

WESTERN CLARION

Official Organ of

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

A Journal of
CURRENT
EVENTS

HISTORY
ECONOMICS
PHILOSOPHY

No. 897

NINETEENTH YEAR.

Twice a Month

VANCOUVER, B. C., AUGUST, 16, 1923.

FIVE CENTS

Communist Revolution in Germany?

By LUDWIG LORE

GERMANY is in the midst of a severe crisis. When the market value of the mark sinks from 444,000 to 1,100,000 per dollar in one week, we get something like a mental picture of the chaos that reigns in industrial Germany today. Prices keep step with the most breath-taking jumps the mark may take but lag far behind, due in no negligible degree to the earnest effort of the Social-Democracy and the labor union bureaucracy to remove every unpleasantness from the path of German capital. Hunger, starvation, disease and desperation follow apace. Bread riots are the natural consequence.

So unspeakable is the misery in Germany's industrial centres today, that even the most callous onlooker appreciates that violence must and will be the inevitable outcome. Misery has reached the point when life loses its value, and open rebellion seems preferable to fatalistic resignation. No one knows this better than the capitalist press. And sensing the storm in the air, it is already preparing public opinion to meet it and its consequences, with righteous holiness and virtuous disapproval by making the communists of Germany—and, of course, Russia—responsible for the "German revolution" that, in their eyes, is as good as an accomplished fact.

At the end of last week every capitalist and every socialist newspaper in America and in Europe featured on its first page the news that the Communist Party of Germany was preparing for a revolutionary outbreak on Sunday afternoon July 29. A credulous world already saw rivers of blood, a holocaust of murder and rape, and a Soviet government in Germany on Monday morning. As a matter of fact, even the not too apparent intelligence of these newswriters and correspondents might have perceived—and probably was not entirely unaware of the fact—that the C. P. of Germany was trying with all its power to prevent an outbreak at this time.

It called open air demonstrations, it is true, to protest against the spread of Fascism in Germany. But not with a view to violent uprisings. The fact that it turned these demonstrations into indoor meetings when it saw the German Nationalists and Socialists were placing the stamp of open rebellion upon them, shows how far from revolt was its actual purpose.

The Communists in Germany are preparing for the overthrow of the German government of reactionaries and weaklings. But they are intelligent enough to know that he who permits the enemy to choose time and place for an encounter puts himself at a hopeless disadvantage. Certainly the present moment offers the revolutionary working-class anything but a favorable position. Germany has neither raw materials nor products, neither money nor credit.

For the French and the Belgians, a proletarian uprising would be the signal for still more extensive military occupation. Revolution would mean a food-blockade, and the revolutionary leaders would be held responsible for the hunger and starvation that the united capitalists and socialist coalitionists have brought down upon the nation. The peasants

in Germany are not, as they were in Russia at the time of the Russian Revolution, poor, downtrodden, miserable slaves. They are, and have been for years, the profiteers of the present chaotic conditions, and will fight like tigers for their restoration.

Furthermore, it is an open secret that Poland, that vassal of French imperialism, created for the sole purpose of cutting off Russia from German assistance, and serving today, with equal efficiency, to prevent the Russian Soviet Government from coming to the aid of a revolutionary Germany, stands armed to the teeth, ready to plunge into the Baltic border states and to march upon Danzig as soon as France gives the signal. And above all, it should not be forgotten that a revolution, should it break out in Germany today, would bear not the international character of the Russian uprising, but would be tainted with a nationalism fostered by Entente brutalities. The force of its onslaught would be directed against the enemies without, rather than against the capitalists at home. Too long the latter have been playing the role of fellow-sufferers. Too large a part of the working class has forgotten that the German capitalist is its enemy.

The Social-Democracy, with its miserable policy of civil peace with the German bourgeoisie, created a situation that makes a revolution at this time a dangerous undertaking. It has nurtured a spirit of nationalism that has befuddled all class issues. By its policy of concession after concession to France and Belgium, it has reduced Germany to a nation of beggars; has broken its morale and its self-respect. And so long as the Social-Democracy maintains its influence over a large portion of the German working-class, a revolutionary uprising in Germany would mean new betrayal and new compromise with capitalism, and would end inevitably in a debacle that would leave the proletariat, for years to come, to take up the fight for its liberation.

The Social-Democracy is rapidly losing ground. The left elements of the Independent Social-Democracy, that joined the S. D. P. less than a year ago, in hopes of galvanizing it into revolutionary action, have never been completely assimilated.

They are the ferment of an active opposition that is threatening to split asunder this mighty bulwark of proletarian counter-revolution. Wherever the United Front propaganda of the communist forces became effective, and socialist and communist workingmen went into the fight for better conditions shoulder to shoulder, a new understanding of communism and communist motives resulted. The superstitions and traditions, the slanders and false accusations that the socialist press had built up before the eyes of its readers, to conceal the true face of the revolutionary proletariat, faded away. True understanding and real comradeship grew up instead.

In important industrial centers, and even in entire provinces, the united front is an actual fact, in spite of the dictates of the Central Executive Committee of the United Social-Democratic Party. In Saxony, where a Left-Socialist government is in power, this co-operation has borne wonderful fruit. In the parliament Right-Social-Democrats are launching bitter attacks against their party-comrades of the left. The official U. S.-D. P. speakers

call cabinet ministers "Bolshevists;" the Left-Social Democrats reply that there is only one difference between certain Social-Democrats and the bourgeois Democrats—the latter are less reactionary. The disintegration of the U. S.-D. P. is growing apace.

This is a process that will require time for its completion. To disturb it now by consciously and determinedly calling the working-class out upon the streets, would be suicidal. None know this better than the German and the Russian communist leaders. No one knows better than they that an ill-advised uprising may loose a storm of reaction that may not only wipe the communist movement of Germany off the map for years to come, but may precipitate a new world war that will engulf Soviet Russia.

Revolutions are not made. They arise out of intolerable economic conditions, created by a ruthless ruling class. It is not impossible that in Germany, in spite of the honest endeavors of communists to prevent it, a revolution may break out, because the suffering of the nation has reached a breaking point. Should this be the case, the communists of Germany and their comrades the world over will step into their rightful places as the advance guard of the militant proletariat, to direct this mighty flood of revolt into the channels of class conscious working-class political action, that it may sweep down with irresistible power all the forces of reaction, capitalism and weak kneed counter-revolution, in its path.

—Voice of Labor (Chicago), Aug. 11, 1923.

LOUCHEUR, STINNES & CO.

BEFORE 1914, the exploitation of the two mightiest mining areas of the continent, Lorraine and the Ruhr, ensured the predominance in Europe of the German bourgeoisie.

In order to break this dominion, the victorious Entente had to destroy its foundations. The Versailles Treaty therefore provided for the separation of the ores of Lorraine from Germany, and their incorporation in France, while the Ruhr coal was left to Germany.

But even the most solemn agreements, written in the blood of millions of poor propertyless victims, and protected by armies comprising millions of soldiers, cannot hold good if they contravene economic realities. The Treaty of Versailles, like many other treaties, is nothing more than a scrap of paper, because it attempts to break up the natural unity of the Rhine valley.

The German metal industries are as little able to do without the ore of Lorraine as the French metal industries of Lorraine are able to dispense with the Ruhr coal. The mutual economic dependence of the two areas is inalienable. The Rhine flowing between them must again become what it was before, a connecting line. It is only possible to properly utilize the huge riches of the Rhine valley when the owners work in the closest relationship with one another.

What form will these close relations take? Three possibilities may be considered:

(Continued on page 8)

Socialism and Science

By J. E. COHEN

MAN is not the product of social conditions alone. He is a human being, and traces of the lower animals are still very decided in him. As a human being, albeit endowed with considerably more mentality than the other animals, he has tried to explain the physical universe about him with mingled fear, wonder and perplexity. He has worshipped the sun, moon, other animals, his own organs and idols. He has imagined his gods to inhabit everything that grows, the elements, and the vast firmament that transcends his powers of conception. He celebrates by fast or feast such perennial phenomena as the coming of the seasons. He greets sunrise and sunset with prayer and is in the throes of the problem of immortality. And these things exert no little influence in shaping customs, traditions and traits of character; they make no little impression upon social arrangements.

