

Printed by
GARDNER & CO.,
VANCOUVER, B.C.

WESTERN CLARION

A Journal of
CURRENT
EVENTS

Official Organ of
THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

HISTORY
ECONOMICS
PHILOSOPHY

No. 919 TWENTIETH YEAR. Twice a Month VANCOUVER, B.C., JULY 16, 1924. FIVE CENTS

The Gates of the Ruhr

BY J. T. WALTON NEWBOLD

THE next stages of the deliberations on the question of Germany's liability to make payment of Reparations to France and Belgium are going to bring into prominence factors that have, hitherto, remained in the background, seeming only of secondary importance. We are going to be made acutely aware of the fact that the profitable exploitation of such an industry as has grown up in Lorraine and on the Ruhr depends not only on the harmonious co-ordination of iron and coal mines, coke ovens, blastfurnaces and steel works, but also upon the goodwill of those who handle the raw, semi-manufactured and finished material passing between the various establishments and issuing from them on to the world market.

Both the Lorraine ore-field and the Ruhr coal-field have this double handicap that the outlets which serve the most economically are situated within the territory of a foreign state. This difficulty has presented itself as a problem of grave concern to the industrialists and to the statesmen of France and Germany for many a long year and now that it is complicated by the post-war antagonisms of the two countries and the vested interests of Antwerp and of Rotterdam it is going to require a skill and discrimination in adjustment that there is no indication of in Europe today.

However a settlement may be arrived at or the conflict of economic and political forces may continue, one thing is certain and that is, that it will affect the wage rates, hours of labour and volume of employment of hundreds of thousands of miners, iron and steel workers and railway and port employees along the east coast of Great Britain from Methil Docks to Dover. For that reason, if for none other, it is imperative that we should try to understand the issues that are at stake. The Rhine is the natural artery up and down which the heavy traffic of the Ruhr and Westphalia has always passed and must in the nature of things continue to pass. The great emporium of Rhineland trade has been and is the Dutch port of Rotterdam whose prosperity is bound up, as recent shipping returns make evident, with that of Rhineland to which it sends foodstuffs, ore and other raw materials and from which it takes outward bound coal and manufactures. The development of the Ruhr has made Rotterdam the wealthy city that, during the nineteenth century, it has become. It has given it an independence so far as coal and other commodities were concerned that has enabled the Dutch to snap their fingers at the powerful shipping and mercantile community of London and the east coast ports of England.

Rotterdam has stood mid-way between two great industrial areas and has grown rich and influential in her commerce with them both.

Formerly, there was a considerable flow of Dutch capital to the iron industry of Durham, and in the coal trade between the north-east coast on the one side and Holland on the other strong links of mutual interest were forged that endure to this day.

Just before the war the Furnesses of Hartlepool acquired a monopoly of the grain-elevators of Rotterdam and with twenty-eight of these, discharging up to 30,000 tons per day, were doing, in conjunction with four German partners, a roaring trade in American and Canadian grain with the Rhineland.

In the summer of 1914, the same group established a shipyard with Dutch capital at Schiedam and, in 1917, re-organised and re-capitalised their big coal shipping agency with its fleet of tugs and lighters. In 1920, Furnesses entered into further alliances with Dutch merchant capital and are now interested in coal-mining in the Limberg area of South Holland.

Through Amsterdam, the banking group of Mendelssohn & Co., who act with Krupps, inter-lock with Kleinwort & Co., who operate with Furnesses. Kleinworts and the Westminster Bank, whose interests are very closely associated in the Furness group of shipbuilding and steel companies in Scotland, are now co-operating in banking enterprise in Holland.

At the same time, Van Muller & Co., the great mercantile agents of Rotterdam, are working with Vickers, Ltd., on one hand and with Otto Wolff and the A.E.G., on the other. Mullers are shipowners and Wolff has 20 per cent. of the capital of the Societe de Navigation du Rhin. Krupp, Wolff and Muller co-operate in Germany, Vickers and Furnesses in the British Empire.

None of these parties, severally or collectively, will be disposed to permit France, whose representative is president of the Rhine Navigation Commission, to dominate the waterway as far as the sea.

Whilst Rotterdam has the very greatest importance for the water-borne traffic coming to and from the Ruhr, the nearest port is that of Antwerp which, prior 1914, took several million tons of Ruhr and Rhineland exports through her docks every year. At that time, the Belgian capitalists and their Government wished to have a canal built connecting the Ruhr and the Meuse—connected, in its turn, by canal with Antwerp—but the German Government, under the insistent pressure of Bremen and Hamburg, refused. By the Article 361 of the Treaty of Versailles, however, the Belgian Government secured that "should Belgium within a period of twenty-five years from the coming into force of the present Treaty decide to create a deep-draught Rhine-Meuse navigable waterway in the region of Ruhrort, Germany shall be bound to construct . . . the portion of this navigable waterway situated within her territory."

Just as Hamburg and Bremen by the Ems-Canal were seeking to exploit the Ruhr so was Antwerp determined by similar means to get her grip upon its resources. This influence within Belgium is, like that desiring the closest customs union with France and Luxemburg, the cosmopolitan banking interest at the centre of which is the Societe Generale de Belgique. It has in hostility to it not only the British and Dutch but, also, the lesser colliery and iron and steel concerns of Belgium and Northern France.

The occupation of the Ruhr had the effect of greatly increasing the number of ships coming into Antwerp—bringing coal from England. Antwerp's trade with Middlesbrough as, also, with Newcastle, Cardiff and Hull has, for decades, been very considerable, the staple article being, of course, coal.

Any such proposition as a canal linking up the Scheldt with the "fat" coal region with the Ruhr would meet with the strongest resistance from the Durham, Humber and South Wales exporters.

The iron works of Northern France have always been such good customers of the Durham coke-oven

owners that the latter have no desire to lose them, either, to the masters of the Ruhr.

But more important than its present connection with the Ruhr is Antwerp's present and past connection with the North of France, with Luxemburg and with Lorraine. Despite all the efforts of French Ministers of Commerce and of the French railway companies from 1883 onwards to develop Havre, Calais and Dunkirk as the ports of the Nancy region, heavy traffic persisted in going 590 kilometres to Antwerp rather than 652 to Dunkirk and 783 to Havre.

Antwerp has been the port for decades of the great iron and steel concerns of Northern and Eastern France participating in the Comite des Forges and for the industrial production of the region around Metz. That explains, very largely, why there has been so much Belgian bank and trade capital in the two great "banques d'affaires" of France, the Banque de Paris et des Pays Bas and the Banque de l'Union Parisienne, and why Belgian money has been poured into what were, seemingly, French concerns.

But the railways running from Antwerp south-eastwards through Luxemburg to Switzerland were largely built with British capital and, like the shipping of Antwerp and the ready money of Antwerp and the coal of Antwerp, were under British influence.

The political Entente was no accident of politics. It was an incident of economics and Antwerp was the link.

The capitalists of Antwerp, of Northern France, of Luxemburg and Lorraine can only get out of traditional economic tutelage to British capital by the aid of American capital and the acquisition of German coal. If they acquire the latter they will draw the former as a magnet draws iron. Foreign capitals will jostle each other on the road to Ruhrort.

Of this fact, Poincare and the Bank of France are conscious and, therefore, daring in their diplomacy and their finance. They have the support of a group of forces, rallied in France, in Belgium, in Holland and in Central Europe with that circle wherein stands Schnieder et Cie, and in which, also, are the Wendels and Stinnes together with the Chatillon Commertry Steel Company and the Banque de l'Union Parisienne.

In this group, which represents older and more mellowed elements in capitalism, are Lloyds Bank, Ltd., the Shell Oil companies, Lazard Brothers, the Baldwins, the Peases and, apparently, Dorman, Long and certainly the Pearsons. Looming in the background are J. P. Morgan & Co., Schroeders, Rothschilds and others of the older financial houses of Europe and America.

These interests, dominant in the privately-owned railways of Britain and France, become fabulously wealthy in the building of the railways of the world, grown rich upon the credit and underwriting business of the vast overseas commerce of Britain and Belgium, participants in the finest spoils of empire development, are now driving forward to the complete liquidation of all economic independence within Central Europe and its approaches.

The French State, debtor of British and American high finance, now once more come to its rescue,

(Continued on page 3)

Imperialism

BY F. W. MOORE.

(Concluded from last issue)

WE have, however, diverged from the gist of our story, and must needs return to Egbert, King of Wessex. No sooner was he on the throne than the Danes attacked his country: for awhile they were defeated by Alfred, the Great, but eventually in 1017 they conquered and afterwards held it until 1042; then followed a quarter of a century of English rule. At that time, according to the 'Public School History' England was a "land of small country villages, the old 'tuns' or townships where people lived by tilling the soil . . . but the village was no longer the community of the independent freeman described by Tacitus: now the little wooden houses of the tillers of the soil afterwards called 'villeins' were grouped about the larger house of the chief man later known as the lord of the manor: to him they owed certain services, and from him they received protection. These villages or manors were grouped into larger divisions called 'hundreds'. Many hundreds made up a shire: each shire had its shire reeve or sheriff, who was the king's representative, and watched over his interests; over all were the king and the Witan. He was in general, the lawgiver, the leader of the army and the judge."—Public School History, page 31.

