

WESTERN CLARION

A Journal of
CURRENT
EVENTS

Official Organ of
THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

HISTORY
ECONOMICS
PHILOSOPHY

No. 920.

TWENTIETH YEAR.

Twice a Month

VANCOUVER, B. C., AUGUST 1, 1924.

FIVE CENTS

The Expert's Report

WHEN we begin to study what has been going on in Germany since the war, seeking causes and explaining events, we find ourselves at once up against certain fundamental and traditional factors which lie deeply embedded in the history of Central Europe. To take an example: Comrade Newbold has referred in one of his recent articles to the failure of the middle-class revolution in 1848 in Germany, as having been one of the primary causes of the European War, because its failure left the greater part of the German-speaking countries still controlled by the families of the agrarian nobility, thus creating an area where the great international money-lending houses of Paris, Brussels, and London had no access or undisputed control of the government machine. This is undoubtedly true, but one can go much further back than this and see in the failure of the merchant classes of the German towns in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to establish their influence over the feudal princes of Germany, in the decay of the overland trade routes along the Rhine and over the Alps to Venice and Genoa, in the maritime discoveries of the sixteenth century and in the terrible and devastating Thirty Years War, in which the rising mercantile classes of Holland, Sweden, France and Italy and of the counter-Reformation in the Holy Roman Empire used Central Europe as a battle ground for their national struggles for the control of the new trade routes; we can see in all these facts the real cause of the relative backwardness of Germany both politically and economically during the nineteenth century.

Germany, in fact, had not worked off—and did not till November 9th, 1918—the last relics of her feudal system. Even Bismarck, with all his astuteness, as a junker who realised that the industrial capitalist class was the coming power, was compelled to allow the agrarian nobility of Prussia large political rights and a privileged position in the military, diplomatic and civil services. And so, loaded with the burdens of the feudal past, Germany entered the war, which the international banking groups waged against the Hohenzollern regime in order to secure for themselves in Germany a government which would be absolutely subservient to their will and permit their capital investments to flow unhindered into Central Europe and its colonial areas in the Balkans, Turkey and Russia. But it was obvious that a Germany governed by a combination of the agrarian nobility and the rising industrial capitalist class, each following different and indeed conflicting ends, could not wage war with the same effectiveness as the Allied governments, in which the State machinery was controlled by a class basing its political power on the latest phase of capital accumulation, a combination, as it was at that time, of industrial and finance capital. I make that distinction explicitly. For our Marxian outlook enables us to see in the development of society, including capitalist society, different phases, each growing up in the bosom of the other and finally absorbing or destroying its parent phase. And just as the feudal system arose out of the self-sufficient community and destroyed it, so did mercantile capitalism arise out of and destroy feudalism, industrial capitalism destroy pure mercantile capital accumulations, finance

capital or fixed-interest bearing, mortgage-holding capital arise within industrial, speculative capital, deriving its accumulations from the holding of ordinary or common stock in coal, steel and engineering industries.

But finance capital has not destroyed industrial capital. That struggle seems to me to be coming now, and it is as well to face facts and not to imagine that the working class in Europe has got an easy task before it because capitalism is on the decline. It is only true that a certain kind of capitalism—industrial speculative capitalism—is on the decline, but the money merchant class that lends to governments, holds railway debentures, mortgages on land, ground rents, etc., is not only not declining in power, but, has immensely strengthened its economic position since the war, and is pushing to the wall the war profiteer and munitions speculator, whom it is pressing for the settlement of the debts contracted during the war boom and inflation of after-war years.

The position, therefore, at the commencement of the war was that in the Allied countries finance and industrial capital held the balance of power in the control of the machinery of the State. Both were interested in the war, the fixed-interest or passive capitalist, the big money-lending houses that had for some years past been consolidating their hold on all European governments except the German and Austrian; these on the one hand and the owners of coal mines, smelting furnaces, ships, shipyards and engineering workshops, who looked to the war to provide an unlimited outlet for their products on the other, both were interested in the war and in the defeat of Germany for different reasons. Nevertheless, during the actual process of carrying on the war the industrial speculative capitalists were able to increase their economic power in relation to the fixed-interest and mortgage capitalists and bankers. The inevitable inflation and issuing of depreciated paper currencies caused fixed-interest stock to lose a part of its gold value, whereas the holders of ordinary shares in munition and allied works were able to accumulate vast profits.

The process, however, did not go so far in the Allied countries as it did in Germany, where the war profiteers of the type of Stinnes threw off the greater part of their bank debts by benefiting by the fall of the mark, and cornered the mineral resources of the country in their own interest. In France and England the passive capitalists were not ruined, though greatly weakened. It is true that the Coalition Government of Lloyd George became the mouthpiece of the war-profiters ruling England, but in France, thanks to liberal assistance from Wall Street, the franc was artificially supported and so an equilibrium of economic power was maintained between the French rentiers and the French industrialists. The Versailles Treaty was a compromise between these two classes of capitalists in the Allied countries. It enforced the payment of large cash sums from Germany, which would, if they could have been paid, have balanced the French Budget and brought the franc back to its par-value. On the other hand, it contained clauses, which handed over large German coal and mineral regions to France and her economic colonies, thereby making it possible for the Comite des Forges, the association of French heavy industries, to gain control over the raw material resources of a large part of Europe.

But this very economic partition of Germany in the interests of the Comite des Forges and incidentally of the German heavy industries too made it impossible for the German Treasury to hand over even the smallest fraction of the cash sums demanded under the London payment plan. The mark collapsed and the Comite des Forges clinched its victory—the victory of the war speculators in France and Germany, of the inflationists and the heavy industry trusts—by the occupation of the Ruhr. The small investing classes of Germany were ruined and the French rentier saw the franc follow the mark.

Now begins the counter-offensive of the owners of passive capital. Enter the International banking oligarchies with their demand for a "revision of the Versailles Treaty," the stabilisation of the European exchanges, the balancing of the German Budget, based on a unified Germany (implying the withdrawal of the French economic measures in the Ruhr), the reduction of German reparations payment to the level of what Germany is capable of paying and the assisting of this by an international loan to Germany. A feeble attempt to secure this programme's adoption was made at the Cannes Conference in January, 1922, when Rathenau in reply to a bankers' committee drew up plans to balance the German Budget, but the obstruction of Poincare and Millerand, acting under instructions from the Comite des Forges and of the French rentiers, who were not long-sighted enough yet to see how they would be benefited by a general stabilisation, blocked the way of the bankers. An attempt was made again at Genoa, but the oil trusts complicated the issue and finally captured the attention of the conference by their intrigues to corner Russian oil. During the summer of 1922 Pierpont Morgan came to Paris and the bankers' committee was reformed. German Treasury officials were invited to come to Paris and discuss plans. This, too, broke down through the obstruction of the inflationists and industrial capitalists in France and Germany. Then came the Ruhr occupation and the final stage of financial collapse and economic partition of Germany. The speculative capitalists and holders of ordinary shares in industrials in France and Germany held high festival!

But the process of inflation sooner or later has an end. The public in Germany became aware of the fact that the mark was worthless paper and that inflation is no good unless the fact that the currency was not worth the figures printed on it was only known to a select few. As soon as the fact is public property, the game of the inflationist is up. And it was up in Germany by the autumn of 1923. Then was the time for the international bankers to take the field and the appointment of an expert committee of the reparations Commission to investigate the capacity of Germany to pay. The French rentier had become scared at the falling franc and at the absence of any result from the Ruhr occupation, as far as he was concerned. He was not interested in the monopoly which the Comite des Forges had secured over the mineral resources of the Rhineland, because he was in the main a holder of fixed-interest-bearing government bonds. After five months this Experts' Committee has reported and we see in it the most important international document which has appeared since the Versailles Treaty.

—M. Philips Price. (The Plebs, London)

Concerning Party Outlook

BY J. HARRINGTON.

THOUGH in Canada no one seems inclined to accept the pointed invitation to discuss Party policy, Comrade McDonald makes the ante, by a few plain questions, as in the face of recent happenings he was bound to do. In throwing my little chip into the game I decline to discuss the matter from the basis laid down by him.