Progress along this line is made by finding a natural explanation for what was formerly deemed supernatural. Science replaces faith. Knowledge ousts superstition.

"Science," say the scientists, "is general knowledge systematized." Science consists of properly arranged facts and theories and laws in regard to what passes about us.

The workingman does something like this at his bench or machine. Thus, before weaving, it is necessary to sort the cotton from the wool, material of one texture from that of another, that of one color from that of a different color, and that of expensive dye from that of an inferior grade. In like manner, science takes facts that are generally known, or should be generally known, and sorts them out according to the points of resemblance and distinction.

Science regards nothing as stationary. Everything is in a condition of flow; in the moment that it is one thing, it is becoming something else. "The present is the child of the past, but it is the parent of the future." As so often has been said, the only thing constant in nature is the law of perpetual change.

This law of perpetual change we see in operation all about us. Mother Earth shrugs her shoulders and mountain ranges rise or fall; she puckers up her lips, and ocean currents swerve around the continents. When she is cramped for room and stretches herself, there is likely to be an earthquake and perhaps tens of thousands of lives are lost and cities are demolished in a twinkling. Volcanoes remain to warn man of the restlessness of nature.

But while everything changes its form, nothing is ever lost. Life and death are companions throughout existence, the crest and trough of the wave of time. One makes way for the other. What perishes fertilizes what is about to be born; the dead, by giving life to the living, becomes the substance of the living. Shakespeare uses this idea in one of his plays:

"Hamlet: A man may fish with the worm that hath eat of a king, and eat of the fish that hath fed of that worm."

King: What dost thou mean by this?

Hamlet: Nothing but to show you how a king may go a process through the guts of a beggar."

In proof that we are related to all about us, Moore declares that more than two-thirds of the weight of the human body is made up of oxygen, a gas which forms one-fifth of the weight of the air, more than eight-ninths of that of the sea, and forty-seven per cent. of the superficial solids of the earth.

Nothing is constant. Everything changes. But that is all it does. Matter may be shifted about, but it cannot be lost. And however much force may be brought into play, only its form is altered. It is not destroyed. So far as we can see, the matter and force about us have always been and will always be.

There was no beginning, and there will be no end. They are everlasting.

This old earth of ours has been changing for quite a while. Boelsche thinks it is a million years old. And there is no telling how many millions of times the stuff of which our world is made was the stuff of other worlds or stars. We know ours was not the first or the last formed. Fitch declares that it is only a millionth part in bulk of the solar system—our sun, planets and their moons—and we know that the solar system is probably only a millionth part of the dust of the heavens. So that our ball of toil and trouble is only a grain in the celestial sandstorm. And the earth were here for the greater part of its million years before the being we call man arrived. Again quoting Moore: "Man is not the end, he is but an incident, of the infinite elaborations of Time and Space."

It may be accepted for a certainty that man was not created as man. He is the outcome of animals lower in the scale, which fact Darwin first dwelt upon. Evidence is plentiful on this score. Huxley, in "Man's Place in Nature," tells of the ties between man and the manlike apes, man's next of kin. Thus, there is greater difference among men's brains than there is between those of man and the gorilla. The difference in skull and skeleton between man and the gorilla are of smaller value than that between the gorilla and some other apes. The same is true of the dentition. Man in the embryonic stage is nearer to the ape than the ape is to the dog. Bebel declares that monkeys are the only beings, besides man, in whom the sexual impulse is not fixed to certain periods.

The process of the human embryo, from egg to ego, has the appearance of a panorama of the biological scale. Dr. Weisler, in his work on "Embryology," tells us that at the twenty-fifth day the embryo presents a well-developed tail. While maternal influences cease at the second week, up to the fourth week the heart of the human embryo is that which is the permanent condition of fishes. The nails begin in claw-like projections. In the seventh month, the lanugo, or embryonic down, makes its appearance, covers the surface of practically the whole body, and disappears in the eighth month. This is a relic of the days when what is now man was a hair-covered animal. Fitch gives a list of rudimentary organs, which were once useful in the animal ancestors of man, but are now rather harmful. Such is the vermiform appendix. Boelsche declares that the blood of the chimpanzee may be mixed with that of man without harm, which is the severest test, as bloods of different species act as poisons toward each other. Boelsche follows the clues from man, step by step, down to the very beginning of life, the primordial cell.

All of man's organs and their functions hark back to the remote past. "Life was born blind, just as many animals are to this day, but it was gradually prepared for sight," says Dr. Meyer. Scientists go even further. Franke declared: "The plant possesses everything that distinguishes a living creature—movement, sensation, the most violent reaction against abuse, and most ardent gratitude for favors—if we will but take sufficient time to wait with loving patience for its sweet and gentle answers to our storm questions." While rooted to the ground it nevertheless has power, in a measure, to adapt itself to external agencies. It feels "light-hunger," not unlike the light-hunger in man which Ibsen makes the climax of his great morbid play "Ghosts." Again, more than five hundred varieties of plants devour insects. Plants also have a refined sense of smell, taste and location; there is the beginning of a nervous system, and a tendency toward division of labor, instinct, and perception.

So France concludes: "Even if all our hopes are not realized, we have brought away a mighty knowledge that reaches down into the very depth of all beings the certainty that the life of the plants is one with that of animals, and with that of ourselves."

It is difficult to draw a sharp line between man and the other animals. Grant Allen, in the "New Hedonism," thinks that what elevates man above his fellow creatures is ethics, intellect and the sense of beauty. Yet it is quite certain that many birds find considerable enjoyment in a harmonious color scheme, while savages are not very far superior to the ingenious animals, such as the ant, in ethics and intellect. Franklin called man the tool-using animal. And while Kautsky declares that, "Neither as a thinking nor as a moral being is man essentially different from the animals," he goes on to say that "what, however, alone distinguishes the former is the production of tools, which serve for production, for defense or attack. . . . With the production of the means of production, the animal man begins to become the human man; with that he breaks away from the animal world to found his own empire, an empire with its own kind of development, which is wholly unknown in the rest of nature, and to which nothing similar is to be found there."

Everything changes. Man has evolved out of lower animals, and the plants are likely his distant relatives. Arthur Morrow Lewis sketches the modern theories of organic transformation in this wise: "Lamarck was the first to present the theory of evolution in a thoroughly scientific manner. Then Darwin discovered the great principle which rules the evolution of organisms; the principle of 'natural selection.' Then Weismann repudiated current ideas as to how the fittest 'arrived,' or 'originated,' and presented in their place a theory of his own, which is still under discussion. De Vries raised the question as to whether new species 'arrive' by a gradual accumulation of tiny changes, or by sudden leaps—mutations—and demonstrated the latter by his experiments with the evening primrose."

Darwin's theory, regarded as epoch-making in science, is: Natural selection by the survival of the fittest in the struggle for existence. Or, as it is commonly put, nature performs her wonders through the desire for food and offspring, hunger and love. It is the special merit of Darwin that his theory was the first satisfactory attempt to interpret the activity of organic beings, and to explain why they change. And Lester F. Ward tells us: "Science is mainly interpretation."

The question if interpretation is a very broad one. It flows out of many things. Thus Darwin acknowledges he was influenced by the now discredited theory of Malthus that more human beings are born than sustenance can be provided for. Both Darwin and Malthus, in turn, were influenced in their interpretation by such circumstances as the condition of England of the time. So that, today, the Malthusian theory is practically abandoned, while the Darwinian theory has been amplified in many directions. Thus, Kropotkin shows the importance of "mutual aid" in the struggle for existence, repudiating the notion that it is a struggle of each against all.

Herbert Spencer first formulated a theory of evolution that embraced the many fields covered by science. He declares evolution to consist of the "integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion; during which the matter passes from an indefinite incoherent homogeneity to a definite coherent heterogeneity; and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation." This is all-inclusive, but gives no hint of the particular laws of development governing one science as

against another, astronomy as against physics, or biology as against sociology. And a very serious mistake is made in imagining that laws belonging to one science apply equally to another. This is especially so of biology, organic science, and sociology, social science. While man, as an individual, belongs with the other forms of life; man, the social being, has made a departure from the other forms along independent lines. In one case evolution is a spiral that rises back of the lowly worm and sweeps upward in ever widening curves until it embraces the universe; in the other case, it begins in savagery, moves upward through barbarism and civilization to enlightenment.

