

# WESTERN CLARION

A Journal of  
CURRENT  
EVENTS

Official Organ of  
THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

HISTORY  
ECONOMICS  
PHILOSOPHY

No. 912.

TWENTIETH YEAR.

Twice a Month

VANCOUVER, B. C., APRIL 1, 1924.

FIVE CENTS

## The British Labor College Movement

BY J. F. HERRABIN.

HERE is no need to remind students of social history that the most significant social factors are not always those most widely advertised. And what is true of society in general is true also of the working-class movement itself. It is all too easy—often, indeed, it is almost inevitable—to judge of the character and strength of any particular section of that movement from its platform orators, its leader-writers, its Trade Union negotiators, and all those other figures (or “figure-heads”) who, by superficial observers, are accepted not only as representing, but as actually typifying, the personnel of the movement at large. Generalizations based on such slender evidence are unsafe guides—either for action or for criticism.

One of the most significant facts in the “inside” history of the British Labour Movement during recent years has been the striking growth of the demand, by the rank and file of the movement, for Education in the Social Sciences; for a grounding, that is, in the broad facts of History and Education, studied from the working-class point of view. Yet the Labour College Movement which has grown up as a result of that demand is by no means as widely known—and that despite the fact that the Times and the Morning Post have recently done what they could in the way of greater publicity!

From quite small beginnings, 15 years ago, the Labour College movement in England, Scotland and Wales has developed into a widespread national organization, with (this year) upwards of 17,000 students enrolled in its various classes. Most significantly, the whole movement—the original demand, and the machinery by which that demand has been met, has been, in the main, an entirely “rank and file” affair. Until quite recently none of the more prominent working-class leaders, political or industrial have been identified with it. It had its origin in a quite spontaneous expression of “rank and file” opinion—a strike of Trade Union students undergoing training at Ruskin College, Oxford, an educational institution carried on with more or less “liberal” aims and standing definitely for the idea of “social solidarity” so far as education was concerned. The Trade Unionists who supported this institution perceived no contradiction between this attitude and their own independent working-class action in political and industrial affairs. But the students who revolted (in the spring of 1900) realized the contradiction very clearly; and they were able to persuade a sufficient number of the members of their Trade Unions (chiefly railway-men and South Wales miners) to make possible the establishment of a resident college based on a recognition of “the antagonism of interests between Capital and Labour” and on the fact that this antagonism expressed itself, so far as educational matters were concerned, precisely in those subjects of most interest and importance to the workers: i.e., in all those subjects dealing directly or indirectly, with the structure of society and with “social problems.”

For the first four or five years the greater part the energies of those interested in the movement were directed towards keeping the Labour College in existence—and a very precarious existence it was at times! But during this same period, evening classes began to be established in various industrial centres—in Lancashire, Yorkshire, and South Wales,

especially; while the Socialist Labour Party group, centred in Glasgow, were laying the foundations of a similar educational movement in Scotland. During all this time, the propagandist organization established by the pioneers of the movement—the Plebs League—and its monthly organ, the Plebs Magazine, served as links between the different centres and gained fresh converts to the cause of Independent Working Class Education.

In 1914 the resident Labour College in London was definitely taken over by the two Unions—the National Union of Railwaymen and the South Wales Miners Federation—sections of whose members had from the first been its most active supporters; and from this year onwards, accordingly, the mass of the movement was able to concentrate on what, after all, was its most important aim—the establishment and development of the evening classes for workers up and down the country.

During the war years, despite the absence of many active workers in the army or in person, this class-work increased by leaps and bounds. The existence of a rival organization in the field, the Workers Educational Association—which stood for the same ideas of “social solidarity” as Ruskin College had done, and which aimed at making ruling-class culture more accessible to the workers—made it possible for the whole of the Plebs propaganda to be conducted on a definitely class basis; and fought out—in Trades Councils and local Trade Union branches—as a definite class issue. It was the very essence of the movement’s slogan, Independence in working class education, to force this question of working-class independence—i.e., of “class-consciousness all round”—into the forefront. The discussions which went on everywhere between the advocates of the two opposing points of view, had accordingly far more significance than a mere debate on educational problems pure and simple. On the one hand, the men of the Plebs Labour College group took their stand on the Marxian view of history, on Marxian economics, and on the need for the workers, starting from these bases, to develop their own “fighting culture” as a weapon in the class-struggle; on the other, the University-trained champions of the Workers’ Educational Association proclaimed that education was “above the battle,” that it was concerned chiefly with the “humanities,” based on eternal verities and unaffected by ephemeral things, like class distinctions, and that, even apart from the humanities, it was possible (and desirable) to teach quite impartially the fundamental truths about society and existing social systems, without any bias on the side either of capitalists or proletarians. It was impossible to conduct such an argument without raising basic questions about the very foundations and aims of the whole working-class movement. Labour College propaganda, accordingly, cannot be regarded as confined to a specialised field and as having, therefore, but minor reactions on the workers’ movement generally.

By 1921, the various class-centres had increased both in numbers and activities to such an extent that some definite form of national organization was generally felt to be desirable; and in the autumn of that year a conference of representatives, convened by the Plebs League, decided on the formation of the National Council of Labour Colleges,

now the central organization of the movement. It is composed of the Labour College, London (the only residential institution in the movement); the Scottish Labour College, co-ordinating the various districts in Scotland; over 70 local Labour Colleges, i.e., evening-class centres in different towns; the Plebs League which enrolls individual enthusiasts, and which serves as the publishing department of the movement; and of such national Trade Unions as inaugurate educational schemes for their members and make financial grants to the N.C.L.C. for this purpose. (The two most important of these are those established by the Building Trade Workers (A.U.B.T.W.) and the Distributive Workers (N.U.D.A.W.) Very many Trades Councils, local Labour Parties and Trade Union branches are affiliated to the local Colleges.

Last year, 1922-23, the number of students attending classes was just under 12,000. This year, as has already been stated above, that number promises to exceed 17,000. The great majority of the tutors are voluntary workers. But the support of the national Trade Unions has made it possible to establish whole-time organizers in the principal centres, and these men invariably act as tutors also.

Not only has the actual class movement been thus organized, but the equally important task of providing textbooks and other literature has been tackled. The Plebs League, which—in addition to its monthly magazine—had previously issued short economic and historical text books by W. W. Craik, Noah Ablett and Mark Starr, has during the last two years issued four volumes in a uniform textbook series. An Outline of Psychology (fourth edition now printing), An Outline of Imperialism, An Outline of Economics, and An Outline of Economic Geography (first edition of 5000 copies already nearly sold out within three months of publication). Each of these books was originally drafted by one hand, then discussed and revised by an editorial committee. In addition to them, several smaller books and pamphlets—including What to Read: A Guide to Books for Working Students—have been issued by the League; as well as cheap “students’ editions” of such books as Philip Price’s Reminiscences of the Russian Revolution, in R. W. Postgate’s Revolution, from 1789 to 1906. In the Plebs Magazine itself, of course, numerous short studies on economic, historical and geographical subjects are published.

The main problem which the Labour College movement is setting itself to solve—both as regards actual teaching and publications—is that of so simplifying and condensing the essential facts of History, Economics, and Social Theory, as to make practicable the provision of at least an elementary training in these subjects for the whole rank and file of the workers’ movement. This, under existing circumstances, is a more pressing problem than the carrying on of further research work, or the development of theory—though of course the two sides of the educational movement cannot be kept entirely separate. But the very weakness of the Workers’ press in Britain, as compared with certain other countries, makes all the more necessary this “popularization” of the fundamental facts about society, from the working class point of view, by means of

(Continued on page 3)

# Lenin's Life and Work

BY KARL RADEK.

FOR the first time in the history of humanity the news of the death of a statesman not only thrilled the whole world, but went to the heart of millions in every country, and among all peoples. There are countries in which millions mourn for him, other countries in which his mourners number only a few hundred thousand, and again others in which they count but a handful. But there is no people among which there was not someone who said, on the 22nd of January: "My leader is dead."