Whether the British Labor Government is worthy the support of the working class or not could scarcely be established by debate, nor can I imagine a more profitless discussion. When we say it is worthy, or worthless, we merely state our personal feeling concerning a political fact. And the fact, I take it, is what should interest students of Marx. The history of British politics for the past thirty years presents a phenomenal advance of the working class in that domain, particularly so since 1918, and we can very well lay aside our personal contempt for such creatures as the Hodges, the Wards, the Clynes, the Thomases, and their ilk, in view of the fact that over four million votes were cast for Labor. That is a subject for discussion, that and a representation of 192 in the British House.

The Canadian Labor Party and our attitude towards it is another matter and we are bound to meet the issue without equivocation. The plain fact is that officially we have taken a new stand on the matter. We have recognised them as a working class party and have co-operated with them in an election. We have done this before but never officially. I as the official candidate of the S. P. of C. have received the endorsement of a Labor Party Convention in open negotiation; I have spoken at their meetings and the Labor candidates have spoken at mine.

It is the fate of all human institutions, organisations and groups, to discover that, at times, their ideas of right and wrong must take second place to the facts of life, and we have on more than one occasion compromised, though never officially. When Tom Kelly ran as a Labor candidate in Cranbrook and Jack Leheny supported him, while not officially recognised they nevertheless had the private benediction of the Executive, and when Bill Davidson was nominated by a convention of Trade Unions and Party locals on the Socialist ticket it caused a few murmurs, but they were scarcely heard and soon forgotten. He received the official endorsement and the whole-hearted support of the entire membership. Generally we have sailed pretty close to our programme, but in the last election in British Columbia, we have departed far from the beaten track.

Now for some time a few complexes have been ragging my libido to a frazzle, and here is where I clean out my subconscious sewerage. The exposed plumbing had long been leaky, but "Progress," with his "back to logic" plugged the entire system and I had a sublimation almost sufficient to hoist me to the top of Mount Everest, but its generous current turned awry, by innumerable small matters requiring immediate attention; I could only mutter, like those Kautskians in Trotskyian clothing: God! I wish I were in Germany.

One thing has cursed me during recent years: In vain I called, thou canst not say I did it; like Blanco's ghost it would not down. Somehow in a life of considerable reading, much discussion and a few casual moments of reflection, I had absorbed the notion that mankind does not order his life by considered thought. He was not the thinking animal. But somehow this fact had never received the attention it merited, and for that matter does not now. A recurring question annoyed me,—why do they do it? The midsummer madness which seized Europe in 1914 started this eternal interrogation, when Marxists of long and unquestioned standing, Internationalists, anarchists, anti-patriots and what not suddenly discovered at the very moment that their life long mouthings called for a little practical usage, that they had a country worth fighting for. Then came the very thing they claimed to desire more than life itself, the thing they had dedicated

their life to achieve—a proletarian revolution—whereupon they commenced to curse and to swear, and say I never knew the man. Indeed, Russia and the general attitude of society toward Russia in 1917, and '18 is proof that mankind does not justify his conclusions by sifting the evidence, he sifts the evidence, to justify his conclusions.

To be sure, all his activity does not arise from such palpably dishonest thought processes. A bricklayer who had his own pet notions as to what constituted a plumb wall, or a blacksmith who disagreed with what experience had taught mankind is the welding "spit" of steel, would soon cease to be either the one or the other.

So in practical affairs, where the fruits of our activities are immediately apparent and have an instant and important bearing on our physical welfare, we rarely harbor for long ideas that are markedly stupid. This can not be said of conduct which affects our social being, the ultimate consequence of which will not be apparent for some time.

The Choice of a Presidential candidate by the Democrats in New York recently is exhibit No. 1. The choice of Davis was not the result of rational thought, but a compromise of expediency. It might be my singular experience, but I am forced to the conclusion that these quite evident idiots were in no marked way different to the ordinary human animal, and their deportment was quite ordinarily human and rational and follows not from their political opinions but from their God given faculties. The same creatures rooted and cheered there as will mark their ballots in November. And by the same token marked their ballots here last month. Human creatures, with senses, affections, passions, apprehensions, hopes, prejudices and capacity, I did believe, and almost yet believe that they can be moved by reason, by persuasion, by facts. But I am compelled to admit that events and conditions is the logic, and time and experience the eloquence of our case.

Thus there are for me two epochs, before the war—and now. The ten years have convinced me that what we considered good tactics up to 1920 are no longer desirable; principal of which might be considered antagonism to any labor groups. In 1920 I ran as a Socialist candidate in antagonism to a Labor ticket. At that time I spoke night after night to audiences of not more than twenty, half of whom were party members. Last month, in conjunction with a Labor ticket, I spoke to audiences of many hundreds. Nor was that all, in 1920 I tried to explain to my acquaintances who were outside the socialist movement why I could not co-operate with the Labor Party; I might have been more profitably employed reading the original manuscript of Plato's Republic. I could not, lacking the bare essentials, understand it; they could not understand me for the same reason. I will go even farther than that; members who had joined the Party since the war were equally dense. And I can go even further still: had a vote at any time been taken on the question of mutual support by and with Labor groups it would have carried.

Well then, for various reasons since 1922 interest in Socialism and revolution has fallen off, the Clarion and standard Marxian literature, as also the propaganda meetings have suffered accordingly, and Party membership is at a standstill. I see everywhere; men who have a fair understanding of Marx, some might say they professed to it, but that is merely begging the question, and who were active and consistent supporters of the Party, now working in the Labor Party; I knew them then to be trustworthy and reliable in working class affairs; and their departure to a less rigid field of propaganda is not sufficient evidence to me of runaway. However, since 1914 we have had a world war, a proletarian revolution successfully sustained against the onslaught of the whole world, several abortive revolutions, a number of master class dictatorships

naked and unashamed, a Labor Government in Britain, a complete collapse of several national currencies, a near collapse of international exchange, a progressive movement in the ultra conservative sections of the United States, along with many other things not even dreamed of in our philosophy of 1914 being probable within half a century, and if conditions and events are the moving factors in human affairs, we should avoid the tendency toward being a practical answer to the age old query regarding an immovable object and an irresistible force.

Sure enough, we have compromised with the Canadian Labor Party; we put up one man, permitting them to fill the slate with five Labor men, and so far an invitation to discuss the question has gone a-begging. No such invitation would have been required half a dozen years ago, proving that no doctrine can withstand the logic of events, the eloquence of time. The Party membership has quietly accepted the fact, that while a few thousand in a select group of workers may invariably be right, and can always state their aims and objects clearly, four million workers, moving with a working class bias, however incoherent their aims or muddled their leaders, can never be wrong. Quantity makes quality here, and wrong become right, an alchemy which can not happen in formal logic but which is quite apparent to Marxian thought.

To a Marxian, Socrates is not always Socrates and he may be a man one day and a moon the next. Some of the British Labor Government heads, all the Party Parliamentary group in fact, may be no more worthy working-class support than I am, but I do not consider that worth a presentable factor. I have definitely conceived and added to my creed the firm conviction that the individual and his character is nothing, the Party and its program a mere indication, the class and its aspirations the only thing that matters, and the indications in the last British election is sufficiently revolutionary to call for investigation, if not for admiration.

This is as far as I would wish to go. While convinced that the vast majority of our class, or of humanity to be exact, never devote sufficient thought to social problems to ever base their political conduct on scientific lines, I am just as confident that they are influenced by habitual practices, and if they can be interested, will more readily accept a common-sense view that is strange to them than a foolish one that is familiar. But to attain that discriminating faculty a certain grounding in Social subjects is required.

This brings me to a closer affiliation with the Labor Party, and so far as it stands today I consider it impossible. It would call for our acceptance of a platform more impractical and visionary than the most impossible of impossibilities and would handicap our educational work, and perhaps engender more strife than ever. It would be quite possible to work with them, each doing the work it found to hand, possibly later, when the movement had developed and had a permanent standing, but certainly not under present conditions. In the matter of reforms there is no change. There are still a few, as there has always been, who think that reforms are not only useless but harmless, but the Party as a whole, so far as I can judge, still holds to the position that reforms can only be granted and enforced by a permanent majority. And it is some satisfaction to hear Labor men after a year or two in office explain to their supporters their reasons for failing to do something for them. But for various reasons reforms have been granted and enforced, and members of the S. P. of C. were at least saddled with the responsibility of sponsoring them in the House.