It remained for William, the Conqueror, in 1066 to transform these institutions into organs of the Feudal System, a system that had already much vogue in Europe. William became owner of nearly all England by declaring forfeited the lands of those who had fought against him. The barons were granted large tracts by the king, and the knights smaller portions by the barons: less important holders still were the villeins who tilled the soil.

For these privileges, the barons supplied the king with a certain number of warriors when occasion required, while they themselves expected similar service from the knights. The barons paid homage to the king; the knights to the barons and the king.

From this system were born the traditional ideals that pervade the environment of the civilized world of today; yet centuries ago the power of the baron was broken by the effective weapon of trade so much despised by him. The legendary king has degenerated into a figurehead whose office of military leader, a judge, and law-giver is a mere tradition of the past. Generations ago the Feudal System, with all its appurtenances, lapsed into desuetude. Its work has been accomplished. It welded the industrial factors, mainly agricultural, of the several countries in which it had vogue, into a consolidated whole. Its traditions are still powerful and necessarily reactionary. The pseudo conception of respectability founded mainly on the ability to escape from manual labor and to play the unconscious part of a toady, has world-wide vogue in all classes of society today, and is a direct inheritance from the universal flunkiness that pervaded the atmosphere of Europe as a result of the homage that prevailed on that continent when the feudal system was in flower: hence we delight to invest the whole world in the royal robes of feudal respectability, and to shout vociferously for one king, one flag, and one empire.

It might be that this would not be a bad slogan if the people regarded it as of temporary duration: but that is precisely what they don't do. The feudal instincts are still very strong. The world has not yet awakened to the fact that the realities that gave rise to its ideals, are dead, and that from their ashes, phoenix like, have arisen analogous realities, which in turn have given birth to a universal conception of a world government in the making—a government in line with the process of historical evolution, and therefore the greatest government possible at this stage of man's development.

The doom of monarchial supremacy was sealed by Oliver Cromwell. The institutions created to suit the everlasting sameness in the manner of landlord

exploitation were altogether incompatible with the needs of a constantly increasing expansion in trade and commerce, and from that time until the present, the bourgeois have been wringing concessions from the prejudiced guardians of feudal institutions. The reasons for these demands became patent to the world as soon as its people began to depend on the use of steam and coal in the daily production of commodities. Men realized that in the new form of production on a large scale in factories, labor had become socialized. They felt that its regulation also called for social effort in the political arena. It was to the needs born of these conditions that we may attribute the agitations that finally led up to the passage of the various reform and ballot acts of the last century: and if by the acquisitions of these, men did not become anything like as strong socially or politically as one would expect, yet with respect to their former helpless state their condition was greatly improved since in the ballot was involved that potential strength that only needed as a stimulant for its realization the inevitable unemployment and misery that followed in the wake of the development of capitalism: nevertheless this improvement was not so much as to enable them to escape from the semi-slavery incidental to the necessity of using the means of life on suffrage, and to the possibilities involved in that situation, the shrewd employer soon became wide awake. The ballots of his men were needed for the capture of political power held by the landlord class—political power entrenched in outworn institutions and customs that were now an encumbrance on the body politic.

At that time also factory towns with thousands of inhabitants had no representatives in parliament, while 'rotten' boroughs with hardly any population, and in one case with none at all, were allowed two members who represented one man, the owner of the property in the said borough. (See Public School History, page 263.)

These details we mention, not as news, but to show that at the bottom of all these changes economic determinism was continually active: but economic determinism was not confined to masculine activities; alas! it has long ago entered the home where woman—lovely woman, is supposed to reign on a metaphorical pedestal of peace and happiness.

It was economic determinism that routed her from this last make believe of feudal tradition—we won't discuss the thousands that have been driven by sweat-shop conditions of so-called respectable business establishments to seek public homes in modern Babylon. We shall refer to the honest horny-handed reputable daughters of toil who are supposed to be queens of wage-slave castles, (as the houses of modern Britons are entitled to be called) but who, with their married sisters, are often forced by circumstances to act as perennial locumtenens for those skilled "lords of creation," who before the introduction of modern machinery, made by hand such articles as window frames and panelled doors. The woman learned the business of turning a wheel in a few hours while her lord and master of yesterday took several years as an apprentice to learn how to do the work that is now accomplished by her through the mediumship of the machine: thus does economic determinism upset all our out-of-date plans for the future. In like manner economic determinism must make any plans of the I.O.D.E. that are not in-line with historical evolution null and void: nevertheless we do not advise the I.O.D.E. to take up arms or to enter the realms of direct action, or engage in political sabotage of any description. We would merely point out that a thorough examination of this subject will soon convince the sorority that they are leaning on a broken reed when they rest their hopes on the development of empire. We might also add in emphasizing this fact, that our empire offers no more guarantee of safety than any of the others: like the others it is in the clutches of an economic determinism by reason of which the require-

ments of trade and commerce call for markets and natural resources. We cannot, under the present system of production and distribution get sufficient of the former within the limits of our national boundaries, and in reference to this point the gist of an article in the British Columbia Federationist for June 6th, might very aptly be discussed. It is recorded there that we were told lately in the House of Commons, by one, Gardiner, M.P., for Medicine Hat, that the average payment to the workers in salaries and wages for the whole of the Dominion of Canada, was 42 cents for every dollar's worth of wealth produced. This, in accordance with the law of competition by reason of which employers are able to buy efficient labour power in the cheapest market, would be about sufficient to sustain a family according to the lowest standard of living that a sufficient number of men to do the work are willing to tolerate: but these recipients of salaries and wages constitute the vast majority of buyers in the home market, and in that market others must be for sale, after spending a reasonable percentage for repairs of machinery and other expenses, commodities approximating in value the amount paid in wages: and what we want to know is this: How could any reasonable person expect people receiving only 42 cents to buy back something like 84 cents worth of commodities? A little thought will show how ridiculously absurd it is to suppose that this surplus product could be disposed of in the home market of any industrially-developed country. How then could we dispose of it within the limits of our national boundaries? And if we cannot dispose of it, within these limits, are not "the problems which confront our empire" connected with the other fellow's empire? and if we would "forward every good work for the betterment of the colonies and the people" must we not impress upon the latter a knowledge of their dependence on the good will of other colonies and other peoples, if in the competition for markets, we try to avoid the real danger of plunging all parties into the horrors of war.

To say this, is much easier than to do it. We know that self-preservation is not only the first law of nature, but of empire also. The object of its existence therefore, under conditions of world-wide rivalry for naval and military supremacy, is the acquisition of the greatest power possible, which in turn is impossible without access to an unlimited amount of oil and iron. Myriad millions therefore must be spent on war and defence that ought to be spent on education.

The ineffable stupidity of this may be imagined when we consider that "in modern war the explosion of a single shell, even if it hits nothing destroys labour and material roughly equivalent to a comfortable cottage or a year's holiday for a man. If the shell hits anything, then that further destruction must be added to the diminution of consumable goods. Every shell that burst in the recent war diminished by a little fraction the purchasing power of every coin in the world": Well's Outline of History, page 889.

A colossal sum for defence, even in times of peace, must be contributed in taxes by the citizens of the various would be imperialistic states of today.

This means that the infinitely magnificent potentialities of the mass mind of humanity are kept in a state of stagnation by the myth of imperialistic advantages: a myth that serves to hide the nature of the metaphorical explosive that lies in the continued diplomatic rivalry that exists between the representatives of the financial interests of the several countries and a myth, that will probably remain hidden in insidious propaganda until the day arrives when the somnambulist multitude are awakened to the stern realities of life such as in the late war caused the Red Cross Man to exclaim:

((Continued on page 6))

The Problem of Becoming

SOcialist philosophy is said to be, like that of Heraclitus, Hegel and Darwin, "dialectic," (see Engels' "Development of Socialism from Utopia to Science"), as contrasted with the non-evolutionary, rigid "metaphysical" systems. The poet Burns, too, writes dialectically when, in one of his songs written to excuse the unreliability of "fickle man" in love affairs (not woman, be it noted), he says that "Nature's mighty law is change."

According to Engels, the philosophy of change was first clearly enunciated by the ancient Greek, Heraclitus, in the words, all things flow. Under the form of "the problem of Becoming," this was the first philosophical question to arouse controversy, inasmuch as being persists; beings constantly change; they are born and they pass away. How can beings both persist and not persist? Reflection upon this, the chief metaphysical problem, gives rise to three systems; the types of all European philosophies—the Eleatic system; the system of Heraclitus; and the atomistic system, which, in the idealistic sense, was proclaimed by the Pythagoreans; in the materialistic sense by Leucippus and Democritus, and with a dualistic turn by Anaxagoras. The term "Eleatics" comes from those thinkers who formed a "school" in the Grecian town of Elea. The Eleatics maintained that being is everything; according to Heraclitus, change is everything and being or permanence is only an illusion; the monadists and atomists held the conciliatory view that both permanence and change exist—permanence in the beings, perpetual change in their relations. The Eleatics denied becoming; Heraclitus worshipped it; the atomists professed to explain it. We Socialists, as above said, support the Heraclitian attitude.

