

WESTERN CLARION

A Journal of
CURRENT
EVENTS

Official Organ of
THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

HISTORY
ECONOMICS
PHILOSOPHY

No. 927

TWENTIETH YEAR

Twice a Month

VANCOUVER, B. C., NOVEMBER 17, 1924

FIVE CENTS

The Rise and Decline of Neo-Communism

By HAIM KANTOROVITCH

(Reprint from "The Modern Quarterly").

THE popular and artistic descriptions of the Russian Revolution by J. Reed, Albert Rhys Williams and others, served as a warning to me not to take seriously anything that romantically inclined reporters, dreaming of socialism, might write about social and economic questions. What has happened in Russia? According to the above-named writers, and according to many of their friends, the soldiers in Russia wanted peace, the peasants land, and the workers socialism. The Kerensky government not giving them what they wanted, they then decided to make another revolution. The thought naturally occurred to them that if they should make a second revolution within a few months after the first, it would be wise to make it a Social Revolution. So they did. How very simple it was! And how beautifully they have done it! Read John Reed or Williams and you will find that the makers of the Russian Revolution were more like angels than human beings; what heroism and self-sacrifice these peasants and soldiers showed, what bravery they exhibited! It really sounds more like a fairy tale than a statements of facts.

The Reeds and the Williamses and their kind are socialists by sentiment. Socialism for them is an artistic dream—nothing more. They are really bourgeois intellectuals who come to hate present society out of sheer ennui. It is not their business to inquire whether Russian productive forces have developed to a point where a social revolution is possible; nor is it their business to inquire whether the peasants could ever be relied upon by the proletariat in its fight for socialism. They have seen the Russian Revolution, they have seen a grand uprising, they have met a few leaders and found them "jolly fellows;" they have read a few revolutionary proclamations that sounded terribly revolutionary to their tamed American minds—and they liked it all. At home they also tried to "frighten the philistines" by writing terrible stories and committing as many little unconventionalities as were permissible in the literary circles of Greenwich Village. They liked the revolution. It was so different, so much more exciting than they had at any time dreamed!

I well remember a debate between John Reed and a certain New York Menshevik. Reed's opponent, thoroughly educated in Marxism, asked Reed whether he believed that Bolshevism is not just the opposite of Marxism. Reed replied in somewhat these terms:

Oh, you fellows are not living beings; at best you are bookworms always thinking about what Marx said or meant to say. What we want is a revolution, and we are going to make it—not with books, but with rifles.

The audience liked it very much, and through a very generous applause acknowledged Reed the victor of the debate. But if there were socialists in the audience to whom Marx is more than a name and socialism more than an artistic sentiment, I am

sure that they must have shaken their heads gravely and said to themselves, "No, nothing good can come out of this kind of propaganda." The proletarian audience, with hate burning in their hearts towards existing capitalism, drank in the words of these romantic admirers of Bolshevism and found in them a momentary satisfaction like the drunkard in his wine, and like the latter, they did not give thought to the disappointment and disillusion that would come when the sobering-up process had set in.

What really happened in Russia is this. After the first revolution chaos prevailed. The peasants did not wait for the provisional government to finish its agrarian program. They simply seized the land of the big and even small landlords and divided it. They were ready to support any government that would ratify what they had already accomplished. The army was demoralized, the soldiers having deserted openly and in groups. The soldiers wanted peace (as well as the peasants and workers), but they cared very little what kind of peace they should get; they wanted peace not because they were internationalists or pacifists, but because they wanted to go home to their families and to the new land that they were now acquiring. They cared not whether the kind of peace they should get would help or hinder international socialism. They would have supported any government that would have made an end to the war. Still worse were the conditions of Russian industry. Transportation was disorganized, raw materials scarce, and in some instances unobtainable. The prices of the means of life soared to such an alarming height that no manufacturer could afford to pay workers a living wage. As a consequence increased unemployment spread, and with it dissatisfaction with the government increased. "Why doesn't the government do something!" the masses demanded. What could the government do?

There were only two ways out—either to restore order by depriving the peasants of the expropriated lands and by shooting down the workers, or ratifying the expropriations of the land, nationalize the mines and factories, and get out of the war by all means. The Kerensky government could not do any of these things. It had no loyal army to rely upon, and, besides, it was a coalition government. It could not afford to break openly with either the workers and peasants or with the landlords and capitalists. There was no middle way. The Russian bourgeoisie was small and unorganized and powerless. The most sweeping social reforms were possible, reforms that would have brought the Russian workers nearer to socialism than the workers of any other country.

Neither the Social Revolutionists nor the Mensheviks correctly understood what they were to do. Moreover, none of them had the courage to do what the objective conditions required of them. The only party that understood clearly the latent possibilities of the moment was the Bolshevik party. Lenin, of course, knew very well that there could be no question about establishing socialism in Russia. In his

polemic against Kamenev, Steklov and others who later became his chief helpers, he made this point very clear. "But," said Lenin, "if we can get the government in our hands, we will use it to strengthen the position of the Russian proletariat." It was only later that he expressed his belief in the possibility of establishing socialism in present-day Russia.

In a disorganized Russia, with a government that had the support of few, it was comparatively easy for a small but determined minority to get the state power in their hands through a military coup d'etat. We must not forget that the Bolsheviks were at first in favor of a popular democratic constitutional assembly. They took over the state power until the constitutional assembly met. They did not think then that democracy was a bourgeois prejudice. But when the constitutional assembly met, the Bolsheviks found that they were in the minority, and what is more, they understood that they could not get a majority in any national election at all, even though they had tried to satisfy the peasants by ratifying the land expropriations. At once they felt that the democratic way would not do for present-day Russia. They then dissolved the constitutional assembly and declared the dictatorship of the proletariat.

This was not enough. Being a small minority, they understood well enough that with freedom of speech, press and assembly, with free discussion going on all over the country, they would not be able to hold out against the other parties, and they therefore had to declare all such institutions to be merely bourgeois prejudices, and abolish them. But even this was not enough. They also knew that though the bourgeois parties could not very well compete with them, the socialist parties could, and they thereupon began a war of extermination against all new and competing radical parties. The red terror was more against the Mensheviks and social republicans than against the bourgeoisie.

Now what was the influence of all this on the proletariat of other countries?

Long before the war and the Russian revolution it was apparent that there was great dissatisfaction within the rank and file of the socialist movement. Socialism in its last phase, though retaining its

1. It was not a question of theory at all. The Bolsheviks did not come at first with ready-made plans to execute. As a matter of fact, they took over the government because they were compelled to do it—compelled by the circumstances—and whatever they have done in Russia, no matter how much we disagree with them, was done because there was no other way at the time. It was terrible to read that the first proletarian government was arresting hundreds of socialists. The thought that the first Socialist Republic had to do away with freedom of speech, press and assembly was very grievous to every socialist, but nevertheless we all felt that there was no other way; all this was the result of Russian conditions. Above all, we knew that it was either the Bolsheviks or the monarchists, and whoever allied themselves with the latter to fight against the Soviet government became traitors to socialism, even if they did it with the best socialist intentions.

revolutionary phraseology, had in reality before the war become a social reform movement. It is true that the social revolution formally was the goal of the socialist movement. But the term revolution had lost its significance; no practical value was attached to it. Political action had become the all-in-all. For the socialist movement the practical achievement was its real aim. In theory they were all Marxists; in practice they were really Bernsteinians. It is a curious fact that, while Bernstein has lost his theoretical fight against the orthodox Marxists, he none the less has won over to his side every socialist party in Europe, and even those who have never ceased calling him traitor. Plechanoff, Kautsky, Mehring and others fought against Bernstein's philosophic heresies only, but modern socialism, in the form given it by Marx and Engels, is not a philosophy in the usual sense, i.e., it is not one of those so-called systems thought out by a philosopher in his neatly furnished cabinet, without any relations to real life and the struggles that are going on beyond his cabinet. It has nothing to do with ultimate eternal truths for which philosophy is searching. "We have no ready made truths," declared Marx and Engels at the beginning of their career; "we bring no dogmas; we come to interpret what is going on around us"—and what was going on around them? A terrible class struggle, a war for life or death between the upholders of the regime and those bent upon destroying it. They foresaw that it could end in no compromise and could not be fought with dapper hands or with polite, gentlemanly speeches in parliament. In a letter to his American friend, Wedemeyer, Marx very clearly expressed what he thought to be his most important contribution to socialist tactics. In that letter he said:

As far as I am concerned, I cannot claim to have discovered the existence of classes in modern society, or their strife against one another. Middle-class historians long ago described the evolution of the class struggle, and political economists showed the economic physiology of the classes. I have added as a new contribution the following propositions: (1) that the existence of classes is bound up with certain phases of material production; (2) that the class struggle leads necessarily to the dictatorship of the proletariat; (3) that this dictatorship is but the transition to the abolition of all classes and to the creation of a society of equals.