While we could not as a party pretend to be Marxian and seek the support of our class on any other than the class struggle issue, neither do I think that the class struggle involves a direct attack

(Continued on page 8)

The Problem of Becoming

(Continued from last issue)

NOW, Hegel perceived three stages in the process of thought-growing and reality; 1, a positive or affirmative; 2, a negative; and 3, a negation of that negative stage. These stages are also known as the thesis, antithesis, and synthesis; the latter being similar to, yet more developed than, the first; and this third step Hegel called "the negation of the negation." A famous example of this process is given by Marx in chap. xxxii, of "Capital," vol. I. This constitutes another uprising against the hard and fast conceptions of "formal" (Aristotelian) logic; for the latter regards nature's series of causes and effects as being an indefinite and infinite progress in a straight line of entirely new and unreacting phenomena. The truth is, says Hegel, that an effect B is not only the cause of C, but B also reacts back upon its cause, A. That is, A would not be a cause if it did not effect B; therefore, it is owing to (or because of) B, that A is a cause at all. Parents, for example, are the cause of their children; and children (the effect) in turn are the cause of their parents being parents—as the latter in these modern times of much emancipated youthhood, are frequently made all-too-painfully aware!

Since the effect, because it reacts upon it, is only relatively pre-determined by its cause, the causal series in nature is not a straight line drawn out to endlessness, but a curved line that returns to its starting point; that is, says Hegel, it is a circle. But we Socialists having in view, among other things, humanity's social origin at Primitive Communism, and our certain development towards a modern advanced machine—founded Communism, hold rather that the line of progression is spiral instead of circular, because while, like a circle, the spiral returns back towards its point of origin, yet the latter finishes above this at a much **Higher Plane**.

The reciprocal reaction of the effect upon the cause increases the importance of the effect because it gives it a character of relative freedom that is lacking in those philosophies which consider that effects necessarily depend upon their pre-existing causes; whilst, in reality, they are only in a certain measure effects, and merely relatively determined. Hence, the Socialist materialistic conception of History recognises that if we are the creatures and the effects of material conditions, we on our part have the power and inclination to turn around and revolutionise those surrounding to suit ourselves. There is neither in the beginning, in the middle nor in the end of the causal series, a cause distinct from all the rest, nor absolute with reference to the others. The absolute is not to be found in any particular part of the causal chain; it resides in the sum-total of the particular relative causes. The latter are not forced slaves of a first cause that excludes all other causality and with regard to which the relative causes are as nothing; but each cause takes part in the absolute. Each is relatively absolute, none is absolutely absolute. No one cause has an exclusive claim to omnipotence; the sum of individual energies or, everything that exists through causal power, constitutes all existing power. The two spheres into which being is divided when it becomes essence and phenomenon, are reunited in reciprocal action, and thus become logical totality. Nevertheless, though Hegel began by proclaiming the absoluteness of reason, he subsequently and doubtless reluctantly confessed that there is alongside of the rational element in nature, an illogical element which presupposes a principle different from reason. Hence, says Prof. Weber, even the most decided monists advance a relative dualism.

A valuation of Hegel's philosophy is supplied by the introduction to Dietzgen's "Positive Outcome of Philosophy" from the pen of Dr. Pannekoek; who states that "the Hegelian philosophy was finally superseded by dialectic materialism which declares that absolute truth is realised only in the infinite progress of society and of scientific understanding.

This (says the Dr.) does not imply a wholesale rejection of Hegelian philosophy. It merely means that the relative validity of that philosophy has been recognised."

Along with a number of other rationalist forerunners, Hegel held that what is truly essential, original and fundamental in us and the universe, is Thought. But Schopenhauer (died 1860) taught that it is Will, whereas thought is but a derived or secondary phenomenon, an accident of will. We are essentially will, and the entire universe, considered in its essence, is a will that objectifies itself, that is, gives itself a body or a real existence. The form that this universal will takes, is a desire-to-be or will-to-life. As with him, the will is a perpetual desire-to-be, it is around that, which creative evolution revolves. The Darwinian principle is, that the physical and mental characteristics of all creatures have been chosen by nature in rendering them fittest to survive. With Schopenhauer the reverse is the case—it is through the creature's own desire that it possesses sharp teeth or beak, huge claws, strong muscles, active legs, etc., etc. Therefore, Schopenhauer really was, what Ramsay Macdonald falsely stated Marx to be; namely pre-(before)-Darwinian, although to a certain extent he believes in Nature's struggle for existence. But he denies, as pantheism does, that the will principle is a person. Schopenhauer regards will as the unconscious force that produces specific beings, individuals living in space and time. This Will is that which when not-being, strives to be; becomes life, objectifies itself in individual existence: it is, in a word, the well-to-be. As long as there is a will, there will be a universe. Individuals come and go; but the will, the desire that produces them, is eternal, like the specific types according to which it produces them. Birth and death do not apply to the will, but only to its manifestations. Our innermost essence, the will, never dies, and therefore death is not a subject for grief. All this might be said to be forms that Becoming assumes.

In opposition to the last-named, Nietzsche denied that the universal principle is a will-to-life. He held that it is, especially as regards organic life, a deliberate and conscious Will-to-have-power. But as power is necessary to complete living, one might almost infer this from the will-to-life. Nietzsche's main point, however, was to reveal how the sick, the inferior and the degenerate in general, if they can not be dominant in true, good and superior respects, will nevertheless assert themselves in modes of thought and action in very unpleasant agreement with their undesirable limitations. Hence, he enlarges upon such manifestations of power or powerlessness, as what he calls "master-morality" and "slave-morality."

Our business, however, as Socialists, is to get the Workers and all intelligent persons to use their wills in every possible manner, whether openly or secretly along Socialist lines. United action in this way would irresistibly move mountains of the greatest Capitalist obstacles and finally sweep them entirely away!

In concluding his "History of Philosophy," Prof. Weber refers to numerous philosopher authorities, right back to Aristotle, all of whom hold that the Will is at the basis of everything. Nature, or the will, he insists, undoubtedly strives after being; but does so in order to realise through this relative end, an absolute end—the Good. He then continues as follows:

"If it (the will) had no other end than being, it would find complete and supreme satisfaction in life, even without morality. Now experience superabundantly proves that the man who lives simply for the sake of living, becomes surfeited; and that he alone is not surfeited with life, who lives for something higher than life. Besides, a will that is supposed to strive, necessarily and fatally, for being and nothing but being, could not turn against itself, as happens in suicide, and as Schopenhauer himself

urges it to do in his doctrine of the negation of the will, although otherwise condemning the "autocheiria (taking the law into one's own hands). Finally if the ground of things were the will-to-live at any cost, we should be utterly unable to understand the voluntary death of a Leonidas or a Soerates; and of all such in whom there is something mightier than the will-to-live. We may, it is true, refuse to believe in the disinterestedness of these sacrifices, in the good desired and done for its own sake—in a word, in duty. But we may, with equal right and with no less reason, deny the reality of the world and treat existence itself as an illusion. We must confess, there is no other proof for the existence of a world apart from ourselves, than the imperative of the senses, the self-evidence with which reality forces itself upon our sensibility. Now, in fact, duty is no less evident than the imperative of the senses.

The illusions of sense which philosophy detected at the very beginning of its history, do not hinder the world from being a reality; quite different, it is true, from that which the senses show us, but still a reality; and in so far the senses are veridical (believable). Similarly, however variable and fallible conscience may be in the matter of its prescriptions, their very form compels us to recognise a moral order as the essence and soul of the universe. Whatever part anthropomorphism may play in the vocabulary of Kantian ethics, we must agree that this form is imperative; that there is something even behind our will-to-live, that there is above our individual will, a higher and more excellent will, which strives after the ideal, "Wille Zum Guten." This and not the "Wille Zum Leben" (will-to-life) of Schopenhauer, is the true essence and the first cause of being, "substantiasive deus" (substance or God—Spinoza)."

The immediately foregoing passage from Prof. Weber, simply states, in philosophical detail, what Shakespeare affirms through the medium of his Hamlet who, in relating the plot against his life which he discovered when sailing to England, makes this comment: "Sir, in my heart there was a kind of fighting that would not let me sleep: methought I lay worse than the mutines in the bilboes (mutineers in chains). Rashly, and prais'd be rashness for it: let us know, our indiscretion sometimes serves us well, when our deep plots do pall: and that should teach us, There's a divinity that shapes our ends, rough-hew them how we will."