The death of Lenin gives the proletarian idea an enormous impetus in every country. In every country the proletarians have learnt to fight for the fragments of Lenin's ideas which have reached them in our letters and resolutions. When they had tested these ideas by their own experience, and had seen in them the truth of their life, they were reassured. They knew that the ship of international revolution was being steered by this genius of the international proletariat. And they had faith in his captaincy. But now everything is changed. Every member of the working class who is accustomed to think is now fully engrossed with the thought of how he can best learn from the work and life of Lenin, how he may find in Lenin's books the weapons for his struggle, how he may learn to employ these weapons self-reliantly. In this regard there can be nothing so characteristic as the words spoken by a German communist on hearing of the death of Lenin: "Do not give us a selection from Lenin's works, give us all Lenin's works in the most important European languages, so that we can appropriate to ourselves his manner of thought and his methods, by means of our own independent work."

Many years will pass before we can erect this monument to Lenin, even in the leading countries of the labour movement, before we can enable the European workers to enter into their full inheritance of knowledge of the life and works of Lenin. Until this has been accomplished, it is the task of the Communists to show what historical role has been played by Lenin, and to draw the outlines of his ideas, however roughly and generally.

Karl Marx's teachings are laid down in his books. His correspondence represents an adequate commentary to his works. Lenin has left dozens of books behind him. When his letters are collected, these will fill dozens of volumes more. But the most important commentary to Lenin's teachings is Lenin's completed work: the creation of the Russian Communist Party and the struggle of this Party for power. It was Lenin's methods which enabled the proletariat to maintain its power under the most difficult circumstances, and it is his methods which Lenin has bequeathed to the Russian proletariat, not only as a means for the maintenance of power, but as a means for the solution of those tasks for the sake of which the working class of Russia seized power.

Marx took part in the revolution in Germany in '48. But as the proletarian elements were too weak in this revolution he could not play any decisive role. The revolution of 1848 in Germany was in itself a belated birth. It came too late to be victorious as a bourgeois revolution, and altogether too early to be led by the proletariat. The revolution of 1848 was followed by decades of reaction, and during this period Marx could only play the part of spectator, and study the mechanism of the bourgeois world. This reactionary period was followed by the epoch of national struggles, in which the proletariat could again play no leading part. Then the meteor of the Paris Commune appeared on the horizon. Marx's mind alone was capable of grasping the meaning of this transient phenomenon. But here again there could be no question of a leading role for Marx.

After the Paris Commune, and until the death of Marx, reaction reigned in Europe. The revolu-

tionary tasks of the bourgeoisie had already been fulfilled in the West. Slowly and despondently the proletariat began to build up its armies again. It gathered together in small groups in different countries, its scattered movements could not be centrally guided. Marx's whole genius exhausted itself in the study of the fundamental laws of development of the bourgeois world and the proletariat which was bound up with it. He was given no opportunity of testing his ideas as the leading genius of revolution in the fire of a civil war.

Lenin stood with both feet on the ground of Marx's teachings, which he understood more profoundly and thoroughly than any other follower of Marx. But Lenin prepared himself, from the first day of his activity onwards, to become the practical leader of the communist revolution. He devoted his whole life to working out those tasks which were not solved till the year 1917: to the preparation of that great breach broken through the front of the international bourgeoisie in October 1917. It is thirty years come next spring that the youthful Lenin wrote as follows in his work: "Who are the Friends of the People?"

"The Social Democrats devote the whole of their attention and activity to the working class. When the vanguard of the working class has possessed itself of the ideas of scientific Socialism, the ideas of the historical role have become widespread and have created firm organizations among the working class, converting the present scattered economic struggles of the workers into a conscious class struggle—then the Russian worker, who is at the head of all democratic elements, will overthrow absolutism and lead the Russian proletariat (by the side of the proletariat of every country) along the straight path of open political struggle, to the victorious communist revolution."

The study of Lenin's teachings on the communist revolution demands above all the study of the methods practised by Lenin as leader in the struggle of the Russian proletariat for power.

The power of conviction evinced by Lenin in his actions as politician, and as leader of the proletarian Party, has been the subject of universal astonishment. Many have regarded this power of conviction as the result of his authoritative character, which rendered him a natural leader of men. Others have seen the source of his power of conviction in his unshakeable faith in Socialism. But the authoritative will does not only attract human beings, it can also have the effect of repulsing them, when the test of history shows that this will had led itself and others into false paths. Lenin's power as a leader lay in the fact that his Party comrades were always convinced that his will was leading them forward on the right historical path.

He could not find this right path through his faith in Socialism alone. Faith in Socialism was equally unshakeable in the leader of the English reformists, Keir Hardie, who led the English proletariat into false paths; and the leader of French socialism, Jean Jaures, too, was a profound believer in Socialism, as was also the most disinterested man of the II. International, Victor Adler, who guided the Austrian proletariat to the abysses of social patriotism. But despite their great faith, all these leaders did not stand the test of history. Socialism is no religion, Socialism is the science of the pre-requisites of the victory of the proletariat. The iron force of Lenin's conviction found its source in the fact that he had thought out Marx's social tenets as no scholar of Marx had ever done before, that these tenets had become part of his being, and that he applied them as no follower of the Father of Scientific Socialism has done. Lenin has not left behind him many works on the general principles of the Marxian teachings, for he was too fully occupied with the practical work entailed in the creation and leadership of a proletarian party in Russia. But it suffices if we remember how Lenin dealt with the questions of historical materialism in the above men-

tioned early work; we only need to compare his treatment of these questions with that of the contemporary writings of Plechanov and Kautsky, and we have ample evidence of Lenin's independent manner of solving the theoretical problems of Marxism. Two or three pages dealing with the difference between dialectics and eclecticism, and inserted apparently quite accidentally in the pamphlet issued by Lenin at the time of the discussion on the trade union question, show how modest he was in designating himself a scholar of Plechanov. Lenin was a great and independent Marxian thinker. And this was the premise enabling this man of iron to become the leading politician of the international proletariat.

Lenin as a thinker, Lenin as a politician of the Russian revolution, developed under conditions rendering the questions of revolution questions of practical struggle. This enabled him to stand head and shoulders above the other followers of Marx.

Lafargue developed in a petty bourgeois country over which had swept the storms of three revolutions, but in which Capitalism had not yet created the pre-requisites of the new proletarian society. Lafargue's great talent was not given the opportunity of developing into genius.

Kautsky, who was the first after Marx and Engels to try and apply Marxism independently, was only able to utilize Marxism for the purpose of studying the history of society. But with respect to living deeds, and to the questions of the German movement, Marxism only served him as a means of explaining to the proletariat that it is impossible either to circumvent or to spring over the class enemy, and that forces must be slowly collected for the decisive battle. According to Kautsky, this decisive battle was still at such a great distance that, when in his works he hesitatingly approached the subject of the seizure of power, of social revolution, he himself had grasped the contours of this question so vaguely, that he overlooked one of the most important tasks of the proletarian revolution—where the victorious proletariat is to obtain its bread on the day following its victory.

Plechanov, the brilliant interpreter of Marxist tenets, the brilliant defender of these tenets "against any kind of criticism," lived far from the spot where the tempest arose, far from Russia. And all his great interest in the revolutionary struggle in Russia proved insufficient to concentrate all the forces of his brain upon the study of the practical tasks of the revolutionary struggle of the Russian proletariat, and there can be nothing more characteristic than the fact, that after Plechanov had written "Our Differences of Opinion," he never devoted a single essay to the detailed study of one of the most important questions of the Russian revolution, the agrarian question.

Lenin, as theoretician and as politician, occupied himself from the first moment of his activity, precisely with the study of the most important fields of activity of the Russian proletariat, and with those main forces which were to participate in the Russian revolution. A comparison of the treatment of the agrarian question by Kautsky, Kschivitzky, and Compere Morel on the one hand, and Lenin on the other, graphically illustrates, not only, the difference between the economic conditions in Western Europe and in Russia, not only the peculiarities of the agrarian question in Russia and in Western Europe, but also the advantages possessed by Lenin as a revolutionary leader, over the chief representatives of revolutionary socialism in West Europe. Lenin not only studied the agrarian question from the point of view of explaining the destiny towards which Capitalism is developing, from the view-point of the correctness or incorrectness of Marxian theses as applied to the agrarian question, but above all from the view-point of the struggle of the proletariat.

