



# The Old Story

OUR comrade makes two statements with which we agree whole-heartedly—1st, that his reply is "a return, more or less remotely, to the 'straight issue.'" It is,—exceedingly remote. 2nd, that it is "weird stuff." So weird indeed it might be an effusion from the Psychological Research Society. And he makes two statements which cause wonder as to whether he reads the articles criticised. We did not say, or imply, that "humanity stepped maturely developed into its straight issues," nor that there was "a separate organ of knowledge, by which peoples chose their particular directions." To which we will return later.

Our comrade's opening remarks seem to mean, that the material conditions of developing society, in all their varied interactions continually tend to the creation of a wider humanity, provided that "no overmastering circumstances arise to defeat the formation of social institutions." With which we have no quarrel. That is certainly enough, the circumstantial of human evolution, but it is no criterion of social revolution.

The question of the straight issue is a direct question of tactics, i.e., whether socialism be achieved through class-conscious understanding, or by the stepping stones of labor reform. It has no direct mediacy, with the broader aspect of "humanity." Consequently, "humanity" does not "step maturely into its straight issues;" but through them it rises to higher wellbeing, and the vantage of its progress is proportionate to all sociality of preception. In this human sense, "the life process is a going concern, the pace set by productive development." But it is not a going concern, as a process of growth, like the birth of an oak from an acorn. It is a going concern only in the mechanical connectiveness of the physical, like the development of an invention. In fact, society is an invention. Consequently it is capable of perfection by the visioning mind, and therefore responsive to the conditioning of mind. Hence the issues of the way, the forces that influence its progress, are detailed and determined by the multifarious vicissitudes of conscious development. It may lag, or it may change by sudden mutations. It may be set back to develop with a new vigor. "Our" own capitalist system from the days of that bluff rascal, Henry VIII. proceeded with conservative deliberateness, until the coming of the power machine. Its development, in the last 100 years, overtops the mightiest Empire of all the ages. In half that time Germany rose from a 5th rate power to a first place in the sun. And in four tragic years reduced to a colony of the powers. Japan is a close second, and in their progress they overthrow the strongest traditions and most established aptitudes, replacing them with their own new particular interests—and their habits. The potent cause of that advance was the close perception of that interest—sharpened by its own conditioning or diffident with the incidence of yesterday. Its virility concordant with its freedom from trammelling convention. Caused by the process of conditions, my Com. not by the process of habits. Created out of the sensitive fabric of time-need, whose discipline in turn, creates, moulds and textures habit and aptitude.

Clearly enough, therefore, "material development unfolds the issues and we must deal with them, adequately or not, as we see them." Hence, if we see them in the twilight haze of "practical politics" they are draped in the unlovely garb of trade issues. If we see them in the clear light of the socialist concept; in the uncompromising features of the class struggle. "Maturity," says our Com. "comes only by struggle over issues, by living the life of the process. . . It is a nature imposed necessity." Our Com. rambles along like a bible student on the periphery of the main issue. Due perhaps to the prismatic hues of the inner mind, or steeple chasing, barebacked on Pegasus, without a bridle.

Certainly to struggle is a necessity. But taking

"maturity" in its implied ethical sense, i.e., success; developed potentiality; that maturity, follows of necessity, only within the ambit of its particular conditioning. Outside of the imposed terms the struggle is a losing quantity—or an expression of X. Consequently, the life of the process, is commensurate with the process of the particular struggle; and the issues of that struggle are therefor narrowed down, to the issue of the terms of its law. And in particular case, the term of its law, is the class-conscious perception of our social conditioning. Sequentially, therefor, all reform—of institution or condition—that leaves that percept untouched (as it must do) will produce struggle, but not maturity; will produce confusion, but not regeneration. And the whole paraphernalia of its expediencies, of palliation which are no more, than the ethic of temperate exploitation, can only lead, in a longer or shorter term, to all the aggrandisement of the ruling class, on one hand, to the progressive degradation of the subject class, on the other; and to the final ruination of capitalist civilisation. But, that society will come to economic freedom by that route, is neither a necessity nor a certainty. That may be the meandering track society may elect to follow, i.e., its contingent circumstance may so impel it. And even at that its "maturity" is finally dependent on the clear perception of its slavery, and consequently, its cause and relief.

In effect, Com. "C" admits this, for he says "neither can a new class . . . create a new social life . . . merely because the old society has become intolerable." His proviso "that unless the necessary cultural development has already taken place" is beside the point. Because a new class cannot create the institutions of its complex, nor the cultural developments of that complex, until by whatsoever means, it has swept away the hampering institutions of its predecessor. It can only sweep away those institutions when it has developed the necessary power, and power is the product of an understanding. The development of the capitalist system has already organized social production. Its further development is almost completely prohibited by its own necessary restrictions. Consequently the inevitable tensions of its social organisation must tend towards social comprehension of that organisation. And from the cleavage strain of that comprehension springs the unity of common interest. In other words, the Capitalist system—and all its self-compelled remedial activities—prepare the mechanical form of the revolution. But its mental reflex has its roots in the perception of the class struggle, and because that reflex flourishes only in the potent soil of antagonism, it can not only, not advance through reform, i.e., the organisation of its restriction, but in complete struggle against it, in the complete negation of the organized forms of established conventions. Moreover, neither the conditions nor the methods of the medieval bourgeois are any guide to us, the modern proletariat. The power arrayed against us now, is mightier and more concentrated, than against them. The conditions of their revolution, were purely political. They could buy and bribe and dieck and counterdeal. They could share the rule and the plunder. The conditions of our revolution are social. We can neither buy nor bribe. We cannot share the office. We have no plunder to divide. And we have every tradition of authority to violate and set aside. "We have nothing to lose, but our chains; a world to gain." And because of the mighty imports of the conditions and the stakes, our sole hope of triumph is the clearest undeviating issue of the class struggle. The labor party on the other hand, is a younger son of that vanished bourgeoisie. That is why its methods are the traditions of extinct traders—the petty hucksterery of "freedom." That is why it is not an expression of independence. That is why it cannot call the bluff of tradition. And it never will. It will decay with the institutional system of which it is a composite

member. Only its skeletal form will remain upon which a new virility of untraditioned progress, will construct a mightier edifice of knit and visioned resistance.

