

KODAKS BY THE WAY.

(Continued from page 1)

the system by which alone they live, the new social interests, servitors of the new humanity, now developed and organized, take control and build, like the fragile corals, a new life and nature on a wider cycle of development, on the ruins of the old that has perished.

Obviously man plays a part—and an increasing part—in the drama. Yet, so far, the limitations of his ancient heritage confine him to the role of creature. The game itself, its power and sense and sweep is latent in the environing media. Within that environment man is compelled to act, and to act in accordance with environing need. So he is the child of his circumstances. He does not contrive; he follows. He does not devise custom; he submits to it. He does not create his conditions; he accepts them. Out of his ever great and changing necessity he is forced to struggle against his conditions. And in this struggle he learns both to contrive, to devise and create. But he is also forced, by the laws of his development, to create, along with his devices, a new web of circumstance which enmeshes him as irrevocably as the series that went before. While at the same time the law of his being urges him to prune the rose bush of desire to the contour of his vocation. It is only society itself, threatened in its satisfactions and preservation, that can inaugurate the tremendous task of widening the borders of its habitude. And then only when its life forces, driven in on themselves, are compelled to new outlets for their spontaneous energies, new vestments for their modified progeny.

As a working class party, a party claiming the interests of the wealth producers, i.e., therefore, Socialism, is it not evident that if we must play within the rules of the game we cannot dance to the piping of exigent opportunity? Non-socialist parties cannot serve the workers and retain political place. Even if their policies did contain gems of value they would be useless; because, if they were not truly evaluated by those who must give them effect, they would be jockeyed out of court and memory. If such contrivances were useful would we be the "intelligent electorate" of today? Or conversely, would an intelligent appreciation of political society require such devices? Every party going its own way, after its own light, and functioning, is neither a help nor a principle. Such division is only another sign of the incidence of Capitalist oppression that, in growing extremity, forces man self interested against man, and group in conflict against group. Primarily it will neither be our arguments nor our appeal than can weld their refractory antagonisms. It will be the mighty Napoleon of finance that will whelm in defeat those separate interests and merge them in the percept of a common ideal. To function together in unity we must have a common principle. And a common principle implies a common thought. Without that thought, function and principle are but masks, jostling in the market place of opportunity. Indeed, the function of an organization derives from its principle. It serves its interests; gives it vitality. It is the spring on which its objective turns; and (socially speaking) if it does not pivot on fact, it will pivot on confusion. All labor bodies are but vendors of commodities, mercantile or political. As such they function, for such is their principal. And in the act, they betray themselves—and us. And to dream of collusion with such is to prove ourselves quaint votaries of Queen Mab.

To get Socialism we must want it. To want it we must know it. And the teacher who must prove it to us is social experience. There is no short cut to it. It cannot be forced upon us. It is not a chance resultant. It will not descend upon us like the mantle of Elijah. We cannot jump the wall of environment; and we will not take it from a plate. That is, we will not accept it—in the mass—by argument. It must spring, like Athena, grown and panoplied, from the jealous monster who would stifle its advent. It must come, like an armed man, conscious of its power. It must come, clear eyed, passionate with reality, out of the fever and tumult of

common life, that withers our every hope; thwarts the simplest desire; seduces the most reasonable expectation; that makes merit and initiative a laughing stock; that brings the most earnest endeavor to a piece of bread; that corrodes with the vitrol of gain the home, the heart, the soul, even life itself; and destroys in the dripping crucibles of Capital the image of humanity.

To advance the cause of labor is to advance Socialism. And to serve Socialism is to plead the cause of Socialism. Not fraternity or affiliation; not conciliation or custom; neither expediency nor compromise. None of those things. But what it is;—the democratic control of the common means of social life, for the single heritage of society. Most workers will listen; for it pulses with terrible reality. Some will accept for their life proves a witness to its truth. And those who turn away from our paltry logic with disdain will give ear to the impregnable logic of time. When we do that, we do all the conditions will effectively allow. When we see that, we can be sidetracked no more. And when we have that, we have all.

POLITICAL REPRESENTATION.

(Continued from page 2)

machine, and alone renders legitimate civil engagements which without that would be absurd, tyrannical, and subject to great abuse."

In the formulation of this general will, all individuals share alike. Here Rousseau proclaims the doctrine of absolute political equality with a vengeance. If the state, he says, is composed of ten thousand and citizens, then each member of the state has one ten-thousandth part of the sovereign authority. If the people is composed of one hundred thousand men, then the citizen's suffrage is reduced to a hundred-thousandth part, and he has obviously ten times less influence in the formation of the laws. Hence it follows, declares the philosopher, "that the larger the state becomes, the less liberty there is."