The Professor then proceeds to his conclusion: "Thus freed from the wholly accidental and passing alliance formed with pessimism in Schopenhauer's system, the monism of the will is the synthesis towards which the three factors which . . . co-operate in the development of European philosophy are tending. These factors are: reason, which postulates the essential unity of things (Parmenides, Plotinus, Spinoza); experience, which reveals the universality of struggle, effort, will (Heraclitus, Leibniz, Schelling); and conscience, which affirms the moral ideal, the ultimate end of the creative effort and universal becoming (Plato, Kant, Fichte).

"Nature is an evolution, of which infinite Perfection is both the motive force and the highest goal (Aristotle, Descartes, Hegel)." PROGRESS.

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.

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 _____ Ewen MacLeod

SUBSCRIPTION:

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

921

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

VANCOUVER, B. C., AUGUST 1, 1924.

THE PROSPERITY INDEX.

WHILE all over the world people are assembled voicing their peace time determination that there shall be no more war the Allied conference is assembled in London trying to patch together the fragments of misery left everywhere into a working whole for the resumption of conditions which make war possible. Indeed, if we may judge of the anxiety displayed by the financial stakeholders in the game, the chief, if not the only factor operating to the hindrance of the launching of any definite immediate war note, is the fact that the last war was over costly and arrangements for the payment of its expense bill, quite irrespective of actual payments, seems impossible to effect. It would appear that new international wars, although their likelihood is "accepted on principle," are unlikely happenings to be at once looked for until the monarchs of finance and industry settle their quarrels over the questionable spoils of the last one. The propelling force in the settlement is a desire everywhere in the business world to end the post-war business uncertainty; the humanitarian, so far as he is effective, takes second place.

Two years ago the world of finance, strongest in its parts now in America, outlined the terms of its willingness to extend credit to Germany. These were unacceptable, to France mainly. In the see-saw and give-and-take since then many factors have appeared to influence terms and the alliances of the groups who stands to gain. Whereas a year or two ago French and American finance appeared to join together in exercising weight since then we have heard less of mutual hostility between Great Britain and United States concerning oil bearing areas and we have seen a great palaver of ostensible friendship manifested between these two latter countries. Shell and Standard Oil appear less rowdy concerning Persia and with the Lausanne agreement the Asia Minor territory, the cradle of everlasting strife and, eighteen months ago the centre of world attention, has become placid. Germany reached out for her share of exploitable areas and the share she lost has been a big bone of contention among the several "victorious nations." Germany herself, if settlement (so called) on the basis of the Dawes Report is effected, will be established virtually as a mandate area under control of an international finance commission. How far she may be bled within any fiscal period shall be indicated by a well contrived "prosperity index," not the prosperity of her people but of her return on capital investment. Her producing class will simply suffer the exactions of a new brand of overseer. How far the un-German nature of the impending exploitation process may affect the nationalist sensibilities of the people has been indicated already by the many demonstrations made by the people against the French occupational forces in the Ruhr area. It is not to be supposed that the population of 1914-18 has yet shed all its nationalist sentiment.

The Dawes Report has been accepted "in principle" by the nations concerned in Reparations and if in its main contents it becomes effective the world of finance will advance to Germany extensive credit, properly secured against abuse by any individual creditor nation, and the effort will be made to set in motion the wheels of industry and to re-establish

the productive Germany of 1914. German state railways, industries and agricultural enterprises are to be denationalised and subjected to a "spread" control. This means an effort to further squeeze the productive population to the yielding of still more surplus but for a changed master. The gauge is the prosperity index and the indicator is to run as far up as possible without wrecking the plant. The Dawes Report is an important document, surely. How important we may conjecture by its terms: How important it will be for Germany will be a matter for time to show. The prosperity index will have to spread itself all over the industrial world or its efficient working in one area may wreck the productive plant all over.

HERE AND NOW.

In our constant efforts to centre attention on our needs Here and Now we have presented our sorrowful tale with as much buoyancy as we could seize upon from time to time. The buoyancy at our immediate command is about enough to disrupt the whole structure of Coueism. The reason for which is as follows:

Following \$1 each: A. Olson, C. F. Orchard, E. Johnson, E. F. Rawlings, J. H. James, J. M. Wilson, H. Christians, Sr., L. N. Bull, R. F. Kavaner.

Following \$2 each: J. Woods, G. Broadhurst, M. and G. Stafford.

G. E. Wilkinson \$8.60.

Above, Clarion subs. received from 15th to 31st July, inclusive, total \$23.60.

CLARION MAINTENANCE FUND.

J. Woods \$1; A. Tree 27 cents; J. Wedin \$1.50; St. John Comrades, (per S. E. White) \$6.75.

Above, C.M.F. receipts from 15th to 31st July, inclusive, total \$9.52.

VANCOUVER ELECTORAL DISTRICT STATEMENT OF ELECTORAL EXPENSES

Income	
Cash advanced by Socialist Party.....	\$25.00
Collections Theatre Royal Propaganda Meetings June 1, 8 and 15.....	87.93
	<hr/> \$112.93
Expenditures	
Materials for Sandwich Board.....	\$ 4.41
Sandwich board carrier, 3 days at \$4.....	12.00
Automobile advertising, 2 days.....	10.00
Rent Theatre Royal.....	60.00
Copy of Election Act.....	.35
Copy of Voter's List.....	.25
Printing.....	5.75
Advertising "Labor Statesman".....	4.00
Balance returned to Socialist Party.....	16.17
	<hr/> \$112.93
	Local No. 1, S. P. of C.
	A. R. SNOWBALL, Secretary
	E. MacLeod, Treasurer.

The War Drum

A sharply-contrasted point of view is given in an important book issued by Signor Francesco Nitti on "The Decadence of Europe." It is in the form of a quotation from M. Clemenceau and I am afraid puts forth a very widely held opinion. M. Clemenceau said in a speech delivered in the French Chamber:—

"I conceive of life after the war as a continual conflict, whether there be war or peace. I believe it was Bernhardt who said that politics is war conducted with other weapons. We can reverse that aphorism and say that peace is war conducted with other weapons."

Now, although that is taken from a leading exponent of France, it might just as well have come from a number of the military leaders in Germany, or in France, or even some of the militarists in this country or in America, for it expresses a very common opinion, and it has, as expressed, just that mingling of truth and falsehood, just the form of words that may carry two very different meanings, which appeal to those who are not in the habit of subjecting the formulas thrown at them to a close scrutiny. To say that life is conflict is to express a truth, but it is, after all, only half a truth. For life is not fundamentally conflict within the group, but is fundamentally co-operation. The war should certainly have taught us that if it has taught us anything, for the prime condition of carrying on the war was the suppression of conflict among ourselves; and to conclude that because life involves conflict (rather a different proposition), therefore the conflict must take the form of military warfare, is to make the confusion almost criminal in its dissemination.

There is no ground for the popular belief that primitive society was continuously at war. That picture of primitive life is as false as the eighteenth-century doctrine of the noble savage. The savage is not noble, neither is he filled with ideas of war—unless one chooses to call war the contest that is going on between man and the animal world. Society commences in the grouping of people on a basis of co-operation, and cannot commence, nor can it be sustained, in any other way. There are circumstances connected with early society which give rise to contests between groups, but these circumstances need not detain us here. And even when there is established a definite military class, with warfare a recurrent feature of tribal life, the life of co-operation is always in the background, and upon that militarism fastens its tentacles. For militarism is par-

asitic from every point of view. It obviously cannot support itself in the means of living. That has to be provided by others, and whether it is provided by the people with whom the army fights, or with the people for whom the army fights, does not affect this in the slightest degree. But militarism is as parasitic morally as mentally. No army in the world has ever been able to keep itself fit by fighting. The inevitable effect of that is to demoralise and to weaken. It is only by falling back upon the virtues developed during seasons of peace that an army can get its moral strength, just as it must fall back upon the wealth amassed during peace-time to support it during war. The militarist class is the most parasitic that society has yet invented. It produces nothing, and under modern conditions it may be questioned whether it can even discharge the function of protecting.

The truth stated by M. Clemenceau, but so stated as to become a dangerous half-truth, is that life is conflict. So it is, or, to put it from the point of view of a scientific sociology, life is conflict in and through co-operation. There is with all men a love of rivalry, of conflict, and the delight in victory; and these feelings are so deeply rooted, and so persistently displayed in all stages of human existence, that one is quite justified in attributing to them some special value in social life; and a special value they undoubtedly have. Briefly, they stand as among the immediate incentives to conduct that make for development. Among animals we have in the conflict that takes place for the possession of the female a rough-and-ready form of selection which secures that the weaker specimens shall not survive. With man, where the conflict takes on a more intellectual form the desire to stand well with the rest of the tribe, the power of public opinion, the sheer delight of exercising qualities, whether of mind or muscle, keeps alive the love of conflict, and the delight in victory, with the tribute of admiration that is paid the victor. Conflict is thus indeed deeply rooted in life, but the mistake made by generalisers of the militaristic variety is in assuming that the typical and inevitable form of this is the soldier, whereas the truth is that a social life developed to even the point that we have developed it makes the soldier merely a degraded form of qualities that should find a much healthier expression, and which during times of peace actually does find it.