(Continued on page 3)

# When the Gods Thirst

THESE are days of cataclysmic change, and therefore it is not unnatural that one should often hear the question, especially from people with whom one's views are more or less under suspicion, "Are you in favour of revolution?" The questioner is usually somewhat afraid of his question, and his trepidation is betrayed by the manner, half bantering, half challenging, in which he puts it. Such queries seem to us extraordinary; as extraordinary, indeed, as would be the question "Do you believe in hurricanes?" Since hurricanes arise from certain atmospheric conditions which it is beyond the power of man to alter, one's approval or disapproval of them is a matter of little practical interest; and since revolutions result from political and economical conditions which are also pretty well outside the sphere of influence of the average person, the question whether one believes in them or not is irrelevant. The parallel is not quite exact, since it is possible, although extremely difficult, for human beings to affect the conditions making for revolution in such a way as to avert it. We shall touch on this point again a little later; what we wish now to emphasize is that, given the political and economic conditions which make for revolution, it will come, in spite of men's opinions concerning it, as inevitably as storms occur in the physical world.

One may, of course, find people who believe in revolution—who believe, that is, that it is necessary—and one may find people who work actively to bring it about; and the majority of people no doubt believe that it is to the propaganda carried on by "the rabid, lawless, anarchistic and disgruntled element of society," to use Mr. Daugherty's comprehensive phrase, that we must look for the causes of revolution. That there is a disgruntled element of society, is incontestable; and that when revolution actually appears, it is this disgruntled element that mans the barricades and storms the Government buildings, is also incontestable. But this element is not casual. It is the natural product of the exploitation which is at the basis of our economic order. When a predatory economic system has been developed so far that the vast majority of people are reduced to misery and want, and the exploiting classes have become correspondingly corrupted in the process, the next step is revolution; not because this person or that person has advocated it, but because life under such an order has become intolerable. The most effective workers for revolution in France were the privileged classes; and the same thing was true of the old regime in Russia. Peoples are slow to revolt, because their actions are dictated not by reason but by their economic condition. It takes an incredible amount of oppression, abuse and actual starvation to bring them to the point of rebellion.

Once they have been brought to that point, the forces released by their action are likely to produce strange and terrible effects. We have lately been re-reading Anatole France's vivid picture of the Reign of Terror in "Les Dieux ont Soif," and we were impressed anew with the cruelty of the French Revolution, the suffering that it visited upon innocent people, and the hideousness of the passions that it released. We do not know what M. France's intention was in writing the book, but we can not help wondering whether it was to remind the French people of the fearful price that their grandfathers paid for the dubious political blessings that they themselves are now enjoying. Yet the French Revolution, terrible though it was, extravagant and often ridiculous, marked a great step towards freedom. It did not establish liberty, equality and universal brotherhood, but it established the right to aspire to those ideals. It failed to establish freedom because it did not abolish privilege; it merely redistributed privilege; but it performed an immeasurable service in clearing away the dead lumber of feudalism and freeing men's thought from feudalistic ideology, and in substituting for the old form of government by a divinely

ordained sovereign, political forms which were at least popular in semblance.

If the leaders of the French Revolution had understood that freedom is a matter of economics, and not of politics, and that it can not exist while it is possible for one class in society to live by the labour of another class, the history of the last century might have been very different from what it has been. There was a school of economists in France at the outbreak of the Revolution that could have enlightened them in this respect—the Physiocrats; but they were connected in the popular mind with the old regime, and were therefore discredited. Moreover, the French Revolution was a bourgeois revolution; its leaders sprang from the middle class, and the middle class was as jealous of its rights in property and land as the old aristocracy had ever been. It is no wonder, therefore, that Robespierre declared that to advocate the division of land and property was to make enemies for the Revolution. It remained for the Russian Revolution, after a century and a half of so-called popular government had shown that the more political government changes, the more of it is the same thing, to proclaim to the world the fact that freedom can not exist where one class in society is legally empowered to exploit another; and to attempt to establish an order of society in which such exploitation would not be possible. Incidentally, we believe that the Russian Revolution will be found to have done great service to the world in helping to abolish the quasi-religious worship of established political institutions that succeeded the old superstitious veneration for monarchs.

The Russian Revolution may fail to establish the order its leaders desire to inaugurate. If it does fail, then the Russian people will be obliged to endure again, sooner or later, the agony of revolution and counter revolution. The peoples of Western Europe and America most certainly have this prospect to face, unless by some miracle they show themselves wise enough to put a curb on their exploiting classes. The parliamentary machinery which has been developed during the past century and a half has failed to halt the enrichment of the few and the impoverishment of the many; and its failure has been largely due to the inability of the peoples to recognize their own interest and use that machinery to further it. This inability, which is due to ignorance, apathy and misdirected education, has caused control of popular forms of government to pass into the hands of the people who are interested in having their privileges ensured by legal sanction. Yet it is not impossible, although it seems highly improbable, that the creaking machinery of popular government might be utilized to abolish those very monopolies and privileges for whose perpetuation government has so long existed. For example, if the land-values campaign in England had succeeded, it is theoretically conceivable that the English people might have elected representatives who would have put in force, through the existing legal procedure, changes quite as revolutionary as anything contemplated by the Russian leaders. It is possible, of course, that such changes would have caused civil war, for those who enjoy privilege do not part with it easily; but in such case the onus of revolt would have been upon the privileged classes rather than upon the disinherited. In this country, where the popular forms of government are cumbersome and inflexible, their effective use in the popular interest would be even more difficult than in France or England; yet the thing is not flatly impossible. In this respect those nations which have parliamentary government are better situated than were the Russians under the Tzar or the French under Louis XVI. They can use the forms of government for the purpose of changing its content.

They can not do this, however, until they come to see clearly what is wrong with the present order, and what steps are necessary to change it. The disillusionment of the war and the period which has

followed it has been an invaluable educational force. The Russian Revolution has been another. Indeed, the educational process has been speeded up enormously during the past few years; but whether it will win the race against revolution is a question. We should be inclined to feel more cheerful about the probable outcome, if the British Labour party had not pledged itself to save the economic situation in England by a capital levy! (\*) At such moments we are sure that revolution will win; and perhaps it is a feeling akin to our own which makes the fearful inquire with bated breath whether or not one is in favor of it. The Freeman (N. Y.)

(\*) The British Parliamentary Labor Party has advocated a Capital Levy on a general plan (still in the propaganda stage), the same to be effective subject to electoral approval and the approval also of financial and departmental experts as a definite practical measure. If the Labor Party has "pledged itself to save the economic situation in England" in this way we have not yet seen the text of the pledge.—Editor Clarion.

## LENIN'S LIFE AND WORK.

(Continued from page 2)

ariat for power, from the view-point of the choice of suitable allies for the proletariat in its struggle.

Kautsky saw these allies only in the agricultural workers. But whether his rejection of the attempt (designated by him as opportunism) to win over the poor peasantry was merely the result of a correct or a faulty application of Marxism, or the result of the passivity of German Social Democracy, the result of its practical renunciation of the struggle for power and the limitation of the horizon of the German proletariat to a horizon of craft interests—this question is best answered by the fact that German Social Democracy did not even know how to begin the struggle for winning over those village strata which Kautsky held to be the allies of the proletariat: the agricultural labourers. Lenin discovered in the peasantry an ally for the struggle of the proletariat for power, and taught for decades, through all the ups and downs of Russian history, the need for creating an alliance between the fighting proletariat and the peasantry.

(To be continued in next issue)

## THE BRITISH LABOR COLLEGE MOVEMENT.

(Continued from page 1)

educational machinery. The dangers of oversimplification, of "short cuts" to knowledge, must be faced and overcome. The need for a more widespread understanding, by proletarians, of the "whys and wherefores" of the proletarian position is obvious. It is that need which the British Labour College movement is trying to meet.—"Inprecorr."

## SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

### PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

EVERY SUNDAY

### THEATRE ROYAL

SUNDAY MARCH 30.