We did not say, or imply that "people chose by a separate organ of knowledge." But we do say that habits and aptitudes of peoples and nations, were no more the disposing caused of their varying movements and directions than Clydesdales and hackneys were differentiated by an aptitude for work; or that whales and manatees took to the open sea because of an "indisposition" for salt water. That is the evolution of fairyland. Man and horse and whale took their especial directions not from habit, but by the compulsion of living conditions that violated their habit, and spun them out in new cycles of development in the restless energies of change. The robber barons of the dark ages did not dot Europe with their strategic castles, by reason of habit, they chose by clear concept of their means of power. The owners of England did not corral John at Runnymede, because of their common dispositions to short change their overlords, but because they were class conscious. The Gothic Empire of Rome—the noblest of its times—crumbled, without leaving a land mark, not for inaptitude for government but because it countered the rapacious plunderbund of Italy. The Russian people did not adopt the Greek church, because of a predilection for Byzantine ikons and scapularies. It was fastened upon them by an organized hierarchy, conscious of its means of control. Clovis and Pippin, Martel and Charles, Lewis and Lothair, did not crimson the soil of France with rapine and violence, by habit—though such was the wonted ruffianism of their kind. But because of a conscious comprehension of the means and will to power. The people of today do not fasten Capital upon their backs, like the hermit crab with the anemone, by the custom of authority, but because of the inculcated lie of authority. In every case it is the ignorance of the people to the actual relationship of reality. To break that ignorance is the task of the hour. To break the apathy of its 'habit' not by the circumlocutions of custom, but by direct appeal to fact.

"The reason a child knows little and an adult knows much is because the latter has formed habits, the other has still to acquire." Not so. Again we say, that habit is the derivative of the system: the system is not derivative from habit. The reason a child knows little, and an adult little more, is because the former has not the elaborated experience which forms the mind, the latter is denied access to the available means of knowledge. Habit is but a secondary thing: a barrier to the ethic of law. If a carpenter built by habit, we would be resident in towers of Pisa. If doctors treated by habit, they would soon be in prison. While a politician is so little ruled by habit that he is actually versatile in the mercurian artistry of diplomacy. An electrician, who lived by habit, would live precariously. A researcher who operated the factories of industry by habit, would soon be on the street. A financier who traded by habit, would soon trade in the margins of poverty. And a proletariat attempting to live by habit, would soon solve the great mystery. We no more think with our habits, than we see with our eyes, or dream with our consciousness. These are but the mirrors of cosmic impress. Change the form and the answering image is faithful as a shadow in the sun. Conversely, color the image, and it flashes back, in reflexive sequence on the living magma of time. The mind is the "organ of knowledge"—fertilised with the heritage of the ages. It is the one fount of power, the motive source of progress; the moving reason of change; the living hope of humanity. By it we know; and by it we assuage. The age of habit has less place in the machine era than ever. Like forelocked time, it belongs to a bygone day. Our life and times call for mental alertness; for quick-witted resource; for unerring ac-

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 unepithelial 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.

## Western Clarion

A Journal of History, Economics, Philosophy,  
and Current Events.  
Published twice a month by the Socialist Party of  
Canada, P. O. Box 710, Vancouver, B. C.  
Entered at G. P. O. as a newspaper.

Editor: \_\_\_\_\_ Even MacLeod

### SUBSCRIPTION:

Canada, 20 issues \_\_\_\_\_ \$1.00  
Foreign, 16 issues \_\_\_\_\_ \$1.00

927 If this number is on your address label your  
subscription expires with next issue.  
Renew promptly.

VANCOUVER, B. C., NOVEMBER 1, 1924.

### EXIT LABOR

THE Labor's party's little experiment in government has come to end, it would seem. And by the later stages of the contest it would appear that there is something to be said for the view point of George Bernard Shaw: The rulers of England never allow elections to be fought over English issues. There is an atmosphere of the tragic and grotesque in the matter of the British proletariat worrying over the stability of the Russian in the matter of loans—or anything else. They like law abiding critturs!

However, there can be no doubt that nine months of office have crowded a great deal of practical experience into the people of the Labor party. The play of surface politics is always in plain sight, but the currents that have the driving force lie in the state of health of the machinery of capitalist production. Thus the Labor party went to the country stating, "The supreme need of this country as of the whole world is peace among the nations, and the restoration of industry and commerce." That is to say, ill-health on the part of the capitalist scheme of things had seriously threatened peaceful relationships and "restoration" must needs come about. That word restoration is unfortunately chosen, because it means acceptance of what has gone before, the necessary forerunner of just such conditions as we have. At anyrate, the British electorate have entrusted the restoration of trade and commerce to the powerful wisecracks of the great Conservative party, which is appropriate enough anyway.