The names of Darwin and Spencer must be bracketed with that of Marx. If science is mainly interpretation, let it be remembered that the same year Darwin's "Origin of Species" appeared, 1859, Marx, in his "Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy," first fully formulated his theory of historical materialism, and employed it to trace the development of a number of economic theories. And historical materialism not only interprets the intricate phenomena of social evolution, but also accounts for the intellectual super-structure, explain-

ing, for instance, the rise of the Darwinian school. For this reason modern Socialism is called scientific. It does not detract from the glory of any of these three giants of thought to group them together, as Ferri has done.

Just as the biologist declares that nothing happens by accident, that every phenomenon answers to the test of cause and effect, that the manifestation we call free will is dependent upon everything else, so the Socialist declares that nothing happens by chance in society, that all is part of a more or less well ascertained process making for a better social order. Just as the biologist refuses to ignore the struggle for existence, but declares this to be a very important fact in biology, so the Socialist refuses to overlook the struggle of class in society, but declares this to be its most important fact. Just as the biologist traces the descent of man, shows how intimately he is related to his next of kin in the animal province, and declares that man partakes of what there is in his ancestors down to the primordial cell, so the Socialist traces the evolution of society, showing that institutions are largely the reflex of material needs, and that one social system makes way for another.

Motives, Materialistic and Otherwise

BY using phrases such as "Ye shall know the truth and the truth shall make ye free," or "Ye must be (mentally) born again," or "There must be a mental revolution before we can have the material revolution," Socialists imply that they recognize intellectual factors as well as material ones. And when we say that, in face of the apparent slowness of progress, still our Socialist knowledge gives us a certain gaiety of outlook, we again proclaim like the various mind culture and self-suggestion schools, the value of healthy mental attitudes. Marx himself, in his Co-operation chapter, points out how mere social contact of the workers begets such an emulation and stimulation of the animal spirits that the efficiency of each laborer is heightened. Also, dealing with reduction of hours in the English cotton mills to show how important is the moral element, Marx quotes the workers' report to a factory inspector, wherein they emphasize how the prospect of getting away sooner at night filled them all with one active and cheerful spirit, thus adding to their efficiency.

Still it is plain that what logicians call the "final cause" or object of the foregoing is some personal tangible advantage or a productive increase and so the material factor is dominant. Dr. Royal S. Copeland warns us that "We hear much about the power of mind over the body. We ought to hear more about the influence of the body over mind. . . . In every case of mental distress or disturbance, the physical basis should be sought, found and removed." He also tells us to eat to live, not live to eat, and therefore to eat regularly but moderately.

To make the latter recommendation universally possible, implies the Socialist revolution, a material change that the doctor is doubtless not favorable to seeing that, as a U. S. A. senator, he recently advocated, as a cure for the farming collapse, the eating of an extra slice of bread; which would be as useless as it would be immoderate! With regard to the eating question, Clarence Meily's book throws some light on the relationship between Puritanism and mince pie; but it was through reading an article in a farm journal that caused the undersigned

to see the bearing of mince pie on horse-training. The author of the article—an expert ex-horse trainer—seriously stated that he would not tolerate around his stables any assistant who made a practice of eating late suppers with mince pie added, because the resulting digestive disturbances would create fits of ill temper in the epicure during which he, in five minutes, would do more harm to his horse charges, than could be counteracted by calm and rational treatment of them in five month's time!

"A hungry man's an angry man," and that famous recipe for marital bliss "feed the brute!" are familiar sayings; but it would indeed be strange if the "myriad-minded man" had not equally observed the importance of food factors; and so we do find that Shakespeare has often treated thereon and nowhere more specifically than in his tragedy "Coriolanus." As regards that ancient Roman nobleman, this play is a tragedy, because he carried just a wee bit too far that Nietzschean "master morality" stuff, which is only admirable when possessed and yet used with discretion and righteousness. Quite in keeping with Com. Harrington's recent statement that when the masses do revolt the blame (or onus) of battle rests not on them but on their masters, it was Coriolanus' extremely contemptuous treatment of the Roman Plebs—the victims too of grossly brutalizing environmental conditions—that shortened his career. At any rate, in an attempt to account for a previously unsuccessful effort to appease the haughty Roman, an old man friend of his hazards the following explanation of the failure, which illustrates how thoroughly Shakespeare had seen the influence on body and mind of the elementary material factor:

He was not taken well; he had not din'd;
The veins unfill'd, our blood is cold, and then
We put upon the morning, are unapt
To give or to forgive; but when we have stuff'd
These pipes and these conveyances of our blood
With wine and feeding, we have suppler souls
Than in our priest-like fasts: therefore I'll watch him
Till he be dicted to my request,
And then I'll set upon him.

Are Bible students aware that they have scriptural "authority" for that non-freewill doctrine that used to be called Necessitarianism but is now

usually termed Determinism? Do they also know the "Good Book" affirms the parallel fact that the basic character of the individual is unalterable? But be it noted, Determinism does not exclude responsibility, in a certain sense of the word, on the part of the individual. That the late infidel Prof. Haeckel should affirm that after a 2,000-year struggle, the determinists have emerged completely victorious, might carry little weight with some. But when we find Prof. G. E. Moore, of the aristocratic University of Cambridge, England, in his book on "Ethics" (Home University Library) ending his Free Will chapter with this evasive, non-committal sentence—"therefore, this chapter must conclude with a doubt," the Bible student may rely upon it that Haeckel and others are pretty well right!

As Buckle, Minto, etc., have remarked, poets have a mysterious prophetic faculty which often enables them to anticipate later philosophical and material discoveries; and the various prophets and teachers of the Bible were also their nation's poets and dreamers. Therefore, we find them more or less specifically making several determinist statements which may be found in both the Testaments. Here, for example, is one declaration of non-free will principles: "O Lord, I know that the way of man is not in himself: it is not in man that walketh to direct his steps" (Jer. x, 23). The next proclaims the unalterability of basic human character: "That which is (mentally or morally) crooked cannot be made straight; and that which is wanting (personal excellencies or virtues) cannot be numbered." (Eccles. i, 15).

The general mass thoughts and actions of humanity, Marx accounted for by his "Materialistic Explanation of History," which has also been called Economic Determinism. But this latter phrase is also more fittingly used to describe another influence of more purely personal nature. It is the influence in the individual of the way they get their livelihood and which makes them defend and preserve it irrespective of its good or bad effect on them or on society. By referring to Acts xvi, 19; 20, 21; and Acts xix, 24 and following, this should at once be made clear.

Now, if the religionist, who is so much interested in good thoughts and actions, has accepted the determinist position that it is the interacting together of a person's natal qualities—the heredity—with his environment, that inevitably produces at some particular moment the resultant effects; it should also be clear that the stronger the heredity the less perfect need the environment be:—as illustrated by the common remark "you can't keep a good man down!" But, if, as is generally the case, the personality is weak, and so has much difficulty in arising victorious, then the only hope lies in a revolutionary improvement of environment: "Lead us not into temptation" indicates their Lord's awareness of this fact; for, though basic character is unalterable, it is certainly not undevelopable.

Now, of all environments, science and reason teach us that the Socialist one is the best, just as experience has clearly shown us the capitalist one to be painfully defective. The religionist should therefore, before everything, give Socialism a thorough chance to effect its good results in the way of establishing a veritable heaven upon earth; for, in the noteworthy instance of the U. S. A. Protestant Bishop, W. M. Brown, it was his determination to do so, that enabled him to bravely face heresy trials, insults and poverty—a remarkable example, from a wise and good man!

PROGRESS.

MANIFESTO

— of the —
SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA
(Fifth Edition)

Per copy 10 cents

Per 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.....Ewen MacLeod

SUBSCRIPTION:

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

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

VANCOUVER, B. C., AUGUST, 16, 1923.

HISTORIC MATERIALISM.

HISTORIC materialism, or the Materialist Conception of History is that conception which arises from the examination of historical facts in the light of the determinist principle. History is the story of the human race, or of a portion of it. Consequently it is in the nature of a landscape painting in that it necessarily confines itself to the prominent features, rather than to detail. What are the really prominent features of history depends of course on whether history is viewed from the classical or the materialist standpoint. The main difference between the classical and the materialist conception of history is that one deals with deeds, and the other with happenings, as will appear.