Marx, of course, knew very well that the dictatorship of the proletariat could not come about as a sudden act, as the result of a conspiracy, of a revolutionary minority. In the International Workingmen's Association (The First Internationale) Marx had to fight hard against the Blancists who held the above views; his hardest fight, however, was against the tactical views of Bakounine. As is well known, Bakounine was at first a very intimate friend of Marx, even a Marxist in a certain sense. He was the first to translate the Communist Manifesto into Russian. The fight between these two giants of the first internationale was entirely on questions of tactics; later, in the course of the fight, the differences in their respective philosophies came to light. Bakounine believed that the social revolution could take place at any time. The only thing needed is a small but determined revolutionary minority that should get hold of the state through an armed uprising, destroy it and free the people. Once they are free, they will organize their social life on an anarchistic basis. Bakounine looked with disfavor on all the activities of the labor movement that aimed at the betterment of the conditions of the working class under capitalism. Trade unions fighting for higher wages and less hours, political socialists fighting for political and social reforms, he considered as either fakirs or fools, and regarded their activities as harmful to the social revolution. First of all, he reasoned, they spend their time on worthless things. The condition of the working class cannot be bettered under capitalism, anyway, but what is more important is that this reform activity may instill the hope into the hearts and souls of the workers that the revolution can be avoided, that we can, to use a modern expression, "gradually grow into socialism."

Marx and Engels could not agree to this view on

the social revolution; this was just the opposite to the tactical consequences of their entire philosophy. Marx knew that revolutions cannot be made at will. Marx knew that "no social order ever disappears before all the productive forces for which there is room in it have been developed; and new higher relations of production never appear before the material conditions of their existence have matured in the works of the old society." But he knew, moreover, that the "will to revolution," the class consciousness necessary for the accomplishment of the revolution, is not something that can be created by books and speeches. The class struggle that persistently goes on in daily life teaches socialism to the workers. The class struggle goes on, whether we recognize it or not; the workers will fight for any kind of relief they can get in their daily life, even if we advise them against it.

The economic conditions have in the first place transformed the mass of a country into wage-workers. The domination of capital has created for this mass of people a common situation with common interest. Thus this mass is already a class as opposed to capital, but not yet united in its purpose. In the struggle . . . this mass unites and it is constituted as a class for itself. The interests which it defends are the interests of its class. But the struggle between class and class is a political struggle. (Misery of Philosophy, Eng., p. 189.)

Recognizing this, Marx and Engels knew that the work and struggles of the trade unions are not futile tasks, but are steps in the evolution of the class consciousness of the workers. Moreover, they recognized that everything gained by the workers on the economic or political field is a positive gain—positive in the sense that it gives to the workers a more favorable position in their fight against capitalism. "The undying achievement of Marx," says Clara Zetkin, who is now the most prominent leader of German communism, "is the fact that he has thrown a firm bridge between socialism and labor movement. Thanks to the Marxian conception of history, we conceived the inner tie between reform and revolution in history . . . he (Marx) showed us that reform and revolution are not two different methods of the class struggle . . . but two different phases of historical development that are organically united." Every struggle for every reform is a step on our way to socialism. Even the super-revolutionist, Anton Panecek, who left the Comintern because the latter was not revolutionary enough for him, has this to say on the relations between reform and revolution: "A reform, achieved through a struggle, any achieved law in fact that is important for the workers, is for the proletariat a gain of power." Rosa Luxemburg, who is rapidly becoming the saint of the communist movement, has expressed the view of every Marxist on reform and revolution, in the following words:

Can social-democracy be against social reforms? Of course not. And can we place our ultimate aim, the social revolution, in opposition to social reform? Certainly not. The practical struggle for social reforms, for democratic institutions—a struggle that aims to ameliorate the life of the working class, on the basis of the existing order, such a struggle is for social democracy the only way of the proletarian class struggle, for the conquest of political power and the abolition of wage slavery. (See Reform and Revolution—her reply to Bernstein.)

I could fill a book with quotations to show that this is the view of every Marxist in Europe, but this would be useless and would take up too much of my limited space. I will therefore quote only one more authority, one whom I hope no one will accuse of reformism. I mean Lenin. The Russian anarchists have criticised severely the Russian social democrats, who have always held the view that the Russian workers would have to first fight together with the other classes for a democratic republic and various other social reforms. The anarchists claimed that with the social democrats reforms are of primary and revolution of secondary importance. To this Lenin replied in his book, "Chto Delat (What Is To Be Done, p. 46):

We are not delaying (the Revolution); we only take the first step toward it, by the only road; namely, by the road of the democratic republic. Whoever wants to go to socialism by any other road than political democracy must

arrive at, in the economic and political sense, absurd and reactionary conclusions.

And in another book of his, "Dvie Taktyki" (Two Tactics, p. 89), he plainly says:

Revolutionary social democracy includes in its activities the fight for reforms; this fight is for it a part of the struggle for freedom and socialism.

Marx and Engels had also an entirely different view of the state than Bakounine. According to Bakounine, two states must be destroyed before anything can be done; according to Marx and Engels, the working class

must first acquire political supremacy, must rise to be the leading class of the nation, must constitute itself as the nation (Communist Manifesto, p. 38.) The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest by degrees all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the state—that is, of the proletariat organized as the ruling class. (Com. Man., p. 41.) We see then, instead of destroying the state, the workers must use it to further their ends.

But more than anything else, Marx and Engels opposed the Blancist-Bakouninist idea that the revolution could be accomplished by an armed uprising of a minority. In what is called Engels' "last political testament," his preface to Marx's "War in France," published by the Labor News Co., under the title "The Revolutionary Act," he says that "with the successful utilization of the general franchise, an entirely new method of the proletarian struggle had come into being and had quickly been built up. . . . The rebellion of the old style, the street fight behind barricades, which up to 1848 had prevailed, has become antiquated." He even goes on to warn his readers that "the ruling classes, by some means or another, would get us where the rifle pops and the saber slashes." He also teaches us that "the time is past when revolutions can be carried through by small minorities at the head of unconscious masses."

We are now in a position to make a resume of the Marxian conception of the social revolution:

- (1) The social revolution cannot be made at will.
- (2) The social revolution comes as the culminating point of a long-drawn-out class struggle.
- (3) This class struggle is not created by class consciousness; on the other hand, class consciousness is created by the class struggle.
- (4) The workers must continually fight for their daily demands; anything gained in this fight, whether by political and legislative reforms does not matter, strengthens the workers in their fight against capitalism.
- (5) Socialism cannot be established before capitalism has reached the zenith of its development.
- (6) The social revolution will be the mass action of the majority of the workers and cannot be the act of a conspiracy by a revolutionary minority.
- (7) The first act in the social revolution is the conquest of political power, the inauguration of the proletarian dictatorship, although this dictatorship is nothing else than the political rule of the working class, i.e., the majority of the population.

(To be continued)

HERE AND NOW.

Our efforts in broadcasting station P.D.Q. in Clarion subs. meet with but little excited response from the tuners in. We reach a deaf ear.

From which we suppose the reader will snigger—"Growling Again." That's so and this is why:

Following \$1 each:—A. Jordan, J. Nelson, Wm. Olson, Cumberland L. and A. Association, H. De Grand Ry., J. Bombardieri, A. R. Pearson, C. E. Carver, L. Sarilo, Ben Huntley, W. Scott, J. Dennis, Wm. Clarkson.

P. Chadwick \$1.50; "P. L. D.", T. Scott.

Above, Clarion subs. received from 1st to 13th Nov., inclusive, total \$18.50.

Marx in Social Theory

A CRITICAL REVIEW—No. 3

There is no system of economic theory more logical than that of Marx. No member of the system, no single article of doctrine, is fairly to be understood, criticised or defended except as an articulate member of the whole and in the light of the preconceptions and postulates which afford the point of departure and the controlling norm of the whole. As regards these preconceptions and postulates, Marx draws on two distinct lines of antecedents,—the Materialistic Hegelianism and the English system of Natural Rights. By his earlier training he is an adept in the Hegelian method of speculation and inoculated with the metaphysics of development underlying the Hegelian system. By his later training he is an expert in the system of Natural Rights and Natural Liberty, ingrained in his ideals of life and held inviolate throughout. He does not take a critical attitude toward the underlying principles of Natural Rights. Even his Hegelian preconceptions of development never carry him the length of questioning the fundamental principle of that system. He is only the more ruthlessly consistent in working out their content than his natural-rights antagonists in the liberal-classical school. His polemics run against the specific tenets of the liberal school, but they run wholly on the ground afforded by the premises of that school. The ideals of his propaganda are natural-rights ideals, but his theory of the working out of these ideals in the course of history rests on the Hegelian metaphysics of development, and his method of speculation and construction of theory is given by the Hegelian dialectic. (Veblen).