Without going too far afield in speculating in political futures it would appear safe to say that the incoming Conservatives inherit an "easier" international European tension than the Labor group found ten months ago. Irrespective of party destinies, their condemnation or approval, capitalist financial interests have won out and the policies of international financial interests as against industrial have worked their way in European politics to the point where they have the controlling voice in affairs. They have waited these several years for the advantageous control of Germany, and they appear to have got it—and that through the agency of the British Labor Government, itself in full understanding of the matter yet driven by circumstances. Russia's case comes next. It is apparent finance has its eye to the best bargain there; the terms of the bargain offered it does not see clearly enough as being in its favor.

In this election Labor has lost some forty seats and has gained three quarters of a million votes. If it can be said that three-quarters of a million people have turned their attention to a serious consideration of the import of Labor's appearance in political life then a gain may be registered. Meanwhile, all hands await the "restoration." It is certain the Conservative party will do its best there.

## Instead---

BY "GEORDIE"

IN the last article on the subject of Price I outlined the principle of diminishing utility and indicated that the margin of utility would be determined by the factors limiting the supply of the given use-value. Its marginal utility would be that of the last unit actually enjoyed, or foregone, seeing that the units on the hither and farther sides of the marginal line may be considered equal. The factors limiting supply are generally comprised under the head of "Scarcity" and are, first, absolute scarcity as in the case of manuscripts, pictures and other unique objects; secondly, the human effort and "sacrifices" necessary to procure the article. This latter is the most usual case and may be further complicated by the existence of monopoly control of supply or by the action of the state as in prohibition.

It may be necessary to observe here that subjective value thus determined varies for each and every individual and is, further, incommunicable by that individual.

Now, it will be remembered that, in the case of that hypothetical individual, Homo Economicus, the pleasure-gain experienced in the enjoyment of any given use-value was contrasted with and, so to speak, limited by the pain-cost, the efforts and sacrifices incurred in production. In the actually existing society, however, this pain-cost appears as a money payment. Money is a commodity like any other and is subject to the law of diminishing utility though it is important to notice that in this case the fall in utility is so much slower on account of the fact that the money commodity, being the universal equivalent, gives command over the whole world of commodities. The marginal utility of money is therefore lower for a rich man than for a poor one. He, of course, offsets this by the increased variety and superior quality of the commodities he purchases. For the rest it is obvious that the wealthy man would have some difficulty in contrasting the satisfactions he experiences with the pain cost incurred by some other individual, these being psychological changes experienced by entirely different persons.

Now, as we know, the demand for a commodity, in the economic sense of the word, is effective demand: desire backed by resources. The resources of a people depend on the natural wealth of that country and on the productive efficiency of that people. It has been so long since Bastiat first emphasized it that it is too often forgotten that the supply of commodities forms the demand for commodities. It is not our present purpose to enquire into how this comes about, but it is a fact that the individuals comprising any given society vary as to their command over these resources. There are, therefore, so far two variable factors: marginal utility and command over resources.

We, have, further, to take note that in any given market (the extent of the market will vary with the nature of the commodity and the facilities for transportation, etc.) there is a tendency to the prevalence of a uniform price for any given commodity. In consequence, then, of the variable factors above mentioned there is in this market what has been called a stratification of demand. There are, so to speak, layers of purchasers graded according to the intensity of their wants and their purchasing power. The lower layers are, of course, much more numerous than the higher ones. At any given price, therefore, only those will be purchasers for whom the marginal utility of the commodity in question is greater, or at least not less, than in their opinion would be indicated by this price. Those who are just persuaded to buy at any given price comprise the "marginal fringe" of buyers. An increase in price will shut out large numbers of purchasers and a fall in price tends to bring in a lower stratum. It

will be observed that the price can only coincide with the marginal utility in the case of the marginal purchasers in the marginal stratum. Those purchasers for whom the subjective value of the commodity exceeds the price are said, in Marshall's phrase, to enjoy a "consumer's rent." There are more tangible forms of rent.

It will be noticed that a price has been assumed as existing. The circular nature of the argument may be excused by the fact that we are examining a single phase in a dynamic process.

The changes in demand occasioned by variation in price vary greatly with the nature of the commodity. The demand for a commodity is said to be "elastic" if a slight fall in price should result in a more than proportionate increase in the quantity taken and vice versa. Necessaries are generally in the "inelastic" class. The demand for such things as bread or salt would not be greatly affected by a slight change in price. On the other hand the commodities generally classed as luxuries are found to be "elastic" and very responsive to a fall in price. This fact is of some importance in the consideration of monopoly prices.

Where the subjective value—the consumer's estimate—exceeds the objective value or price there is an inducement to buy and this consideration will affect the order of buying. The consumer, moreover, has to distribute his income over a number of purchases, and he is supposed to so order his buying that the marginal utility of all his purchases is approximately equal. This is generally considered to be important since variations in any of the factors concerned will bring about a redistribution of demand for the commodities comprised in the budget of that particular class of purchasers.

All of which would seem to be sufficient warrant for saying that people will buy an article if they want it badly enough, if they have the money to pay for it and if the price is sufficiently attractive. In fact, it appears to me there might possibly be some grounds for a suspicion that old Butler was right when he says in Hudibras that:

The value of a thing  
Is as much as it will bring.

A few quotations to close. These are recent pronouncements on the question, and are useful as indicating the change in contemporary economic thought.

"Again, if supply is greater than demand, it means that the quantity in the market is greater than can be sold at the previous price for a smaller quantity, with the result that the combined factors of diminishing unit-importance and the stratification of buying power come into play and the seller must accept the lower general price set by the marginal consumers."

—Prof. N. J. Silberling: "Demand and Supply" p. 24.

