

Anthropoidia and Canaille

By F. W. MOORE.

WE have often heard it said that humanity might reasonably be regarded as belonging to two main categories, namely: those who exploit others, and those who are themselves exploited, but we don't ever remember having heard it suggested that the major part of capitalistic society might, quite as appropriately, be subdivided into two classes under the names of anthropoidia and canaille.

Far be it from us to insinuate that all capitalists and workers are of the development consistent with enrollment under these headings. In millions of them the consciousness of class with the eternal struggle involved, has been awakened; and to these there is no delusion as to the ephemeral nature of their stewardship or to the abiding importance of the development of humanity. They have already followed Tennyson's advice by "casting out the ape."

Nevertheless we cannot hide from ourselves the outstanding fact that to numberless others of the fraternity, life has no meaning except in-as-far as it contributes, by hook or by crook, to the acquisition of dollars and cents.

It is the naked truth about this section of the capitalistic world that we mean shall form the gist of this article. It shall be the truth unapparelled by the conventional veil of euphony so that the untrammelled vision of the anthropoidal capitalist may be the means of making him "see himself as others see him," and bring home to his consciousness a realization of the senseless delay in development that the tactics of the federated anthropoidia and canaille, are inflicting on the long suffering human race.

The purely anthropoidal section of capitalistic society is, of course, class conscious. The canaille is not. Men included in the former recognise the tremendous power of class solidarity, and by whatever political name they are known, a federation of their forces always materialises when a common danger threatens their capitalistic institutions. The canaille, on the other hand may be known, as the name implies, by the canine fidelity of its members to old parties and systems. Most graphically are they described by Dr. Crane in "Farm and Home" for August 14, 1924. In referring to classes he says: "One exercises its emotions in hating other classes," and, of course, with such a class we are not concerned at all. The next line, however, shows his familiarity with our friends; "the other thinks that his class is as good as any, hence the class feeling does not bother him." Nothing could be more precisely true than the statement involved in the last seven words. Such a man may be right in considering that his class may be, at least morally, as good as any other; but if he imagines it has the means to compete in the acquisition of those characteristics by which classes are graded now-a-days, with the class that has unlimited access to this world's goods, he only shows his abysmal ignorance of the fact that at the point of production, in the mines, mills and factories he often works several hours a day for nothing for the anthropoidia, that is after he has produced sufficient to support himself and family in accordance with the standard of living that happens to be in vogue in the country in which he is employed: consequently his class, which includes over 90% of the combined manual and mental workers, is doomed to comparative poverty; yet, in the eyes of the cheerful canaille, it is as good as any other. Are not the universities and high-schools almost free? Do not therefore the sons of poverty have the same chances to develop as the wealthy? Quite logical indeed would this argument be were it not for the fact that the environment of poverty is rarely such as will induce a taste for a university, but rather be the means of impressing on a would-be aspirant the necessity of looking for a job

about the time the wealthier man's son is thinking of entering the high school. The vast majority of the poorer people do that, and continue working for a mere existence throughout life. Contrast this condition with that of the class with whom he fondly imagines his is on an equality. Let us find approximately what are the resources on this class.

According to Dr. Whitney in an article on page 639 in the "Scientific Monthly" for June 1924: "The power outside his own muscles that man has learned to control, has grown to one-hundred man-power for every man in the country." Now consider the improved industrial conditions that have evolved since the days of the industrial revolution; if one examines the "Vancouver Province" for February 11th, 1923, he will see a long list of examples illustrating the point, two of which will be sufficient to quote here: "In coal mines an automatic conveyor for pier loading with twelve men replaces one hundred and fifty. . . ."

"Two men unloading pig-iron with an electric magnet and crane replace one hundred and twenty-eight."

Taking into consideration the fact that the ordinary man before the industrial revolution, made a more independent living than he does today at his precarious job, we must conclude that a large part of the 99% increase in production to the man, referred to by Dr. Whitney, is appropriated and made use of as a means of acquiring such education and culture as is available, by the class that the comparatively poverty stricken member of the canaille compares in equality to his own.

Poor gentle canaille! Don't you know that you must remain a block-head for ever if you don't break away from that enervating trance that prevents your class becoming conscious of its condition? Do you not know "There are none so blind as those that won't see?"