IN the last issue and to some degree in the previous one, I essayed a description of the Hegelian dialectical conception of the mechanics of the evolutionary process. That conception is Marx's point of departure for his survey of the domain of unfolding human culture (material and immaterial) by means of his Materialistic Conception of history. According to the dialectical conception in the hands of Marx

"The goal of the life-history of the race in a large way controls the course of that life-history in all its phases, including the phase of capitalism. This goal or end, which controls the process of human development, is the complete realization of life in all its fullness, and the realization is to be reached by a process analogous to the three-phase dialectic, of thesis, anti-thesis, and synthesis, into which scheme the capitalist system, with its overflowing measure of misery and degradation, fits as the last and most dreadful phase-struggle of the Marxian system and the evil, (antithetical element) in life is to Marx a logically necessary evil, as the antithesis is a necessary phase of the dialectic; and it is a means to the (socialistic) consummation, as the antithesis is a means to the synthesis." (Veblen).

Let us now look to the English classical school of economists, who were subscribers to and elaborators of the system of "natural rights," from which system, Veblen says, Marx derived certain of its preconceptions and ideals of liberty. I may also remind the reader, so far as Marx's debt in economic theory to the classical school is concerned, that he himself, in the "Critique of Political Economy," traced his labor-theory of value to Ricardo (1772-1823) and through him to Adam Smith (1723-1790), the reputed father of that school.

The English classical school of political economy was a part of a wider movement of political liberalism rising at the high tide of the 18th century characterized by a then new tendency in philosophic speculation in moral and legal theory and social, political and economic doctrine. The new tendency developing, it later became known as the liberal-utilitarian movement. In its field of endeavor, it was the ideological expression of the new developing order of industrialism, as against the old order of a feudal and agricultural economy whose predominance as an interest was passing in the nation. Adam Smith, Jeremy Bentham, its philosopher, James Mill, John Stuart Mill, father and son, are some of the famous names associated with the history of the movement. It is the preconceptions and postulates of this classical school, its point of view with which it went to its scientific work which, for our purpose of understanding Marx, we are now chiefly interested in. But first, what is a point of view?

"What is spoken of as a point of view is always a composite affair: some sort of a rounded and balanced system

of principles and standards, which are taken for granted, at least provisionally, and which serve as a base or reference and legitimation in all questions of deliberate opinion. So when any given usage or line of conduct or belief is seen and approved from the modern point of view, it comes to the same as saying that these things are seen and accepted in the light of those principles which modern men habitually consider to be final and sufficient. They are principles of right, equity, propriety, duty, perhaps of knowledge, belief, and taste. . . . Evidently these principles, which so are made to serve as standards of validity in law and custom, knowledge and belief, are of the nature of canons, established rules, and have the authority of precedent and prescription. They have been defined by the attrition of use and wont and disputation, and they are accepted in a somewhat deliberate manner by common consent, and are upheld by a deliberate public opinion as to what is right and seemly. In the popular apprehension, and indeed in the apprehension of the trained jurists and scholars for the time being, these constituent principles of the accepted point of view are 'fundamentally and eternally right and good.' But this perpetuity with which they are so habitually invested in the popular apprehension, in their time, is evidently such a qualified perpetuity only as belongs to any settled outgrowth of use and wont. They are of an institutional character and they are endowed with that degree of perpetuity only that belongs to any institution. So soon as a marked change of circumstances comes on,—a change of a sufficiently profound, enduring and comprehensive character, such as persistently to cross or to go beyond those lines of use and wont out of which these settled principles have emerged,—then these principles and their standards of validity and finality must presently undergo a revision, such as to bring on a new balance of principles, embodying the habits of thought enforced by a new situation, and expressing itself in a revised scheme of authoritative use and wont, law and custom. In the transition from the medieval to the modern point of view, e.g., there is to be seen such a pervasive change in men's habitual outlook, answering to the compulsion of a new range of circumstances which came to condition the daily life of the peoples of Christendom." (Veblen).

The scientific point of view of the classical school was a composite of two main canons of truth, specifically, what is termed the "Hedonist" tenets, and a conception of an "order of nature" permeated with spirituality. The Hedonistic principles were drawn on psychological lines, of a conceived nature of man, taken collectively and individually, and of the motives supposed to control human conduct. The primary general principle was that the greatest happiness of the greatest number was the chief purpose and end of human association. At the same time, the Hedonistic conception of the psychology of the individual was that self-interest is the ruling principle in man's conduct, but that if each individual was allowed his "natural" right to an unimpeded sphere for the exercise of his economic activity, this activity would work out, even though unintended by him, in consequences beneficial to the community at large. Upon this reasoning the system of "natural rights" was based. In general terms, the economic theorists worked with the assumption that self-interest moved the individual along the line of avoiding pain and gaining pleasure. In prospective economic activity a balancing of gains in terms of pleasure as against pain-cost, and its calculated results, guides the laborer, or the capitalist. Pain-cost is in terms of the irksomeness of "labor" for the laborer, incurred when the pleasure of idleness is deferred, I presume, and "abstinence" for the capitalist, who thus defers present pleasure of spending his whole income, all in order that an increment of pleasure over pain-cost may accrue in the future. Thus the famous "economic man" of the history of economic theory. I quote Veblen again on the classical school.

"Seen through modern eyes and without effort to turn past gains to modern account, the metaphysical or pre-conceptual furniture of political economy as it stood about the middle of this-century (the 19th) may come to look quite curious. The two main canons of truth on which the science proceeded, and with which the enquiry is here concerned, were: (a) a hedonistic-associational psychology, and (b) an uncritical conviction that there is a meliorative trend in the course of events, apart from the

conscious ends of the individual members of the community. This axiom of a meliorative developmental trend, into shape as a belief in an organic or quasi-organic (biological) life process on the part of the economic community or of the nation; and this belief carried with it something of a constraining sense of self-realizing cycles of growth, maturity and decay in the life-history of nations or communities.

"Neglecting what may for the immediate purpose be negligible in this outline of fundamental tenets, I will bear the following construction. (a) One the ground of the hedonist or associational psychology, all spiritual continuity and any consequent teleological trend is hereby denied so far as regards individual conduct, where the later psychology, and the sciences which build on the later psychology, insist upon and find such a teleological trend at every turn. (b) Such a spiritual or quasi-spiritual continuity and teleological trend is uncritically affirmed as regards the non-human sequence or the sequence of events in the affairs of collective life, where the modern sciences diligently assert that nothing of the kind is discernible, or that, if it is discernible, its recognition is beside the point, so far as concerns the purpose of the science."

Which it to say, I take it, that the later science says man alone is endowed with purpose, and whatever trend of things and events, whatever continuity and direction of trend there be, to a socialist order of life shall we say, is to be traced solely to the consequences, whether intended by them or not, of the actions and conduct of men, considered as responses to the stimulus of the brute, impersonal forces of the environment. Marx's constitution, his nature, and his attitude at the moment of impact in great part decides what will serve as stimulus, as well as what the manner and direction of his response will be.

To still further illustrate the shift of pre-conceptual ground on that matter of the later post Darwinian science on the character of the forces in the process, from that of the early modern science, let me throw into high light of contrast Adam Smith's point of view:

"In his view (Smith) Nature has made provision for social well-being by the principle of the human association which prompts every man to better his condition: the individual aims only at his private gain, but is led by an invisible hand to promote the public good; human institutions, by interfering with this principle in the name of the public interest, defeat their own end; but when all systems of preference or restraint are taken away, the obvious and simple system of natural liberty establishes itself of its own accord."—(Ency. Britt.)

It is obvious from that reasoning that Smith imputed governing and directive power and purpose to a principle or law of nature, while practically denying to man any power to effect the trend of the process. A greater "will" than man's was working out the process for the good of man, his business was to find out what Nature "willed," by knowing her principles and laws of life and to conduct his personal, communal and national affairs in accordance with her will. Such reasoning again, as we saw in Hegelian cosmology, exhibits the persistence of that old animistic propensity of man to impute personality and will to things and forces of the environment outside himself; he "knows" of them by first hand knowledge of the facts of his own personality; he in fact, projects his own personality into them, sometimes in such fashion as he feels how he would like them to be. So, an Almighty Heavenly Father, with

(Continued on page 8)

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

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

928

VANCOUVER, B. C., NOVEMBER 17, 1924

A SUCCESSFUL FAILURE.