"The price of a commodity is determined by the conditions of both supply and demand; and neither can logically be said to be the superior influence, though it may sometimes be convenient to concentrate our attention on one or other of them. The chief factor on which the conditions of demand depend is the utility (as measured in terms of money). The chief factor on which the conditions of supply depend is the cost of production. (Again as measured in terms of money). The prevailing trend towards an equilibrium of demand and supply can thus be expressed as follows:—

A commodity tends to be produced on a scale at which its marginal cost of production is equal to its marginal utility; as measured in terms of money, and both are equal to its price.

—H. D. Henderson "Supply and Demand" p. 65.

"It must not be understood that the marginal fringe of buyers, or any of the buyers above the margin for that matter, are acting usually from careful rational analysis of all factors in the case.

They are in large measure the victims of custom, habit, imitation, suggestion and tradition. Their minds are influenced by social conventions, ingenious advertisement, clever salesmanship, and their decisions are probably more often non-rational than rational. But by whatever psychological process, good or bad, they reach a decision to buy or not to buy, that decision is the determining force in the price scale."

—L. G. Edie, "Prin. of New Economics" p. 288.

Next issue something on supply and cost of production, and then possibly some critical work. What a life!

# 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

# "The Futility of Reform."

By J. A. McDONALD.

**I**N the process of Capitalist development there are times when the social mechanism functions badly. The methods of continuing the process must be changed. The ragged ends of the system must be sandpapered and the gearing overhauled. Necessity demands the introduction of social reforms.

These reform measures are guided through state legislatures by the ruling class and, consequently, become the law of the land. Such measures are invaluable to them because they ensure the perpetuation of class rule. They serve to prolong a social form that might otherwise collapse or at least proceed in an ineffective manner.

In the long list of these reforms there is not one that affects the basis of the capitalist system. They are engineered for the purpose of mitigating some of the most baneful effects of class society. The hundreds of legal enactments placed on the statute books of every land, each year, are not formulated to effect a fundamental change in the social relationships existing today but rather to make possible the smooth development of the system that is.

While all measures so devised by the ruling class have as their objective the protection of class interests yet from the workers' standpoint no favorable change has been registered. This is palpable when we examine the history of those countries where reform legislation has made the greatest headway.

Britain and Germany are two shining examples in this connection. The numerous legislative changes of the past century have assisted the rulers of both nations to accomplish much. But looking over the field from a worker's standpoint we fail to find a trace of any material gain.

One has only to scan the pages of Chiozza Money's "Riches and Poverty," or the "Decay of Capitalist Civilization," by Sidney and Beatrice Webb to understand how reform legislation has affected the workers of Britain. The political speeches of the last election campaign could be read to the same purpose.

Every party in the field had to admit the gravity of the situation. Usually the party in power paints in rosy colors the picture of social conditions, while those in opposition portray affairs in shady lines. But on this occasion the Baldwin Government was seeking a change from free trade to protection and, in order to establish the validity of their claim, they were forced to show how ineffectual the old methods had been. Unemployment, poverty, slavery were on the increase and every politician agreed.

With such facts at our disposal why should we of the working class continue to fight for reforms that

tenderness for sinners. If we wish to turn back, let us turn back to Tertullian, who pictured hell as a sort of peep show for the saved, guaranteed to furnish unfailing entertainment to the fortunate inhabitants of paradise, which—but his own vigorous style in the treatise "De Spectaculis" will give a more vivid picture:

"How shall I wonder! How shall I laugh! How shall I rejoice! How shall I triumph when I behold so many and such illustrious kings groaning with Jupiter their god in the lowest darkness of hell! Then shall the tragedians pour forth in their own misfortune more piteous cries than those with which they had made the theatre to resound, while the comedian's powers shall be better seen as he becomes more flexible by the heat. Compared with such spectacles, with such subjects of triumph as these what can praetor or consul, quaestor or pontiff, afford! And even now faith can bring them near, imagination can depict them as present."

To Tertullian eternity did not seem too long a

cannot assist us! Cannot the history of the older countries be taken as a guide by us of this continent? I think so. And it was in the light of such perspective that the founders of the Socialist Party Canada adopted the attitude they did. They were able to visualise the futility of reforms. They understood that nothing less than a social revolution would suffice to remedy social conditions.

While seeing that a reform movement was detrimental to working class welfare, they did not adopt an attitude of hostility to each individual measure. The idiocy of such a contention should be obvious to any one of normal intelligence. Every reform does not necessarily militate against our interests as a class. An extension of the franchise, or of the educational system, for instance, could not be construed as being detrimental to us. When such measures are introduced by our masters we can make what use of them we may. But it must be realised that the innovation emanated from social necessity on their part. It was their business to patch up the system in the best way they knew how and because the measures I have mentioned assisted them in this respect is no reason why we should detour to wage a special war upon what we can utilise for our own purpose.

The chief aim of capitalist reformers is to salve the worst sores of modern society so as to prolong the system of exploitation, and increase the surplus values extracted from the workers. They always insist, however, that they are animated only by a desire to benefit all sections of the body politic even to those whom they exploit. The results give the lie to such a statement.

Nothing of a drastic or revolutionary nature can be expected in the way of social legislation so long as capitalism lasts. The ruling class will introduce nothing that interferes with its right to rule and exploit. Every act placed on the statute books finds its way there because of its utility to the world's owners.

So long as a working class organisation remains a minority in a legislative body it cannot turn its own desires into law. Those who dominate will not allow it. The inclination may be there to do great things but the conditions are against it. As Labriola has well stated—"The economic system is not a tissue of reasoning but it is a sum and a complex of facts which engenders a complex tissue of relations. It is a foolish thing to assume that this system of facts which the ruling class has established with great pains through the centuries by violence, by sagacity, by talent and by science will confess itself vanquished, will destroy itself to give way to the demands of the poor and to the reasoning of their advocates. How demand the suppression of poverty without demanding the overthrow of all the

time in which to make up for the kindness and forbearance demanded of him on earth.—The Nation (N. Y.)

