

Canada the Land of the Blest

(By F. J. McNey)

YOU all know Henry Ford, of "tin lizzie" fame, of course. Well, Henry is also the owner of a weekly publication that he calls "The Dear-born Independent," in which we find many interesting articles and items of information. In the issue of January 19th, 1924, of the said paper, we find an article entitled "Canada Again on Feet in Economic Come-back," written by Mr. Edward Jerome Dies. Mr. Dies starts out on his story of the "economic come-back" of Canada, like a transcontinental mail train thus:

"Canada is again on her feet. This nation of the Northern Lights, boasting a population of eight million souls and sprawling from ocean to ocean over an area larger than the United States, has staged an economic come-back that will be glorified by the historians."

How is that for a starter? You think it is fine if he can just keep it up. Well Mr. Dies not only keeps it up, but he gains speed as he goes along; just listen to what he has to say about the prosperity of the Canadian farmers.

"Whirring reapers have been pouring into the world's bread basket what may be the biggest wheat crop in Canada's history. Authoritative estimates have placed the yield well over 470,000,000 bushels, and the oats yield at around 450,000,000 bushels."

Farmers are jubilant over the outlook. All Canada is jubilant. "Canadian farmers have passed through all the unhappy conditions experienced by the American agrarians."

We are plumb delighted to hear that the Canadian farmers are so rich and prosperous and happy, and that their troubles are over forever. And we don't expect to hear another squawk out of them. Mr. Dies goes on to explain that designing revolutionary politicians have, from time to time, tried to seduce the Canadian farmers, but with little success. The farmers are neither to be frightened nor bribed into doing what is wrong. After a little more of this kind of stuff Mr. Dies goes on to tell us about the prosperity of other Canadian industries. Speaking of the lumber industry he says:

"During the present year this industry has gone forward at great speed and will mark up a 1923 return to the Canadian people of more than \$600,000,000. Virtually all of the forest area is publicly owned. A vast army of workers are engaged converting forest products into wealth. Forty million dollars will be paid to workers in the pulp and paper mills alone this year while nearly twice that sum will pass to workers in the lumbering industry."

It is worthy of note that even Mr. Dies is aware of the fact that the timber as it stands in the forest is not wealth. It is only after it has been converted by "a vast army of workers" that it becomes wealth. You will also note, that this "vast army of workers" in the lumber industry and in the pulp and paper mills of Canada produced wealth to the value of six hundred million dollars in the year 1923. Very good. Now, when I was going to school, forty million dollars plus twice that sum was equal to one hundred and twenty million dollars. And one hundred and twenty million dollars, in this case, is

equal to the total amount of wealth received in the form of wages by all the workers in the lumber industry, as well as those in the pulp and paper mills of Canada in the year 1923. Now if we subtract one hundred and twenty million dollars from six hundred million dollars we find that we have four hundred and eighty million dollars of a surplus, or eighty per cent, of the whole sum that we can't account for. Our books don't balance at all. What is this four hundred and eighty million dollars worth of wealth, and where did it go? It can't be surplus value because there are many people who will tell you that there is no such thing as surplus value. And yet we are told that the "vast army of workers" who produced this four hundred and eighty million dollars' worth of wealth never got it.

After telling us all about the prosperity of the workers in the lumber industry and in the pulp and paper mills of Canada who are so rich that they can afford to lose four-fifths of the wealth that they produce every year, and never miss it, Mr. Dies proceeds to inform us about the prosperity of various other industries, and finally winds up by asking the question, "What does the prosperity of the new Canada mean to the United States?" As this question appears to be quite in order, he tells us what the prosperity of the new Canada means to the U. S.

To the average American citizen it will come as somewhat of a surprise to learn that before the bells toll in the new year America's financial investment in Canada will equal if not surpass the British investment."

Becoming more explicit Mr. Dies tells us that our financial investment in Canada one year ago was two billion dollars, and it is estimated that we have fattened the jack-pot to the extent of another half billion during the last year. In other words, Canada is our backyard. That is what the prosperity of the new Canada means to "U. S."

Still running in high, Mr. Dies has now made a complete revolution of Canada's prosperous industries and returns to his point of departure to give a little more advice to the farmers. So here it is:

"So everything considered, Canada has cause to be jubilant. Her big crops from cheap lands will offset low wheat prices. Her industries are humming. Her finances are strong and sound. Her trade balances are good. There is work for all. In the West, where there is room for a population of millions, many new residents from foreign lands, all carefully selected, are taking up farm lands."

"Meantime the government, following a policy established several years ago, is doing everything possible to assist the farmer. This judicial assistance is not, however, of the kind that would appeal to the lazy farmer of a socialistic or communistic turn. The government helps the farmer who helps himself, and the Canadian farmer has proved that he can help himself."

Of course, nobody would expect the government to assist "the lazy farmer of a socialistic or communistic turn," but why any other kind of a farmer should need assistance in such a prosperous country as Canada is a mystery yet to be explained.

but so long as it exists it would be as criminal for us to ignore it in our propaganda as it would be for us to neglect the more probable alternative. To say that one who points out this probability as a very important consideration is "an advocate of violence" is a sophism—"a false argument intended to mislead."

Two articles by C. H. Norman in the Glasgow "Forward," Jan. 5 and 12, support my views. Com. Harrington has had an article of similar vein in his series, "Revolutions, Political and Social." They deal with the question of political power in Great Britain—the country we all have in mind when we talk of a possible peaceful outcome of the class struggle. The articles are entitled, "Citizenship and the General Election," and the author claims to have made a close examination of English politics over a period of twenty years, and, on occasion, to have had special opportunities of ascertaining the truth. What are his conclusions? I will quote a few of them only, to economize space, but I hope the Editor will find an opportunity to print the articles in full in a subsequent issue.