CHAPMAN COHEN

The Labor Party as Seen by Newbold

THE Labor Party is as I understand it, something very much bigger, something very much more inspiring than a mere creation of any one or any two or three bodies of propagandists who have succeeded over a period of years in impressing upon their audiences the reasonable character of their political propositions.

It is not something that has been conjured up by Socialists, called into existence to give effect to a theory or to materialize an ideal. It is not something which, if you turn it up, you will find to have stamped upon it, "Made by the I.L.P.," or by any other of the sects that have, during more than forty years, been passing resolutions in committee rooms or bawling themselves hoarse at the street corners.

It is the politically organized working men and working women of Great Britain, and, in association with them, a number of other men and women who have come to realize that only in that company can they express their personality to their own satisfaction. It is a spontaneous, however slowly developed, movement of the vast masses of the common people.

To complain that its aims are vague, that its methods are halting, that its leaders are confused, cranky or even crooked—as many of them, doubtless, are—is utterly to fail to understand the Labor Party for what it is, one of the great, inevitable forces which conditions produce, and of which history bids us to take cognisance.

The Labor Party is a strange medley, but it is only yet in the early stages of growth. It will, in the course of time, become something more than a party, it will become identical with the working class. It is, in fact, the working class becoming conscious of itself and of its destiny.

It came slowly and tortuously into existence between 1869 and 1908, not to win the masses for Socialism or even to the cause of political independent political action, but to win for them two or three quite definite, immediately practical objectives—Trade Union rights, Workmen's Compensation, and the Miners' 8-hour Day. Having won these things, it became of little or no account until, after the war, there were again things for which the workers had to fight the whole Capitalist class. Then, the workers, enrolled in their Unions or merely reacting to the misery of low wages and over-crowding and unemployment, sought in the Labor Party a means to improve their lot.

Gradually, ever so slowly but ever so surely, the masses of the people begin to understand that things have come to the pass that only when they resolve to take will anything be given to them.

The Labor Party has force only in so far as that understanding hardens from a hesitant unrest into a fixed and resolute revolt.

That again, will only happen when conditions become so unbearable that men and women used to a decent standard of living—not the slum proletariat—will break with those terrible traditions of respectability that shackle this imperial people.

It seemed in 1919 and, again, in 1921, that large masses of workers were reaching the point when they might actually revolt and grasp political power, not waiting for a General Election, but by Direct Action. Some of my comrades thought then, and think still, that only craven and treacherous leadership prevented the Revolution developing. There never was "a cat in hell" chance of the workers rising either in 1919 or in 1921. They still had illusions too many and too profound. They still had faith in collective bargaining. They still had faith in Parliamentary democracy. Their conditions were uncomfortable, but they were far from being unbearable.

No one can precipitate a revolution. If there are traditions, such as there were in Ireland in 1916, one may awake them, but here there are no such traditions.

That does not mean there will be no revolution here. The Revolution is not very far off. It lies in the years ahead when John Wheatley is going to

try to make the Capitalists pay for the building of enough decent houses for non-Capitalists to live in; when Tom Johnston is evicting the Scottish landlords, and when the M.F.G.B. is insisting on the miners being treated as human beings should be. The money needed to set the unemployed to work, to give the children of the workers a first-rate education, to give full compensation to all injured and wounded in the service of Capitalism in peace and war cannot be found except by cutting to the very bone the already steadily falling rate of profits taken by the Capitalists.

The Labor Party will find itself face to face with the alternative of surrender or of faking power and of holding power. The latter will mean Revolution.

It is conceivable that the Labor Party may put up its hands and ask for a truce with the Capitalists. Some of its leaders will, certainly, go over to the enemy and others will go into retirement. But it is extremely improbable that their defection will be the signal for anything but a howl of execration or a shrug of pity from the vast majority of the Labor Party.

We are very fortunate in this country. We are having a chance to discover our Eberts, our Noskes and our Schiedmanns before entering upon the critical stages of the struggle. This trotting round to Buckingham Palace, this standing about in feathers and kneebreeches, this dining and wining with the Capitalists, this fawning upon the King and playing golf with princes and coal-owners is a jolly good thing. It is showing the workers in time who are the "climbers," the "table hunters," and the "belly-crawlers" in the movement.

These people are only dangerous so long as they are not discovered. Since the rash has come out so soon there is no need to get unduly alarmed. The right thing to do is to isolate them at once. Some of them may get over it. Others, probably are incurable. After all they are infinitely more comic than they are tragic.

What some comrades need is a sense of proportion.

The Labor Government has made some ghastly errors. It has got in its fore-front some frightfully "hard cases" and some queer "mugwumps." It has made some most serious surrenders. It has not been able to do much more than administer the bankrupt estate. It has not been able to impose heavy taxation, to bring forward drastic proposals for dealing with unemployment.

Its failures have, however, been failures not of intent but of necessity. Its failures will be repeated, moreover, by a Labor Government even when it has a majority. It is a prisoner in the hands of the interests of high finance.

What is needed—and, surely, Tom Johnston or someone else on the back benches is the man with the courage, the ability and the pertinacity to do it—is for someone very definitely to say why the Labor Government cannot find money, and, therefore, cannot give effect to the aims that I, for one, believe it would if it could but it can't.

The Labor Party has been allowed to get into office and to remain there because interests which can always manipulate the Capitalist political parties—hoped in that way to discredit it, and, whilst there is nothing to take its place, to sow dissension in its own ranks.

Yet, when the worst that can honestly be said has been said, the balance of advantage is on the side of the Labor Party. It has given to the workers an object-lesson. It has shown them Labor in the seats of the mighty. It has whetted their appetite for power.

There are two things we should aim at today. The first is to secure the return of the Labor Party at the General Election with such a majority that those who believe in Parliamentarism may have the most favorable opportunity possible to test their ideals. For my part, I intend to give them every assistance. I hope others of my comrades will do the same. We have nothing to lose, those of us on the

Extreme Left, by such a tactic. The only lessons that count are not those written in windy resolutions but taught by stern experience.

The second thing to do is to work ceaselessly to achieve an eventual unity of the Left. This cannot be manufactured. It can only come about when we find ourselves doing the same kind of things in much the same kind of way.

Here we are years along the road, and miles nearer the enemy. He is right in front of us and curling around on either flank. We are not marching up from the depots, learning strategy en route. We are actually deploying on the battlefield. We are up against the one enemy, Capitalism, the enemy we hate more than anything else. If we have any sense, we shall cultivate sympathetic understanding, indulge in the minimum of recrimination and reserve our blows for that big, ugly brute opposite.

J. T. WALTON NEWBOLD.
in "Forward," Glasgow.

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.

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 _____

The Decay of Business Enterprise

BY THORSTEIN VEBLEN.

BROADLY, the machine discipline acts to disintegrate the institutional heritage, of all degrees of antiquity and authenticity—whether it be the institutions that embody the principles of natural liberty or those that comprise the residue of more archaic principles of conduct still current in civilized life. It thereby cuts away that ground of law and order on which business enterprise is founded. The further cultural bearing of this disintegration of the received order is no doubt sufficiently serious and far-reaching, but it does not directly concern the present inquiry. It comes in question here only in so far as such a deterioration of the general cultural tissues involves a set-back to the continued vigor of business enterprise. But the future of business enterprise is bound up with the future of civilization, since the cultural scheme is, after all, a single one, comprising many interlocking elements, no one of which can be greatly disturbed without disturbing the working of all the rest.

In its bearing on the question in hand, the "social problem" at large presents this singular situation. The growth of business enterprise rests on the machine technology as its material foundation. The machine industry is indispensable to it; it cannot get along without the machine process. But the discipline of the machine process cuts away the spiritual, institutional foundations of business enterprise; the machine industry is incompatible with its growth; it cannot, in the long run, get along with the machine process. In their struggle against the cultural effects of the machine process, therefore, business principles cannot win in the long run; since an effectual mutilation or inhibition of the machine system would gradually push business enterprise to the wall; whereas with a free growth of the machine system business principles would presently fall into abeyance.