A week or two ago, toward the eve of the United States Presidential election campaign, the La Follette publicists wrote that overwhelming support was coming over to the Progressive Party, State by State; and since Coolidge has gained 14,100,000 popular votes to 8,000,000 for Davis and 4,300,000 for La Follette it would appear that the electoral barometer is out of order.

The central point of La Follette's political philosophy appears to reach back into the Jeffersonian concept that the people are sovereign over their government, upon which principle there hangs a great deal of strife in American political life. The presumption is that, under the terms of the Constitution (plus Amendments) the people elect their government and that consequently its destiny is in their hands. But the Supreme Court may declare, by judicial interpretation, any act of Congress to be in violation of the Constitution and so upset the Jeffersonian principle concerning the will of the sovereign people as directly applied through the prevailing electoral system. Child Labor Laws, Workmen's Compensation Acts, Railroad Rates bills, Income Tax laws, Labor Laws of one sort or another have been discovered to be unconstitutional from time to time and the judicial interpretation of the Constitution which, until 1913, allowed a wide use of the injunction process to stop strikes, reserving its use to the government, has harassed the trade union movement in such strivings as it has made.

It is here that La Follette secured the endorsement of the official trade union movement, in advocating placing restriction upon the veto power of the Supreme Court over legislation by Congress. He had the pledged support of the A. F. of L., the Socialist Party of America and the progressive farmers, and these, with such others as were attracted to his progressive banner brought him the vote recorded.

Coolidge as the acknowledged candidate of big business meant nothing insidious or harmful in political life to the American voter, nor did Tea Pot Dome, nor the Lorimer Bank scandal, nor did the apparent marketing, huckstering and jerrymandering of Republican or Democratic nominating conventions mark any hesitation on the part of labor to accord its sanction. But two or more years of an uninterrupted chance to work under a Republican administration meant something; an Immigration Restriction Act meant something. Labor likes that sort of thing, and while it may lend a tolerant ear to expositions which concern its status, from present plans to theoretically curb the power of big business to town planning in the new Jerusalem, it plumps for what it sees immediately ahead.

Some men are well placed in opposition and La Follette—if it is not too tremendously compromising to be able to acclaim his failure—may have no reason to regret his non-success. As in the case of the Labor Government in Great Britain Brailsford's words are well given—they have lost office and have found a chance to rediscover their principles.

'IS IT NOTHING TO YOU?'

MEN do strange things in which reason appears to play no part. If the observance of Armistice day is expected to produce mass emotion it falls far short—far short even in emotional effect. Most people concerned seem in some fashion to appear not unwilling to do as others do, and to obey quiescently the general ukase commanding honor to the dead covering the space of two minutes, and so far as comprehending further significance in the ceremony is concerned there is no apparent anxiety in evidence.

Standing on the rear platform by our street car conductor on Armistice Day—he wore his France button—our conversation with him during the two minute stop ran along these lines—our question commencing:

"I suppose the substance of this ceremony is respect for the dead?"

"Yes, I guess that's it."

"I suppose it means all of the dead, Germans as well as Allied dead? No use in holding grudges now, don't you think?"

"Yes. Sure. That's it. No, I don't think it is, and yet I guess it is. I guess so. No. Damned if I know."

Thereupon the other passengers proceeded to discuss the matter of whether the dictatorship of the

dead was national or international and opinion appeared to be divided.

As an evidence of the fact that men do queer things we cite the following item from "The Daily Province" (Vancouver) Nov. 12, 1924:—
Ejection of London Veteran Halts as Silence Gun booms.

London, Nov. 12.—While William C. Rolfe, his wife and children looked on, bailiffs tossed the Rolfe household goods to the street in a poor section of London on Tuesday.

Sharp at 11 o'clock the warning gun for the two-minute armistice sounded and the bailiffs drew stiffly to attention, as did Rolfe. At the end of the brief period of silence, the ejection of the Rolfes continued.

Rolfe fought throughout the war in the British army.

What appears to us lacking in that news item is information to the effect that so well drilled a man as Mr. Rolfe neglected to help the bailiffs in shifting the furniture. We suspect, however, that his experiences in peace and in war have made Mr. Rolfe a trifle ironical. Or perhaps, like other people, he does strange things because his individual actions are not called particularly into question since he acts in a big company which as usual, finds such logic as may be needed for its actions in numbers.

PROFESSIONALIZING THE FIELD OF EDUCATION

By F. W. MOORE

THE following extract from the "Weekly Province" of August 14th, 1924, is self-explanatory: "The greatest task of the Canadian Teachers' Federation is that of professionalizing the field of education, stated H. C. Newland, M.A., LL.B., of Edmonton, president of the Federation, in his presidential address this morning to the delegates here in convention. "The performance of this is conditioned in two ways: (1) teachers must assume the leadership in dealing with educational problems, and in framing educational policy. There can be no doubt that if the people of Canada really believe in education as they believe in medicine, or dentistry, or law they would expect expert guidance from teachers as from doctors, dentists, or lawyers, and would also pay the cost of education far more willingly and gracefully. (2) Teachers themselves must receive a training in scientific education which compares in intensity and in duration with a course in medicine or law."

The President of the Teachers' Federation is undoubtedly honest and possesses the highest ideals with regard to education, but unfortunately under the surveillance of a political system whose continued existence depends on the mental rape of the populace, they are absolutely impossible of attainment. We admit that his views on an intensive course of scientific training are both correct and practical, but an important question remains to be asked: Would teachers be allowed the privilege accorded to doctors and lawyers, to develop their art in strict accordance with the needs of humanity? We think not. The researches of doctors and lawyers are not incidental to the exposures of the economic causes of human degradation, whereas that is precisely the target to which the aim of a group of scientific teachers with an honest desire to give the best service, would tend. It follows that the legal and medical men would incur none of that enmity that must accrue to the teacher if he dare to benefit education by metaphorically fertilizing the soil in which alone it can yield a satisfactory crop. How barren it is may be judged from the fact (stated under different circumstances in another article) that the intellectually sluggish inhabitants of the capitalistic world of today are indifferently content with the allocation of a shamelessly small percentage of the international revenue towards purposes of education, while a proportionately large amount is squandered on wars and defence. In this respect the United States might be quoted as a typical ex-

ample of the rest. Her appropriations for the year 1920 amounted to nearly six billion dollars, and of this huge sum, according to Dr. Rosa of the United States Bureau of Standards, 92.8 per cent. was spent on account of past wars and present armaments, and 1/8th of 1 per cent. on education. (Social Service Bulletin, for April, 1921).

Under these circumstances one could hardly expect the multitude to develop much interest in, or possess a great thirst for education of the scientific variety. The extremely moderate desire that does exist is confined, for the most part, to the wealthier classes whose progeny have the time and the money to supplement the comparatively meager advantages that the expenditure of so disgracefully small a percentage of the national revenue has been the means of providing for the poor. How then could we expect the poor, who constitute the bulk of the population of every country, to have that enthusiastic love of education that would inspire them to insist on its development for its own sake, that is along lines that coincide with the development of the human race?

How the acquisition of these ideals was automatically prevented in the past is graphically described by Achille Loria in his "Economic Foundations of Society." On page 151 occurs the following: "The privileges of the owning class as a group finally engendered such a condition of affairs that it became irrational, and even dangerous to extend political power to the non-owning classes. In short the intellectual capacity necessary to good government was developed among the proprietary classes as their wealth increased, and opportunity was thus afforded of cultivating the higher virtues of the mind. The disfranchised classes, on the other hand, lost intellectual power with their increasing misery and degradation, and relapsed into greater brutishness as the distinction between the rich and the poor became more marked. This mental degradation of the non-owning classes involved political incapacity as well, and made it socially necessary to deprive them of privileges which they could only have exercised in an irrational and brutal manner, involving the entire society in anarchy and ruin."