Heraclitus was an Ephesian and because of his love of apparent, but not actual absurdities, was called the Obscure. He considered all bodies as transformations of one and the same element, which he sometimes calls fire (pyre), and sometimes warm breath (psyche) and which resembles either what physics formerly called caloric or modern chemistry calls oxygen. This original matter extends from the boundaries of the earth to the limits of the world. Everything that exists is derived from it and strives to return to it, everything is transformed fire; and conversely, every being may be and actually is, eventually changed into fire. His physics, says Prof. Weber, reminds one of the mechanical theory of heat of modern physics which also considers all organic life as a transformation of the sun's heat. Earth and solids are extinguished fire and will be rekindled afresh at the hour fixed by Fate. Universal life is an endless play of creation and destruction. Rest, standstill, that is, being, is an illusion of the senses.

But the perpetual flow of things is not an easy process, like the gliding of a brook over a bed of stones. Becoming is a struggle between contrary forces and opposing currents, and it is this continuous battle that produces all vegetable, animal and intellectual life on the face of the earth. This anticipates Darwinism. Everything arises from the strife of opposites. Organic life is produced by the male and the female; musical harmony by sharp and flat notes; sickness makes us appreciate health; exertion makes us value repose; without danger, no courage; without evil to overcome there would be no virtue. The animal lives the death of the vegetable; man lives the death of the animal; virtue lives the death of vice, and vice, the death of virtue. Hence good is a destroyed evil and evil is a vanished good; and because evil does not exist without the good nor the good without the evil, therefore evil is a relative good and good is a relative evil. Like being and non-being, good and evil disappear in the universal harmony. In all this drama of perpetual change, there is nothing stable in the eternal process but the Law which governs it and which neither gods nor men can modify.

Empedocles was also a later evolutionist who de-

rived his views on the origin of plants, animals, man, etc., from the interaction of Love and Discord, with Love as the principle of principles and Discord as its indispensable accomplice. The struggle between these two immaterial principles which unites and separates the elements, results in alternative periods of separation and periods of union as a fatal and eternal necessity. The modern expressions for Empedocles' principles of love and discord, are attractions and repulsion.

Our next philosopher, Hegel, (died 1831) is important as being the teacher whose methods Marx handled with "unsurpassed mastery in the service of Socialism." He was, however, with all his powers, an idealistic and not a materialistic thinker and also somewhat of a mystic, perhaps due to his original theological training. Marx was, therefore, as he said, compelled to upraise his philosophy from off its head and set it solidly, feet down again, on the ground; for with him, the origin and essence of the process of growth is not to be sought in the material forces, but in the logical idea, reason, the universal spirit, the absolute, or from the religious side, God. As Socialists largely follow and consider of importance the Hegelian theory of absolutism, that subject is further discussed.

In Schelling, Hegel's contemporary, things proceed from the absolute which, therefore, remains outside of things. In Hegel, the absolute is the process itself; it does not produce movement and life, it is movement, life, process and evolution. This movement has its law and its goal. Its law and its goal are not imposed upon the absolute from without; they are indwelling in it, they are the absolute itself. Now the law which governs both human thought and unconscious nature, is reason; the end at which things aim is also reason, but self-conscious reason. Hence the terms absolute and reason are the same. The absolute is reason, which becomes personified in man, after passing through the successive stages of inorganic and living nature. But reason is not, as Kant conceives it, the human understanding. It is the law according to which being in general is produced, constituted or unfolded; or rather, it is both a subjective faculty and an objective reality. It is in me, as the essence and type of my thought, and it is in the things as the essence and law of their evolution. The true philosophical method, the indwelling or dialectical method, is to leave thought to itself and to its own self-activity. The science which does all this is Logic, in the Hegelian sense of the word; and Hegel's logic is both what that subject is usually understood to be, and also what is called ontology—the part of metaphysics which treats of beings or existences.

The moving principle in Hegelian or Dialectical Logic is as follows: a contradiction is reconciled in a unity, it reappears in a new form only to disappear and reappear again until it is melted into the final unity. It therefore, repudiates the Aristotelian "principle of contradiction" according to which a thing cannot both be and not be. The common root of pure concepts is the notion of being which is at one and the same time the most elementary and the most exalted notion. Quality, quantity, proportion, phenomenon, action, are all models of being. All our concepts express modes of being, and hence are merely transformations of the idea of being. But how does being, which is everything, become anything else, and by virtue of what principle or inner force is it modified? The contradiction contained in being is this principle or force.

Being is the most universal notion and therefore, the poorest and emptiest. To be white, black, extended or good is to be something; but being, pure and simple, and without any limitation, is equal to non-being. Hence being is both itself and its opposite. If it were only itself, it would stay immovable and barren; and if it were merely nothing, it would stay equal to zero and would be likewise quite powerless and fruitless. Because being is both,

it becomes something, a different thing, everything. The contradiction contained in being is resolved in the notion of becoming or development, because becoming is both being and non-being (that which will be). The two contraries—being and nothing—which breed becoming are contained and reconciled in becoming. A new contradiction results which is taken up by a new combination and so on until the absolute idea is reached.

And in this continual process of becoming, Activity is the same as Reality. Nothing is real except what is active. Absolute rest does not exist; and because "reason alone is real," he concludes, conversely, that what is real is rational or, as condensed into his famous aphorism, "Everything which is real is reasonable, and everything which is reasonable is real." Reality as contrasted with mere possibility, becomes necessity; what is real is necessarily active. Activity, reality, and necessity are the same thing. A being exists insofar as it acts, and it acts insofar as it exists.

(To be continued)

THE GATES OF THE RUHR.

(Continued from page 1)

has seized upon the gates of the Ruhr and the Rhineland, has depreciated temporarily the value of assets which, surrendered by their German owners, either indirectly or directly, to the conqueror, the latter must pass over as guarantees for loans made to stabilise the franc and to balance the Budget.

The banking and money power of Britain and of America see in the possession of the industrial resources of Europe a means to their retention of control, economic and political, within their own capitalist societies. The industrialists of America and of Britain would either keep out of Europe or perpetuate the independence of Central European industry or, somehow, seize it for themselves by rescuing Germany with a loan guaranteed on her railways.

Interest fights interest, vertically and horizontally, in the hideous death-grapple of the European bourgeoisie. Should victory come to either or should they call it a draw and agree to recuperate their dissipated strength upon the spoils, the results will be calamitous not only to the blast furnace men and steel workers of Aberavon and of Middlesbrough, to the coke oven men and the miners of Durham and Yorkshire and South Wales, but, also, to the port employees of the Tyne and the Tees, the Humber, the Thames and the Bristol Channel, and the railway workers on all the British systems.

Antwerp and Rotterdam will become the inlets and outlets for the one great industrial region that capitalism will develop in Europe.

Nowhere is international preparedness so urgent a necessity as it is on the part of the workers in the ports and on the railways, in the mines and at the furnaces in Britain, Germany, Belgium, Holland and France. The facts are so obvious, the menace so palpable that to state them should be enough.

Yet on the industrial field as in the sphere of high politics where a Socialist Premier exchanges platitudes with a Capitalist Premier, the one "creating an atmosphere," the other guarding his position, what is being attempted to bring together transport workers, railway men, blast furnace men, steel workers and miners in a common and united front against a common and ever more united enemy?

—The Labor Monthly (London)

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

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

VANCOUVER, B.C., JULY 16, 1924.

ILLUSTRATIVE.

EVERYBODY is familiar with the columns of figures commonly set forth concerning the vast expenditures on armaments made by the various nations for the purposes of offence or defence, or both. Ordinarily, in face of the comparative figures set forth in such cases, whatever lesson may be learnt as to sheer human wastefulness is prejudiced by the appearance of dread arithmetic.

Recently H.M.S. Hood, with attendant ships, cast anchor in British Columbia waters and stayed a week or more. The Hood is advertised as the biggest warship afloat, a matter in which we are not tutored. We are interested, however, in the following interesting comparison of power capacity as between that engine of destruction and the combined Stave Falls and Lake Buntzen power plants of the B.C. Electric Railways Co. Ltd. This appeared in The Buzzer of July 11. Ordinarily, the function of The Buzzer is to forward the idea that a B.C.E.R. street car is a public utility.

"One interesting fact about H.M.S. 'Hood' was that her 144,000 horse-power was more than the combined capacities of the Stave Falls and Lake Buntzen power plants of this company.

"This immense energy, of course, was mainly for driving the huge mass of metal through the water at 32 knots an hour, whereas the energy developed at our plants is used for a million lights, as well as for running motors, elevators, street cars, and the like.

"The total connected load of No. 1 elevator is 2,200 horse-power, but the maximum ever used during the last eight months was 1,100 horse-power. Imagine an industry using 144,000 horse-power!

"Another interesting feature about the 'Hood' was the safeguards against the breakdown of any part of the electrical system. Power to operate the signals, telephones, and so forth, could be sent half-a-dozen ways. If power for the signals failed, there were storage batteries. If power for the pumps failed, there were man-power pumps available. If one range-finder was shot away, there were others.

"These safeguards are reproduced on a lesser scale in a power system. It is not possible to use storage batteries to supply a city with current in case of breakdown, but by having duplicate transmission lines and substations dotted throughout the community, it is seldom that an interruption takes place longer than necessary to switch over to some other line."