The histories extant, belong, almost exclusively, to the former school, and naturally so because their writers have been taught, and have accepted as a matter of course, that man is a free agent more or less the master of his own destiny. From which it follows that peoples, and the human race generally, are also free agents and their histories consist of their actions. Of these actions the most spectacular appear to the classical historians as the most important.

So we find the classical histories devoted almost exclusively to chronicling wars, rebellions, and the deeds and misdeeds of rulers and conquerors, with a marked tendency in the modern histories to extol the virtues, real or suppositious, of their monarchs and "great men" generally, particularly those more recent, and to conceal their faults and failings. Further the charge is frequently levelled at their authors of seeking to glorify rulership and class institutions for the purpose of blinding the ruled to their real interests. We are, however, disinclined to credit them with so much ill-disposed acumen and are of opinion that the appearance of doing so arises not from any design on their part as from the fact that they themselves are imbued with the class ideas which they promulgate as a matter of course.

On the other hand, history of the materialist school is the very reverse of the above. Its basis is that man is not a free agent but a creature of circumstance. That he has not been created but has grown, and is growing. That environment has moulded him to his present form and characteristics upon a base determined by heredity, which itself, again, is but the effect of the environment of his progenitors. That his actions are merely the reactions of a so-constructed being under the impulses of the circumstances surrounding him. Their individual members being thus the races and peoples are also creatures of circumstance; their histories are not the spectacular effects, but the underlying causes which occasion these.

History, then, is elevated from the category of more or less informative and interesting literature, and is transported to the domain of science. It becomes a department of biology. Its study ceases to be a genealogy of kings and princes, a tabulation of dates or a critique of the characters of individuals. It becomes a research into the piecing together of a vast chain of causation. Attila, Alex-

ander, Napoleon, Washington, cease to be mighty heroes or villains and become mere instruments in the working out of human evolution.

Man's primal impulse is to live, to procure his living. Circumstances attendant upon the procuring of his living are therefore the circumstances which will have the greatest and most far reaching effect in determining his habits and ideas. Cannibalism, however repulsive it may appear to us, to the cannibal, being a part of his mode of procuring a living, seems a mere matter of course. Socially the means of life may be more readily and securely procured; social life appears, therefore, perfectly natural. By the enslavement, in its varied forms, of the weaker by the more powerful, the latter may procure the means of life more securely and easily. Slavery appears to them therefore, right and just, in fact, the prevailing mode of slavery always seems no slavery at all, and the discontent and revolt of the enslaved seems culpable and even ungrateful. All things that tend to justify and conserve are themselves justified and accepted. Behind it all lies the primal impulse to live and procure a living, more or less complex as the process of procuring the living may be and whatever wants and desires may go to make up the living to be procured.

It is the study and elaboration of this discovery which has given rise to the general formula of historic materialism that, in any given society, its structure, government, laws, religion, philosophy, habits, customs and ideas, are determined by its mode of production of the means of life.

D. G. MCKENZIE

—From Western Clarion, Feb. 25th, 1911.

BOOK REVIEW.

The New Economics

Martin Cumberland and Raymond Harrison.
London,
Cecil Palmer,
Oakley House, Bloomsbury St. W. E.
1922.

THERE is no such animal as a policeman. There are, however, men who, by reason of certain mental and physical qualities and special training, function as policemen. In the same way there is no such thing as money. Certain commodities function as money.

This observation has been suggested to me by a consideration of the book now in front of me, which is called, God knows why, "The New Economics." Had the authors been better acquainted with the science of political economy they could, no doubt, have added to their collection of economic fallacies. Seeing, however, that the book is really intended as propaganda in favor of a much-touted currency, or rather credit reform, it will be sufficient to notice one of these, the one I have referred to in the opening paragraph, and that is the extraordinary illusion that money need not be a commodity; that value can be created without labor; that the State can, by its simple fiat, invest pieces of gold, silver or paper with all the attributes of value and create credit out of thin air.

The money-commodity has several functions. The most important of these are: Firstly, to serve as a measure of value, or, if the term "measure" is found objectionable, let us say a denominator or standard of exchange value, and secondly, to act as a medium of circulation.

Now, the function of the money-commodity as a standard of exchange value is by far the most important and it is becoming more so in proportion as paper substitutes for it in circulation and this again is superseded by the cheque and clearing system conducted by the banks. It is safe to say that at least 90% of business is now conducted in this way; practically the only currency in circulation being that required to circulate the pay roll. It is no accident, therefore, that the people who used to demand "plenty money" are now asking for credit on the same broad and ample scale.

The money-commodity, however, cannot be substituted for in respect of its function as a measure of value. To perform this function it must possess

exchange value. It is no answer to this statement to say, as do the authors of the book in question, that "a fixed standard of value is impossible" . . . "as the exchange values of all commodities including gold (are) constantly fluctuating." Of course they fluctuate. That proves they are commodities. No commodity can have a "fixed" value. It is, however, desirable that the money-commodity should be as stable in value as possible and that is one reason why gold has, by a process of elimination, attained that position.

If now, one should disregard the function of money as a measure of value and limit one's attention to that of medium of circulation it is clear that the illusions I have referred to might very readily arise. In this case we get a line of argument such as this:—

"A circulating medium, in whatever form, is only a means of facilitating exchange of goods."—p. 58.

"Money facilitates the exchange, but the exchange value of any particular class of commodity must be reckoned in some other commodity. Price merely equals these values."—p. 59.

"Money has no intrinsic value, but only an exchange value. The value of money to the individual depends upon its effective demand or the goods it can purchase in the market at any given time."—p. 16.

Now this stuff, though confused, is quite innocent and even defensible if provided with a sound basis. But when we find lurking behind it, as we always do in statements from such quarters as these, the idea that the State or any other authority can create value, then the whole argument becomes futile and can only lead to confusion. For instance, on page 12 of the book under review I find a statement to the effect that "society decides to use a metal like gold for its currency, and fixes a certain arbitrary value upon pieces of gold of a certain weight, etc."

Now, this is absurd. The State does nothing of the kind; cannot do it, as a matter of fact. This particular fallacy, however, whether directly stated or implied, will be found to be the joker in all propagandized of this kind.

In their statement of Gresham's Law the authors are guilty of a blunder which is typical of the whole book. That law is stated as being to the effect "that counterfeit money will drive out good money." This is probably only a blunder, but then, blunders are unpardonable in a book of this kind.

I can agree heartily with the authors when they say: "The economic progress of mankind, therefore, is one of increased productive capacity, with a diminishing amount of human effort, and consequently the possibility of increased leisure amongst members of the community." (p. 40). But I am convinced that the possibility here mentioned is not to be realized by fooling with the mechanism of exchange.

This book is evidently put out as propaganda for the Douglas scheme. Whatever may be the merits or demerits of that particular scheme it's propaganda is but ill served by ill-informed piffle of this kind.

"GEORDIE"

CLARION MAINTENANCE FUND.

R. Thomas \$1; F. Tidswell \$1; Alex Shepherd \$2.04; P. T. Shepherd \$2; A. B. Chambers 50c; J. Parnell \$2; Martin Ophus \$5; St. John Comrades (per M. Goudie) \$11.25.

Above, C. M. F., receipts from 27th July to 14th Aug., inclusive, total \$24.79.

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.

Hokum

"ARE we a revolutionary party?" asks Com. C. K.* Well, what is revolution? In this case it is "the" revolution. That is to say in socialist concepts, it signifies the complete abolition of the capitalist form of society, with its concomitants of private property (capitalist) and wage labor commodity production. And the substitution of a society having social possession of the common means of life and co-operative production for social advantage. That is, that revolution is an entire change in social relations; not a mere class flurry of temporary reform, or the political abrogation of party license. In this sense, and from the revolutionary viewpoint, it makes no difference whether "the" revolution is now on or is only approaching. The particular stage of revolutionary development does not affect its final objective—the utter abolition of capital. Nor does it affect the methods of accomplishment until society is far gone in the decline of disintegration. For the obvious reason that the dominant standards of organized agencies of capitalist society are quite opposed to the unrealized standards of a socialist society. It is because man thinks before he moves that society is conservative to its accustomed standards. And it is only in the later phases of capitalist development, with its consequent negations of social attributes and amenities, that social reality can be made clear. Neither man nor society can be made to think by force. The reason of being can only be presented to the being of reason. And that being is not molded to the fashion of the ideal, but to the fashion of time-growth.

