nature, its simple elements are common to every form of its social development. But any given historical form of this process further develops its material foundations and its social forms. When it has attained a certain degree of maturity the given historical form is cast off for a higher one. That the moment of such a crisis has arrived is shown as soon as there is deepening and widening of the contradiction and antithesis between the conditions of distribution, and consequently also the historical form of the conditions of production corresponding to them, on the one hand, and the forces of production, productive capacity, and the state of evolution of its agents, on the other. There then arises a conflict between the material development of production and its corresponding social form'.

"But the Hegelian dialectic appears most strikingly in the famous twenty-fourth chapter (sec 7) of the first volume of 'Capital' (German) p. 837 Kerr ed.), where the evolution of capitalism from small middle-class ownership through all phases up to the Socialist revolution is comprehensively outlined in bold strokes: 'The capitalist method of appropriation, which springs from the capitalist method of production, and therefore capitalist private property, is the first negation of individual private property based on one's own labor. But capitalist production begins with the inevitableness of a natural pro-

cess its own negation. It is the negation of the negation.' Here we have the three stages: the thesis—private property; the antithesis—capitalism; the synthesis—common ownership." (M. Beer).

In a previous article I said that the Hegelian dialectical scheme of causation had been dropped by the later modern science; its mode was obsolete. Readers will appreciate the fact and, I think, though it had its great values, the grain of a less romantic, more commonplace, matter-of-fact scheme of the process of evolution associated with the name of Darwin. Next issue I propose to deal with the English classical school of economics in respect as its postulates and preconceptions influenced Marx, and also, I hope, bring this review of his theory of history to a close by including in it an outline of his theory. Somehow, my objective, those quotations from Marx, which are to show that the anti-Labor party position of the S. P. of C. is not Marx's position, as claimed, retreats as I advance. However, I recall, as I remember it, one of those haunting sayings of "Geordie's" and am comforted: "It is not where we are going that is so important, as what we pick up on the way." In the meantime, as a sop to my impatient critics, I offer them the recommendation to read the opening passages of the second section of the Communist Manifesto, which open with explicit announcements, as below:—

"In what relation do the Communists stand to the proletarians as a whole?

"The Communists do not form a separate party opposed to other working class parties.

"They have no interests separate and apart from those of the proletariat as a whole.

"They do not set up any sectarian principles of their own by which to shape and mould the Proletariat movement.

"The Communists are distinguished from the other working class parties by this only," etc., etc.

And that's (Marx and Engels).

And that is what I advocate. In that item of Marxism, at any rate, I am nearer Marx than my critics. There are no chances for various interpretations of the terms of those announcements. They are as clear and forthright and as free from dubiety as the instructions of a sergeant-major on parade. Readers may see, as I do, that, already in my part presentation of the Marxian theory, the terms of those announcements are implied in the theory, they issue by inference out of it, as of necessity: the human forces in antithetical opposition to each other in the dialectic of history in its modern stage, are the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.

Do Comrade MacDonald and the rest of those who support the anti-Labor party position set themselves over and against the founders of revolutionary socialism by repudiating what they set down in the Communist Manifesto as a fundamental tactic for revolutionary socialists? If so, let them say so to that effect, as I do whenever I have occasion to differ with Marx. It does not do to differ with him, and at the same time keep up appearances of orthodoxy by a barrage of stone throwing at my (acknowledged) unorthodoxy; for readers are thus liable to be misled into getting an impression that my critics must be dispensers of the Marxian word, pure and uncontaminated of personal predilections read into it, or by considerations of a modern kind, and give them credit or otherwise, accordingly. People who live in glass houses should not throw stones, say I. Come now, comrades, confession is good for the soul and for honest discussion! C.

## MANIFESTO

of the  
SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA  
(Fifth Edition)

For copy ..... 10 cents

For 25 copies ..... \$2

Post Paid.