Speaker: W. A. PRITCHARD

Subject: "Socialism as a New Order."

All meetings at 8 p.m.  
Questions. Discussion.

## Western Clarion

A Journal of History, Economics, Philosophy,  
and Current Events.  
Published twice a month by the Socialist Party of  
Canada, P. O. Box 719, 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

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

VANCOUVER, B. C., APRIL 1, 1924.

### "INVISIBLE GOVERNMENT"

It is quite commonplace to remark among socialists that governments function as executive bodies operating on behalf of the ruling class, yet the fact does not seem to find recognition among other people excepting under such circumstances as are now holding the attention of the people of the United States and known as "the government scandals." And then the recognition is only a near recognition, because the circumstances, in form, are irregular and exceptional. In the ordinary course of events, given honest men and an amendment to the regulations in the election and practice of government here and there, and all would be well.

But would it? It appears to be the case always that wherever there are business interests these manage to influence the courts, the legislature, and, one way or other pretty well everything else to the promotion of their interests. The recent revelations of official corruption in the U. S. A. point simply to the crudities in the method employed. But has Ex-President Taft's judicial "impartiality" suffered anyway seriously in repute on account of some little publicity concerning his annual income received from the U. S. Steel Corporation, something like \$50,000—the detail escapes us for the moment? And how clumsily the arrangement must have been made between Sir Richard Squires (when Premier of Newfoundland) and the Dominion Steel Company! Clumsy because the knowledge is now public that he received \$46,000 from the D. S. C. while concessions and what-not were being negotiated between his government and the latter. "The 'Daily Herald' (London) seems to be worried over this because D. S. C. stock is largely held in Great Britain! And at the same time Lord Cowdray's Mexican Oil Company is accused of fomenting the late Huerta revolt there, it being quite as good principle to knock a government down as to build one up, according to circumstances. And in Nova Scotia, we learn from J. S. Woodsworth's address in the House of Commons, March 4, the now famous British Empire Steel Corporation has its influence wherever it may be needed. In the case of J. B. MacLachlan who was sentenced to two years' imprisonment for "Seditious Libel" (since released on ticket-of-leave), when his case came before the Court of Appeal he found his original trial Judge a member of the Court, a man who had been before his elevation to the Bench counsel for the company which was the main instrument in MacLachlan's prosecution. In that territory "Besco" is all-powerful. It is not strange therefore that four of the judges of that Court of Appeal had been earning their bread through "Besco" or one or other of its subsidiary companies. There are fourteen of them all told. Enough in a territory otherwise sparsely

populated with industrial activity to be looked upon as the "plum" of legal business.

All these details are merely confusing if it is not seen that industrial enterprise works that way for its own regular protection and in furtherance of its objective, which is profit. If the details go astray a little and venture into public gaze the fact simply

denotes that the "covering" has not been close enough. Every confidential bookkeeper in the employ of "the interests," great or small, has his B. and C. items in his ledger—Bribery and Corruption. It is so called simply because it collides with the theory of democratic government as we have it. But that is what we have.

## More Questions and Comment

BY F. J. McNEY.

WITH regard to the quotations from the "Outlines of Economics," they demonstrate Professor Ely's ability to raise a large crop of camouflage on soil carefully dressed with a famous fertilizer which is not at all scarce, but which may be found in great abundance not only in the stock yards of Chicago but everywhere else, and if the quotations given by "Kid" Morgan fail to make this point clear, then read the whole book. Furthermore "Kid" Morgan proves himself to be an apt and talented disciple of Prof. Ely in this respect, as we shall see later.

He tells us that when Prof. Ely says value means value in exchange; that is just what I thought he meant all the time and that is just why I went to the trouble of explaining in the preface to my article on "Marginal Utility" that "our aim is to find what determines the exchange value of commodities, or on what basis do commodities exchange one with another. This is the question that the marginal utility theory is supposed to answer." Next, we are informed that, "It is necessary that a commodity must be relatively scarce to possess value in exchange." Well that is a modification anyhow. It is no longer necessary that a commodity must be scarce to possess exchange value, but it must be relatively scarce. The "Kid" continues: "Nor can a commodity possess value without being scarce, seeing that 'scarcity' used in this sense, simply means 'difficulty of attainment' and this again means that its production involves an expenditure of effort. In short, a commodity cannot possess value (as determined by the amount of socially necessary labor time) without at the same time absorbing certain costs of production (price of production)."

That passage transcends anything that even Prof. Ely has written in the line of camouflage. I don't know where the "Kid" got his definition of scarcity but it is certainly the most remarkable one I ever read. According to this definition, if a man does not possess the necessary pieces of silver to buy a portion of a particular commodity he will find it very difficult to attain, and consequently, no matter how abundant the said commodity may be, it is scarce. But this is not the sense in which Professors Ely and Fairchild use the word scarcity at all. Ely says that a thing "must exist in less than sufficient quantity to satisfy all wants," and Fairchild says, "The only things that have marginal utility and so have value are those that are limited in quantity, so that there is not enough to satisfy everybody's wants." However, I admit that Ely and Fairchild are not trying to reconcile the marginal utility theory with the labor theory of value.

Another interesting statement in the above quotation is that the value of a commodity is determined by the amount of socially necessary labor time required for its production, plus the costs of production. Surely a double-header like that ought to confer value upon any commodity, be it ever so abundant. Would "Kid" organ be kind enough to explain this point a little?

We are also informed that Prof. Ely does not

consider labor power a commodity. It is interesting to note in this connection that Prof. Ely makes no distinction between labor and labor power at all, in spite of the fact that he has read the "Old Master;" perhaps the "Kid" can tell us why? It is, however, really kind and thoughtful of the Professor to admit that labor is a factor in the production of values; he might have denied even that. Then, after admitting that in his opinion labor power is a commodity, the "Kid" tells us that "the supply of labor power invariably exceeds the demand." Now if we are not all qualified for the bughouse that statement means that there is always an abundance of labor power. It means that the commodity labor power always exists in more than sufficient quantity to satisfy all wants, and yet, in spite of hades, it possesses exchange value, even if that exchange value does consist of a "bare subsistence."

Let us now consider some of "Geordie" Morgan's troubles. "Geordie" complains bitterly that he has been fishing for suckers for five years and never got a bite, or words to that effect. Now an advocate of the marginal utility theory would, no doubt, explain such a state of affairs by pointing out that it was due to a scarcity of suckers, but I, on the other hand, being opposed to the marginal utility theory on general principles, hold that suckers exist in great abundance,—the question is why don't they bite? The trouble as I see it, is that for many years "Geordie" has been enjoying—or suffering from—a reputation of infallibility as a Marxian economist. "Geordie" has been looked upon as the Pope of economics, and consequently, he was taboo as far as criticism was concerned. Is it any wonder that there were no nibblers?

However, I have a crow to pick with "Geordie" this time myself. "Geordie" says that my article on "Marginal Utility" was "old-fashioned." Now is that not enough to make a man jump up into the air and never come down? Old-fashioned! And I was sure that it was quite modern and up-to-date. I feel hurt "Geordie," I do indeed. I have not slept a wink since I read that letter. I may recover from the shock in the course of time but I will never look the same. Anyhow, it is now up to "Geordie" to favor us with an up to date and "new-fashioned" article dealing exclusively with the marginal utility theory of value, and I invite all the critics to be ready to light on it like a flock of buzzards on a tree-jackal.

Editor's Note: It seems to the editor that a great deal of the recent writings on these matters has been to cross purposes and that the lack has been somewhat a lack of universally understood terms. For instance, although he has never read Ely's "Outlines of Economics" the Editor's conjecture is—gleaned from these recent writings on Ely's virtues and iniquities—that there are several "Kinds" of scarcity according to Ely—& Co. Maybe not. The reading of Ely's "Outlines" is no doubt necessary, although it appears to the editor that Ely is quite good enough in the Appendix (A)—see quotation by L. T. Morgan, Clarion 1st March. The editor is in hope that someone who has read Ely will be able by this Appendix to absolve him from the necessity of doing so.

Now regarding L. T. M. It so happens that the U. B. C. examinations are on now and he is in the throes of such worries as are involved in "Arts '24" One Gethsemane is enough at a time.