The institutional basis of business enterprise—the system of natural rights—appears to be a peculiarly unstable affair. There is no way of retaining it under changing circumstances, and there is no way of returning to it after circumstances have changed. It is a hybrid growth, a blend of personal freedom and equality on the one hand and of prescriptive rights on the other hand. The institutions and points of law under the natural-rights scheme appear to be of an essentially provisionally character. There is relatively great flexibility of possibility of growth and change; natural rights are singularly insecure under any change of circumstances. The maxim is well approved that eternal vigilance is the price of (natural) liberty. When, as now, this system is endangered by socialistic or anarchistic disaffection there is no recourse that will carry the institutional apparatus back to a secure natural-rights basis. The system of natural liberty was the product of a peaceful regime of handiwork and petty trade; but continued peace and industry presently carried the cultural growth beyond the phase of natural rights by giving rise to the machine process and large business; and these are breaking down the structure of natural rights by making these rights nugatory on the one hand and by cutting away the spiritual foundations of them on the other hand. Natural rights being a by-product of peaceful industry, they cannot be reinstated by a recourse to warlike habits and a coercive government, since warlike habits and coercion are alien to the natural-rights spirit. Nor can they be reinstated by a recourse to settled peace and freedom, since an era of settled peace and freedom would push on the dominance of the machine process and the large business, which break down the system of natural liberty.

When the question is cast up as to what will come of this conflict of institutional forces—called the Social Problem—it is commonly made a question of remedies: What can be done to save civilized mankind from the vulgarization and disintegration

wrought by the machine industry?

Now, business enterprise and the machine process are the two prime movers in modern culture; and the only recourse that holds a promise of being effective, therefore, is a recourse to the workings of business traffic. And this is a question, not of what is conceivably, ideally, idyllically possible for the business community to do if they will take thought and act advisedly and concertedly toward a chosen cultural outcome to be achieved through business traffic carried on for business ends, not for cultural ends. It is a question not of what ought to be done, but of what is to take place.

Persons who are solicitous for the cultural future commonly turn to speculative advice as to what ought to be done toward holding fast that which is good in the cultural heritage, and what ought further to be done to increase the talent that has been intrusted to this generation. The practical remedy offered is commonly some proposal for palliative measures, some appeal to philanthropic, aesthetic, or religious sentiment, some endeavor to conjure with the name of one or another of the epiphenomena of modern culture. Something must be done, it is conceived, and this something takes the shape of charity organizations, clubs and societies for social "purity," for amusement, education, and manual training of the indigent classes, for colonization of the poor, for popularization of churches, for clean politics, for cultural missionary work by social settlements, and the like. These remedial measures whereby it is proposed to save or to rehabilitate certain praiseworthy but obsolescent habits of life and of thought are, all and several, beside the point so far as touches the question in hand. Not that it is hereby intended to cast a slur on these meritorious endeavors to save mankind by treating symptoms. The symptoms treated are no doubt evil, as they are said to be; or if they are not evil, the merits of that particular question do not concern the present inquiry. The endeavors in question are beside the point in that they do not fall into the shape of a business proposition. They are, on the whole, not so profitable a line of investment as certain other ventures that are open to modern enterprise. Hence, if they traverse the course of business enterprise and of industrial exigencies, they are nugatory, being in the same class with the labor of Sisyphus; whereas if they coincide in effect with the line along which business and industrial exigencies move, they are a work of supererogation, except so far as they may be conceived to accelerate a change that is already under way. Nothing can deflect the sweep of business enterprise, unless it be an outgrowth of this enterprise itself or of the industrial means by which business enterprise works.

Nothing can serve as a corrective of the cultural trend given by the machine discipline except what can be put in the form of a business proposition. The question of neutralizing the untoward effects of the machine discipline resolves itself into a question as to the cultural work and consequences of business enterprise, and of the cultural value of business principles in so far as they guide such human endeavor as lies outside the range of business enterprise proper. It is not a question of what ought to be done, but of what is the course laid out by business principles; the discretion rests with the business men, not with the moralists, and the business men's discretion is bounded by the exigencies of business enterprise. Even the business men cannot allow themselves to play fast and loose with business principles in response to a call from humanitarian motives. The question, therefore, remains, on the whole, a question of what the business men may be expected to do for cultural growth on the motive of profits.

Something they are doing, as others are, from motives of benevolence, with a well-advised endeavor to maintain the cultural gains of the past and

to make the way of life smoother for mankind in the future. But the more secure and substantial results to be looked for in this direction are those that follow incidentally, as by-products of business enterprise, because these are not dependent on the vagaries of personal preference, tastes, and prejudices, but rest on a broad institutional basis.

The effects of business enterprise upon the habits and temper of the people, and so upon institutional growth, are chiefly of the nature of sequelae. It has already been noted that the discipline of business employments is of a conservative nature, tending to sustain the conventions that rest on natural-rights dogma, because these employments train the men engaged in them to think in terms of natural rights. It is unnecessary to return to this topic here, except to notice that, in its severer, more unmitigated form, this discipline in pecuniary habits of thought falls on a gradually lessening proportion of the population. The absolute number of business men, counting principals and subordinates, is, of course, not decreasing. The number of men in business pursuits, in proportion to the population, is also apparently not decreasing; but within the business employments a larger proportion are occupied with office routine, and so are withdrawn from the more effectual training given by business management proper. If such a decrease occurs in any country, it is almost certainly not to be found in any other country than America.

This business discipline is somewhat closely limited both in scope and range. (1) It acts to conserve, or to rehabilitate, a certain restricted line of institutional habits of thought, viz. those preconceptions of natural rights which have to do with property. What it conserves, therefore, is the bourgeois virtues of solvency, thrift and dissimulation. The nobler and more spectacular aristocratic virtues, with their correlative institutional furniture, are not in any sensible degree fortified by the habits of business life. Business life does not further the growth of manners and breeding, pride of caste, punctilios of "honor," or even religious fervor. (2) The salutary discipline of business life touches the bulk of the population, the working classes, in a progressively less intimate and less exacting manner. It can, therefore, not serve to correct or even greatly to mitigate the matter-of-fact bias given these classes by the discipline of the machine process.

As a direct disciplinary factor the machine process holds over the business employments, in that it touches larger classes of the community and inculcates its characteristic habits of thought more unremittingly. And any return to more archaic methods of industry, such as is sometimes advocated on artistic grounds, seems hopeless, since business interests do not countenance a discontinuance of machine methods. The machine methods that are corrupting the hearts and manners of the workmen are profitable to the business men, and that fact seems to be decisive on the point. A direct, advised return to handiwork, or any similar discontinuance of the machine industry, is out of the question; although something in the way of a partial return to more primitive methods of industry need not be impracticable as a remote and indirect consequence of the working of business enterprise.

The indirect or incidental cultural bearing of business principles and business practice is wide-reaching and forceful. Business principles have a peculiar hold upon the affections of the people as something intrinsically right and good. They are therefore drawn on for guidance and conviction even in concerns that are not conceived to be primarily business concerns. So, e.g., they have permeated the educational system, thoroughly and intimately. Their presence, as an element of common sense, in the counsels of the "educators" shows itself in a naive insistence on the "practical" when

(Continued on page 7)

Socialism and Science

SCIENCE, like the Socialistic movement, is international. It is no respecter of person or place. Under a certain atmospheric pressure and temperature, vapor condenses into rain. It does so in America; it does so in China. To exploit labor, the means of production must be owned as private property. It is so in America; it is so in China. Because like causes produce like results, when an industrial depression sets in over the world, we know it is not due to the perversity of a few Wall street bankers, but to international unpaid labor.

So we know that some tremendous force was at work when, for example, the generation that saw the end of the 19th century, witnessed the inauguration of the factory system, political disturbances in America and France, new departures in economics, medicine, treatment of the insane, criminology, psychology, philosophy and science. Historical materialism declares that the primary cause was the clash between the rising capitalists, whose right lower science then was, and the feudal aristocracy. Again, in the middle of the century, when the revolutions of 1848 placed the capitalist class completely on the throne, there was an impetus given to science that brought forth the theory of organic evolution, and that brought forth the scientists of the working class with the theory of social evolution. And just as Alfred Russel Wallace arrived at the theory of natural selection independently of Darwin, so Engels and, later, Morgan arrived at the theory of historical materialism independently of Marx—showing that both theories were the ripe fruit of circumstance.