That is what socialism implies by "education." Not an ineffective appeal to reason—ineffective because not in accord with prevalent social conceptions. Not a barren philosophical argument, which, in its day and generation flies over the heads of its audience. Not a logical deduction, based on a premise vague in the minds of its hearers. It implies, indeed, those things, but connective with and involved throughout the steady development of the social economic. That economic works with the precision of law. It is law. And because it is law it moves in the dim ways of its own determinism, awaiting the shock of discovery and its consequent yoke to the modified direction of social intelligence.

The economic of capital, based as it is on profit production, inevitably contracts on social conveniences and natural desires. By its necessary development it drives social intelligence into the narrow grooves of class interest—and individual prostitution. By its waste of the social forces of production, it increasingly restricts social necessity. And by the developed manipulation of those forces—for the purposes of narrow ambitions—it imposes quite impossible inhibitions on a social necessity of progress that can be staged now, only to the darker expense of the future. And whether that progress be fast or slow, whether it be retarded or accelerated, and however moribund society may be in the practice of its ancient customs, the mechanical logic of time will force home on the social mind the perception of its meaningless customs. "Who does not venture beyond the fact" says Huxley, somewhere, 'seldom gets as far as the fact.' And although the logic of development will force conviction ultimately, it is only the intelligent logic of reason—by looking beyond the fact—that can forewarn of the possible disaster; that can mitigate the probable chaos and obviate the certain misery and as certain degradation of fortuitous development.

But, in fact, there is no accounting of development fortuitously. The power of the mind is a principle factor in social development—and is destined to be the greatest agency in human progress. Economic development furthers mental development. It is continually supplied with an increasing abundance

of sense material, augmenting its capacities, stimulating perception, fostering its dormant virility of reason. These powers and capacities exist in society. They are creations of its growth. Like the reservoirs of natural resource they are ready to be drawn upon in due time and season. And it is because of those capacities—those logical and deductive capacities—that the appeal to reason is made. The propaganda of social education is justified in the forward imagination that foresees, with the enlarged experience of social progress, a more or less corresponding ratio of enhanced social intelligence. Force may effect change. But the same agencies that flourish force will be called upon to think of their resultants afterwards. The essence of socialism is to think of them forehanded, to the end that the philosophic logic of deduction may synchronise with and temper, the lusty—but it may be chaotic-logic of developing fact. The materialist conception is not political, merely, or economic. It is the whole complexus of reality that molds and influences society. It is this division of material forces that hinders the cohesion and harmony of society, similarly as the division of economic forces prevents the solidarity of labor. The past is a pointer to the future only as it affords a clue to its determination. The causes of that determinism are concrete in yesterday and today. But the synthesized incidence of the unfolding potentialities of tomorrow are to be interpreted not only by the torch light of history, but by the sparkling achievements of progress. It is for this, among other lesser reasons, that the house of socialism is divided against itself. Because it refuses to account the cumulous of development and its consequences. And it is for this, among other reasons, that Com. C. K.'s arbitrary separation of "material" and "mental" is peculiarly misleading. In reality no such separation is possible.

Consequently, if "the S. P. merely 'educates' and leaves its listeners to act as they list," it leaves them, perforce, to the circumstantial discovery of facts, which now they will not accept. And not accepting, utterly prevents that unanimity of action which alone can precipitate a social society. It is not that socialism is indifferent to that action. Willy nilly it is involved in society's activities. But its perception of the time-facts of social development make it patent. The necessity of meting all-comers in a society hostile alike to its endeavors and philosophy engendered its (miscalled) dilletantism of discussion (a discussion that is the first fruits—and the proof—of the effectiveness of its propaganda). It recognises the fruitlessness of forcing society against its own convictions; or, of attempting to mold it, by human endeavor simply, to the pattern of reasoned philosophy. Not yet is that the process of development. And knowing that, knowing that social freedom is the offspring of social freedom, it musters its energies in the only fertile field of enterprise—the stimulation of social understanding, awakening under the rude shocks of economic progression. Nor has it ever been either "blate or seaur" to stand firm on its principles when to stand was exceedingly unpleasant. It has done so because of its fundamental understanding of social phenomena—and it augurs well for the future.

We agree with C. K., that man is a sentimental being—(not an animal). Society is not a thinking sentience. It moves on moonshine. That is to say, it reacts to the misapplied functions and misinterpreted relations of the fundamental expressions of human nature. But to say that is not to say that society does not think. Back of impulse is thought, the direct incentive of immediate necessity. The same material conditions which compel social movement expresses to all the same principle. And as principle is social, and interprets and manifests itself in social interaction, so through social inter-

action it must be influenced and explained.

But an explanation to be effective must grapple with the essence of its subject. And in proportion as it reaches down to this essence it influences the tenor of development. Because it is in unison with the facts of development. An explanation that is false may influence the tenor of events. But to its undoing. The unfolding cycle of change, by its increasing dissonance with the fact and its symbol, will ultimately demonstrate its falsity. But the percept that separates the essence from the incidental separates, at the same time—or distinguishes between—the fact and its expressed emotion. Emotion in its riper aspects is the mental reaction to the misunderstood environments of yesterday. And in the process of adaption to ever changing environment—whose changing brings out more clearly the antagonism between the real and its reflex—this emotion seeks to veil the deep, the unpleasant, and it may be, repulsive reality. And it is no easy task, as all know who have tried, to rend this clinging veil of sentiment from the underlying temple of the truth. But it is the unveiling of reality we desire. For we are persuaded that only in the acceptance of reality can life be made secure and society be organized harmoniously. Fact is not to be conferred, gift like, either on man or mass. That assumption is the prerogative of progress. And it is delicate to handle. Nor can it be coated with the sugar of ancient emotion, i.e., garlanded with the thought forms of yesterday, and rendered palatable and a cogent force for the social revolution. For the emotion of social society, like the emotion of all other societies, is conceived in the fundamentally different terms of a fundamentally different ideal, and can flourish only in the fruitful soil of its own aspirations.

Those two assumptions of the "compelling truth" and the "materialism of man" are surely no assumptions. There is something compelling in the truth. Not because of itself as a logical proposition; but because of its power as the expression of developing necessity. When that truth may be accepted is a matter of time-perception. That it is not accepted now is but the special pleading of desire. That it will be accepted is certain. The implication contained in the "assumption" that man is not materialist is because he has not accepted the "holy truth" of socialist education. But, as pointed out, that is not the real meaning of social education. It is not the spoken word only. It is the spoken word plus the social concept of social relations. It is not the truth of reason that is the crimson centre of activity, but the compelling truth of progress. The social conceptions of social relations are visaged through no legerdemain of "tactics," but on the contrary, mainly through the wayward movements of social development. And the tactics of its presentation are determined by the progress of events, not by any delusive panic of sentiment.

When we are about it we may go further. It is not truth that is "one man's meat and another's poison," but only man's concept of the truth. The wily Pilate's question is just a metaphysical abstraction implying finality and assuming the absolute. But neither final nor absolute are facts in time experience. If it be argued that it is only by man's concepts of truth that anything of truth is known, then the answer is that only in evolving man's grasping ignorance of the cosmic process can any abstraction obtain at all—and influence us through reflex emotion. And after all, what is truth but law? And what is law but the conquest of ignorance by understanding? The world was declared to be a plane until the thinkers of the middle ages showed otherwise. Ptolemaic astronomy was acclaimed until Copernican observations proved differently. Mass "fell" by its own "weight" till gravity demonstrated the error. "God" created man, till time proved

(Continued on page 8)

* See Western Clarion, July 3, 1923.

Revolutions: Political and Social

BY J. HARRINGTON

Article Eleven.

THE situation in Vienna during the last days of October 1848, cannot be better summed up than in the words of Marx: "Inside, confusion, class division, disorganization; a national guard part of which were resolved not to fight at all, part irresolute, and only the smallest part ready to act; a proletarian mass powerful in numbers but without leaders, without any political education, subject to panic, as well as to fits of fury, almost without cause, a prey to every false rumor spread about, quite ready to fight, but unarmed, at least at the beginning, and incompletely armed and barely organized when at last they are led to battle; a helpless Diet, discussing theoretical quibbles while the roof over their head was almost burning; a leading committee without impulse or energy."