## HERE AND NOW.

Reading the business journals, we learn that this being the year of the U. S. Presidential election and that event being almost over and done with, we may expect money to loosen up to such an extent that the business which is likely to make the greatest stride in prosperity will be the adding machine manufacturing business. These machines, it seems, are guaranteed to last but four years.

About the only use we have just now for an adding machine is to add up our losses. We're in favor of a president who will make losses impossible, so we're not voting this election.

However, where there's life there's hope, they say—but that's nothing to boast about. Neither are

rest! To demand of this society that it shall change its law which constitutes its defense is to demand an absurd thing. The partisans of critical communism recognised that history has the right to follow its course. The bourgeois phase can be outgrown and it will be. But as long as it exists it has its laws. The relativity of these exists in the fact that they grow and develop in certain determined conditions, but their relativity is not simply the opposite of necessity, a mere appearance, a soap bubble. These laws may disappear and they will disappear by the very fact of the change of society, but they do not yield to the arbitrary suggestion which demands a change, proclaims a reform, or formulates a program." (Essays on the Mat. Con. of Hist. pages 83 and 84.)

An organisation that places the advocacy of reforms on its program must of necessity confuse the minds of the workers. It makes it appear to them as though capitalism could solve its own contradictions, and assure every unit in society better conditions than now obtains if only the social machinery is properly oiled and attended. It causes the worker to tinker with each little defect in the system instead of using his energy to change the foundation. It stimulates confusion and retards progress.

In view of these facts the wisdom of the Party founders can scarcely be questioned. They dealt with realities and fashioned their program accordingly. The position they adopted was in harmony with the teachings of Marx and Engels in the Communist Manifesto. This textbook was not meant to apply exclusively to the year 1848. It was an explanation of capitalist society, and even though some words and phrases might become obsolete, or require to be changed, yet by and large it suffices as well today as it did when written.

But now, the S. P. of C. has decided to plow a new furrow. It was not done on the spur of the moment. More than two years ago I predicted the coming change. The verification of a prediction does not necessarily prove the truth of the hypothesis that led to the prediction. But in this case I think it does. It did not require special ingenuity to note the development of the present attitude.

If the issue were placed before the Party membership for a decision there would probably be some value in a continuation of my contributions. But under the present circumstances they can have little effect. The deed is done. The Party has decided to go the new way. A clear cut revolutionary program has given way to a more popular demand. I have stated my position in regard to the change. I have done my utmost to portray its fallacy. But all to no avail. The will of the Party is otherwise. Its decision is final. Time—the mighty arbiter—will solve the problem.

these cash returns.

Following, \$1 each: J. Dennis, J. McDonald, G. Beagrie, F. P. Dawes, J. R. MacDonald, T. Dorrill, Albert Sumner, A. R. Sinclair, A. Toppano, O. Erickson, J. C. Budge, H. Melbo, J. N. Hintsa, Dr. F. Ingles, P. F. Gibbs, Wm. Allen.

C. R. Morrison, \$3; C. H. Lake, \$2; C. Lester, \$2.

Above, Clarion subs, received from 16th to 31st October, inclusive—total, \$23.

## CLARION MAINTENANCE FUND.

Following, \$1 each: J. Chrystal, J. R. MacDonald, O. Erickson.

Following, \$2 each: J. McLennan, Jim Lott (per W. McQuoid), W. McQuoid.

C. H. Lake, \$3; St. John Comrades (per S. E. White), \$15.25.

Above, C. M. F. receipts from 16th to 31st October, inclusive—total, \$27.25.

# The Evolution of Industry

By W. McLAINÉ.

(Continued from last issue)

EVERY new invention, every revolution in the productive process, and every fresh application of science to industry, increases the power of capital, because it increases the productivity of labour without the benefit of that increase going to the producers. The function of the capitalist, so far as his relations with the workers are concerned, is to buy their labour power at the cheapest possible price, and to get as much in return for the price he pays as he possibly can. If, therefore, a new machine is introduced into the workshop which will make it possible for one worker to do the work of two, or more than two, then the individual worker becomes a greater profit-producing asset. If, in addition, by the aid of the "speed-man" and the scientific manager, output can be still further increased, capital will give these industrial pacemakers its blessing. But of the workers in general it will mean that while a greater volume of commodities is being produced, some of their number will find that their places have been taken by the machine, and they will be forced by the pressure of circumstances to compete for employment with those inside the factory. The history of industrial evolution is the history of a movement of the workers to a situation in which they have less and less of security, and in which they have no guarantee that tomorrow will not find them in a far worse position economically than they are in today. Production has increased a thousand-fold as the centuries have advanced. Yet the workers still find themselves engaged from day to day in a ceaseless conflict in the workshop, in order that predatory capitalism shall not encroach further upon their meagre standard of living. This conflict is not new between sections of the workers and sections of the employing class. It is between the workers as a class and the employers as a class. The workers fight with the only weapon they possess—the power to withhold themselves from production and hence to make for the time being no profits for their masters. The employing class, combined, federated, interwoven and intermingled nationally and internationally, fights with its hands upon the storehouses of nature, upon the tools and the means of producing wealth. The struggle has within recent years entered upon a still wider phase. The control of the machinery of Government being in the hands of capitalism, it has, time and time again, been placed at the disposal of the dominant class when open warfare has taken the place of the silent, ever-present contest in the sphere of production. The strikes of the last few years have very largely been against the use of the power of the state to assist Capital the better to control the workers. Labour has discovered that in its economic power, that is, in its organised power to labour or not to labour, it has a weapon that can make or unmake legislative enactments. The State proposes, and may enforce, while labour is quiescent, but against labour in revolt the capitalist State is powerless. That is the lesson of the movement towards State Capitalism, that state now in actual process of becoming and in which the capitalists relieved of all personal concern in industry, but provided with State guaranteed interest on their capital, will function more actively in the political sphere for the purpose of extending that form of legislation which in its modern form began with the Insurance Act and has culminated in the Munitions Acts, that form of legislation which, in short, differentiates between the workers as such and all other members of the