Thus we have set before us a contrast, strikingly presented and illustrative of the useful and destructive plant combinations of this day and age. Even at that we sometimes get a red notice from the B.C. E.Ry. Co. threatening to cut off the "juice" if we don't pay up.

OPPOSING DOMINATION.

ON another page of this issue we reproduce from The U. F. A. (official organ of The United Farmers of Alberta) a letter from nine farmer constituency M.P.s. in the Federal House to their leader, resigning from the caucus of their party. It appears that they have been, at a later date, joined by several others of the same (Progressive) party.

While we are unable to locate any of these peo-

ple, by their utterances, as belonging precisely to our mold, there is no doubt whatever that incessant educational propaganda by our own comrades throughout the prairie country has shewn itself in the deliberations of the various farmers' organizations there and that their parliamentary representatives, in some cases, tend to throw off the appearance of the orthodox party hack.

We shall look with interest for further manifestations of spirited independence and stubborn loyalty to their mandate from those elected people. It should have a tendency to focus more earnest attention on the seriousness of the farmers' position and problems, and to emphasize the point that he is not just playing politics.

SECRETARIAL NOTES.

ON the 6th July, along with some others who took us with them to keep them cheerful, we found ourselves in the coal city of Nanaimo attending a Socialist picnic and eating more than the prescribed procession of calories properly allows a weak vessel like us to hold.

Whatever weakness the Nanaimo folks may have manifested in the way of electing a candidate was not apparent in their capacity for organizing men, women, kids and foodstuffs on the picnic grounds. Arthur Jordan appeared to be about as busy a man as we'd seen in any one day, and all others of the local group of workers and their friends alike were busy also. The women folk spread innumerable gargantuan feasts on the grass in magnificent fashion, and all hands turned to. Bill Grieve, we had heard, in recent months had "gone on a diet," which made us anxious. We are able to assure troubled friends, however, that he increasingly resembles the girth of Dickens' Aunt Peggotty. A good breath, properly inhaled, and Bill's middle vest-button is like as not to hit you in the eye.

In the correspondence columns Comrade John A. McDonald asks for an official answer to the question as to whether or not the Party attitude has changed toward the British Labor Government and the Canadian Labor Party.

The answer is that it has not changed its attitude toward reform parties.

(The British Labor Government and the Canadian Labor Party are just about as old as one another, hence we suppose John A.'s question to refer to the traditional Party attitude toward reformers in general. That is, the Party attitude could not very well change toward these, in particular, time being considered). The C.L.P. Platform or By-laws governing its proposed association of working class organizations and S.P. of C. Platform are mutually exclusive.

About eighteen months (or so) ago, particularly in Vancouver, class and local group discussion was carried on over a wide field. There appeared a tendency towards a lessening of surety among many of the comrades concerning the Party position, its success or otherwise, its attitude on politics, on trade unions and the like. At the same time all kinds of Party "heresies" were expressed. About that time, we recollect, we invited all hands in an editorial note to spread it around. "C." set to it from his particular angle, and likely as not he would have done that in any case. John A.'s "keynoter" point is not at all within the facts of the case. There is no doubt, however, that "C.'s" attitude has had its influences, especially in challenging accepted fundamentals, although sometimes the nature of an onslaught may determine the manner and range of his defence. It goes without saying that internal Party discussion is good. In the present case it appears to be an aftermath of all other world changes of the past few years and to accord with general scepticism of dogma in all quarters. Hence we have the "points of view," to which we would gladly add Comrade McDonald's. It would appear to us that even had the answer to his questions been in the affirmative a platform debate would hardly meet the case. It is not likely anyway that he could find anyone among us who would be altogether willing to accept responsibility for the position of the Labor Government. That is, there is as much criticism here, ap-

parently, of the Labor Government as elsewhere. But it is a good thing to have fair and informed criticism. We gladly look forward to an article from John A.

IMPERIALISM.

(Continued from page 2)

"Everywhere thrills the air
The maniac bells of war
There will be little of sleeping tonight;
There will be wailing and weeping tonight;
Death's red sickle is reaping tonight:
War! . . . War! . . . War!"

But if war is an inevitable complement of capitalism, and the everlasting world-wide preparation for it ought to serve as a proof that it is, and our youths must sacrifice themselves as soldiers, then let them at least know on whose altar they are being offered. Let them have some knowledge of the economic causes of war. Let them not imagine that we, because we belong to a great empire are more saintly in any way than the rest of the world. Let them not think that we are the only ones that shout vociferously: "What we have, we hold" and let us hope that when the next war materializes our youths will have learned to abhor that disgusting tradition that has disgraced the condition of military life for centuries—a condition implied in these words: "Theirs not to reason why; Theirs but to do and die."

Surely the abolition of sentimental drivel like that, is a world-wide necessity of the most urgent nature. With an enlightened army of soldiers who understood the economic causes of war, backed politically by an enlightened body of men and women there would be little danger of disaster to the empire: without this knowledge; without a consideration of the just claims of other nations; without the ideal involved in a final federation of the free peoples of the world, there cannot be even the proximate principles of a permanent peace discussed. Is it likely that monopolistic empire founded on, and maintained by force, and ready, if necessary to crush any weaker country that stands in the way of her ambition, could entertain these ideals?

We might as well ask if it is likely that the leopard will change his spots.

The imperialistic states of the world, which do not necessarily imply kingdoms, are even now struggling diplomatically for advantages.

The latest distraction of this nature being the exclusion of the Japanese from the United States of America: but whatever mythical excuse is used by the United States to prove that her action is for the benefit of the people as a whole, the real cause lies in an attempt to destroy the competition of the oriental business-man and agriculturist, by force. The case is just another example of the ever-growing pressure, due partly to the constant increase in the use and products of machinery involving a perpetual shrinkage in marketing accommodation, that different sections of the international bourgeoisie bring to bear on each other, and in the meantime it serves as an industrial straw to show which way the wind is blowing. The pressure referred to above is a constantly increasing quantity and therefore must some day become unendurable.

Pressure of various kinds, due to imperialism, put an end, by the sword, to all empires of past ages, and he who would look for a different fate for our modern institutions of the same nature, must indeed be deficient in reasoning power. There is just the one chance that they may be rescued from their suicidal policies by the increasing enlightenment of labour the world over. Was it not Wells that said there is a race on between education and anarchy? and never did he pass a truer remark.

If modern empires are not so rescued, we are bound to believe after a contemplation of the historical past, that they must once more bite the dust of humiliation, and be forced in the future as they were in the past to find relief in the less objectionable state of a virile barbarism.

That has always been the end of monopolistic imperialism; that is the inevitable curse that must dog its every step in the future.

The Brainbox

BY G. G. DESMOND

WE fill a jar with peas till it will not hold another. Then we can fill the spaces between the peas with sand till it will not hold another grain of sand. Then we can fill the spaces between the grains of sand with water and the spaces between the molecules of water with gas. Possibly then we could remove the gas without disturbing the water or the sand without disturbing the peas. We could not take out the peas without stirring the sand; still less could we take out the bottom pea or the farthest grain of sand without moving a great number of other particles.

A shopkeeper may have in a small warehouse a great number of different articles, and, if he is very gifted, may have a wonderful knowledge of where each article is to be found. The brain will, in fact, hold all that the room holds, but in a miraculous order. In the room the old things farthest from the door will take a long time to get out and many things must be disturbed to get at them. In the brain the thing demanded is always at the top, and comes forth almost without commotion among the other vast and wonderful contents. Not entirely so. We can scarcely take out a treasure without one or two things clinging to it by "association of ideas," sometimes preceding it and leading to its discovery, sometimes suggested by its delivery. "Clover" brings "bee," or "cow"; "gun" brings "part-ridge" or "spaniel," and so on. We can turn over the simplest idea and find it incrustated with values, historic, economic, philosophic, poetic, flocking to it from all parts of the warehouse in which it has been stored.

The Cosmic Reservoir

The capacity of the largest warehouse is limited, but the capacity of the brain, with its less than a hundred cubic inches, has never been overtaken. It contains the earth and sea and all that in them is, the sun and its billion-mile-distant planets, other suns a thousand times as large and a million times more far. Minutest things, too, can be left there for fifty years to turn up fresh as ever when called for, or more often, uncalled for. It doesn't matter how often ideas acquired long ago have been overlaid by later learning, everything is equally accessible at a moment's notice, except that there is a store, and probably a vast one, that does not commonly respond at all to the waking owner, a treasure enjoyed only by the subconscious self, when we are asleep, perhaps, or in a trance. We attempt the solution of a problem by day and are baffled by the absence of some vital factor. While we are asleep and unconscious this is somehow rummaged out for us and we awake with the problem solved. We are gradually getting to know how to explore this unconscious hoard, so that nothing that enters the brain, however casually, need be lost. The author of *The Gate of Remembrance*, the most remarkable testimony to this phenomenon that I know, calls it "drawing upon the cosmic reservoir."