1. "Wherever you look in the various methods of government which have been adopted in the world, nowhere can you find any long period of control of government by a citizen-electorate representing the vast mass of the community."

2. "The men who really rule England are quite unknown . . . my conclusions are that the country is not, in the last resort, controlled by the Cabinet, by the House of Lords, by the House of Commons, by the bureaucracy, nor even by the bankers; . . . Let me quote the only known published statement on this subject by Robert Lowe, Lord Sherbrooke, on the influence of British statesmen, written when he was Chancellor of the Exchequer. 'I am now in almost the highest position that can be attained by any Englishman born into my rank of life; yet I feel that I have no real influence. Matters of the highest importance are not decided by us. A small inner chamber of the great aristocratic families arranges these affairs among themselves, and we have little to do but register their decrees.'"

3. "One of the most peculiar incidents in the war was the way in which Mr. Asquith's Liberal government was replaced by the Coalition government. Mr. Pease, the Education Minister, made the astonishing disclosure, carefully boycotted at the time, that the first intimation that the Cabinet received of Mr. Asquith's intention to reconstruct his cabinet was a circular letter in which Mr. Asquith informed his cabinet that, from the date of the receipt of the circular; he would take it that they had placed their resignations in his hands with full power to fill their places with other people!"

4. "The cabinet of Great Britain would appear to be nominees of some unknown and powerful forces, either a phalanx of the great families of England, or a group of financial autocrats, who are the individuals who manipulate the courses of international trade and the money markets of the world. But no one can tell with certainty; though one of the most famous state papers in the world is believed to be the document penned by Disraeli on this subject, which has never seen the light of day."

5. "The political transformation of England has been achieved through a series of revolutionary acts from the time of Magna Charta to the Civil War, the revolution of 1688 to the semi-revolutions of 1832 and 1911. There is no guarantee that the economic rights and liberties of Englishmen can be secured without similar efforts, as the redistribution of economic power is a more terrible problem than the redistribution of political power, for those who hold their economic privilege of exploiting Labor are certainly no more willing to surrender that right than Charles I. was to give up the royal prerogative to tax the people without the consent of the House of Commons. That is perhaps why I am sceptical as to the likelihood of there being permitted a Labor Government at a time such as this than are many people, for, unless it is to the advantage of the propertied class to resort to the temporary expedient of a Labor Government, there never was a time when the feeling of landlord capitalism was more hostile to the ideals of better conditions for the working masses of England than the present, except in the dark period of reaction which followed 1815."

If this is the situation in the most constitutionally democratic country in the capitalist world, how long will "C's" process of gradualism take to achieve concrete results?

Another sophism:—"Economic motives serve for him to explain all human conduct . . ." I was dealing with class interests, and in that conflict economic motives function to the practical exclusion of all others. Individuals occasionally act with an apparently single-hearted devotion to ideals and principles and can be given credit for it. The prohibition campaign was initiated in Canada by idealists for moral purposes. It was taken up by the employing class from economic motives, (much to the dismay of the purists) and only then did it become a live political issue.

Strange that he should accuse me in the next breath of "idealizing an individual man!" I quoted the case of Shaftesbury as the spokesman of the more farsighted business interests who saw the danger of seriously depleting the labor supply by unchecked and unregulated exploitation.

The most glaring sophism of all is his distortion of the obviously limited meaning of my brief sentence in which I referred to the present position of the Labor Party in Great Britain, advancing the suggestion that, whatever its shortcomings might be, it could hardly be

Correspondence

"BY THE WAY"

Ed. Clarion:—

"C's" reply in the Clarion of Feb. 1, does not get us anywhere as far as a reply to my query: "What kind of a class struggle does 'C' present to us" is concerned. If he thinks fit to characterize my arguments as those of an ignorant demagogue, it may be my privilege to style the line of "argument" he adopts in his last article as that of a sophist, for it reeks of sophistry. Take a few instances.

First Col.—"His thought is violent, too violent to have a coherent background of philosophy"—"J. H. B. seems to deny the efficacy of any method other than violence, and is therefore committed to defending it and its propagation as a fundamental principle of socialism." Who is not reminded of Metcalfe's charge to the jury—"Force! force! force!" as purporting to describe correctly the whole intent and purpose of the Winnipeg defendants' propaganda activity? It should surely not be necessary

to refer to the fact that a Socialist who recognizes the class struggle between workers and exploiters should also be bound to take cognizance of the very probable fact that the capitalist class, being in possession of the repressive forces of the state, would use them to the limit to preserve their rights of exploitation in defiance of the expressed will of the majority, however constitutionally the latter might be registered. A peaceful, orderly and constitutional issue of the struggle is to be desired by all means, and, as far as I am concerned, and the Party propaganda as far as I have observed it, that has been the line along which we have striven. If, at the same time, we have pointed out that, in the very nature of the struggle and the vast interests at stake, a peaceful outcome would very probably be denied us and the solution arrived at through the final arbitrament of force, then we have only done our duty as we saw it. All our efforts have been directed to securing such an overwhelming display of support for the principles we advocate that the exploiting class would realize the futility of resistance. We all, ("C" expected), doubtless realize it to be a forlorn hope, for the ruling class has shown itself capable many times in the past of forcing the issue and defeating revolutionary movements before the latter were ready,