Science and Socialism belong together. For, just as, in ancient times, potentates slew bearers of evil tidings, so modern scientists and Socialists have been execrated, upon the supposition that there would be no evolution if science did not say so, and there would be no class struggle if Socialists did not direct our attention to it!

The capitalist class, having reached the zenith of their career, are opposed to further progress, and leave science to shift for herself. So one group of thinkers are losing themselves in the maze of "science for the sake of science." Their work is sterile or, is apt to be devoted to designing automatic machinery and inventing labor-saving devices, rather than health and life-saving appliances. Their "expert" testimony depends upon how much they receive an hour and who their clients are. But another group acknowledge the consequences of the modern theories and subscribe to the program of Socialism. Theirs is known as proletarian science. It is founded upon a wider, fuller and completer materialism, for "materialism is," as Untermann says, "the handmaid of revolution, and without it no proletarian movement complies with the historical requirements of its evolution." It is because the proletarians, propertyless workers, "have nothing to lose but their chains," that they take hold of the guidon of science and carry it forward to fresh victories.

In proletarian science, evolution and revolution are twin forces. Every period of slow development, evolution, is followed by a complete change, a change of the fundamental principle, or revolution. Revolution paves the way for further evolution. To use a well-known illustration: The embryo is part of the mother, growing slowly through the placenta, until the moment of birth, the revolution. The child thenceforward is independent. It may live, even though the mother perish in the act of giving it birth. Applying this theory to past and present society, the Socialist holds that capitalism is evolving to the point where a social revolution will bring forth a new order, Socialism. More than that, de-

velopment along the same line increases in velocity as it reaches its culmination. Feudalism did not last nearly so many centuries as primitive communism did millenniums. Capitalism is not more than five centuries old at most; full-grown, hardly a century. Nowadays, new machinery is no sooner installed than it is ready for scrapping. The industrial revolution gave capitalism its spade. It began digging its grave when it annexed the Orient.

The theory of evolution by slow accumulation is, for that matter, hardly less radical than that of alternate evolution and revolution. Nature fulfils her purpose of corroding mountain ranges and augmenting the oceans as well by the sputtering spring as by the gushing geyser. To the lone traveler on the road at midnight, when all is wrapped in slumber, who stands, a mere speck, at the center of that infinite sphere strewn with stars, nature is just as majestic and terrible as when she drives a tidal wave that engulfs a city. The unpretentious sailor who remains at his post of duty, while the ship is sinking, and for thirty hours flashes wireless signals of distress, so saving hundreds of lives, is adding a little to the comradeship of labor and love that is the harbinger of the better-time a-coming.

Objections raised in the name of science against Socialism, Ferri readily disposes of. Indeed, most of these overlook the fact that Socialism is the only consistent explanation of social evolution. On the other hand, Massart and Vandervelde very satisfactorily compare parasitism in the social world with that in the organic. The slave master, the feudal lord, as well as minor celebrities, such as the pirate and brigand, belong to the past. In our own day we note that the higher a class is, the more useless is it. Financial capital domineers over landed property, transportation exacts tribute from manufacture and agriculture, while the capitalist class exploit the workers. The capitalists perform little or no necessary functions; the purpose they serve is largely ornamental. They are parasites, merely devourers of the workers' substance, as Lafargue wittily pictures in his "Sale of an Appetite."

The word parasitism, by the way, was used in sociology before it was in biology. Here we may remark, philology, the science of language, is of considerable aid in the study of the origin of institutions. Lafargue, among Socialists, has made the best contribution in this respect. To cite a few instances: He tells us that the term capital dates back only to the 18th century, and that it has no equivalent in the Greek and Latin tongue, showing how absurd it is to speak of the capital of the savage. Likewise, a savage's notion of private property is substantially different from that of a civilized man's. The savage never reveals his name to a stranger; the civilized man has cards printed especially for purposes of introduction. And, quoting the Jesuit Charlevoix: "The brotherly sentiments of the Redskins are doubtless in part ascribable to the fact that the words "mine" and "thine" are all unknown as yet to the savages."

What science teaches us, therefore, is that everything, organic and social, has passed and is passing through a continuous evolution and revolution up to higher forms. We are certain that those who have gone before did not dispose of the riddles of the universe, we are reasonably sure that we know a little more than they did. And we can be positive that we who live today have not uttered the final word,—they who come after us will add something to the jot of knowledge we possess.

Nature's plea for democracy is exemplified in the formula: "Science is general knowledge systematized." Not what some individual discovers and makes his secret, but what is commonly known and is an influence in common life, is of scientific value. Further, evolution granted, capitalism will pass away as did feudalism, chattel slavery and primitive communism. And if Socialism is not to be the outcome of the present drift toward industrial collectivism, what social order will?

When the class-society of today has given way to the fraternity of the world's workers, it does not mean that progress will cease, and that the human family will deteriorate into a low level of equals. On the contrary, to be economically free, to rest assured that our material wants are disposed of for all time to come, and so end the conflict for bread, means that our energies and capabilities can then be directed toward intellectual pursuits, and that, consequently, man will begin a new course of development: he will describe a new arc in the spiral of intellectual splendor.

—J. E. COHEN in "Socialism For Students"

THE DECAY OF BUSINESS ENTERPRISE

Continued from page 6

ever the scheme of instruction is under advisement. "Practical" means useful for private gain. Any new departure in public instruction, whether in the public schools or in private endowed establishments, is scrutinized with this test in mind; which results in a progressive, though not wholly consistent, narrowing of instruction to such learning as is designed to give a ready application of results rather than a systematic organization of knowledge. The primary test is usefulness for getting an income. The secondary test, practically applied where latitude is allowed in the way of "culture" studies, is the aptness of the instruction in question to fit the learners for spending income in a decorous manner. Hence quasi-scholarly accomplishments. Much of the current controversy as to the inclusion or exclusion of one thing and another from the current curriculum of secondary and higher schools might be reduced to terms of one or the other of these two purposes without doing violence to the arguments put forth and with a great gain in conciseness and lucidity.

There is also a large resort to business methods in the conduct of the schools; with the result that a system of scholastic accountancy is enforced both as regards the work of the teachers and the progress of the pupils; whence follows a mechanical test of competency in all directions. This lowers the value of the instructions for purposes of intellectual initiative and a reasoned grasp of the subject-matter. This class of erudition is rather a hindrance than a help to habits of thinking. It conduces to conviction rather than to inquiry, and is therefore a conservative factor.

In the endowed schools there is, moreover, an increasing introduction of business men and business methods into the personnel and the administrative work. This is necessarily so since these schools are competitors for students and endowments. The policy of these schools necessarily takes on something of the complexion of competitive business; which throws the emphasis on those features of school life that will best attract students and donors. The features which count most directly in these directions are not the same as would count most effectively toward the avowed ends of these schools. The standards which it is found imperative to live up to are not the highest standards of scholarly work. Courtesy as well as expediency inclines these schools to cultivate such appearances and such opinions as may be expected to find favor with men of wealth. These men of wealth are business men, for the most part elderly men, who are, as is well known, prevailing of a conservative temper in all cultural matters, and more especially as touches those institutions that bear on business affairs.

A more far-reaching department of the educational system, though not technically rated as such, is the periodical press, both newspapers and magazines. This is a field of business enterprise, and business principles may be expected to work more consistently and to a more unqualified result in this field than in the school system, where these principles come in incidentally.

(To be continued in next issue)

Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde

THE discussion that has received so much attention in the columns of the Clarion relative to an article eulogizing the Labor government by Taylor, has somewhat found another admirer in "C," who quotes Marx and Engels in true Kautskian style, to substantiate the Labor government's Bourgeois policy. "C's" article on the "Theoretical Aspects of Social Reform" is only an evasion of the three criticisms, and he assumes a position and starts his whole argument on a basis upon which none of the three criticisms presented, which is a trick only becoming to the reptile journalists. But since the gauntlet has been thrown down to us "Three Musketeers," I must, as one of them, take issue with "C" as he is as much in that hopeless rut on revolutions as our friend Taylor is on History.