community, and aims at giving to labour a definite Labour status, a legal fixing of a dividing line between a working section of the community and a permanent funded patrician class. The capitalist class knows that society cannot remain stationary. Its dream is of a future state in which it will be transformed into a great functionless Feudal hierarchy, its maintenance made possible by reason of the surplus wealth which labour's energy will make greater as each day passes. Thus from out of the class conflict does capitalism look to the Servile State.

## Labour's Great Task.

Viewed from the standpoint of industrial development, the day of the capitalist class has passed. No longer pushing forward and helping along evolution, it represents all that is reactionary in society. The only class that, looking forward, can still be revolutionary and that cares nought for the status quo, is the working class, which, by labour of hand and brain, keeps the wheels of all social life revolving. But the capitalist class will certainly not voluntarily abdicate in favour of the workers. On the contrary, the lesson of history is surely this: that the dominant class in every epoch has striven with might and main to retain its hold upon the source from which its wealth was obtained even when the changed conditions had taken from that class its economic significance. The walls of the capitalist Jericho will not fall down in response to resolutions trumpeted by Labour Conferences, but must be stormed and ultimately levelled by the workers organized as a class for the purpose of taking all power into their own hands. In spite of the abundance of riches which is manifested on every hand, capitalism has failed to provide a decent standard of life for the people. It has failed to provide a continuity of any kind of existence that is worth while, and it has failed to safeguard the lives, the health, and the well-being of the workers. Capitalism must go, and with it the wage system.

Machine development has removed most, and is fast removing all the dividing lines which have kept the workers separated in groups, each seeking its own advancement even though that brought an injury to some other group. It is now possible for a worker in one industry or branch of an industry to be transferred to some other and yet become, in a very short time as adept in his new occupation as he was in the old. The Trade Union form of industrial organisation, that was in keeping with the conditions that produced the craftsman, the apprentice, and the demarcation dispute, will not and cannot perform the task that lies ahead. That task is not negotiating for minor improvements in working conditions; these will be conceded by the employing class with alacrity, as that class is placed more and more on the defensive, and will be given for the purpose of sidetracking the revolutionary elements in the army of organised labour. The industrial organisations of the future will have placed upon them a double duty. They will have to displace the employing class from its position as the dominant factor in industrial life, and will have to undertake the work of organising the industrial life of the new society. Industry, that is to say, the production of wealth, is the basis of the whole fabric of social life and the success of the political revolution will be measured by the amount of attention that has been paid to the question of the workers' control of industry. The chief duty of the workers to themselves is to organise, so that they may be assured that they themselves will control their own destinies, which means that they will control the product of their own labour. Before this has been finally accomplished, capitalism in the political sphere will make its last stand and will rally to its aid all the counter-revolutionary forces that it can induce to join it. The working class has therefore to organise in readiness for that solemn moment when it will throw down the chal-

enge to the most inefficient and most corrupt class that history has produced. It has to organise politically for the purpose of preventing the chaos which a counter-revolution can only bring and of seeing to it that what labour is prepared to do on the industrial field is not jeopardised.

Industrial development has made it possible for all to live in the very fullest sense of the word, free from care as to what the morrow will bring. Hitherto all the happiness, all the leisure, all the freedom to enjoy what bountiful nature has provided for her children has gone to one class, which has appropriated all that labour has produced and has given to labour in return a mean, miserable lodgement on sufferance upon the outskirts of what life really means.

Workers, the future is ours. We have been robbed through the centuries, we are robbed today to a greater extent than ever before. Let us organise and dare to claim our own.

THE END.

## ECONOMIC CAUSES OF WAR

By PETER T. LECKIE.

NOW READY

Preface by the author.

132 PAGES.

Per Copy, 25 Cents.

Ten copies up, 20 cents each.

Post Paid.

## PLATFORM

### Socialist Party of Canada

We, the Socialist Party of Canada affirm our allegiance to, and support of the principles and programme of the revolutionary working class.

Labor, applied to natural resources, produces all wealth. The present economic system is based upon capitalist ownership of the means of production, consequently, all the products of labor belong to the capitalist class. The capitalist is, therefore, master; the worker a slave.

So long as the capitalist class remains in possession of the reins of government all the powers of the State will be used to protect and defend its property rights in the means of wealth production and its control of the product of labor.

The capitalist system gives to the capitalist an ever-swelling stream of profits, and to the worker, an ever increasing measure of misery and degradation.

The interest of the working class lies in setting itself free from capitalist exploitation by the abolition of the wage system, under which this exploitation, at the point of production, is cloaked. To accomplish this necessitates the transformation of capitalist property in the means of wealth production into socially controlled economic forces.

The irrepressible conflict of interest between the capitalist and the worker necessarily expresses itself as a struggle for political supremacy. This is the Class Struggle.

Therefore we call upon all workers to organize under the banner of the Socialist Party of Canada, with the object of conquering the political powers for the purpose of setting up and enforcing the economic programme of the working class, as follows:

- 1—The transformation, as rapidly as possible, of capitalist property in the means of wealth production (natural resources, factories, mills, railroads, etc.) into collective means of production.
- 2—The organization and management of industry by the working class.
- 3—The establishment, as speedily as possible, of production for use instead of production for profit.