The belief that these conditions are still to be coped with has, no doubt, inspired the leaders of the Worker's Educational Movement to give expression to such sentiments as are embodied in the following excerpt from the Social Service Bulletin for September 1922. The words are said to have been spoken by Fannia Cohn of the International Ladies' Garment Worker's Union at the first worker's
(Continued on page 7)

Another Slant on Neo-Marxism

SOME time within the past few years our friend "C" became intoxicated with a "new idea of social regeneration. It was a purely rational consideration on his part that impelled him to take his fondest theory out in the back-yard and strangle it—metaphorically speaking. The desire "to be something in the political life of the community" and the "exigencies of protagonism" were as dust in the balance, as against the desire to be up-to-date in philosophical speculations! Disappointed in his expectations of a proletarian upheaval, he discarded the theory of class struggle for that of equity between class and class. Abandoning the barren fields of economics, he ascended the Olympian heights of philosophy. There, in company of kindred spirits who had preceded him, he evolved a philosophy which, in its application to those who disagree with it in any detail, presents the aspect of a stern and holy religious crusade. Like the sinner who has found "salvation" he imputes to his former companions in sin, who refuse to embrace the "new faith" whole-heartedly and without reservations, the vice of "violent preconceptions," of "distrust of constitutional procedures," of "hatred of labor parties,"—in short all the sociological and philosophical transgressions to which he himself has confessed by the rather naive admission in one of his articles: "that I have been that way myself." "C's" new faith is not a simple one. His doctrine is neither symmetric or synthetic, like the dialectic Marxism of "R." On the contrary it meanders through the Clarion columns, discursively attempting a reconciliation between the dynamic idea of the class struggle and its antithesis—"community interests."

Whenever I hear Christian sectaries "arguing the scriptures" among themselves I immediately get out of earshot, knowing that the discussion will be a most sterile one, as for every Roland that one of the disputants conjures from the Good Book, his opponent calls forth to combat an Oliver. Likewise with the Marxian scriptures: devotees, sectarians and interpreters! In my opinion the Book of Genesis contains the "fundamental" proposition on which rise the infinite variety of Christian cults. While making no claim whatever to be counted among the persons on whom "C" confers the title of Marxian I submit that in the "Historical Tendency of Capitalist Accumulation" (thirty-second chapter "Capital" vol. 1.) Marx sets forth in a vivid word picture a brief but illuminating description of the working out of his entire system from "fundamental proposition" to final "consummation." Space forbids quotation at length, but we must hark back to Marx's conception of the transition from capitalism to socialism, being as brief in quotations as possible. According to Herr Marx, the history of all political societies of the past, as well as the present epoch, is a history of struggles between the exploiters and the exploited. At a certain historical period the genesis of capitalist accumulation appears. A new mode of production develops, constantly accelerated by the expropriation of the individual private property of the small producer.

"As soon as this process of transformation has sufficiently decomposed the old society from top to bottom, as soon as the laborers are turned into proletarians, their means of labor into capital . . . the further expropriation of private proprietors takes a new form. That which is now to be expropriated is no longer the laborer working for himself, but the capitalist exploiting many laborers. This expropriation is accomplished by the action of the immanent laws of capitalistic production itself, by the centralization of capital. One capitalist always kills many, and in hand with this centralization, or the expropriation of many capitalists by the few, develop, on an ever-extending scale, the co-operative form of the labor process . . .

"Along with the constantly diminishing number of the magnates of capital, who usurp and monopolize all advantages of this process of transformation, grows the mass of misery, oppression, slavery, degradation, exploitation; but with this too grows the revolt of the working class, a class always increasing in numbers, and disciplined, un-

ited, organized by the very mechanism of the process of capitalist production itself. The monopoly of capital becomes a fetter on the mode of production, which has sprung up and flourished along with, and under it. Centralization of the means of production and socialization of labor at last reach a point where they become incompatible with their capitalist integument. This integument is burst asunder. The knell of capitalist private property sounds. The expropriators are expropriated."

In the above exposition of the transition from capitalism to socialism—there is no ambiguity. It occurs with the inexorability of cosmic law. Socialism must come! There is no room in the Marxian synthesis for the intervention of fortuitous circumstance, or the idiosyncracies of "purposeful men" to alter the course of its irresistible and "timeless" process. Yet "C" the neo-Darwinian-Marxist, says that "Socialism is not inevitable by virtue of a trend in the nature of things. Man is the only purposeful factor in the process." In the last sentence appears the influence which some of these "psyches," who are neither Darwinians nor Marxians, have over our friend "C." I refer to Prof. Wm. MacDougal, professor of psychology at Harvard University. At a recent session of the British Association for the Advancement of Science at Toronto he made this announcement: "In general biology the mechanistic neo-Darwinism is bankrupt before the problems of evolution." There has been a rapid change, said he, from the scientific materialism of Huxley and his contemporaries when the idea of purpose was discarded. In those days the world and all living things in it were presented to us with so much prestige and confidence as one vast system of mechanistic determination that one seemed to be placed before two acutely opposed alternatives: "on one hand science and universal mechanism: on the other hand, humanism, religious mysticism and superstition." Today, the whole situation is changed, said he. Then he went on to dwell on the "mysteries of human life," and "the steadfast purposive adaptive striving of a resolute personality." I fancy MacDougal is one of those kindred spirits with whom "C" reflects on the mystery of human life." It seems rather peculiar that "C" who quotes, in support of his "new" theory, the moderns from Dewey to Tawney, never mentions or quotes from the very fountain-head of revisionism, Bernstein's, "Evolutionary Socialism" (1898). Yet Bernstein in his work which was influenced by pragmatic considerations and a desire that the German S. D. Party should become purely a party of social reform, advances all of the arguments against revolutionary socialism, which are now used by "C." Bernstein, in his introduction to "Evolutionary Socialism," which is well worth reading especially in view of recent events in Germany, says: "I am fully conscious that it (his viewpoint) differs in several important points from the ideas to be found in Karl Marx and Engels—men whose writings have exercised the greatest influence on my socialist line of thought. . . I have now a controversy with socialists who, like me, have sprung from the Marx-Engels school; and I am obliged, if I am to maintain my opinions, to show them the points where the Marx-Engels theory appears to me especially mistaken or contradictory." (Emphasis mine.) That was a straightforward manner in which to approach the question. He did not seek to prove, by a method of indirection and innuendo, directed against his associates who held to the "catastrophic" collapse of capitalism, that the viewpoint he represented was Marxian. On the contrary, his object was to demonstrate the mistakes and contradictions inherent in the Marx-Engels system. As is well-known to students of socialist history, Bernstein and his followers finally gained control of the German Social Democracy. The party policy became that of compromise; permeation of the bourgeois state, class peace, policies which seemed a huge success, until an "episode" (the Great War) "just happened" as

it were—which so disturbed the "norms and trends" of social-democracy in Germany that the entire structure collapsed. It has since been rebuilt and remodelled and is now an adjunct to another cycle of expropriation. Which is not an unmixed evil—according to Marx. I am not so naive as to say, that if the revolutionary socialists had won out over their evolutionary rivals in the struggle for control of the German S. D. P. the cumulative results would have been substantially different. Reformers who were wont to point with pride to the great achievements of social reform in Germany prior to the "episode" now view with alarm the increasing degradation of the workers and middle class in that country. Hours of labor lengthened, through the economic crisis and the abrogation of the state's right to intervene with the right of free contract between master and man, "the people's property" or municipal and national enterprises, auctioned off to private capitalists, increasing degradation of the masses, is now the aspect which that once ideal land presents. Taking issue with my statement in a recent article, "that the progressive degradation of the European was a fact" our friend "C" by a series of artful evasions and nicely balanced sentences, proceeded to differentiate the mechanistic working of the capitalist system as a whole into separate and independent motions, labelled "episode" (war) "aftermath," (depression) "disturbing factor," "norms and trends," and what-not. By a process of selecting favorable "motions" and the exclusion of other factors which are an essential part of the real conditions of capitalism he builds up an imaginary "normal economic process" which fits in with his theory. Has "C" any other criterion worth a "hoop in Hades" other than his desire for social-democratic progressive policies, that the "episode" and "aftermath" are not at present the real "norm and trend" of capitalist society in the here and now!

"C" contends that the present degradation of the European workers did not issue out of the "normal economic process," but is an "episodal result of the late war." What then was the war a result of, the immediate "normal economic process" or the result of some other episode; which was again the result of episodes, without end? As an indication of some of these norms and trends, which he has not in mind, I will refer "C" to "Foreign Affairs" July 1924, which contains a series of replies given, in the House of Commons, by the Under Secretary of Foreign Affairs to E. D. Morel, on the expansion of the Austrian state armament industry; the British Government being a participant in a loan to Austria. It appears that under the treaty of St. Germain Austria is forbidden to export war munitions, the manufacture of which is "legally" confined to one state factory. In spite of the treaty, or because of it, it seems that the principal Austrian industry is the manufacture and export of war munitions to the surrounding countries. Six ammunition factories are now illicitly manufacturing and exporting their products, which included "1,000,000 rifles to Jugo-Slavia manufactured at the Steyr works, and between February and April 20 of this year, 116 wagon-loads of infantry ammunition to the same state." The Labor Government Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs said, "he was aware that the illicit export of war material from Austria had taken place on various occasions." But the "matter was being carefully watched by the Organ of Liquidation in Austria." It appears that both the British and French have established armament factories in Austria under the auspices of the League of Nations and both are "busily engaged selling the most modern implements of destruction to both sides in a possible war. The more we sell to one group, the easier it is to persuade

Continued on page 8)

The Study Class, Stage

By J. A. McDONALD.