As for "Geordie,"—if he ever catches up with the abundance of work he always has on hand no doubt he will go over these matters, breaking trail for us all again—to use.

# Machines and Human Machines

BY F. W. MOORE.

ONE would hardly think so but yet it is a positive fact that the vast majority of commodity-producing machines in the world today are human. Others of course are made from wood or metal but the most complicated as well as the most perfect the world has ever known, is the human being, which ever since the time that marks the beginning of exploitation of man by man, has been infinitely more in vogue as a means of producing value for an actual or virtual owner than his metal or wooden analogue, that competes with him victoriously for the possession of his job.

Myriad millions of these human machines were used in the ages of the past to produce the vast wealth and misery-tainted magnificence of the ancient world.

In those days of Freedom's agonized existence the mental organism of humanity had little encouragement to concentrate on invention. The need of making labour-saving machinery did not exist, since the supply of labourers could easily be replenished. In the case of Rome this was accomplished by following the auctioneer that attended the battlefields with the intention of disposing of the prisoners to the highest bidder. This custom was the vogue until her frontiers were so widely extended that she found them impossible to defend any longer; in other words Rome, as we are told in Wells' Outline of History, p. 521: "was no longer an invading but invaded power, consequently her supply of slaves had fallen off." It was meet therefore that Constantine, The Great, in the fourth century after Christ—"should try to make a caste of the peasants and small cultivators and to restrict them from moving from their holdings: in fact he sought to make them serfs." On these serfs it was intended that the Roman exploiters should depend in the future for their supply of labour-power.

In the feudal days, the human machine, all over Europe, was still paramount. It became a sort of fixture on the demesne of the Lord of the Manor, but later still, the practise of retaining help perennially was found to be less profitable than wage-slavery, a system, in the nature of which was inherent an extension of the bounds of liberty, slight indeed, yet embodying the privilege of seeking a master, who would exploit him on terms he considered more favourable.

Yet insignificant as this privilege appeared to those who held higher concepts of manhood's dignity, the modicum of freedom so acquired proved to be the fairy's wand that brought about a worldwide industrial revolution, for now in contrast with the gloom of the long night of the period of chattel slavery, the faintest gleam of the dawn of a better day, typified by the almost imperceptible measure of liberty that had accrued with the genesis of the wage-worker, awakened the power of invention and discovery in the immeasurable potentiality of human capacity—a power incidental to a series of marvellous machines that must eventually bring about the total destruction of the social fabric through the competitive struggles for markets for their products—struggles of which the Great World War may be taken as a mild example of what we may expect in the near future—or be the means of bringing those leisure hours that are essential for the awakening of those mental powers that are latent in all classes of men; powers that if once given universal expression would produce results in all the arts and sciences to which those of today are but as a single drop of water compared to the oceans of the world; powers that at the present time have opportunities to develop in a small percentage of the population only, and even in them in the crude manner peculiar to the restrictions imposed by the rules of economically interested convention; powers that if given stimulation to growth—stimulation born of suitable environment, would in a very short time be the means

of converting the territories of the great nations that are at the present moment virtually threatening war against each other in the covert terms of diplomacy, into a federation of world states that would involve the nearest approach possible to a veritable heaven upon earth.

One or other of these results is inevitable as a consequence of the effects of the development of machinery, which is gradually and of necessity supplanting its less profitable human rival. The idiotic conception that Capitalism functions with such equity that everlasting life must be its portion, arises from a most absurd sophistry embodied in the statement that 100 per cent. of the discarded human machines are used again under conditions of full labor-time in the extra factories called into being at the instance of luxury; indeed, there are men who appear to be otherwise in the full possession of their senses who hold the mathematically impossible tenet that the continued development of machinery, far from causing unemployment, actually provides additional employment by virtue of the necessities of certain new trades such as those that sprang up incidentally to the needs of automobilists. They seem to be completely unconscious of the fact that most of the old trades have been socialized, and that the work done by such a man as a skilled carpenter is now accomplished by a boy, a woman or an unskilled laborer who knows enough to turn a wheel or to do similar service in a sash and door factory.

Watchmakers who used to make by hand the parts needed for time-pieces, can now buy them factory-made at a very low price, and the same may be said of most, if not of all the other skilled trades; as a matter of fact when men are re-employed they do not lose their inventive genius by reason of the change of work. Inventions are bound to have as much vogue in the new factories as in the old, and we might add that when new inventions are introduced into a factory the great object in view is the cutting down of expenses by using cheaper labor-power than that produced by so many "hands," and this is as it should be. We want to see machinery developed to the pitch where it will take the place of man in production. With the infinite quantity of power involved in the use of machinery at his disposal, man ought to be able to give 90 per cent. of his time to self-culture, mental, physical and ethical, but this he can never do until he learns how to make machinery in the aggregate pay for his education and for the environment that must be created if he would have a sufficient quantity of his fellows interested in the same.

Machinery to day is gradually bringing about the destruction of the old social order. It must necessarily create more and more unemployment until eventually we change the conditions under which this state of affairs exists, or deliberately commit evolutionary suicide.

Here is a passage taken from Syms and Wrong's "Public School" history concerning the power of machinery, not only to produce goods, but to cause, if necessary, the substitution of one boy for one hundred workers. On page 254 there is the following reference to James Hargreaves' Spinning-Jenny—"A child could manage the new spinning machine and it did the work which formerly required one hundred spinners." This meant that approximately 99 per cent. of the spinners were thrown out of work wherever this machine was introduced, and, of course, on pain of commercial death it was found necessary to introduce it everywhere. Most, if not all other industries, are affected more or less in the same way.

The following excerpt from the "Vancouver Province" of February 13th, 1923 (and published in "Clarion" 910) will throw further light upon the subject:—

"In the steel industry one or two men with unloaders replace twelve to twenty men unloading by hand.

In furnace charging by use of the skip hoist, larry car and automatic weigher, two men replace fourteen.

In pig casting, seven men with a casting machine replace sixty.

In open hearth operations, one operator with a charging machine replaces forty hand chargers.

With travelling cranes, twelve men pouring, replace thirty-seven.

Two men unloading pig-iron with an electric magnet and crane replace one hundred and twenty-eight.

In the clothing industry, six men operating two boarding machines replace twenty-eight. One girl operating a rib cutting machine produces twenty-five times more than by hand. In men's clothing in various processes, machines with a single operator replace six and eight workers.

In the shoe industry, one lasting machine produces the equivalent of six to ten hand workers.

In the glass industry, one type bottle machine replaces fifty-four workers.

In the window glass industry, production with a machine blower increases thirty to fifty times.

In coal mines an automatic conveyor for pier loading with twelve men replaces one hundred and fifty men.

In cigar making, four operators with machines, produce the equivalent of fifteen by hand.

In wrapping machinery for bread, tobacco, chewing gum, cigarettes, soap, sugar and razor blades, one wrapping machine with one operator replaces as high as forty hand workers.

The tendency to replace hand workers by machinery is spreading to every branch of industry and business. Even in offices, adding machines, book-keeping machines, and other devices are gradually replacing the old clerk of other days."

An analysis of these figures will show that roughly speaking, out of six hundred and thirty-three men employed in various industries, only fifty-two or about 8.15th per cent. retained their jobs after the introduction of the new machines.

Is it possible, in the face of these figures, to imagine that all the hands are re-employed on the old terms? This might have been the case at the beginning of the industrial revolution, but to-day conditions are different. An examination of statistics concerning unemployment for the last few years will prove that it has now reached the chronic stage all over the civilized world: obviously it is here not only to stay, but to grow worse. That is predicated by the conditions that cause it.

Indeed we can further deduce that it has developed into a disease. We don't say it is incurable, since common sense would indicate that a judicious transformation of those social institutions, that are responsible for it would be bound to effect cure.

What we need today is an industrial government based on the public ownership of the means of life. That, and that alone can divert the forces that are now working inexorably towards a future condition of anarchy into the channels opening on further development. It may be that we are not quite fitted for such a super-institution: but it should be our business; indeed it should be our religion, to prepare ourselves as soon as we possibly can by taking into consideration the economic laws that inexorably influence the whole course of our lives

"Till each man find his own in all men's good  
And all men work in noble brotherhood,  
Breaking their mailed fleets and armed towers,  
And ruling by obeying Nature's powers  
And gathering all the fruits of earth and crown'd  
with all her flowers."