While from every point of the compass marched reinforcements to the troops already surrounding the doomed revolutionaries. Yet, so far as legality goes, as Fyffe points out in his "History of Modern Europe," "The Viennese Assembly, treating itself as a legitimate and constitutional power threatened by a group of soldiers who had usurped the monarch's authority, hesitated to compromise its legal character by calling in the Hungarian Army." This army, however illegal its support might have been, was the only power which could have maintained the Assembly's legal character. And that perhaps only temporarily, for "Nicky thy elephantine hoof" (as a writer in Blackstones magazine pleasantly ruminated on the invasion of revolutionary Europe by Russia), was already anxiously awaiting "legal" sanction to stamp out the rebel movement.

When Auersperg left the city there arose a movement to overthrow the Assembly and install a government more in tune with the new development. Robert Blum opposed this, and his influence prevailed, so much was any semblance of illegality feared. No such scruples troubled the attacking army, now under the "legal" control of Prince Schwarzenberg, the new prime minister, one of the most unprincipled scoundrels that ever lived, a man whose private life was so foul that the Neapolitan Court was the only one which would tolerate him as ambassador, but a man singular in this, that he carried the same reckless disregard of conventions, which caused his expulsion from several European courts, with all that the removal of an Ambassador carried with it, into all his activities. Few men have exercised power who were less hampered by the restraining-influence of what we call humane feelings, and possessed of greater courage. With Prince Windischgratz, Marshal Radetzky and the Ban Jellachich as his generals, he had a guarantee of implicit obedience. The attack on Vienna then opened, unhampered by legal qualms or tender feelings toward property, human life or ultimate consequences.

The suburbs were soon entered. The defenders, under Messenhauser, whom Marx characterises as "more of a novel writer than even a subaltern officer," were hopelessly confused; he believed the defence was hopeless and advised surrender. That this man was the only military produce of six months of semi-warfare is significant of the nature of the struggle we are reviewing, the beating of blind forces upon the barriers of development. Second in command was Joseph Bem, a Polish soldier of fortune, who had arrived with the Frankfort delegation. One of those men, which the times pro-

duced in fair numbers, from Buonarrotti to Dombrowski, dauntless, tireless, uncompromising skilled and resourceful soldiers, bred in the camp, like Othello, since first their arms had seven years pith till now some few Moons wasted. Anarchist and republican, their life and energy ever at the service of revolution. Marx says he was the only man who could save Vienna if any man could. Postgate pronounces him theatrical, for very little reason, certainly less than could be leveled at most generals; a failing, too, common as the breath of our nostrils among humans.

Being a foreigner, and a Slav at that, the requirements of the situation which he well knew—unquestioned obedience, in fact, a dictatorship—could scarcely be enforced by him. Looked upon as an interloper alike by the Assembly and Windischgratz, who indeed exclaimed—By what right does this Pole interfere in the affairs of Austria?—his life was in almost equal danger whether victory or defeat awaited his friends. Bem thrust himself to the front, and while his commander counsels surrender, he drove the motley army to its task with threats and abuse; and believing that with an inexperienced and divided force such as he commanded it was better to attack than defend, he organized a sortie, but the inexperience was just as fatal in this. Different groups of the Viennese troops met in the darkness and mistaking each other for the enemy started a fight of their own. In vain Bem tried to rally them; in the confusion, his horse shot beneath him, abuse, threats, and blows, were of no avail; the Viennese fled to their city, and Bem wisely retired to second place.

A truce was arranged on the 30th, and had hardly been accepted when from the tower of St. Stephen's Church, observers among whom was Messenhauser, saw beyond the investing lines the smoke of a battle. While the Magyar generals were awaiting the mantle of legality to cover their actions, Kussuth had prevailed on them to march without its protecting folds. This however could not be done without much misgivings, and an order to advance was followed by an order to retreat, until the army had lost that confidence requisite to determined action. They now advanced with the almost certainty of an order to retreat. When the news reached the beleaguered people that the Hungarian Army was on its way to their assistance, preparations which should have been made at the outset were now considered, but such was the intense respect for property, they were never carried out. One absolutely necessary military measure, the destruction of the railway, was contemplated and rejected; leaving a swift means to launch a large force at the advancing Magyars.

The Viennese did, however, disregard the truce just entered into, and fell with fury upon the Slav army in the suburbs. Thus after hesitating to break the legal sanctions they committed the most abominable of military offences, and added a spur to the virtuous slaughter perpetrated by an outraged soldiery. God in heaven but the moral conduct of man is a mystery not less confounding than some communists' valor; the psychologists can find in the inhibitions of sex some causes for the Viennese and Hungarian legal treading as well as for the elephantine tread of the Austrian war lords. Or does their mystery mongering go that far?

But we in our fatuous perversity can only marvel at the small matters, which, at these decisive points of history, have determined the fate of thousands of our fellow slaves; at the unexampled courage with which our class has squandered life and energy in struggles of no consequence to them; forgiving unto seventy times seven the treachery of all other classes, while harboring the meanest suspicions and nursing the bitterest animosity toward

their own; at the deadly apathy in the day of defeat, permitting reaction to enforce them to enchain each other. All right, call in the quacks, but excuse our departure; we never could abide noise, and the sex nostrums of the newly wise are to us, as efficacious as the tom toms of the witch doctors.

The Hungarian army, demoralized by the vacillating policy of its generals; was hopelessly routed by Windischgratz, and Vienna was now left to withstand the assault of an army flushed by victory over its former conquerors.

The Slavs fell upon Vienna with such fury that before dark of the 31st all was over. And even while the infuriated Slavs were butchering in almost insane frenzy the defenders in the suburbs, in the town itself riots and strife over small matters were frequent. The energy of the investing army, possessed of a happier libido, was devoted to the slaughter of its enemies.

Bem and some of the word-spinners from Frankfort escaped. Blum and Froebel were captured. The latter was released because of some expressions he had voiced regarding the unity of the Austrian Empire. Blum was shot. Bem was still to appear in arms against the Austrian, in the struggle for Hungarian "liberty," a struggle which lies outside our story. But which proved the soundness of the Slav poet's metaphor, regarding the Slav ocean and the Magyar Island. Nicky with his elephantine hoof put an end to the victories which everywhere attended the Hungarian armies in the war which followed the fall of Vienna. And for Hungary there remained not a semblance of that independence which had long been hers in fact, if not in name.

The Dual Empire returned to the status of the Metternichean period, and under Schwarzenberg, with his pitiless and unscrupulous policy, was restored to the autocratic status existing prior to the tidal wave of revolution. One change, a vital one, was all that remained to mark those inspiring months, the Feudal system of land tenure was gone forever.

The remaining months we will discuss in our next, taking up the last remnants of the revolution, and the effect of the second disaster on Germany; leaving Vienna, as we would a chamber of horrors, to the imagination of our readers.

HERE AND NOW.

SOME letters of sympathy have come this way since last issue, joining with us in mourning the memory of one time presentable cash totals. We are encouraged and exhorted to hold out. If we hold out, it is said, the crisis will pass and the halcyon days will come again. Fine. It is easy to see our readers are readers also of the news from Germany. The German chancellor has quite a time in the German "Here and Now" department—as you might say—especially when the "money makers" go so far as to quit work. Now it is just as hard to cash in on kind words as to stabilize a trillion or two of marks. And so we come to writing "Notes," Here and Now. Our printer also writes "Notes," and so we rely on the Clarion reader to help us frame our reply. The reply, of course, is only acceptable in terms of cash. The simple problem is to increase the total:—

Following \$1 each: C. Twist, R. Thomas, A. J. Bell, W. Braes, J. W. Dargie, A. Clark, F. Tidswell, A. Hollingshead, J. Knight, L. B. LaMarche, R. Emery, J. Staples, G. Broadhurst, A. Toppano, R. Wotherspoon.

A. Hallberg 50 cents, O. P. Lundgard \$2; B. E. Polinkos \$3; Wm. Pardy \$2.35; Harry Johnston \$2; J. Glendenning \$2; D. MacPherson \$2.

Above, Clarion subs, from 27 July to 15th Aug. inclusive, total \$28.85.

The Story of the Evolution of Life

BY T. F. PALMER.