HAVING already shown that neither Marx nor the Socialist Party of Canada ever stated or inferred that all social reforms were necessarily inimical to social progress, I will now try to elucidate the position of the revolutionist in the modern working class movement.

On this continent we have a population of approximately one hundred and thirty-five millions of people. These are divided up into several national groups which, to a certain extent, compete with each other. But, taken on the whole, we are confronted with the fact that regardless of national boundaries practically all of them obtain a living in the same manner. From the owners' standpoint, too, it can easily be shown that the house of Morgan, and similar concerns, are interested in the exploitation of Canadian and Mexican resources and workers just as much as those of the United States.

While no section of the world has witnessed such a rapid development of industry, commerce and finance during the past quarter of a century as this continent, yet it cannot be said with any degree of accuracy that the intellectual development of the masses has kept pace with the strides made in the field of production and exchange.

If we were to add up the total membership of those political and industrial organisations which claim adherence to the revolutionary faith we would have an aggregate of less than fifty thousand members. Even in arriving at this conclusion we would have to accept each group's estimate of its own numerical strength.

This showing is in all conscience weak enough even could we grant that all of these were Marxian students, possessing a fair working knowledge of social forces, and being imbued with a desire to accomplish a profound social change. Yet the facts of the case are that the great majority of even this limited number are merely discontented workers who feel the pressure of the system, but who cannot analyse or explain the cause of social conditions. Only a very small fraction of this total represents the element which has given serious consideration to working class problems.

So far as a revolutionary movement is concerned there is no such entity on this continent today. True, there is lots of life and activity and social progress, but even our philosophical acrobats, in all their versatile contortions, cannot conjure forth anything that could be termed a movement of the working class marching in the general direction of their own emancipation.

There are ample factors to account for the prevailing lethargy, but the enumeration of such would be outside the scope of this article. Enough, for the present, to realize that such is the case. In view of this situation, we can state without fear of successful contradiction, that the conscious endeavor to dispossess the ruling class and introduce a social form where production will be carried on for use is confined to those groups that are engaged in educational work.

There may be strikes and rebellions, and political elections resulting in apparent victory, but the revolutionary import of such mass outbreaks is not sufficient to stimulate any great enthusiasm until a proper concept of the struggle obtains. Back in 1911, the Social-Democrats of Germany registered more than four millions of votes in a national election, but there is now no necessity in consuming space to relate what happened when the world war broke out. In the presidential election of four years ago, here in the United States, more than a million voters staggered blindly to the support of the Socialist and Farmer-Labor parties, but in the present campaign even the leaders of these "revolutionary" groups are found in the petit bourgeois camp of Lafollette.

The strength of an organisation can be judged fairly well by the number of propagandists it possesses. If the party is strong and flourishing it is only because of the fact that it has a considerable number of members equipped with the necessary knowledge, and that these members are losing no opportunity of presenting their case. Stagnation and decay reflect a loss of those who previously carried on the revolutionary activities.

The extension of study classes is the crying need of today. We must provide the masses with the intellectual armor and weapons necessitated by the nature of the class struggle. In this respect no organisation on the continent has functioned better than the S. P. of C. in times past. I remember a few years ago here in 'Frisco there were four classes conducted simultaneously by as many organisations, and every one of the instructors were ex-members of the S. P. of C.

This does not imply that even this Party always took advantage of the opportunities offered. In my estimation too much stress was laid on economics at the expense of the class struggle. It has often appeared to me that teaching economics in Vancouver was a form of recreation. It was a more congenial hobby than gathering stamps or

raising pigeons. This estimate, if correct, would account for the fact that so many ex-members, after getting the rudiments of an economic education, drift into the role of Marxian Monks. They refrain from any participation in educational work.

A knowledge of the class struggle, and the materialist conception of history is just as essential to working class progress as to be able to grasp the fine points of the law of value, and the theory of surplus value. Lacking these fundamentals, we are likely to discover fairly well versed economists advocating an excursion into the broader field of labor politics.

As to the benefits accruing from such an education, frankly, I can see none. Labor parties, in other countries, have succeeded in routing their opponents and forming governments of their own political leanings but these have not been conducive to revolutionary progress. The various states of Australia have elected Labor Governments many times since the beginning of the present century. In those parties were also to be found individuals mouthing phrases from Marx and Engels. But what has been accomplished from a working class standpoint?

The same poverty and degradation is apparent there as here. A Labor Government passed a War Precaution Act in which free speech and free press were ruthlessly suppressed. Striking workers are shot down by labor troops when they dare to attempt a betterment of conditions. Unemployed masses are clubbed by labor police for the crime of holding protest meetings on the public streets. A Labor Premier asks for votes because his government presents "a safe, solid bulwark against revolution."

These are the results of experience and even the few who are able to quote Value, Price and Profit are swallowed up in the maelstrom of reaction. Nothing is gained but much can be lost. It is not a question of what the world may do to us so much as what we can do to the world that matters now. How can we obtain the best results from our efforts.

It is still my contention that we can do most by confining our labors to the educational field for the present. We can easily find means to secure the attention of sufficient workers to make our endeavors pay. We can present our philosophy in the serenity of the class room to far greater advantage than aimlessly wandering in wider fields. The present is ours to utilise, the future will take care of itself.

Interpreting the Marxian Position

BY C. LESTOR.

THE policy of the Party is now under discussion, and as an old-timer I feel very much interested in the matter. The articles by "C" do not ring true; they echo with the clap-trap of compromise. A party, like an individual, has its own particular psychology and the S. P. of C. has its own particular characteristics that distinguish it from other organisations. In the days of our youth we went forth seeking battle with everything and everybody that sanctioned the continuance of the present system. We hated reformers whole heartedly and mopped them up gleefully. They were so afraid of us that they bolted the doors and guarded them with the police to prevent us from getting in every time they held a meeting. What glorious days those were! And now "C" tells us we were wrong. He implies that our tactics and policy need revising. We call ourselves Marxists. Let me try to

give the Marxian position. I take the following from the Encyclopedia Britannica, as I think it fits the case exactly.

"The great work of Marx may be described as an exposition and criticism of Capital. But it is indirectly an exposition of Socialism, inasmuch as the historical evolution of Capital is governed by natural laws, the inevitable tendency of which is towards Socialism. It is the great aim of Marx to reveal the law of the economic movement of modern times. Now the economic movement of modern times is dominated by Capital. Explain, therefore, the natural history of Capital, the rise, consolidation, and decline of its supremacy as an evolutionary process, and you forecast the nature of that into which it is being transformed—Socialism.

"Hence the great task of the Marx school is not to preach a new economic and social gospel, not to provide ready-made schemes of social regeneration after the fashion of the early socialists, nor to counteract by alleviating measures the wretchedness of our present system, but to explain and promote the inevitable process of social

evolution, so that the domination of Capital may run its course and give place to the higher system that is to come."

The policy and tactics of the Party in the old days were in line with this interpretation of Marxism.

Does the Encyclopedia interpret Marx correctly? "C" says that we took in the old days an anti-reform attitude. This is correct but we never opposed those forces that were moving in the right direction. Reforms of a reactionary character, that is to say, reforms that we judged would retard the evolutionary process, we ruthlessly exposed as props of capitalism. The economic and political developments are bringing all radical parties nearer together, and some things present a different aspect to what they formerly did. The political tricks and wire-pulling of office seeking leaders in the Labor Parties compelled us often in days gone by

to take a dogmatic stand against the opportunists who from time to time appeared in the movement. We considered it our sacred duty to keep to the straight and narrow path and hew to the line. We did more good work then than we are doing now. It may be conceded that the general level of intelligence in the labor movement has been raised as a result of our efforts and in consequence labor parties are coming nearer to us. What we have to do is to go on with our work in our own way.