## Correspondence

## RE CAPITALIST EFFICIENCY.

Editor Clarion:

H. W. Woods president of the U. F. A., Chairman Alberta Wheat Producers Ltd., etc., addressed the farmers of the Stanmore district on August 12th. For three hours we sat and listened to a confused jumble of economics, capitalist myths, meaningless words and phrases that wellnigh did the English language to death. "False social laws," "True democracy," "Intelligent citizenship," "Efficiency" and "Inefficiency" were the words repeated time and time again, no doubt with the idea of impressing indelibly these magic words upon the minds of the audience. The audience, which, besides farmers consisted of preachers, preacher-students, bank managers, clerks, etc., did their best and with "bleary eyes and blunted souls" hung onto the magic words for dear life, believing, so it seemed, that the salvation and emancipation of mankind depended upon these words. Mr. Woods told the people of the great good the U. F. A. had done for them in the past and promises of even greater things in the future. The poor debt-ridden farmers forgot their miseries for a moment and went home rejoicing. And as they went I thought I heard them sing:

"I will always be staunch  
To my mortgaged-up ranch,  
In the wilds of the sun-blistered lea;  
Where I can rest my back  
On an old gunny sack  
As I dream of the fortunes to be.  
Tis a pleasure for me  
Just to gaze on, to see:  
The mustard, the thistle, the pig weed galore,  
Down the road that leads back  
To my tar paper shack.  
To my mortgaged-up farm at Stanmore."

It is a mighty good thing to have parlor reformers like Mr. Woods come along once in a while; it enables students of the social movement to gauge sentiment and public opinion, it reveals those that are true to the class struggle. "Efficiency" and "Inefficiency" are two words that Mr. Woods specializes upon. Mr. Woods' whole argument can be summed up thus: The milling and agriculture implement industries are efficient therefore these concerns can charge any old price they please for their commodities. Agricultural implements will be higher next year than at present, all due to the efficiency of the implement business. The farmers never had an efficient selling organization and for that reason the farmer is compelled to take just what the other fellow chooses to give him and the way to solve the numerous problems confronting the world is for the farmers to establish efficient selling organizations.

Now I never claimed to know much. I have never won any prizes at a brain judging contest. But the idea that that agricultural implements are high because of the selling efficiency of that industry can be entertained only by those that know nothing about the matter, or by those that have escaped attention of the authorities in charge of mental institutions. According to Mr. Woods' logic Capitalist industries that have lowered prices since the war are inefficient; those that have maintained high prices are efficient. The International Harvester Company and the Standard Oil Company are interwoven, the directors of the one are in part directors of the other. Capitalists in order to concentrate their wealth marry only within their own economic group. So that we find the two great trusts mentioned are related by marriage. One would expect that the one trust would be just as efficient in selling their wares as the other, and yet farm implement prices are on the same level or nearly so as during the war, while oils and gasoline are lower in price. According to Mr. Woods' logic the Inter. Harvester Company is efficient and the Standard Oil Company is inefficient, but the Standard Oil Company is making money and declaring fat dividends while the Harvester Company can hardly make ends meet.

Automobiles and auto tire prices have dropped in some cases to pre-war prices. According to Mr. Woods these concerns are inefficient but they are declaring fat dividends, while the Massey Harris Company has been losing millions of dollars during the past few years in spite of high prices of farm machinery.

The fact of the matter is the agricultural implement business on the North American continent has been over done. 75% of the factories could be junked and the balance could take care of the demand for machinery.

When Western Canada was opened up for development it offered a fertile field for exploitation by manufacturers of farm machinery. Demand for machinery was supplied mostly by American concerns, but Canadian capitalists were not slow to realize the advantage of home industries to supply the home market. Several implement concerns sprang up and by manipulating politics succeeded in having a tariff put on imported machinery. These concerns grew and prospered and in due time began competing in foreign markets. But the thing happened that always happens: implement concerns sprang up in these foreign markets and while inventions and im-

provements increased the ability of the manufacturer to produce more and more goods the markets for these were getting less and less, with the result that Canadian implement concerns are operating on part time. Now if a farmer has 1000 acres of land, buildings, horses and machinery for operating, but only farms 100 acres, it can be seen that capital invested, insurance depreciation, upkeep, etc., would be as great in farming 100 acres with a 1000-acre outfit, result would be waste labor resulting in high cost of production. That is precisely the condition of the agricultural implement business. They are producing 100 binders in a factory capable of producing 1000. There are certain fixed charges that remain the same whether 100 or 1000 implements are produced. Production under these conditions is high. Therefore implements must sell high. This can not be called efficiency. I would call it capitalism digging its own grave.

The efficiency of capitalism! ye gods. Listen to this from the pen of J. A. MacDonald: "The efficiency of Capitalism! At the present time there are approximately 10,000,000 workers unemployed on the North American continent. According to the latest government reports each worker produces on an average about twenty dollars worth of wealth each working day. This amount, which is lost through the efficiency of capitalism, would build 330,000 homes costing five thousand dollars each week. In every city one can see battalions of this immense army of labor desired even the right to work. In every division point and at water tanks one can see their camp fires illumine the night. In these jungles of the working class, due to the jungles of capitalism, one can find shoemakers with their toes sticking out through the remnants telling their owners of the efficiency of capitalism—an efficiency which puts shoemakers into the jungles or the bread line, while millions of workers are without shoes, and machines that could be making shoes are idle and rusting."