## MANIFESTO

of the  
SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA  
(Fifth Edition)

Per copy ..... 10 cents

Per 25 copies ..... \$2

Post Paid.

# Revolutions : Social and Political

BY J. HARRINGTON

## ARTICLE TWENTY-FOUR

THE mutiny of the line regiments that were sent to seize the cannon of the National Guard and the shooting of its Generals, Thomas and Lecomte, removed every possible chance of a pacific solution between the large towns and the group of politicians into whose hands the government had fallen. War, though now inevitable, the Commune was loth to invoke, having in mind difficulties which some "real" revolutionists of these piping days of peace apparently overlook: the victorious German army, whose crushing defeat of the French army in a few weeks had caused a panic in every capital in Europe; the adverse and monarchist vote of the country; their own pitifully inadequate resources consequent upon a five months' siege, to mention a few.

But events brook no argument, however logical, nor can eloquence stay their onward march. It is the prerogative of the ruling class of all times to deal in death with a calm and unruffled conscience, as it is the fate of all subject classes to endure to the limit every form of suffering and degradation before choosing between misery without an end and an end without misery.

It is not our task to solve that riddle, but we wish to emphasise this strange phenomenon—the multitude which on March 18, 1871 shouted, "Long Live the Commune" was practically the same which thronged the streets of Paris on July 19, 1870 shouting, "To Berlin." To expect in the space of eight months that these people should have become Socialists, intent upon a Social Revolution, is asking much more than the law allows.

The Paris Commune becomes a working class tragedy because, with the advent of war every other class fled and left them holding the bag. The cup was found in Benjamin's sack. It is not because the Commune in itself proclaimed any marked proletarian principle, but because the tribunals which condemned to imprisonment and death over a thousand clerks, three thousand laborers, fifteen hundred shoe-makers, twenty-five hundred metal workers and engineers, two thousand stone masons, five hundred goldsmiths, etc. These, from a very long list, will be sufficient when compared with one hundred teachers, one hundred instrument makers; no lawyers, preachers, grocers, nor gentlemen; saving your presence, yer reverence!

Remembering that the events which dragged these workers into a life and death struggle were solely matters of importance to the ruling and business classes, and reading Thiers' speech to the men who overthrew them, "When I see these sons of our soil, strangers often to an education that elevates, die for you, for us, I am profoundly touched," we are safe in declaring that for the Master Class this is the best of all possible worlds. The mistakes of the Commune have been gone over and over again and again. This is a pleasant pastime for a certain type of mind. We find no relish to it. Their mistakes were such, because they were called upon to act a part for which no preliminary training had been permitted, and for which the leaders had not the slightest aptitude.

Theatrical and romantic, they acted their part not under the circumstances of the hour, but in the atmosphere of 1792. This, we have pointed out before, is a very common human failing and can be indulged with pleasure if not with profit at most times, but a revolution is not an opportune moment to display histrionic ability. To dare: to dare again: and yet again to dare is an excellent plan, but we must know how, and what to dare. The Commune suffered in the first place principally from a lack of authority. Three different groups exercised power,—the Commune, being the city government, the Central Committee, elected pending the choosing of a government and after April 2nd the Committee of

Public Safety, an attempt at Dictatorship. To hear some of the neo-Marxists, real Marxists if you please, rave about the Commune failing to establish a Dictatorship we might infer that this was an oversight. Such is not the case. The Dictatorship simply would not establish. No one had that power which is essential to imposing a Dictatorship, and each group was determined not to be dictated to by any of the others.

The "real" Marxists imagine, or would lead us to believe they imagine a Dictatorship is some kind of a machine which might be built at will, and that pure perversity alone accounts for its absence. The Committee of Public Safety was a farce, and its members were mere mouthers. While these three groups wrangled and jawed, recriminated and denounced, the Versailles troops, under a dictatorship crept steadily nearer; forts fell, after superhuman efforts on the part of their defenders, who repeatedly asked for support, and the last remnants of the desperate bands would be in Paris for hours before the Department of War was aware of the disasters. The brilliant Rossel, so imposing in council, so calm and plausible, failed utterly in practical matters, but notwithstanding his futility and pomposity he continued to impress them in council until, ordered under arrest, he fled.

Again, on the first of May an attempt at Dictatorship was made, but this Committee of Public Safety was no more favored than its predecessor and the wrangling continued, and continued too the successes of the Versailles.

Several attempts had been made to reconcile Paris and Versailles, the Masonic Order particularly exerted itself in this hopeless task, but Thiers was now assured of victory and his conciliatory speeches of the first-week of the breach were now changed for an adamant demand "to punish the brigands." The Masons, finding a compromise impossible, draped their banners over the walls and some more theatricals were indulged in, during which they declared for the Commune regardless of the final issue.

The Pole, Dombrowski, who with his fellow countrymen Wroblenski was the only capable military leader at the service of the Commune, assumed supreme command in the closing days of the struggle, but it was too late. The herculean labors of the Parisian proletariat were incapable of wresting victory from that terrible situation; their long struggle had brought part of the country to their aid, but there was no concerted effort, and Bismarck released with each new danger to Versailles, a fresh batch of war prisoners. On the 21st of May the government troops entered Paris through the Gate of St. Cloud, informed by one of their numerous spies, Ducatel by name, of the absence of any troops in the vicinity. At that very moment a General staff officer, addressing the crowd who had been listening to the concert in the gardens of the Tuilleries declared—"Thiers promised to enter Paris yesterday; he did not enter; he will not enter. I invite you to come here next Sunday to the same place, to our second concert for the benefit of the widows and orphans of those who have fallen in the defence of the Commune."

If there are any lessons to be learned from the Paris Commune, the principal one is—to so order our warfare that the exact movements of the enemy be at all times known, and that no super-revolutionary fervor be allowed to rise between our mentality and the real state of the battlefield. Ducatel might betray and Thiers might intrigue, yet the one can be frustrated and the other overwhelmed, but in the grip of a supreme indifference to the real facts of life we are as hopelessly helpless as a twig in a maelstrom. When the dispatch from Dombrowski that the enemy was within the walls reached the Committee of Public Safety, they were trying Cluseret for treason, on the most trivial of street

gossip, and miserable spitefulness, for evidence. From then to the last day of May was nine long days of heroic effort and military impotence.

We cannot go into that nightmare, that vale of horrors; suffice that against hopeless odds the workers of Paris held barricade after barricade until the last stand of the Heights of Belleville left the vanquished at the mercy of the most infuriated master class in history. We do not care to go into the hell which followed that terrible defeat. Lissagaray in his "History of the Paris Commune" paints the picture in all its sordid details. But with that fall the bourgeoisie came into their own. Thiers, the Monarchist, became President of the Third Republic by the same means that Napoleon became Emperor. The contending Monarchies could not peacefully settle the panic-stricken bourgeoisie. And so, after all the political revolutions since 1848, political revolutions of such magnitude as have not been seen within Capitalism, far beyond the few days' struggle which gave Russia her opportunity to attempt a social revolution, after all the strife and all the bloodshed and suffering, the capitalist class achieved its social revolution and settled down to enjoy the fruits of its long struggle.

We will require one more spasm to close "this strange eventful history" in order to again emphasise that historical fact, which must not be ignored.

Political Revolutions can be made by men. Social Revolution can arise only through events.

## HERE AND NOW.

There is more to worry about than to enthuse over, Here and Now, nicer and more handsome cash totals than those recorded here below being the standard of measurement as in days of yore. We are never satisfied, you say. Well, just shoot the figures up and up and we'll promise to tell you when to stop. Don't stop with these:—

Following \$1 each: Jim Quinn, A. Tree, Mrs. Dey, Miss Mary Williamson, D. MacPherson, C. E. Scharff, P. Wallgren, W. A. Pritchard, Arthur Jordan, E. Clements, T. Hanwell, J. McDonald, "K.", K. MacLeod, H. Reed, O. Erickson, H. Lahti, M. Farrell, O. Peterson, J. Jacobs, F. A. Charters.