In the same paper—we think it was the Vancouver Province of September 8th, there appears the following on page 3: "Only Liberia Ready to Cut out War-budget—Great Powers Refuse to Promise Limit to Military Expenditures": in other words Little Liberia alone—we suppose because she is so little—acceded to a request of the League of Nations that as a preliminary to disarmament members promise not to exceed this year their 1923 naval, military, and aviation appropriations. "A majority of the governments replied announcing a desire to reduce their armaments"—but business is business, therefore they declined to accept any restrictions whatever, while France is openly professing (see column in the Province to the left of the one quoted) the necessity of force, and holding a national war-dance at Meaux for the purpose of celebrating the anniversary of the Battle of the Marne. In the face of these facts we challenge the world to deny that the majority of its inhabitants are not justly described by the compound title used above.

Why should there be this insane but inevitable tendency towards a world-wide throat-slitting, just because the machinery of the world is able to produce far more commodities than its owners can dispose of in an ever-dwindling market? Proof of this is easily obtained.

The official bulletin of the Methodist Federation for Social Service for October 1921 has this to say concerning interrupted production: "In normal times many essential industries show a high unemployment once a year or oftener: The clothing worker is idle about 31% of the year; the shoe-maker spends only 65% of his time at work; the building trades worker is employed only 63% of his time; during the last thirty years the bituminous coal-miners were idle on an average of ninety-three working days in the year." Does not that indicate that the ownership of the few, who can only employ men as long as it profits them to do so, is respon-

sible? If Dr. Whitney's statistics in the Scientific Monthly are genuine, then men can produce today one hundred times more than they could at times when by manual labor they supplied the markets of every country with commodities sufficient to satisfy the needs of the population. We feel quite safe then in asserting that if, in former times, by manual labour man could supply his needs in the markets of the world, he could now, and we say it after making an allowance for expenses of machinery and an allowance that is too liberal to be disputed, supply them from fifty to seventy or eighty times over; and yet the anthropoidia, considering only profits for an almost negligible percentage of the population, imagine they can squeeze this high supply of commodities into a compass from fifty to eighty times too small. Monkeys might try to store a ton of nuts in a pint pot, after it was filled, but we doubt it.

To find a motive for acts more suitable to lunatics than to men of affairs, one must prospect in the regions pervaded by class-consciousness. This is precisely what the canaille has neglected to do, while the anthropoidia in doing it lost sight of nature's proffered opportunity to develop themselves, and beheld only the deceitful little dollars and cents that have lured them, and are now luring them steadily towards their own destruction.

HEAVEN AND HELL.

There is nothing surprising in President Eliot's recently expressed opinion that he could not look forward with great pleasure to an eternity passed in any of the heavens imagined by popular theology. The remark is the sincere expression of a man who is drawing to the close of a long and active life and cannot imagine himself as content in even the most blessed idleness ever conceived. His is the natural reaction of the worker, and it is doubtful if anyone ever really longed for eternal rest unless he had been one of those temperamentally incapable of doing anything likely to make him need even a shorter repose.

The crudest imagination can picture a hell terrible enough to satisfy anyone's idea of a place unpleasant as an eternal residence. But men have come by slow stages to forget its existence, and it is not surprising that they should come to a point where they refuse to take seriously pictures of eternal bliss which, even when conceived by the most poetic minds, have always been singularly vapid, suggestive of a condition calculated to bore to extinction the most indolent man within the space of a very small fraction of eternity. The popular preachers, however, having on the whole an extremely low opinion of human character, give up reluctantly the threat of damnation; and, since most of them seem sincerely to believe that vice is attractive and virtue dull, they will be ready to abandon the world as inevitably lost if they can neither threaten nor bribe the ordinary man into being good. They have generally been more loath than laymen to admit that virtue is its own reward; but it really looks as though, for the future, the world would have to get along as best it may with men who, like President Eliot, are willing to work and work well—not in order to escape hell or to win eternal rest but simply because they find in work the incentive they need.

Before we regret too much the good old days when heaven was heaven indeed and hell was boiling hot, it would be well to consider what was really believed. Our grandfathers may have been content with celestial harpers and heavenly choirs, but they themselves were, after all, degenerates from the primitive faith. In the days which were really good and really old imaginations were more vigorous and piety less emasculated by the unrighteous