It is rather a book, an index of things we know about, that the brain resembles than a warehouse of actual things. It is a day book rather than a ledger. Is it written all over and over-written without any kind of order, or does everything get marshalled as soon as entered? Is it double and treble entered, so that you can get at the same idea by many different routes, or are ideas like molecules in a stream constantly rallying in new groups and dispersing? At any rate, the mind is by no means the whole brain. It is no more than the skin or bark of the grey mass parallel to the dome of the skull. But the crumbings or convolution of that skin are so many and so deep that if they could be smoothed out it would give us a surface of some four square feet. The area has doubtless grown with the ages, which seems to show that the capacity of the brain is to be measured by somewhat the same rules that govern the capacity of a slate or book to hold writing.

The brain of animals has been divided by investigators into three definite "levels." The lowest, or third level, a mere knob of the spinal cord, controls only the so-called automatic actions of the body, breathing, heart-beat, digesting. When all the rest of the brain is removed, these functions go on, as well as reflex actions, such as the closing of the eye when something is brought very near it. The second level brain is above the third and below the first level, whose wonderful crumpled surface we have mentioned. The animal that has been deprived of only the first level can hear and see, and smell and taste, and stand up and walk about, but scarcely more. It is mentally defective, as might be imagined, for if the mind resides specifically anywhere, it is in the upper level of the brain. The animal that is without its first level does not remember anything that it has learnt. The dog no longer fears the whip, though, on the other hand, it has no desire to steal, for it has forgotten the use of food. Nor can it learn these things afresh, for it has nowhere to put its learning.

Only the first-level brain, the highly crumpled cerebrum, can remember, can store the fruit of experience, can properly read the messages that come in from the outer world through the senses, can put two and two together, and take proper advantage of what the eye sees, the ear hears, the tongue tastes, and the fingers touch. When it is removed, the animal loses so much that we must say that it is in the cortex, or surface of the hemispheres, constantly endeavouring to extend itself by crumplings within the narrow confines of the skull, that the mind resides.

Instinct or Prejudice?

Into the nose of the rabbit comes the smell of a fox; its ears, perhaps, have some other intimation of Reynard's presence; its eyes perceive the red beast crouching near. Then the first-level brain or mind comes into operation. Something is remembered about foxes not to their credit; the burrow is thought of as a safer place than the open field; legs receive an order that makes them shoot out and carry all the seeing, hearing, and smelling apparatus quickly out of harm's way.

It is necessary for the preservation of the animal that the upper brain should do more than act on what the lower brain may chance to be aware of. It must initiate inquiry, imagine desired or dreaded things to be looked for, resolve defective vision, as when the eye sees a gatepost and the brain says, "it may be a man. Look again." And so there are fibres arising from the second-level brain and piercing the hemispheres to the surface. They are of more importance as we go upward through the animal kingdom, and when we reach the monkeys, the upper brain has so far encroached on the original function of the intelligence department that on its removal the animal goes blind and deaf, as a lower animal does when both first and second levels have been taken away.

It is difficult to see how an animal could have become rational to the height achieved by man except by taking the senses under the control of the mind. We need not only to see and hear things as they crop up, but to look for them, look out for them, attend to them in spite of other distracting and irrelevant sights and sounds, to select if we can the things we are going to remember, to add our previous knowledge of the thing seen to the mere reflection it makes through the eye, to see with the "mind's eye" as we could scarcely do if the mind had not frequently taken part in the act of seeing.

At the same time, this higher control of the senses may lead us into fallacies from which the more automatic, second-level control would save us. The mind being engaged in seeing, hearing, feeling, tasting can, by anticipating the sensation it expects, imagine a cause for it when it is not there. This is commonly known in mesmerism. The patient, being

told that paraffin is syrup, tastes it and finds it sweet, and asks for more. We hypnotise ourselves into similar fallacies more often than we are aware of.

We are all ruled enormously by prejudice. We call it to ourselves God-given instinct, but it is often the result of upbringing, or of constant suggestion from the race or class atmosphere in which we live, and it may just as well be wrong as right.

"Every little boy or gal

That's born into this world alive

Is either a little liberal

Or a little conservative."

Instead of thinking a thing out, we start with a prejudice for it, and "rationalise," as it is called. Thus, the man who thinks he is a sardine, carries a piece of toast about with him to sit on. He wishes to bring everything into tune with his pet theory. That, of course, is a plain case of madness. Another man wants Protection, he knows not why, perhaps because another country has it. We must not call him mad, but we can see how he rationalises from the absurd way in which he overlooks facts. Thus, though the real object of Protection is to raise prices, he makes himself believe that the foreigner will pay, and that the thing protected will be cheaper. The mind's eye, upper level part of the brain is interfering with the intelligence department. The latter presents two and two and prejudice makes them into five. The next case of prejudice may be our own. We can only be on guard against it by continually verifying our sums. The human brain has already done much, is already a marvellous instrument, but in comparison with what it will be, it is but as a rushlight to full sunshine.—The New Leader, London.

HERE AND NOW.

ONE thing is sure and certain, the marathon runners at the Olympic Games have no speed on the people who pass by our office looking the other way lest they have to contritely pay up that sub.

The subs. appended hereto indicate that sub. hunters are still in training, however, although the totals shew there are not enough of them.

Come then, get your eye on a prospective reader and catch him. These are the fast ones this issue:

Following \$1 each: H. C. Mitchell, A. Manson, Agnes Hollingshead, Wm. Craig, R. M. Alexander, H. T. Batehlor, Fred Harman, T. A. Lessay, J. Schulthels, A. J. Bell, J. Higgins, Geo. Jackson, J. A. Jamison, F. W. Parsons, T. Sykes, J. C. Bloomfield.

S. F. Labor College (per J. A. McDonald), \$9.60, I. Neale \$2, Nels Sorlie \$3, S. Pettie \$1.50, T. Walker 50c., Wm. Thomas \$5.

Above Clarion subs. received from 27 June to July 14, inclusive, total \$37.60.

Clarion Maintenance Fund—Following \$1 each: H. C. Mitchell, Agnes Hollingshead, C. Lester, T. Richardson.

James McLennan \$1.50.

Above C.M.F. receipts from 27 June to 14 July, inclusive, total \$5.50.

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.

Correspondence

THE PARTY POSITION.

Editor, Clarion:

Since the Clarion has made the change from an official organ of a revolutionary Party to a compendium of "points of view" "C" appears to have been designated official "keynote." During the past year the Clarion pages have been lavishly decorated with his particular "point of view."

At first I considered it a little joke perpetrated by our old comrade to secure partial relief from abyssmal ennui. I thought he was essaying to become the Peck's Bad Boy of the Party in order to start something in the way of discussion. I could not associate the "C" who has written such a really brilliant series of articles on history, in other years, with the tommy-rot appearing in recent months.

Numerous enquiries have been made by ex-members of the S. P. of C. as to the cause of the apparent change in the Party attitude. To all of them I knowingly, submitted the joke theory. This sufficed for a time.

Of late, however, I began to see the light. "C's" contributions kept coming and every once in a while the editorial columns echoed his concept. When I wrote my criticism of G. R. Stirling Taylor's nonsense an editor's note appended informed me that the article in question was published merely to present the Tory-Democratic "point of view." I saw at once that this was merely a plitudinous evasion. That the real reason was not to present but to support this "point of view."

Now, it is not my intention to wrangle with "C" over his latest effusion. It really explains nothing and clarifies nothing. Its manipulation of the Darwinian concept, in the realm of society, is ridiculous in the extreme. His substantiation of Taylor's brand of history would turn any Marxian to smiles rather than to anger. Numerous scattered quotations from the works of Marx and Engels, interpreted to suit himself, are adduced. These could all be rectified and amended with ease.

My purpose however, in this note is to inquire as to the attitude of the S. P. of C. in regard to the British Labor Government, and the Canadian Labor Party? Has the position changed in recent years? The editorial policy and "C's" contributions would readily lead one to such a conclusion. But, may I ask for a definite official statement on the matter? There are many ex-members and members too, no doubt, who would like to know.

In case the answer is in the affirmative I would gladly come to grips in the matter. Although my time is almost wholly occupied between the demands of the boss and the duty of Marxian propaganda, both in doors and out, I feel certain that I could make arrangements to go to Vancouver, at my own expense, and debate the question with any member the Party should choose. I should be glad to affirm the following resolution—Resolved that the British Labor Government is not worthy of working class support.

Yours for Marxism,

J. A. MacDonald,

San Francisco, Calif.