Following \$2 each: R. Law, H. W. Speed, N. P. Dugan, A. C. Roga, Wm. Dorney.

Mrs. Burrough 50 cents; G. Beagrie \$4; Jim Cartwright \$4.

Above, Clarion subs. received from 14th to 27th March, inclusive, total \$39.50.

## CLARION MAINTENANCE FUND.

J. Dennis 50 cents; J. McLennan \$1.50; Harry Williams \$1; "J. A. K." 50 cents; J. W. Jamieson \$1; D. MacPherson \$1; P. Wallgren 50 cents; A. G. McCallum \$5; Local Equity, Alberta (per A. Jorgenson) \$5.

Above, C. M. F. receipts from 14th to 27th March, inclusive, total \$16.

## COMMUNE CELEBRATION.

The Commune Celebration was decidedly a success from everybody's standpoint, if comments upon the event mean anything. The music was good, dancing and eats were enjoyable, and below stairs—where questions and discussions were unofficially in order—there was a full house.

The committee members and all who co-operated with them in the really hard work of effecting the arrangements are to be congratulated on their efforts.

**THE MACHINE PROCESS**

(By Thorstein Veblen, in "The Theory of Business Enterprise").

**I**n its bearing on modern life and modern business, the "machine process" means something more comprehensive and less external than a mere aggregate of mechanical appliances for the mediation of human labor. It means that, but it means something more than that. The civil engineer, the mechanical engineer, the navigator, the mining expert, the industrial chemist and mineralogist, the electrician,—the work of all these falls within the lines of the modern machine process, as well as the work of the inventor who devises the appliances of the process and that of the mechanic who puts the inventions into effect and oversees their working. The scope of the process is larger than the machine. In those branches of industry in which machine methods have been introduced, many agencies which are not to be classed as mechanical appliances, simply, have been drawn into the process, and have become integral factors in it. Chemical properties of minerals, e.g., are counted on in the carrying out of metallurgical processes with much the same certainty and calculable effect as are the motions of those mechanical appliances by whose use the minerals are handled. The sequence of the process involves both the one and the other, both the apparatus and the materials, in such intimate interaction that the process cannot be spoken of simply as an action of the apparatus upon the materials. It is not simply that the apparatus reshapes the materials; the materials reshape themselves by the help of the apparatus. Similarly in such other processes as the refining of petroleum, oil, or sugar; in the work of the industrial chemical laboratories; in the use of wind, water or electricity, etc.

Wherever manual dexterity, the rule of thumb, and the fortuitous conjunctures of the seasons have been supplanted by a reasoned procedure on the basis of a systematic knowledge of the forces employed, there the mechanical industry is to be found, even in the absence of intricate mechanical contrivances. It is a question of the character of the process rather than a question of the complexity of the contrivances employed. Chemical, agricultural, and animal industries, as carried on by the characteristically modern methods and in due touch with the market, are to be included in the modern complex of mechanical industry:

No one of the mechanical processes carried on by the use of a given outfit of appliances is independent of other processes going on elsewhere. Each draws upon and presupposes the proper working of many other processes of a similarly mechanical character. None of the processes in the mechanical industries is self-sufficing. Each follows some and precedes other processes in an endless sequence, into which each must adapt its own working. The whole concert of industrial operations is to be taken as a machine process, made up of interlocking detail processes, rather than as a multiplicity of mechanical appliances each doing its particular work in severalty. This comprehensive industrial process draws into its scope and turns to account all branches of knowledge that have to do with the material sciences, and the whole makes a more or less delicately balanced complex of sub processes.

Looked at in this way the industrial process shows two well-marked general characteristics: (a) the running maintenance of interstitial adjustments between the several sub-processes or branches of industry, wherever in their working they touch one another in the sequence of industrial elaboration; and (b) an unremitting requirement of quantitative precision, accuracy in point of time and sequence, in the proper inclusion and exclusion of forces affecting the outcome, in the magnitude of the various physical characteristics (weight, size, density, hardness, tensile strength, elasticity, temperature, chemical reaction, actinic sensitiveness, etc.) of the materials handled as well as of the appliances employed. This requirement of mechanical accuracy and nice adaptation to specific uses has led to a gradual pervading enforcement of uniformity, to a reduction to staple grades and staple

character in the materials handled, and to a thorough standardizing of tools and units of measurement. Standard physical measurements are of the essence of the machine's regime.

The modern industrial communities show an unprecedented uniformity and precise equivalence in legally adopted weights and measures. Something of this kind would be brought about by the needs of commerce, even without the urgency given to the movement for uniformity by the requirements of the machine industry. But within the industrial field the movement for standardization has outrun the urging of commercial needs, and has penetrated every corner of the mechanical industries. The specifically commercial need of uniformity in weights and measures of merchantable goods and in monetary units has not carried standardization in these items to the extent to which the mechanical need of the industrial process has carried out a sweeping standardization in the means by which the machine process works, as well as in the products which it turns out.

As a matter of course, tools and the various structural materials used are made of standard sizes, shapes, and gauges. When the dimensions, in fractions of an inch or in millimetres, and the weight, in fractions of a pound or in grammes, are given, the expert foreman or workman, confidently and without reflection, infers the rest of what need be known of the uses to which any given item that passes under his hand may be turned. The adjustment and adaption of part to part and of process to process has passed out of the category of craftsmanlike skill into the category of mechanical standardization. Hence, perhaps, the greatest, most wide-reaching gain in productive celerity and efficiency through modern methods, and hence the largest saving of labor in modern industry.

(To be continued in next issue)

**SUPPLY AND DEMAND.**

**T**HIS law decrees that all commodities placed on the market for sale or exchange shall be subject to the laws of the market. Its mandate, when correctly understood, excludes the caprice or will of any individual buyer or seller. Buyers go to the market with the intention of buying as cheaply as they can. Sellers go with the purpose of selling as dearly as they can. When the market is in favor of the sellers prices have a tendency to rise, and vice-versa when conditions on the market are against them. When things become harder to sell, the sellers are forced to ask less for them. Increased difficulty to sell therefore means keener competition on the part of those having similar commodities for sale. It implies giving the same quantity for a lesser price, or more for the same price. In brief, it is with this continued wrangle between buyers and sellers and the relation between supply and demand that prices are determined. Without this antagonism of interests we cannot imagine prices falling when goods are plentiful and rising when the supply exceeds demand.

**TERMINOLOGY WITH A DIFFERENCE.**

**I**N the days of Rome and Greece the hewing of wood and drawing of water was strictly a slave's work. The slave's function then was to keep his master in ease and comfort; for no other reason were slaves kept in bondage. So too is it with the wage workers of today. What wages the workers receive in exchange for producing the world's wealth are only equivalent to cover the cost of the food, clothing and shelter that forms their keep from day to day. Commodity production is the direct result of wage labor. Those who receive wages produce the commodities. Those who pay the wages own the commodities. In estimating the time to produce the workers' standard of living it may well be called necessary labor, it being sufficient to cover the cost of the workers' keep, and that any portion over and above this would imply surplus labor or surplus products. In other words, "Necessary Labor" produces "Necessary Product" and realizes itself in "Necessary Value." "Surplus Labor" produces "Surplus Product" and manifests itself in "Surplus Value." In speaking of commod-

ities in general it seems out of place to characterize commodity production as being of a social nature, that a commodity is a social product and that its value is determined by the socially necessary labor, or, necessary social labor involved in its production. C. K. speaks of a distinction with a difference, but I fail to see it. In my estimation commodity production is strictly a class function and if wages signify anything at all it tells us that the production of the world's commodities have been paid for in full. The workers today hew the wood, draw the water, dig the coal, smelt the iron, etc., very degrading occupations I admit, fit only for slaves to do, and if we must speak of value do not let us insult our masters by crediting them with doing something that we would run away from if we could.

It is not often I indulge in spilling ink and I hope this brief article conveys what I intended, namely, Commodity Production is a Class Function, and therefore a Class Product, not a social one, and the value of a commodity is determined by the average labor involved in its production.