But why enumerate the ever increasing loss through the social waste of unemployment—the incalculable waste in wealth, and the waste in the degeneration of the workers, which creates all values. The efficiency of capitalism! That is well displayed in the millions of men who are working, yet producing nothing of social value, or worse, whose activity is anti-social. In the modern cities under capitalism there is an amount of useless and wasted labor that would, if properly directed, be sufficient to destroy disease, enlighten mankind, and forever clean the earth of the scourge of poverty. We find thousands of business establishments selling the same product. Thousands of useless clerks do their work for hundreds of useless business institutions, where, under a sane system two or three central stores would be sufficient. Millions of dollars are wasted each week in useless advertising, such as "Buy your Pear's Soap at Robem's,"—met by "Buy your Pear's Soap at Skinem's."

Hundreds of salesmen, middlemen, wholesalers, all part of an inefficient commercial system are part of the "inefficiency of capitalism." Recently I was in Calgary, and found another of the indications of the efficiency of capitalism: Thousands of workers, lured by the siren songs of prosperity, had bought their own homes. They had believed in that "prosperity" which is one of the mirages of the present system. Then in the dark years of 1914 to 1919 they went to France under the lure of another siren song: "A world fit for heroes to live in." Then some of them came back to the darker years of undiluted Wilsonian democracy. And now they are living in the era of capitalist efficiency in a world where war is ended. But they are not living in their own homes. More than half of the homes in Calgary are owned by the city, taken over for taxes. This is the efficiency of capitalism. The efficiency of capitalism! the efficiency of disease and death. Some years ago Dr. Woods Hutchinson, one of the great authorities of the world on medical matters, made the statement that within the period of ten years the medical profession could eradicate the white plague, tuberculosis, if they were permitted to get real sanitation, to destroy the breeding places of the germs which each year are responsible for one out of every seven deaths on the North American continent. These germs breed in the dark atmosphere of poverty, caused by ill feeding and inhuman conditions. But capitalism for its existence demands the same conditions as the tuberculosis germ. But there is a disease more dread than tuberculosis: the living death of insanity. An expert on this subject within the last month made the statement that if the present percentage of increase in this disease were continued the entire world would be insane in another forty years. The whole world will be as insane as the capitalist system in forty years unless the workers take a hand in the management of industry and the reclamation of humanity from the scourge of the present system. Either the workers will organize or within forty years the entire world will be crazy, and being crazy, fitted to admire the efficiency of capitalism, a social system as demoted as ever formed the hallucination of a madhouse.

Under capitalism there can be but one sanity, the sanity of revolt. But one efficiency, and that the efficiency of seeking to build a new society that will be efficiency, a noble mansion in which the workers of the world can express their spirit of workmanship, and find scope for their creative instincts.

Thus closeth the first chapter on capitalist efficiency, from which the Lord deliver us.

Yours for Socialism,

S. V. VALISCO.

Stanmore, Alberta.

## OBITUARY.

Editor Clarion:

The Comrades in Edmonton have asked me to inform you of the death of a great supporter and subscriber of the S. P. of C. and The Clarion. We would like you to have the following notice inserted in the Western Clarion:

Ralph Benedict died on October 12, when he was at a meeting in the new Empire Theatre, of heart failure.

He spent all his life in the working-class movement and nothing was too small or too great for him to do for the cause he worked for.

Having taken part in the movement in Russia, France and Great Britain, and lastly Canada, his experiences taught him the value of education, and he was always ready to help organize a meeting, or give his whole support to any S. P. of C. propagandist.

He was buried on the 15th and a large procession took place, of all grades of thought in the movement, to show their last respects for the work he had done. Representatives of the Labor Party, Workers' Party, S. P. of C. and the Workman's Circle spoke at the funeral, and we can truly say he died as he lived. A good Comrade in the fight for working class emancipation.

Yours Fraternally,  
J. Jacobs.

Edmonton, Alta.

## SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Obey that impulse and subscribe for the  
WESTERN CLARION

Address P. O. Box 710, Vancouver, B. C.

Enclosed find \$.....

Send the Western Clarion to:

Name .....

Address .....

## Literature Price List

Cloth Bound.	Per Copy
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	80c
Ethics and History	80c
Germs of Mind in Plants	80c
The Triumph of Life	80c
Social Revolution (Kautsky)	.80
Essays on Materialist	
Conception of History (Labriola)	1.50
Social Studies (Lafargue)	.50
Paper Covers.	Per Copy
Evolution of Man (Prof. Bolsche)	80c
Wage-Labor and Capital	10c
Independent Working Class Education	10c
Communist Manifesto	10c
The Present Economic System (Prof. W. A. Bouguer)	10c
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific	15c
Slave of the Farm	15c
Manifesto, S. P. of C.	15c
Causes of Belief in God (Lafargue)	15c
The State and Revolution (Lenin)	25c
Value, Price and Profit (Marx)	15c
Two Essays on History (C. Stephenson and G. Deville)	5c
Economic Causes of War (Loekie)	25c
Civil War in France (Marx)	25c
Christianism and Communism (Bishop W. M. Brown)	25c
Quantity Rates on Paper Covered Pamphlets.	
Two Essays on History	25 copies 75c
Communist Manifesto	25 copies \$2.00
Wage-Labor and Capital	25 copies \$2.00
Present Economic System	25 copies \$1.50
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific	25 copies \$2.25
Slave of the Farm	25 copies \$1.50
Manifesto of S. P. of C.	25 copies \$1.50
Evolution of Man	25 copies \$1.75
Causes of Belief in God	25 copies \$1.50
Value, Price and Profit	25 copies \$1.25
Economic Causes of War	10 copies \$2.00
Christianism and Communism	4 copies \$1.00

All prices include postage.

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