COMRADE Macdonald's letter calls for a few remarks from his "Peck's Bad Boy." At the outset I hasten to inform him there has been no alteration in the official position of the S. P. of C. as he is familiar with it, as laid down in the Party Constitution and Platform and its Manifesto. My articles, contesting the soundness of the Party attitude, of opposition toward political labor reform parties have been published in the Party organ as a matter of privilege. As for the other issues which I have raised, such for example as my pleading for a more thorough-going endorsement and advocacy of constitutional methods of change and of the ideal of political and industrial democracy, as against the doctrine of violent overthrow and military dictatorship, I think I am well within my rights as a member of the Party. On the matter of my privilege to contest the Party attitude toward labor parties I advance on its behalf, for one thing, the known fallibility of human judgments. Further, in calling ourselves scientific socialists, I am afraid we make a mockery of the name of science if we close the door to consideration and discussion of Party positions. Are we following the example of the founders of our school of socialist thought, who never let conviction dull their curiosity on the social problems, but were ever on the alert for the results of the latest quest of science? Surely Dietzgen's labors, his repetitive stressing of the inductive character of modern science, were all in vain if he did not impart to us a rooted impression that all theories, laws, generalizations or adopted positions, those inductively derived no less than the deductive, must ever be sub-

jected to review; which is to say, the open door, the open mind and free discussion tempers all the convictions and certitudes of modern science. And how better, I also suggest, should reconsideration and discussion of our positions arise than of our own volition within the Party, rather than of compulsion from without by the agency of Parties hostile to ours, the contest bringing mutual partizan prides and animosities into play to obscure the merits of the questions at issue. Even those who are against me, and the consensus of opinion seems set that way, should, I think, see value in a digging around the roots of our philosophy when the discussion is conducted in that better spirit among ourselves. No party, no nation, no society can afford to suppress discussion among its members, even touching its fundamentals; it does so at peril of dry-rot and decay. If we assume for a moment that changes are really necessary, how else are they to be brought about?

At this point I find it convenient to make a remark or two in reply to many questions put to me in case the Party adopted my position. I fancy my questioners have reached the conclusion that some plan has been conceived among the comrades in Vancouver for a change of Party position in respect of labor parties, along lines which I have been advocating. Assuming my fancy as correct I may say that their conclusion has no basis in fact. I can assure the comrades I am strictly on my own. And, as I sense it, my ideas seem to have gained no more converts in Vancouver than elsewhere—an individual here or there thinks he understands me and agrees. But, alas, I think they agree with my position mainly on the grounds of mere tactical expediency, rather than upon the grounds of what I presumptuously call "my science and philosophy of it." But I do not wish the Party to go the way I advocate for mere reasons of expediency. My ideal of function for the S. P. of C. is to be doctrinaire, pedagogic, the university of the working class movement in Canada (see issue of June 1, 1923). And I hold that the Party attitude to labor political parties should be the same as it is towards Labor's economic organizations. But the Party must first have a philosophy of such a position based upon science. And its members have not got it. Neither can I give it them. I can only attempt to interest them in the way I see the matter and recommend a fresh study of the sciences and history and of Marx. Especially do I recommend a study of organized group life, preferably of small communities, such as a history of a medieval city or tribal commune; they exhibit better the profounder aspects of institutions as of the ways of life and habits of thought of social beings. For a perspective on reforms I advise a study of the psychology of habit, in its social aspects, and traditions as controlling forces, they being not alone forces of inertia retarding progress, but may be also forces of progress. Such studies should show that progress towards a co-operative society does not altogether depend on intellectual development, but mainly perhaps, on the acquirement of the appropriate dispositions, habits, and traditions and ways of life. Reforms that are formative of these requisites of a co-operative social life are among the ways to such a life; they fit us for socialism. The questions run on such matters as the advantages expected to be gained by a change of Party policy, as to what kind of propaganda was to be used, and many more regarding tactics. Mostly, I think, the questions are illustrative of great intellectual timidity. Speaking for myself, I say again, first get the theoretical background of the new position, the history and the science of it, to inform you; the rest will issue out of it. Take your time and use it. If I am eager, I also am not anxious. It is a far cry to the 16th century renaissance, but so we get perspective. And the world do move! That trickling stream of speculative rationalism, of intellectual adventuresomeness, has so broadened and deepened. Thinking of it I get the feel of the flood. Be bold, it is our tide!

I have not his letter by me, but I believe that Comrade Macdonald offers to debate with any member of the Party, if the Party has changed its official position, the subject to be, that the British Labor

Government is not worthy of working class support. As the Party has not changed its position, the challenge does not stand. Still, it would be interesting to have an article in the Clarion by Comrade Macdonald supporting his contention. I speculate upon his probable line of attack. There is the attack that any revolutionary socialist government might shrivel under, that the personnel had failed to show reasonable administrative capacity, taking into account of course, all the difficulties of their position. Comrade Macdonald knows how human the personnel of the Labor Government is, and he knows all about the difficulties of their position, the distribution of political forces (two and a half working class votes went to the old parties to one for Labor), the state of political intelligence, the state of industry and economic life generally, the international and inter-empire problems, some of them bad ones to say the least. He knows that nothing short of a miracle—but then what's the use of talking about miracles—knowing what he does about politics and political science and the art of government, he cannot fail to appreciate those difficulties. But I hardly think our Comrade's attack will be along that line. I have in mind two theories about government. One, that a people, on the whole, get the government they deserve. Of course if that were true, without exception, the people and their Government would be equal on the plane of worthiness or unworthiness, just how you figured it out.

The other theory of government is that of paternalism, extreme examples of which are absolute monarchies. They rule, or claim to rule, in the best interests of their peoples. Of the two I prefer the first, and, as a matter of opinion I think it is the one true theory that approximates the facts. As a theory I prefer it because it throws responsibility on the people, which if accepted by them tends to their correcting their governments. Have not the socialists replied to the anarchists long ago: "The evils of society are not due, as you say, to the evils of government, but rather, on the other hand, the evils of government are due to the evils of society." If that is true, governing these days is a whole of a job.

If Comrade Macdonald had said "Labor Party" instead of "Labor Government," our task would have been easier, none of those stubborn practicalities to discount, nothing but a paper program and our own predilection for or against. Gee! But then again, when you come to look at it—the question of the respective worthiness of the British working class and their Labor Party. Is the British working class more advanced than the Labor Party and thus worthy of a Party more advanced? I ha'e ma doots Mac!

Well we'll have to speculate till certitude arrives with Mac's article.

Editor Clarion:

Permit me to take exception to your foot note in regards to a statement I made in my article, concerning the attitude of the British Government on the Capital Levy wherein you imply my statement was erroneous.

I have as my authority the official organ of the I. L. P., The New Leader, where they state very clearly that since the inception of the Labor Government to office, that "No effort has as yet been made to introduce the Capital Levy as a government measure or as a Private Member's Bill." Of course if you take my statement literally, perhaps there is some justification for your foot-note, but so far as the facts are concerned I am afraid you will find yourself deeply in error.

I am sure, if you will allow me to anticipate somewhat, that the Labor Government will do well to endorse the "Housing Scheme," let alone the Capital Levy.

Such is the nature of the Labor Government.

Yours for Clarity.

M. J. INGLIS.

Calif., June 28, 1924.

Editor's Note: The Labor Party, previous to the last British parliamentary election, set about to propagate the idea of a capital levy in order, as they said, to relieve the industries of the country from the weight—or as much of it as possible—of the internal national debt. The idea of a capital levy had been promulgated in the war time by spokesmen of other parties, for then other immediate purposes. We are not aware that any responsible advocate of the capital levy on behalf of the Labor Party has given it the color of a "Socialist reform," nor have we found that the Labor Party intended to "put through" a capital levy bill whenever they took office. Instead they have

tried to develop the idea that the detail work of formulating the actual terms of any capital levy bill should come out of the findings of a committee of financial (and other) experts and that "nothing rash" should be contemplated that might further upset commerce within the country. In point of fact a Committee is sitting now, appointed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Snowden), considering the national debt and trying to find a way out. The substance of our footnote to Comrade Inglis' article was simply cautionary. By which we mean that when you denounce the other fellow for not having done a particular thing, be sure to show wherein he promised to do that thing, thus meriting your denunciation in that respect.

Editor Clarion:

During my twelve years sojourn in Alberta I have noticed propaganda carried on by the capitalist press designed to keep the farm slave in good spirits so that he shall hop to his work with vigor and produce commodities abundantly. Every spring I have noticed innocent little articles something like this: "Prof. Highbrow of Encouragement University, has just completed a series of experiments extending over a period of twelve years, wherein he has established very important facts relative to the climate of Western Canada. The Prof. has discovered by a study of sun spots and by examining the medullary rays of the redwood trees of Calif., that the next ten years are to be wet and in every way satisfactory to agriculture."

And in the same paper we usually notice something like this: "Babson, the noted economist and statistician, has stated in a recent interview that farm commodity prices have reached bottom and are due for a sharp rise; all farm commodities will rise rapidly during next few months especially wheat; the last named commodity will reach \$3 per bushel before next harvest."

It is surprising how this forms the main topic at the local U.F.A. meetings. U.F.A. and wheat pool speakers pass the information on as they shake hands with their worshippers. The farm slave, after hearing or reading the news, goes home and next morning we find him up and at work one hour before his usual time; and the way he hops to it must be a pleasing sight to those who live from his toil.

Each year the farmer is stung. Either the climate professor miscalculates or the fair prices fail to materialize, or both. This year (although the papers say it is raining) the wheat crop is bound to be only a fraction of what it was last year. And the farmers are the grouchiest bunch you ever saw. They didn't quite make it last year, but if they would only get a bumper crop this year when prices are to be so high, why, they would be "jake." Their necks are getting crooked as a cranes watching the skies for the clouds that the professor told them about.

When one of these grouchy gents begins wailing and weeping, and is wondering how to pull through the coming winter, we are justified in asking what became of the enormous wheat crop of last year, and the fat cattle, hogs and sheep, of the butter and eggs, and other food-stuff. I have before me the annual report of the Dept. of Agriculture for 1923. Alberta produced 167,265,084 bu. of wheat and 114,977,300 of oats, besides millions and millions of bushels of barley, rye and flax.