"C" tells us that he "was moved to reflection on these lines on reading three criticisms of G. R. Stirling Taylor's article on the 'Importance of History.'" "To me," "C" continues, "it was as plain as a pike staff that Taylor was looking to the future of social change in Great Britain. He was simply declaring for constitutional procedures as against the violence of civil war for bringing on revolutionary social changes, and to that end he was urging a study of history so that those who are fighting the battles of labor might do so more efficiently." In other words, "C's" statement resolves itself into this, that if the workers acquired a comprehensive knowledge of history, Socialism could be accomplished by the rapid evolution of Capitalism, instead of by Revolution. Now this peculiar philistine, petty Bourgeois conception is today identified with all the leading social patriots and lackeys, of the Bourgeoisie and is very consoling for the proletariat. "But," says Feuerbach, "whoever consoles a slave instead of inciting him to revolt against slavery, renders services to the slave holder." If our comrade "C" wants to study history with our friend Taylor and H. G. Wells, who after perusing through volumes on history, comes to the conclusion that they want to trim Marx's beard, why all I can say to "C" is, that so much the pity for him, it is not Marx's beard they want to trim but his punch, and like all the rest of the philistines, they sap all the revolutionary strength from history and console the Proletariat with reconciliation of classes, and transform history into a pious doctrine of peace. Our comrade "C" unfortunately falls into the same line of reasoning only in a much more hypocritical manner. He tries to justify Taylor's Tory-Democratic illusions with quotations from Marx. It is pure unadulterated eclecticism and is contrary to the dialectical reasoning of Marx, Engels, and Dietzgen.

"C's" quotation from Engels' preface to Marx's Capital, wherein Engels says that at least in Europe, England is the only country where the inevitable social revolution might be effected entirely by peaceful and legal means. But "C's" cobwebs forbid him to add that it is just as feasible and logical that a social revolution might not come through peaceful channels. What then, "C"? Shall we continue to study history for a peaceful solution?

In order to approach this question from a Marxian or a Dialectical viewpoint, we must state that under certain conditions a peaceful solution can be possible, and again under different conditions it is not possible for a peaceful solution. "C" must state those conditions if he wants to give us a correct analogy for the capture of political power. If we should follow this particular question to its logical conclusion, we could say that if England is the country where a peaceful solution might be effected, then it necessarily follows that in any other European countries it must be a violent one. If one seriously attempted to give a socialist viewpoint of this question, he must first ask if the English government will in the future, as it has not in the past, allow its subjected and colonial peoples free and unhampered access to all the avenues of election and propaganda in peaceful as well as in revolutionary

situations, and will sit by with its army and navy and the rest of its governmental institutions and allow the English proletariat to seize power and introduce socialist economic measures such as socialization and distribution of the means of wealth production without resistance, why then, "C", it is quite possible. But if, on the contrary, "C," the English capitalists take recourse to those same despotic methods on the English workers as they have in the past with the Irish and its oppressed colonial peoples for emancipation from British Imperialism, then it is quite safe to say the English proletariat will be compelled to fight a violent civil war for a seizure of power. Whoever fails to take cognizance of these facts in his analysis of this remote, but inevitable situation, is hopelessly lost.

The whole trouble with "C" is, he condemns the application of violence in all forms as a political measure for a seizure of state power because he takes isolated and individual cases where freaks and coup d'etat artists, who see the revolution around the corner when the objective and subjective conditions for such methods are politically immature and would only result in a heroic defeat. It is like condemning Marxism for its Bernsteins, Kautskys, Spargos, and Hillquits, et al., who have written books galore in an endeavor to reconcile his teachings with their opportunism.

In conclusion I must again quote from "C's" article, wherein he, with rose colored phraseology justifies reformism; "Now as to the present labor of Great Britain or of anywhere else, what would have been Marx's attitude towards it? Anything like that of our three Musketeers who are after its destruction? I am sure not! In my opinion, Marx's efforts in the practical affairs of the working class movement of his time were devoted to the immediate end of getting the working class into a field of political strife as a unit, even though they were not 'Marxists.'" Sure that that strife and positions gained were an important and indispensable phase of their education and development. Marx knew that a new social class with its growing consciousness would begin the creation of its institutions, for furthering its desires; and that institutions are flexible, expanding with the developing consciousness and ambitions of the class. He would not seek to destroy them or sabotage them, but rather seek to assist the class in its development, realizing that its institutions would in turn reflect it's progress. Marx, as a 'Darwinian,' knew that the days of miracles are gone and that procreation, nurture, birth and growth to maturity are inescapable phases of life in this world."

Now this line of reasoning is quite correct on the surface of things, but to one who has not assimilated the teachings of Marx, it presents an omission which takes away the essential core of a revolutionary socialist position on immediate demands and social reform. It is a fact common to anyone who has taken Marx's economic teachings seriously, that he always demanded that the workers fight for a raise in wages, or to resist the encroachments on the part of the capitalists to reduce wages, by the workers clubbing together in trade unions, but he never failed to point out that these trade unions were only fighting effects, and not causes, and consequently were not curing the malady, or as he more brilliantly put it, as palliatives.

This is the basis upon which I criticized the reformism of the Labor Government of Great Britain. It is not my intention, as "C" says, "to destroy the Labor Government," but to assist with all my power in transforming this historical event of the advent of the Labor Government to office, into revolutionary channels. Not to stand by and eulogize the Labor Government like our friend Taylor, nor to concoct quotations from Marx, justifying the hypocritical Bourgeois policies of the Labor Government, but to educate the working class whose minds are not independent from the economic and political circumstances of the Bourgeois environment. The proletariat is tied up with this environment by a

thousand and one threads, which in the course of generations have concocted and spun veritable cobwebs of Bourgeois illusions and prejudices in their heads and as a result, hinder the manifestations of their class interests which will not be removed until the whole superstructure of the capitalist system will collapse and shatter these old cobwebs in its fall. These illusions on private property, the family, state, law, democracy, free trade, religion and the nation and colonial peoples are still dominating the minds of the workers, in England and the rest of the world, but I am deeply convinced that the workers of England as well as of the world will overcome all these illusions and will fulfil their historic mission. So in summing up, we can come to the conclusion that if Marx were alive today and were to express his opinion on the Labor Governments with his powerful pen, he would again say "I sowed dragon's teeth and reaped fleas."

Comment: Is your contributor "C" a Tory Democrat or a Marxian Socialist?

M. J. INGLIS.

Editor's Note: Re the "Comment" which is not a comment, our contributor has already styled "C" a hypocrite—in which case he is bound to be both. What's the use!

CONCERNING PARTY OUTLOOK.

(Continued on page 2)

on any working class organisation. We must perhaps turn aside at times to advise, or direct, and this might produce a quarrel, bitter and prolonged. But the seeking of such a quarrel should be no part of our policy, as it undoubtedly was previous to 1924.

And if to entertain a little enthusiasm and considerable hope from the situation in Britain, and to give the Labor Party there credit for sincerity is a change of policy, I can again admit the charge without reserve. And when the United States can show even one million out of their hundred and ten staggering blindly in the direction of a specific labor project, then we further rejoice and be glad, even if we did not climb on the band wagon.

Literature Price List

Cloth Bound.	Per Copy
Critique of Political Economy	1.65
Revolution and Counter Revolution (Marx)	1.15
Ancient Society	1.35
Capitalist Production (First Nine and 32 Chapters)	
"Capital," vol. I, (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
Germes of Mind in Plants	80c
The Triumph of Life	80c
Feuerbark	80c
Social Revolution (Kautsky)	.80
Origin of Species (Darwin)	1.15
Essays on Materialist	
Conception of History (Labriola)	1.50
Social Studies (Lafargue)	.80
Paper Covers.	Per Copy
Evolution of Man (Prof. Bolsche)	30c
Wage-Labor and Capital	10c
Independent Working Class Education	10c
Communist Manifesto	10c
The Present Economic System (Prof. W. A. Bonger)	10c
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific	15c
Slave of the Farm	10c
Manifesto, S. P. of C.	10c
Causes of Belief in God (Lafargue)	10c
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 (Leckie)	35c
Civil War in France (Marx)	35c
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 22.00
Wage-Labor and Capital	25 copies 22.00
Present Economic System	25 copies 22.00
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific	25 copies 22.25
Slave of the Farm	25 copies 22.00
Manifesto of S. P. of C.	25 copies 22.00
Evolution of Man	25 copies 22.75
Causes of Belief in God	25 copies 22.00
Value, Price and Profit	25 copies 22.25
Economic Causes of War	10 copies 22.00
Christianism and Communism	6 copies 21.00

All prices include postage.

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