But Rousseau is face to face with the fact that unanimity among citizens is impossible and that the general will cannot be the will of the whole ten thousand or the whole hundred thousand, as the case may be, but must, perforce, be the will of a certain fraction of the citizens. He boldly meets the problem, and following the old philosophers he holds that the exercise of sovereignty is by majority. The general will of which he makes so much, is in practice, the will of the majority. With fine confidence he contends that the will of the majority is right and works for the good of the state. The minority is wrong; it is nothing, because it follows from the nature of the social contract that the minority must accept the decrees of the majority. With courage of his convictions, he says: "When, however, the opinion contrary to mine prevails, it only shows that I was mistaken, and that what I had supposed to be general will was not general. If my individual opinion had prevailed, I should have done something other than I had intended, and then I should not have been free."

As he contemplates the consequences of this bold doctrine Rousseau shrinks a bit. There is a limit even to the self-abnegation of the reformer. In Chapter VI of the Fourth Book Rousseau safeguards the oppressed minority in certain fundamental matters by requiring an extraordinary majority of two-thirds—even three-fourths in some cases. But this is rather an afterthought, though a very serious one. It does not vitally affect his extreme doctrines of individualization. Neither did it check materially the fateful consequences of his general doctrine of universal male equality. Rousseau is aware of the dangers of mere numerical majorities, but he cannot escape altogether the results of his general levelling down. There is simply a limit to which he can allow the logic of his argument to carry him. Just as he excludes women from his "people" so he sets some metes and bounds to the doings of the mere majority.

Nothing further need be said to show how revolutionary was Rousseau's doctrine for the old order, or for any order. Under it the rights and property of all groups and all classes become subject to the will of the numerical majority. Any system of

government founded on a compromise, or a balance of interest, in defiance of mere numbers on the one side or the other, thus becomes not only indefensible, but immoral and undemocratic. Written to exalt the individual, it subjects him to a new tyranny—the will of the majority. For his sufferings in conscience or in property, it offers him the consoling information that his individual will, being contrary to the general will, is wrong, and, in fact, not his intention at all!

(To be continued.)

THE DECAY OF BUSINESS ENTERPRISE.

(Continued from page 6)

virtues of allegiance, piety, servility, graded dignity, class prerogative, and prescriptive authority would greatly conduce to popular content and to the facile management of affairs. Such is the promise held out by a strenuous national policy.

The reversion trend given by warlike experience and warlike preoccupations, it is plain, does not set backward to the regime of natural liberty. Modern business principles and the modern scheme of civil rights and constitutional government rest on natural-rights ground. But the system of natural rights is a halfway house. The warlike culture takes back to a more archaic situation that preceded the scheme of natural rights, viz. the system of absolute government, dynastic politics, devolution of rights and honors, ecclesiastical authority, and popular submission and squalor. It makes not for a reinstatement of the Natural Rights of Man but for a reversion to the Grace of God.

(To be continued.)

ECONOMIC CAUSES
OF WAR

By PETER T. LEOKIE

NOW READY

Preface by the author.

132 PAGES.

Per Copy, 25 Cents.

Ten copies up, 20 cents each.

Post Paid.

Literature Price List

	Cloth Bound.	Per Copy
Critique of Political Economy		1.05
Revolution and Counter Revolution (Marx)		1.15
Ancient Society		1.25
Capitalist Production (First Nine and 22 Chapters "Capital," vol. 1, (Marx)		1.00
Vital Problems in Social Evolution		80c
Science and Revolution		80c
The Militant Proletariat		80c
Evolution Social and Organic		80c
Puritanism	75c	80c
Ethics and History		80c
Germ of Mind in Plants		80c
The Triumph of Life		80c
Fenestravik		80c
Social Revolution (Kautsky)		80c
Origin of Species (Darwin)		1.25
Essays on Materialist		
Conception of History (Labriola)		1.50
Social Studies (Lafargue)		.80
	Paper Covers.	Per Copy
Evolution of Man (Prof. Bolsche)		30c
Wage-Labor and Capital		40c
Independent Working Class Education		40c
Communist Manifesto		40c
The Present Economic System (Prof. W. A. Bonger)		40c
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific		40c
Slave of the Farm		40c
Manifesto, S. P. of C.		40c
Causes of Belief in God (Lafargue)		40c
The State and Revolution (Lenin)		40c
Value, Price and Profit (Marx)		40c
Two Essays on History (C. Stephenson and G. Deville)		40c
Economic Causes of War (Leokie)		40c
Civil War in France (Marx)		40c
Christianism and Communism (Bishop W. M. Brown)		40c
	Quantity Rates on Paper-Covered Pamphlets:	
Two Essays on History	25 copies	\$12.00
Communist Manifesto	25 copies	\$12.00
Wage-Labor and Capital	25 copies	\$12.00
Present Economic System	25 copies	\$12.00
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific	25 copies	\$12.00
Slave of the Farm	25 copies	\$12.00
Manifesto of S. P. of C.	25 copies	\$12.00
Evolution of Man	25 copies	\$12.00
Causes of Belief in God	25 copies	\$12.00
Value, Price and Profit	25 copies	\$12.00
Economic Causes of War	25 copies	\$12.00
Christianism and Communism	25 copies	\$12.00

All prices include postage.

Make all moneys payable to E. McLeod, P. O. Box 710, Vancouver, B. C. Add discount to cheques.