The farmers of Alberta raised enough wheat last year to feed a population of 10 million people, and yet those poor slaves are \$9,000 in debt each, and are wondering how they are going to keep body and soul together.

The farmers produced last year 17,750,000 pounds of creamery butter besides millions of pounds of dairy, also 28,400,000 dozen of eggs and 3,500,000 pounds of dressed poultry. Also 55,000,000 pounds of dressed beef, 10,000 head of horses, millions of pounds of pork and mutton; other foodstuffs were produced in like proportion. No need to give figures. We know the problem of production has been solved.

The farmers of Western Canada, according to the Dominion Dept., of Agriculture, produce more per capita than can be produced in any part of the world, this is due to large scale machinery and large acreage handled by one man in the country. Why should we worry because of a little dry spell? No need to worry, but we do. And the reason we worry about next winter's grub is due to the fact that what the Alberta farmer produces, does not belong to him. By a hokos pocus skin game process his wealth has been taken from him. The Alberta farmer could live in contentment and ease, have all the necessaries and comforts of life and a reasonable amount of luxuries. All these things are his by right of producer, but the poor fool doesn't know enough to take what is his. And what are you going to do with him?

I must confess that question "has got my goat."

Yours in the struggle,

S. V. VALISCO.

Stanmore, Alta., July 5, 1924.

PROPAGANDA IN ALBERTA.

Editor Clarion:

In the past, the workers of this part of the masters' domain have always had gentlemen who either told them that it was better to be poor than rich, because, in their reference book called the word of God, it said so; or some other gentleman on the business end of the scheme shouted to the high heavens that he had just discovered a new panacea that would in due course have the effect of producing a Heaven here as well as the one hereafter.

This past week we have been treated with a change of

psychology. Com. Charles Lester has been with us for a few days, and he gave a number of lectures throughout the district, causing many of the paleolithic nut crackers around here something to argue about. In fact, many of them are not quite sure whether they belong in heaven or here. This is the kind of dope we need, and lots of it, if we are to alter the psychology of the children who are being taught with great care all the scientific methods of destruction pertaining to the capitalist system. The recruiting of Boy Scouts will soon be in effect, and all the panderers of the master class will be diligently working preparing them for future cannon fodder. There is work to do; lets do it.

A. B. HENLEY.

Foremost, Alta., June 29, 1924.

NANAIMO ELECTORAL DISTRICT.

W. A. Pritchard's Campaign BALANCE SHEET

Income.	
By collections at meetings	\$181.40
By subscriptions to campaign fund	176.05
	\$357.45
Expenditure.	
Rent of halls	\$ 85.00
Advertising	31.38
Voters' Lists	12.00
Stamps and stationery	4.79
Sign for committee rooms	5.55
Typing	5.00
Election and Coal Mines Act	1.00
Telephone and installment	9.45
Long distance calls	6.30
W. A. Pritchard's expenses	13.00
Other speakers	5.00
Car expenses	14.35
	\$192.82
Balance (cash on hand)	\$164.63
	\$357.45

Respectfully submitted,

Arthur Jordan, Sec'y.

A. O. Watson, E. W. Douglas, Auditors.

NINE MEMBERS BOLT PROGRESSIVE PARTY CAUCUS

Letter to Mr. Forke, Party Leader.

Dear Mr. Forke:

With the kindest feelings towards yourself and after very careful and deliberate consideration, we, the undersigned, hereby inform you that we do not propose henceforth to attend the caucus of the Parliamentary group, of which you are the leader, and in order that there may be no misunderstanding, we herein set forth the reasons which have led to our action and to which we propose to give full publicity.

Protest Against Party System.

Our first duty is to our constituents and to the democratic principles of the political movement which they so heroically inaugurated. That new political movement began among the farmers; it was indeed the political expression of various farmer organizations throughout Canada. Negatively it represents a two-fold protest, a protest against the economic burdens that have been piled upon the agricultural industry as the result of forty years of class government; and a protest against a party system organized and dominated from the top, and by means of which the financial and commercial interests have retained power for so long. Positively it represents a noble effort to give effect in the political field to that co-operative philosophy which has not only constituted an outstanding characteristic of farmers' movements, but which is the world's best hope of saving civilization.

Did Not Desire Another Party on Old Model.

There was, we believe, nothing further from the minds of our constituents than the building of another party machine after the model of the old. That this might be made clear the farmers' organizations, owing to whose activities we find ourselves here, formulated their own political program, did their own political organizing and financing, selected and elected us, and commissioned us to co-operate with all parties, groups or individuals, in order to carry our principles into effect.

Two Kinds of Organization.

As we see it there are two species of political organization: one the "political party" that aspires to power, and in so doing inevitably perpetuates that competitive spirit in matter of legislation and government generally which has brought the world well nigh to ruin; the other is the democratically organized group which aims to co-operate with other groups to secure justice rather than to compete with them for power. It is as representatives of this latter type that we take our stand, and in doing so not only remain true to our convictions, but have regard also to the obligations which we undertook to the farmers' organizations in our constituency. Our task is to represent our constituents by co-operating in Parliament with all parties and groups so as to secure the best possible legislation for Canada as a whole.

Principles Departed From.

In our opinion the principles above outlined, to which

we adhere, have been departed from, and in this connection we desire to draw your attention to a few among the many incidents of the past few years. You will undoubtedly recall that as far back as the Saskatoon and Toronto conferences following the 1921 election, and subsequently at the Winnipeg conference, some difference of opinion and viewpoint was apparent as to the purpose, method of action and future of the new political movement then and there represented.

Tends to Perpetuate Partyism.

The divergence of viewpoint then evident has persisted: indeed has been, we believe, accentuated. Moreover, in our opinion the present Parliamentary organization of the Progressive group tends to perpetuate the type of partyism already described and which we were elected to oppose, and to hamper us in the advocacy of those principles to which we adhere. Some of us, have made attempts to secure reorganization of the group on a different basis, but without results.

Bearing in mind the fact that each constituency represented by us is autonomous in the nomination, election, financing and control of its member, it should be evident that it is impossible to secure our support for the formation of a political party organization on the old lines involving majority rule in caucus whip domination, responsibility for leaders statements and action and so forth.

Paralyzed Fight on Bank Act.

The effort—perhaps unconscious—to build a solid political party out of our group has been distressing and paralyzing. As an example, you will recall the situation last year when the Bank Act was under consideration in Parliament. After the caucus had agreed, without objection, to support those of its members who were putting up a strenuous fight in committee for what they considered necessary financial reforms, a sudden change of attitude took place and the majority actually hindered the minority from putting up such a fight on the floor of the house as circumstances demanded. A notice had been given to the Government of our intention to oppose with all our strength the granting of bank charters for a 10-year period, the minority had to accept a defeat or break the majority.

Marked Divergence of Viewpoint.

You will readily recall similar instances of past differences of opinion struggling against old party properties and conventions; the question of our immigration policy, this year's budget, and so forth, culminating in the recent action of the majority endorsing a proposal to send a Parliamentary delegation to the British Empire Exhibition at the public expense. The divergence of viewpoint has been so marked that it would seem in the best interests of the movement that we be left free from constraint to work for the cause, independently of the present Parliamentary organization. Such a course, we believe would enable us to co-operate more harmoniously and freely with those who remain in the Progressive group and who are in agreement with us on any particular issues.

To Preserve Virility of Movement.

It is with a full realization of our duty to our constituents and for the purpose of preserving the virility and independence of the political movement of the organized farmers of Canada that we now feel it necessary to take such action as has been indicated. We desire, however, to make it perfectly clear that we are free to co-operate with all others, and invite and welcome the assistance and support of those of all parties who genuinely desire legislation such as will best promote the interests of Canada as a whole.

M. N. Campbell, Mackenzie.

Robt. Gardiner, Medicine Hat.

E. J. Garland, Bow River, Alta.

Donald M. Kennedy, West Edmonton.

Agnes C. Macphail, Southeast Grey.

H. E. Spencer, Battle River.

—The U. F. A. (Calgary)

Literature Price List

Cloth Bound.	Per Copy
Critique of Political Economy	1.65
Revolution and Counter Revolution (Marx)	1.15
Ancient Society	1.85
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	75c
Ethics and History	80c
Germes of Mind in Plants	80c
The Triumph of Life	80c
Feuerbavk	80c
Social Revolution (Kautsky)	.80
Origin of Species (Darwin)	1.15
Essays on Materialist	
Conception of History (Labriola)	1.50
Social Studies (Lafargue)	.80
Paper Covers.	
Evolution of Man (Prof. Bolsche)	80c
Wage-Labor and Capital	80c
Independent Working Class Education	10c
Communist Manifesto	10c
The Present Economic System (Prof. W. A. Bonger)	10c
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific	15c

Human Nature

(Reprinted from the Western Clarion of July 15, 1922, by request).

If one is intransigent enough to follow the capitalist-minded one through the distraction of "divide-up," "the reward of genius," and the "rights of individual initiative," he will finally come upon the wicket that opens into that great realm—human nature.