The fault with "C" is that he searches Marx to find things to fit into the particular theory that he desires to formulate and promote. He ignores everything that does not support his own point of view. A writer of this description may help the movement unconsciously but the object of his articles is to satisfy his own ego and to put something across. He has not yet proved that the cataclysmic theory is wrong. The earthquake comes suddenly; the forces working to bring it about are unseen and often unknown, but the result of their operations appears quickly and vividly. The birth of the baby is a sudden culmination of what has been heretofore a slow process. The chicken appears from the egg alive and joyous, not slowly and piecemeal, but all at once. The French Revolution, the Russian Revolution, in fact all great changes come with spectacular rapidity whether preparations are made for them or no. The Social Revolution can be no exception. Under the system supply, in spite of monopoly, still has to anticipate demand and the future cannot be accurately forecasted and anticipated. Every individual puts certain causes into operation every day of his life. There is a general result of the sum total of the causes and effects that cannot be gauged beforehand. The economic factor is, however, the factor that determines. We have to deal with what comes and base our actions upon a study of the economic development. Capitalism contains within it a contradiction that will destroy it. We build upon that. "The forces of social production are in revolt against the anarchy that exists in exchange." The powers of production are increasing. The system is now cramping the economic development in every part of the world. The productive forces are struggling for free operation. In order to maintain the profit system the capitalist class are driven into such a position that they hold back the economic development and hinder the free play of the productive forces. The struggle becomes fiercer as the barrier raised against the inevitable becomes higher. We find that we move more quickly now than at any period in the world's history. We travel further in a year now than we did in ten before the war. Events of great import come upon us thick and fast. The war, the revolutions and conflicts following the war, the Conferences in Europe and elsewhere, the Fascisti, the Dawes plan, the Chinese little squabble and a hundred and one things are indications of the economic undercurrents that are at work. How much longer will the barrier hold? A little temporary relief may be obtained by another war over the markets of China and the trade of the Pacific, but a complete breakdown, sudden and terrible is inevitable. This is my personal view of the matter. "Oh Revolution, thou awaitest not the well-timed day and hour, thou comest sudden of our efforts and in consequence labor parties deny, blind and fatal as the avalanche." Many hold that the transition period would be less violent and protracted than any other that had preceded it. The world is moving like a movie film and as the countries are inter-related we may expect them to be engulfed all together in the throes of an economic crisis, an economic crisis from which there is no outlet within the confines of Capitalism. The problem is solved according to Engels by the proletariat seizing the public power, and by means of it transforming the socialized means of production (now slipping from the hands of the bourgeoisie), because they cannot be any longer profitably operated, into public property. Note that Engels does not imply a slow move but a sudden seizure of the public powers.

To accomplish this act of universal emancipation is the historical mission of the modern proletariat.

To thoroughly comprehend the historical conditions

and thus the very nature of this act, to impart to the oppressed proletariat class a full knowledge of the conditions and of the meaning of the momentous act it is called upon to accomplish, this is the task of the theoretical expression of the proletarian movement, Scientific Socialism.

This is the task of the Socialist Party of Canada.

Let those who are after a cheap trip ticket to parliamentary honors form Labor Parties and chase the illusions of reform, the S. P. of C. must be true to itself.

"The proletariat cannot raise itself without the whole of society being sprung into the air."

My experience in Britain caused me to respect the Socialist Party of Canada and its platform more than I had ever done before. What we want is comrades who are worthy of the organization to which we have the honor to belong. All our troubles have been caused by individuals coming amongst us and trying in various insidious ways to undermine the foundation upon which we stand.

The policy of the paper, that is the articles that appear in the paper, should be written with the idea of advancing the interests of the Party, not retarding them. It would do some of the comrades good to travel a little more. The world moves, but many individuals do not realise the change that is taking place in the minds of the slaves. There is a demand for and an appreciation of the propaganda of the Socialist Party of Canada,—old style. The Clarion is not appreciated to the extent it should be, but if it contained less of the piffle of "C" and more of the straight issue it would supply better the demand of the groping slave for light.

Note: Marx's view was that as this revolution was the expropriation of the few by the many it would be a rapid one, more rapid than any of its predecessors, owing to the fact that they had been expropriators of the many by the few. Marx may be mistaken, and so may "C", and so may we all.

PROFESSIONALIZING THE FIELD OF EDUCATION

(Continued from page 4)

educational conference: "It has always been our conviction that the labour movement stands consciously for the reconstruction of society. It strives towards a new life. It dreams of a new world where economic and social justice will prevail, where the welfare of mankind will be the aim of all activity, where a sturdy love and fellowship capable of enduring daily wear and tear will replace competitive greed, distrust, and selfishness. To attain this end, it is necessary not only to accumulate knowledge, but to develop a social conscience. With this end in view we set out to organize our educational work." and with comparatively great ease, we might add, they can do so, being supported by a labour union; but let the pedagogical employees of a government, the factors of which are, for the most part, satellites of the big financial interests, dare to try to develop a social conscience that is not in every way compatible with the continued acquisition of profits, and they will soon discover that money manipulators hold the star parts on the world's stage today, and that under the circumstances teachers cannot be permitted to take the lead in organizing education other than on a basis compatible with the further development of our present system of human exploitation.

Such reactionary organization could easily be arranged amidst all the appearances of perfect freedom simply by choosing from educational circles leaders whose ideals were compatible with such ambitions as characterize the leaders of imperialism.

Let the average teacher, however, receive that "intensive training in scientific education" which would, of course, involve a knowledge of the economic foundations of social institutions, and he, inspired by a life-long training that tends to make him an idealist, would revolt at those degrading exigencies that would tend to commercialize his intellect, and debase his personality with the instincts of a grovelling sycophant. As a matter of fact ed-

ucation cannot evolve as it should until the prodigious barriers to its progress are removed—those barriers involved in the necessity of squandering billions of dollars, and the lives of millions of human beings in bellicose activities incidental to war and defence; in chauvinistic patriotism; in misleading propaganda; in fact in all the disheartening effects that are incidental to a moribund capitalism.

When the time comes—and it is fast approaching, that the nations will demand real information concerning the economic causes of their troubles the intensive scientific training of as many teachers as possible would be a wonderful asset to humanity: and in the meantime it only remains for such as manage to acquire the "intensive training" to follow the dictates of truth and honesty, by "proving all things and holding fast to (and afterwards disseminating) that which is good."

CLARION MAINTENANCE FUND.

J. Nelson, \$1; Wm. Mitchell \$3; P. Chadwick \$3.50; "B. L. J." \$1; Wm. Clarkson \$7.75; T. B. Roberts \$3.

Above, C. M. F. receipts from 1st to 13th Novr., inclusive, total \$19.25.

ECONOMIC CAUSES OF WAR

By PETER T. LECKIE.

NOW READY

Preface by the author.

132 PAGES.

Per Copy, 25 Cents.

Ten copies up, 20 cents each.

Post Paid.

PLATFORM

Socialist Party of Canada

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

MARK IN SOCIAL THEORY.

powers over dark forces greater than our own, persists perhaps as such a projection by those who feel a need for such protection in a life in which our hold of things is but a sliding one.

In connection with the science of the classical economists it is well to make another note as to their point of view. That school was occupied with examining the economic phenomena of their time, of their "historical present." As it is conventionally dated, the Industrial Revolution took effect within Adam Smith's active lifetime, and some of its more significant beginnings passed immediately under his eyes. Yet the Industrial Revolution does not lie within Adam Smith's "historical present." The new order of machine production was coming in, but handicraft was still pervasive and factory production and business enterprises in the bulk were also on a comparatively small-scale plan. The newer facts of economic life could not then be appraised at their proper significance as a later examination in the light of after events was able to do. Accordingly Adam Smith's examination of his "historical present" was actually an examination of the recent past, more so also, by token, that the theorizing upon his "historical present" was conducted with the habits of thought, preconceptions and standards formed in the recent past.

Let us look at this early modern science with Veblen again:

"Along with the habits of thought peculiar to the technology of handicraft, modern science also took over and assimilated much of the institutional preconceptions of the era of handicraft and petty trade. The 'natural laws,' with the formation of which this early modern science is occupied, are the rules governing natural 'uniformities of sequence'; and they punctiliously formulate the due procedure of any given cause creatively working out the achievement of a given effect, very much as the craft rules sagaciously specified the due routine for turning out a staple article of merchantable goods. But these 'natural laws' of science are also felt to have something of that integrity and prescriptive moral force that belongs to the principles of the system of 'natural rights' which the era of handicraft has contributed to the institutional scheme of later times. The natural laws were not only held to be true to fact, but were also felt to be right and good. They were looked upon as intrinsically meritorious and beneficent, and were held to carry a sanction of their own. This habit of uncritically imputing merit and equity to the 'natural laws' of science continued in force through much of the nineteenth century; very much as the habitual acceptance of the principles of 'natural rights' has held on by force of tradition long after the exigencies of experience out of which these 'rights' sprang ceased to shape men's habits of life. This traditional attitude of submissive approval toward the 'natural laws' of science has not yet been wholly lost, even among the scientists of the passing generation, many of whom have uncritically invested these laws with a rectitude and excellence; but so far, at least, has this animus progressed towards disuse that it is now chiefly a matter for expiation in the pulpit, the accredited vent for the exudation of effete matter from the cultural organism."