(Continued from last issue)

Then there is the celebrated case of the wingless insects of Madeira. Some 600 species of beetles inhabit this island, many of which are confined to it, though they are closely related to species residing on the adjoining continent. Now 200 species of these beetles are incapable of flight although their parent species on the African coast fly perfectly well. Among the insects of Kerguelen Island a similar phenomenon exists. All the numerous species dwelling in this island—moths, flies, and beetles—cannot fly. Wallace contended that these organisms could not have reached these isles in a wingless state, as no insects of this type inhabiting large land areas are destitute of wings, and therefore they must have lost their flying powers, because such powers proved detrimental. Kerguelen Island is constantly swept by gales, much as Maderia is, and these storm-tossed isles are precisely those places where it would prove an advantage to fly badly, as insects winging their way through the air would run great risks of being blown into the sea.

Adaptation to environment is very strikingly illustrated by the presence of animals in dark caves, both in the Old World and the New, which have become blind. Those animals which dwell in the dark recesses into which no ray of light ever enters have become stone blind. On the other hand, the cave dwellers that inhabit those parts of these retreats that are sufficiently near their openings to permit the passage of a modicum of light, possess eyes that are large and lustrous. And in all the various instances these sightless, or almost sightless creatures, are demonstrably the near relatives of the normal light perceiving animals that dwell in the surrounding area. The blind organisms that live in American caves are closely akin to neighbouring American forms, and the same kinship exists between the sightless fauna of European caverns and their normal neighbours. Further, in the great majority of cases degeneration of the organs of vision has not proceeded far enough to completely obliterate all traces of the functional eyes the animals formerly possessed. The remnants of eyes are to be seen in various stages of obsolescence and, truth to tell, the foot stalks of the eyes of the totally blind crustaceans of the Mammoth Cave remain, although the eyes they once carried have entirely disappeared. Prolonged disuse of the visual organs, coupled perhaps with cessation of selection, account for these interesting phenomena, while they lend no support whatever to the rival theory of special creation.

In the human body are to be found scores of organs in a dwindled state that have been inherited from man's animal forerunners. The complexity of the human framework is so vast that a life's study is essential to enable the morphologist to master all its details. Yet it has been established to the satisfaction of all modern investigators that there exist no bone, nerve, muscle, or vessel of any moment in man's anatomy which cannot be traced in the bodies of superior apes. In the words of a weighty authority if we note the aborted structures then, "the entire corporeal structure of man is an exact anatomical copy of that which we find in the ape."

The second eyelid persists as a vestigial organ in man and other mammals. This structure is found in all backboneed animals from lowly fishes to the most exalted members of the vertebrate order. In birds, this eyelid, the nictitating membrane, as it is called, is very highly developed, and it proves useful to them as a protective organ, while in most other vertebrates higher than the fishes it lingers as a relic from the past. Attached to the human ear are muscles in an aborted condition which are present on a larger and functioning scale in four-footed animals. In the man-like apes, as with man himself,

these muscles survive as useless vestiges, while with the inferior baboons and other monkeys these muscles still serve to move the ears. Similarly with the skin muscles which enable various quadrupeds, including the horse, to twitch the skin so as to drive away flies that torment them by sucking their blood. In man these skin muscles have nearly all degenerated into a functionless state, but our ape cousins still use them.

The form of the human foot, again, testifies to our animal origin. All children display a marked tendency to turn the feet inwards, and are not always successfully trained to turn them outwards, and continue to walk in ungainly fashion through life. In the apes and monkeys the feet are used as grasping organs as well as for progression, and the clutching attitude of the foot is very pronounced in the unborn babe, even more so than in the infant. Two other features are noteworthy. The curvature of the legs, and the lateral extension of the baby's big toe, which confers to this digit a striking similarity to the large toe of the monkeys. These infant characters are even more pronounced in the human embryo and correspond to their permanent condition in apes. The same story is told by the hand, for its grasping capacity in the child is out of all proportion to its needs. Then there is the evidence afforded by the persistence of the bones and muscles of the tail. The absence of the external tail in man is urged by the ill-formed as an obstacle to the acceptance of the doctrine of descent. But as Romanes sarcastically said, the disappearance of the tail in man is exactly what the evolutionist expects, as man's nearest living relatives, the gorilla, orangutan, gibbon, and chimpanzee, are all destitute of an external caudal appendage. The absence of the tail in man presents no real difficulty, but serves to remove one, for the very plain reason that if man still retained an external tail the puzzle would be "to understand how he managed to retain an organ which had been renounced by his most recent ancestors." Nevertheless the man-like apes do possess vestiges of a tail, and so does man himself, while the embryos of men and monkeys sport tails that are longer than their legs. Moreover in the unborn child or ape the tail may be set in motion by muscles which dwindle as the embryo develops, and cases have been recorded by anatomical authorities in which these tail muscles persist even in the adult man. Although this phenomenon is abnormal in the present stage of human development it furnishes conclusive evidence of our tailed ancestry.

Another relic is the vermiform appendix, which is much larger in, and possesses considerable value to herbivorous animals, but it is of undoubted detriment to man. This appendix is a blind gut which runs from the intestines, and should any foreign substance find lodgment therein, inflammation results with the development of the disease of appendicitis, which occasions thousands of painful deaths annually. In apes and men this organ persists as a useless and dangerous rudiment, and it remains slightly larger in the apes and the undelivered human baby, than in adult man.

The external ear of the human embryo closely resembles that of the monkeys, while man's completely developed ear betrays unquestionable signs of its modification from an ape-like form. Our hair again, so far as we retain it, bears the plainest resemblance to that of our arboreal cousins, and it is significant that the aborted hair on the human upper and lower arm "is directed towards the elbow—a peculiarity which occurs nowhere else in the animal kingdom, with the exception of the anthropoid apes and a few American monkeys." This curious arrangement is doubtless due to the life in the trees led by our arboreal ancestors. Wallace observed that the orang in its native forests rests its hands on the crown of its head with its elbows directed downwards so that the falling rain travels along the hairs which thus act as a thatch. In numerous

minor details of hair arrangement man distinctly resembles the apes. Many other similar facts might be submitted, but sufficient has been said to prove man's kinship with the brutes. The body of man is a veritable museum of vestigial relics. Wiedersheim the eminent anatomist has recorded 180 relics of the past in the framework of man. They appear in all parts of his body, including the reproductive, respiratory, circulatory, and digestive systems. Eleven of these vestigial structures are not functional in animals higher than the fishes; we have inherited four from reptilian and amphibian ancestors. In man these organs are always useless and are frequently the occasion of suffering and death.

The facts of embryology supplement the evidences already submitted. As Haeckel, Karl Rabl and others have shown, testimonies to evolution yielded by the fossil record are reproduced in abundant measure by the phases passed through by animals as they advance from the egg stage towards the mature condition. In surveying the evolution of horns, as disclosed by fossil remains, their onward progress was proved. Now this evidence is reproduced in the progressive development of the antlers of the living deer. In the first year, their antlers resemble those of their ancient fossil ancestors, and are single pronged. And from the first to the sixth year of the stag's life, the antlers increase by the successive addition of branches year after year. In other language, these animals in their life history recapitulate the past history of their progenitors, near and remote. With certain reservations, kindred phenomena are displayed in all branches of the animal kingdom. In the stag these changes occur after the attainment of the adult state, but the almost remarkable examples of recapitulation are witnessed in the processes of an organism's development before it is hatched or born. One of the salamanders is strictly terrestrial, yet the young proclaim their descent from aquatic ancestors by displaying in their unborn state the gills which they themselves never use, as they breathe exclusively through lungs, but which were essential to their water dwelling ancestors; and, strangely enough, these gills are so completely formed that were the unborn salamander taken from the parent body, just prior to birth, and promptly placed in water, these small creatures will dart about in surroundings that would soon drown their own mother.

The evidence derived from embryology is in itself ample to establish the truth of evolution. It has been erroneously imagined, however, that animals proceed in the course of their embryological progress through all the stages experienced by their near and distant ancestors in their long evolutionary advance. But, as is indeed obvious, the repetition of each ascending stage in the developing young would entail considerable sacrifice in perpetually reproducing phases of past history which are of no utility whatever to present day animal forms. Therefore in various instances, the ancestral history has been abbreviated into reminiscences of earlier events. Many phases of ancestral life have been blurred, foreshortened, or even blotted out. Yet sufficient remains to compel biologists to regard embryology as supplying some of the most powerful arguments and illustrations of the doctrine of modified descent.