To the mind stimulated by capitalist formulae, Socialism is Utopia, incapable of realization by weak and unstable humanity; a fool's paradise, continually voided by the "natural" perversities of the "old Adam." To "sin" is innate in "human nature," says the illusioned wisdom of individual idealism. The erring heart of man must be regenerated before the conditions of life can ever be exalted; and the inordinate greed of desire abrogated before happiness and contentment can reign in the pulsing world of reality. We agree—with qualifications.

There is a proverb that "human nature is human nature." No doubt. But it is something more. It is no constant of creation. It is a product of human gregariousness. It is a result of time and age experience; and it reaches down in kinship to the very roots of life. It is not merely an expression of human society—a vague negative of generality. It is a concrete manifest of a definite character of society. Society is grouped together according to its needs and interests. Those needs and interests determine the nature of the organization, and the nature of the individual man is the reflex of the time-group to which he belongs.

In political society there are two economic classes, the master and owner—the slave and worker; and because of that primary division there are innumerable variations of class distinction. And also because of that first division, there is a general ideation, and a general nature permeating through the whole social mass. It is "wrong to steal" because political society has differentiated between "thine and mine"; he who steals becomes degraded, because he suffers the "base" instincts of the fallen man to dominate him, and subvert the morality of political civilization. It is wrong to undermine the foundations of class society, because it threatens the supremacy, of privilege; the guilty one is seditious because the "inherent" evil of "human nature" overcame the nobler concepts of property. It is wrong to advocate "free love," i.e., the mutual choice of individual man and woman, freed from all economical compulsion; because it saps the security of the bourgeois state; and the audacious one becomes a particularly conspicuous object of depravity. That is general mass ethic conditioned by interests, and upon it is based "human nature," conditioned by time progress.

Certainly it is wrong to steal—in a society which abhors theft. It is certainly uncomely to invalidate class—in a society of privilege. Certainly immoral to argue economic freedom to the bourgeois state. But, it is a mind characteristic of the time which cannot see that political society is a society of thieves; and that cannot visualize the inherent immorality of a society that imprisons one for taking a loaf and honors another for "acquiring" a railroad. It is a mind steeped in the prejudice of class concepts which is unable to distinguish between owner and master, worker and slave; and whose concept of freedom is the ruling class "right of opportunity." And it is a mind disturbed by flickering appearance, perverted by the sophistries of idealism, and rosetted with mythical divinities, which is incapable of mastering the fundamental difference—and the inner meaning of its implications—between the ideal love of economic freedom, and the subsidized "romance" of bourgeois convenience.

Time was when the conditions of society were not the conditions of capital. For thousands upon thousands of years Gentile custom held sway over humankind. The ethic of human kind was then the ethic generated by Gentile conditions, and the human nature of mortal man was fructified by the conditions of Gentile organization. The means of life were then the common possession of the primitive commune. These means were the simple resource, the crude appliance, and restricted experience of un-

tutored peoples. The standards of life were precarious; the mode of existence humble; the hazards of chance great. Yet the kinship of the group developed a fraternity which has not since been equalled, and will not again exist until society is reorganized on the comprehensive volitions of the civilized commune. There was an equality of relationship which finds no place, and could fill no function, in the unlovely standards of bourgeois success. Gentile society had an ordered, rational of reason which was submerged in the political exigencies of organized priestcraft. And it had a dignity of character, a spirit of equality, and a bond of communion which became atrophied with the advent of the military marauder and the pedatory merchant. To steal, to trade, to own, had no significance; for all that was free to the needs of all. The only privilege that existed was the natural birthright of kindred; and the fundamental passions of humanity were satisfied without the fearful licentiousness of the capitalist world.

Ancient society, with its meagre resource and limited production, with its laws of kin and maternal descent, developed an ethic consonant with its need and interest, and its human nature its time ethic. No full clansman would lie or cheat a brother clansman; but he practised both to a stranger. Within the tribe human nature was kindness and help; to enemies it was malignant and cruel. Save for natural calamities, hunger and want and destitution were unknown, and human nature would have revolted at the idea of individual ownership of the means of life, hoarding wealth, or storing common necessities for the sole use of a particular class. The sophisticated missionaries of political lands were shocked at the sexual relations (what they were wont to call "irregularities") of the "heathen" tribes. But the tribal laws of marriage were sacred and inviolate, and seldom broken, a state to which the humanity of capitalism can lay no claim whatsoever. Even in the realm of religion—mythical as all religions are—it was a worship "in spirit and in truth," reverence for a deified ancestor. Not at all the conventional hypocrisy of mercantile Christianity. But the rugged human nature of capitalist society is equal to almost any burden of imposition.

Human nature is a product of the evolutionary process, and like everything in that process it is adapted to changing environments. Surely there is abundant evidence of that. The human natures of the East and the West are incomprehensible to each other. To the Westerner, the Chinaman is a "yellow devil," to the Chinaman, the Westerner is a white variation of the same order. The human nature of commercialism scorns that dogma and all cruelty for its superstitious dogma, the human nature of commercialism scorns that dogma and all its works, but is equally hardened in its own field. To the Hindu the cow is sacred; to the Christian it is a form of food. To the modern man, his wife is inviolate; the Greek offered her to his guest. The South Sea Islander cherishes the skull of his father in his hut; we are content with photographs. Some tribes ceremonially eat their dead, we make the solemnity of death a picnic. An Iroquois Indian would not betray a comrade; political times betray even their gods. An Australian aborigine can dine on an antique whale; we—would rather it were canned. Human nature always revolts at the unaccustomed; never at the repulsive. Always it condones its own usage; never an abstract ideal.

Human nature is not a thing—like a wooden leg or a glass eye. Like digestion or respiration, it is a concrete term for a temperamental function; an expression of the manifest of general environment on particular constitution. Human nature is neither kind nor callous, good nor evil, idealist nor pervert. It is all, or any of those things, according to its immediate circumstances. And its immediate circumstances rest squarely on the fundamentals of life necessity; on self-preservation, food and reproduction. Self-preservation has united man, and most animals, into societies; the search for food has compelled and maintained common endeavor; and the laws of reproduction in association have determined social con-

duct. Through the countless complexities of continual change; through the interactions of ever varying necessities, and the interplay of their mutual reactions, these three have imposed on social man his nature of virtue or vice; his impulse of generosity or greed; his strength or his weakness; his ambition or his unadaptiveness; and the potentials of the ignoble or wonderful aspirations of the ideal. They are the pulsing theme of sentience; the red threading of reality round which, through which, and on which, life harps her infinite variety of factual existence. And according to the circumstantial vicissitudes of the transient age, and the social complex of man, they flash through the human soul, like the coruscating heavens, lifting it on the wings of sublimity, or dulling it on the deadness of stone.

There are all kinds of human nature in the same society—as there are all kinds of men. Because nature never fashions two things alike. Because in the incessant play of change and necessity, life pivots on the laws of adaptation. Because growth, though it spreads (seemingly) in all directions, is impelled by the need of the passing moment into particular channels—and the cycle, ever growing more complex, starts afresh with the self-same laws and the self-same material, but from a new point of departure. There is an infinite scope and scale of variation, and the same outward environment, acting—and reacting—on a different inner temperament, provokes an unending diversity and pattern of human response. The same cause produced the human races, but local detail differentiated in character and color. A common necessity created God, but different climes clothed him with different attributes. A common motive influences human association, but differing interests checker the web of its destiny. The same cause that drove man to his mate, through change of time has diversified its satisfaction. And the same force that urged the haunted man of the wild in quest of physical and social satisfaction compels a continual modification in the conquest of desire, i.e., its attainment.

But precisely the same principle that carried man from the primitive commune to servitude is steadily impelling him from servitude in the higher commune of the social commonwealth. The same necessity that harnessed natural passion with political monogamy is now breaking its long slavery and driving on to the purification of mutual communion. And the same spirit of invention and research which modified the first social industry is again facing man with the need of further centralization of socialized effort. Coming face to face with this necessity, the mind shall see a new light; the beast find a new nature. In the grim hour of necessity we shall discover the regenerating ideal; shall awaken to the conceptual union of matter and spirit; and shall scourge the money changers from the temple courts of humanity. For in the social administration of life's necessities there will be no place for greed, for the ethic of gain shall have disappeared. There can be no burden of privilege, and consequently none of its sordid excess. And the mystery of false desire shall lose its unimaginative forwardness, in the wonder and beauty of natural satisfaction.

Let us have a society where the fear of authority and the spectre of "artificial famine" are not; and the human nature of capitalist exploitation will shed its character of degradation. "as the fig tree sheddeth her leaves." Let us have a society where political devices no longer blight and burden human aspirations and efforts, and man shall develop a new nature as surely as a change of climate induces a new flora. Let us have a society where class and privilege cannot enter; and that society shall blossom like a fertile land. Let us have a society economically free, and the natural passions of humanity shall be ennobled with the new beauty of understanding. Let us have a society whose birth-right is knowledge, and the human mind shall be garlanded and its craven happiness have vanished away; and man shall go, mated with the sweetest happiness. Let us have a world where truth is the final test of things, and the human nature of that world must be fashioned in the image of its creator. R.