Are my critics also in that company? Still even at that, says Veblen elsewhere, those preconceptions resemble the later assumptions of economic theory, that what is "normal" is also right.

Here, at this point I have done with the classical school and the question now is: What did Marx draw from that school in respect of preconceptions and postulates that influenced him in his theoretical work?

For one thing his materialistic-Hegelian preconception of a self-realizing developmental trend in the process of things towards a goal found something of a like nature in the preconception of the classical school of a "benign order of nature and a meliorative trend" in events.

Secondly, the Marxian doctrine of the natural right of the laborer to the full product of his toil, belongs to the system of natural rights.

Third, the Marxian class-struggle proceeds on the lines of the hedonist calculus: self-interest as the motive governing individual conduct in the utilitarian theory appears in Marx's concept of the class-struggle as class interest; the struggle is a conflict of classes over the material means of life and is waged by the contending classes with a consciousness of the incompatible economic interests of one

class with the other. Class-consciousness arises from taking thought of these conflicting economic interests of the classes.

Here ends that part of this review of Marxian theory concerned with the two main intellectual and doctrinal schools of thought in Social theory, German Hegelianism and the English Utilitarians, which influenced Marx during the formative years of youth and the later years of his creative work in economic and political theory. Next issue, the Marxian theory of history, particularly that phase of it touching class-struggles.

ANOTHER SLANT ON NEO-MARXISM.

(Continued from page 5.)

another group to buy more of us." Business as usual. "C."

This will be enough for the present, as I do not wish to encroach on "vested interests" as regards space. Next time I shall deal with the revolutionary myth in Marxism.

THE BRITISH ELECTIONS

For a more accurate study of the strange results which the ambiguity of the Liberal attitude has brought about, we must await the full returns. For our own part we shall be guided rather by the total vote, than by the chance distribution of seats. The measure of our success or disappointment will be the number of ne wadhers whom we have attracted to our ranks throughout the country. We have some losses to deplore which will be felt in the House. Miss Bondfield has paid heavily for her absence in Canada; in Bradford the swinging of the Liberal vote to the Tory side has defeated Mr. Leach, and deprived us of the ripe wisdom and serene courage of Fred Jowett; in London we have to regret especially the defeat of Herbert Morrison, and the failure of Ernest Hunter after a most encouraging fight. Dr. Salter, on the other hand, returns, and Mr. Dalton will bring a welcome reinforcement to our debating strength. Mr. Lees-Smith has been sorely missed in the House, and his return is most welcome, as is also the success of Miss Ellen Wilkinson and Ben Riley. Mr. Mosley has failed by the narrowest margin in his gallant effort, but among the new facts of this election is the certainty that Birmingham can be won for Labor.

Only when we have before us the final figures of the total vote which each Party has polled, can we answer decidedly the question whether Labour has in a measure succeeded in realizing the objects which Mr. MacDonald had in view when he took office. Has there been a gain in confidence and in prestige? It is probable that the result would have been much more favourable if the election had come in August. We have undoubtedly paid heavily for the unlucky handling of the Campbell affair and the Zinovieff letter. We contrived to give the impression of a lack of candour. Our explanations came tardily, and when they came, they failed to remove the suspicion that something discreditable was being concealed. As we look back on these crowded weeks, the doubt increases whether we did wisely to refuse an inquiry into the Campbell affair. There was no truth whatever in the suspicion which our opponents fostered, that "extremists" were dominating the Government. The plain fact is that it would be difficult to name a single Member in our Party who would have approved a prosecution in the Campbell case. The Party was equally solid in its support of the Russian Treaty, and all of us would have regarded the failure to complete it as a disaster. When the heat and weariness of this struggle have passed we shall have to review at leisure the record of these nine months, but our tests will not be those which our opponents use. The shortcomings which have injured us were to our thinking rather temperamental than intellectual. In ability and in devoted work our Front Bench did not fall short. Its leadership, however, too often lacked frankness in the House. It was too ready to treat proper questions as insults. It thought too often in terms of conspiracies and plots, and gave undue weight to electioneering tactics. It somehow failed, when the contest

came, under the stress of excitement and overwork, to raise the issue to the level of reasoned debate.

Two great achievements stand out from this brief period of testing. Mr. MacDonald leaves behind him a superb record by his work for peace and restoration of Europe. When the noise and rancour of this election have faded, hundreds of thousands of those who voted against him will regret his departure from the Foreign Office. The greater gain is that the working masses, at all events in the crowded industrial centres, have won for the first time a new sense of their own power, a new belief in their capacity to govern, and a new resolve to shape our social structure according to their own ideals. Confidence we have indeed won, not, perhaps, among the hesitating voters of the middle class; we have won it where above all we value it, among the workers. It has come to us in spite of the handicap of our impotence in the House; it will grow with our own fidelity to our Socialist creed. The years of opposition which lie before us must be years of constructive and educational work. The tactics of a minority, balanced uneasily between two rival parties, need trouble us no longer. Our single aim must now be to attain at the next election a majority for a Socialist programme. We must carry our message week by week with unflagging will into the villages of rural England. We must help the town workers, who are with us already in sympathy, to understand what Socialism means in morals and in economics. So far from compromising or trimming, we have to restate Socialism in its most challenging and comprehensive form. We have lost office. We have gained the right to be ourselves.—The New Leader.

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Obey that impulse and subscribe for the
WESTERN CLARION

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

Enclosed find \$.....
Send the Western Clarion to:

Name

Address

Literature Price List

Cloth Bound.	Per Copy
Revolution and Counter Revolution (Marx)	1.15
Ancient Society	1.25
Capitalist Production (First Nine and 32 Chapters "Capital," vol. 1, (Marx)	1.00
Vital Problems in Social Evolution	80c
Science and Revolution	80c
The Militant Proletariat	80c
Evolution Social and Organic	80c
Puritanism	80c
Ethics and History	80c
Germs of Mind in Plants	80c
The Triumph of Life	80c
Social Revolution (Kautsky)	80c
Essays on Materialist Conception of History (Labriola)	1.50
Social Studies (Lafargue)	80c
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. Bongor)	10c
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific	10c
Slave of the Farm	10c
Manifesto, S. P. of C.	10c
Causes of Belief in God (Lafargue)	10c
The State and Revolution (Lenin)	10c
Value, Price and Profit (Marx)	10c
Two Essays on History (C. Stephansen and G. Deville)	10c
Economic Causes of War (Leahle)	10c
Civil War in France (Marx)	10c
All prices include postage.	
Christianism and Communism (Blaise W. M. Brown)	10c
Quantity Rates on Paper Covered Pamphlets.	
Two Essays on History	25 copies 10c
Communist Manifesto	25 copies 10c
Make all moneys payable to R. MacLeod, P. O. Box 710, Vancouver, B. C. Add discount on cheques	

an held to
lectures m
the revolution
for disbelie
see all the w
puts it, "the
accuses mys
ways" to the
"ego" that is
per it, "of try
At last, ha
an fallen, like
mocking the M
of my critics, h
old proverb, qui
"don't squint at
"There is nothing
"You're a liar."
ing like cloth
fascists" yell
ing like iron"
bunch of social
"there is nothing
by active
working class as
other, a poet, laur
puritan Sword of
theory of social si
degradation and
to whom life is a
volutionary music.
last issue. Enter
and "joyous chick
"throes of econom
"blind avalanches
den and terrible,
volution thusly: "the
hour," etc., etc
etc., What happen
ariat is on the mov
"there are "sudden
max, "the whole o
So, the actor, "all
ular rapidity," say
of make-believe to
competencies and i
of grease paint, ro
Curse it, how the
drags, how dreary
plex network of est
that have to be cha
let's go to the play
argue with F. C.,
Donald! There's sp
us. So shall we es
rich in emotional
That's all!
I am outcast! B
critics so opinionated
their truths to who
the social problem
tion of data must
So certain of themse
they are not who
fare. I for whom I
owed: "For he wa
us or had a trace; hi
led many echoes of