We will now endeavour to the best of our ability to present as clear an outline of the general embryological arguments as the complex nature of the subject will permit.

In the sexual animals, the egg cell of the female, when fertilised by the male element commences to develop. All plants and animals are composed of cells, and the egg-cell is larger than the ordinary cells which build up the body. In man and in many other mammals this cell is about 1/120th of an inch across. The egg or ovum is frequently surrounded by a membrane which is usually furnished with one or more small openings through which the male element passes when it impregnates the egg. Now although the ova of animals in general are substantially identical, these ova or egg cells must not be confounded with what we know as eggs. For in ad-

(Continued on page 8)

THE STORY OF THE EVOLUTION OF LIFE

(Continued from page 7)

that man created God. The eternal rights of majesty dition to the egg cell itself the egg of a bird possesses a protective shell which encloses a large mass of feeding substances upon which the chick is nourished as it develops, because when once laid by the female bird, the egg content derives no nutrition from the parent body, and must contain within itself the materials which enable it to grow until it is hatched.

(To be continued).

HOKUM

(Continued from page 5)

were inviolate until social economy overthrew them. Social institutions were providential arrangements till social science demonstrated them the progeny of material conditions. But progress has vanquished the sorcery of those magical things. Would it have poisoned the ages to have known the truth of the cosmic process of social relations; of human development; of the evolution of the wonderful mind from the sentience of sensation? Oh, no, no. What ghastly scenes of horror and sacrifice, of blood and tears and woe, lurk in the haunted gloom of antiquity. The poison of the false concept has paralysed the generations of humanity—and it still poisons the life of today.

The core of the matter of material philosophy is that fact exists independently of man or thought; that man is merely one factor in the universal process, not at all the factor. That his mind and thought wonderful though they be, are but manifestations of cosmic energy. That, however concepts of truth may be, the fact is in no wise altered, and the knowledge of it no wise detrimental. And that if man's concepts of reality are not in accord with the processes of reality the result must be disastrous to to man. Movement is growth, and growth is change, and change is law, with all their accompanying interactions; and no feeble interposition of human

vanity can offset the monistic cycle of their unity. True it is that man is, at once, both judge and witness of truth. True it is that his knowledge is but little in the intricate marvel of reality. True it is that the glory of tomorrow may overshadow the prestige of today. But it is also true that the unity of being rests on the witness of time, that the assumptions of his toilsomely garnered science has demonstrated the "process of the suns"; that the logical deductions of his verified assumptions have completely altered the complexion of human destiny; and that beyond the judgments of man there is but the formless unpersonality of materialized phantasy.

One more point we would briefly touch. It is said that Socialists are Socialists because they are individualistic. Likely enough. But it is not the barren individualism of egotism, with its supercilious cult of superiority—a superiority which is an essential denial of individualism. On the contrary, it is the individualism of an altruistic society; an individuality whose superiority is the common attribute of economic freedom, and whose expanding genius is conjured in lusty stature from the unfolding creations of that freedom. And no Socialist party is a "haven of refuge from the common herd." But rather a haven of hope for the full blossoming individuality of labor, undaunted through the centuries of its servitude. And that, amidst the anarchy of a perishing civilization and the crushing discouragements of apathy and resistance, the uncompromising principles of the straight issue—the understanding of the social relations, of the private ownership of the capital means of life—are, like their own red flag of immemorial ages, the symbol of life and its bounty, and the glamorous promise of the peace and concord of the great revolution.

R.

LOUCHEUR, STINNES & CO.

(Continued from page 1)

- (a) the (French) iron submits to the dominion of the (German) coal.
- (b) the coal submits to the iron.
- (c) iron and coal—incapable of dominating one another completely—are forced to make compromise.

The ore of Lorraine, in the hands of victorious and armed France, will not submit to the Ruhr, that is, to vanquished and disarmed Germany. But on the other hand England and the United States, after making such great effort for the overthrow of German dominance, will not permit France to establish her own supremacy on the ruins of Germany, by forcing German coal to submit to the sway of French iron.

Let us therefore examine the conditions for the realization of the third possibility, the only one which appears probable at the present time: an understanding between French ore and German coal.

The men on both sides whose interests are chiefly at stake, and who are therefore best informed—the French and German iron barons—are perfectly aware that such an understanding is inevitable, and that it will be necessary, within a short time, to form a Franco-German syndicate for the exploitation of the mines of Lorraine and the Ruhr. Both parties are preparing for this understanding, and both parties are naturally endeavouring to grant as little as possible, and to gain as much as possible, when entering into the agreement.

In order to fill and defend their cash-boxes—for this is the sole tangible reality in the whole affair—French and German capitalists are resorting to every possible medium of deception and violence.

In the last resort it is a question—and this no communist must forget—of what privileged rights this or that partner is to have over the sweat and misery of the workers, of what proportion of the riches squeezed out of the exploited workers of the Ruhr mines is to be granted to Loucheur, Schneider & Co., and how many millions in return for this are to be accorded to Stinnes, Thyssen & Co., from the

no less scandalous exploitation of the miners of Lorraine.

This question, the one most essential for Stinnes, Loucheur, etc., is one which can be solved by corruption or by violence, by milliards of gold or milliards of shells. These knights sans reproche do not shrink from utilizing the national finances, and the national army, for their private interests and for the satisfaction of their own appetites. They drag both nations at their heels. And to be able to do so with more certainty, they carefully conceal their cash-boxes from sight. In France and Germany alike, the cash-boxes vanish behind a drop-scene painted in the national colors and bearing the dazzling inscription: Liberty! honor! fatherland! Words which for many centuries have served only too often to sacrifice the credulous masses to the designs of their oppressors. The feelings of the workers are again to be played upon, their idealism appealed to, and the same trap laid for them. Once more the German and the Frenchman, the workman and the peasant is to be converted into a "heroic soldier," ready to sacrifice his life and possessions on the altar of his native country, that is, on the altar of capitalist profit.

Thus the German and French capitalists are in full agreement with respect to the division of the mines of Lorraine and the Ruhr. Four years of war, of suffering, of horror and of murder, ten millions of dead, thousands of milliards of debts—this has sufficed to convince them of the necessity of this agreement. All that remains to be settled is the percentage of profit to be assigned to each of these gentlemen. Hence all these negotiations, manoeuvres, and intrigues, carried on for the last four years between high finance and heavy industry, and aided by the enthusiastic intermediaries at the heads of our democratic republics. Hence the waste of further milliards, the slaughter of more workers.

Germany, like France, has so far placed her military power and her budget, the whole of her material and moral resources, at the disposal of her bourgeoisie, has so far offered resistance in the conviction that this resistance would be supported by the English and Americans "to a victorious end." But the rapacity shown on both sides threatened to prolong these haggings indefinitely. France's power, as compared with Germany's weakness is perfectly obvious. France's political and military dominion on the continent is indisputable. France knows that her powerful ex-allies have no present intentions of taking any serious steps against her. Threatened by bankruptcy, she hastens to bring the matter to an end. Her coup de main in the Ruhr area aims at forcing Germany to give way further and more rapidly.—Inprecorr.

Literature Price List

Cloth Bound	Per Copy
A. B. C. of Evolution (McCabe)	\$1.15
Economic Determinism	\$1.65
Evolution of the Idea of God (Grant Allen)	\$1.15
Evolution of Property (Lafargue)	\$1.15
Critique of Political Economy	\$1.65
Revolution and Counter Revolution (Marx)	\$1.15
History of Paris Commune (Lissagaray)	\$1.50
Ancient Society	\$1.85
Philosophical Essays	\$1.65
Theoretical System of Karl Marx	\$1.65
Landmarks of Scientific Socialism	\$1.65
Socialism and Philosophy	\$1.65
Capitalist Production (First Nine and 32nd 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
Germes of Mind in Plants	80c
The Triumph of Life	80c
Anarchism and Socialism	80c
Feuerback	80c
Socialism Positive and Negative	80c
Eighteenth Brumaire	80c
Science and Superstition	80c

All prices include Postage.

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

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.