**MUST WE REVISE THE MANIFESTO?**

**D**AY, by day the class line is being drawn tighter and tighter. The gap between the possessed and dispossessed stands out clearer than ever it did before. "Individual masters no longer exploit individual workers by means of private property in the means of production. On both sides individuals have been submerged. On one hand the working class collectively produce the world's wealth and on the other hand the capitalist class collectively own the means of production, etc." see pages 24-44 S. P. of C. manifesto. In other words, wage workers today collectively supply the directive and physical ability that makes commodity production possible. The capitalist class collectively own the instruments of production and by virtue of ownership collectively own the wealth accruing from its operating. Here we have two distinct class functions. (One performed by Slaves and the Other by Masters.) It being the function of slaves to produce commodities then why not brand them with a proper trade mark—A Slave Product—instead of—a social product.

To state that workers and employees enter into certain definite relations over the buying and selling of labor power does not make the buying and selling of labor power a social transaction but rather a "Class Transaction." as a result of which we have commodity production. In the last analysis the workers have not a vestige of right to what they produce, therefore, commodities are neither "Socially Produced nor Socially Owned." As all commodities are the direct result of wage labor it would naturally follow the value of commodities is determined **Not** by the necessary social labor, etc., but by the "Average Wage Labor Involved in Their Production."

In conclusion, the writer would like to say that socialist terminology, phraseology, is no exception to the law of change. Its building up and breaking down will go on whether the printer wills it or not. For example let us take the Party Platform. Why, it's only a few years ago since it was made more concise and consistent, to harmonise with the object and tactics of the Party. I admit taking part in the agenda then, and now that distinctions with differences have arisen I pen these few lines to test the strength or weakness of our position.

A. G. McCALLUM.

**ECONOMIC CAUSES  
OF WAR**

By PETER T. LEUKIE.

**NOW READY**

Preface by the author.

**132 PAGES.**

Per Copy, 25 Cents.

Ten copies up, 20 cents each.

Post Paid.

## Correspondence

### BREAKING UP THE CAPITALIST SYSTEM BY TEACHING THE CITIZENS TO PRODUCE MORE.

Editor Clarion:—

At a lecture given by Professor Boving on the 22nd February 1924, on Manure and Manuring at the Municipal Hall, South Vancouver, some ideas were given forth by him which I think were very crude from one of his high professional standing.

The professor began his lecture with a short talk on the present economic situation and was really in earnest and talked in a dogmatic manner about it.

He said, after some introductory remarks, that what we the audience (back yard gardeners) were doing was just making a bad condition worse. We were, he said, producing goods for which there was not any need, as the market was already glutted with all manner of agricultural and horticultural produce. He seemed to think that we were only aggravating the situation.

He said also that there were times where we performed a useful function; for instance: when the war was on and all the goods produced were needed we performed a national good (these are not the words used but express the same meaning). That is, when we were helping the ruling classes to kill and maim a large portion of society we were the best kind of citizens, but now if one produced goods that another citizen had to sell in order to live we were less good than we were before. What do you know about that!?

Professors have queer ideas sometimes!

Now, I will try to show here that it doesn't matter whether we back-yard gardeners produce or refrain from producing; the same bad conditions will prevail as long as capitalism lasts. The professor led me to think that he thought we would be much better off if we had a lesser production, also that the reason the farmers were in such a sorry plight was on account of over-production. I will ask the professor and other of like opinions to draw a triangle and just think for a spell that it contains inside of it all the goods produced by the workers, farmers and gardeners in this Canada of theirs. All the commodities in Canada are in that triangle. By whom was this produced? The workers surely; all the workers in Canada produced all that is in this big triangle. Now (Professor and others) just draw a triangle half the size of the first, and since you seem to think that we would be better off with less commodities in the market we will say that this second triangle has only half as many commodities as the first triangle. It will be obvious to every one that it would only take half the workers to fill the second triangle that it took the first, since it is only half the size. The workers get wages for producing goods and farmers get what they can for their product; they take these wages and buy goods with them, but wages only buy a portion of that great amount of produce. There is a large stock of goods on hand after the workers and farmers have exhausted their buying power. Who else need goods after the workers are supplied in any country? Only the bourgeoisie; that takes in all the capitalists and their henchmen of all kinds. Well, this portion buys all it wants and still there are a lot of commodities left over. What means have nations of disposing of this surplus? There is only the foreign market left, and if there is a large army of workers producing goods we will want large and wide markets; with a curtailed production, we will need a lesser market but it will be just in proportion to the producers in any given capitalist country.

But now (Professor and others), these markets are not in existence. All other capitalistic countries have this same large volume (speaking relatively) of goods, and all have their large surplus to sell with nowhere to sell all of it. That is the trouble, Professor; a curtailing of production will not solve the problem; but production for use and not for profit will solve it. "There isn't any one so blind as those who do not wish to see." These are not all highly paid Professors. No: many of them are slaves.

If Professor Boving could find those required markets in which the surplus goods could be disposed of, the capitalists of the British Empire would take the crown off King George's head and place it on the Professor's, and I think they would also give him a larger salary than they are now giving his royal ribs.

A word now about his lecture proper. With my knowledge of agriculture I realized that he knew his subject very thoroughly, and it should help many of the amateur gardeners to grow two spuds where they only grew a small one before, thereby increasing production, and by increasing production we will, in my opinion (and I have given this part of economics a lot of study), end the awful mess of capitalism we are in very much sooner than in any other way we can go about it, and what we produce we should see to it to the best of our ability that society does not waste it. The capitalist system lives largely by wasting useful products. This is incontestable. Strikes only prolong the awful agony that the workers suffer and at this late day only work in the interest of the capitalist class; they get the chance to use up the surplus wealth (goods) thereby getting a new lease of life.

P.S. So you see Mr. Editor and readers that the learned Professor although he thinks that by curtailing produc-

tion prosperous conditions would come about, yet all his work increases production, for which I for one am duly thankful; may he keep on with the good work!

Vancouver, B. C. Wm. P. BLACK.  
February 29, 1924.

BY THE WAY.

Editor Clarion:—

You wouldn't be interested in a dream I had recently would you? It has the merit of being true. Dinkum. I had been much impressed with C's series of articles headed, By the Way, in the "Clarion." They were so well reasoned, so sane and practical, so fascinating. Regarding many points he made had I not thought often on similar lines myself? And, you know, there are none think so true as he who thinks as I do. I went to bed with my head full of it. I dreamt I could fly and set off to your country to get a copy of this wisdom for use at home. I was courteously received and welcomed by Mr. C. It seemed he had been expecting me, for he already had what I required tied up in a neat little bundle and label "A Working Class Philosophy, a Programme and Tactics," by C., as previously published in the "Western Clarion" under the heading, By the Way. He assisted me to strap it across my shoulders in such a way as not to impede my flying. How snug and cosy it felt, so soft and comforting. I felt very happy; I had got what I wanted and, thanking Mr. C. for his kindness, with a light heart I headed straight for home. I flew strongly for a couple of hours or so when suddenly I became aware that I was returning to where I had left Mr. C. Of course I felt disappointed to find I had flown so long in a circle and wasted so much time. I would be more careful next time, and I set off again; but to my amazement in a shorter time I found I had again gone in a circle. I was much annoyed for I had been flying well. I set out again determined I would reach home this time, but it was of no use; in ever narrowing circles I would keep returning to my starting point until it became impossible for me to progress. I began to "get the wind up," I could not understand it; my wings were in perfect order and working well. I had previously felt a slight movement within the bundle on my back; surely that could not have anything to do with it? I alighted, and, taking the bundle off my back opened it to examine its contents. There it lay, each item neatly packed and fitting nicely one against the other, the whole enclosed in an old copy of the "Clarion." As I opened the packet every item fell apart from its fellow and commenced to roll all over the place; they seemed like a lot of mischievous shining littleimps out to enjoy themselves. I tried to tie them up in the bundle again but do what I would I could not get them

to set into their place; some would always roll out to tantalize me. However C. had managed to get them all to lie so snugly together beat me. I could not control them. It seemed to me that a central imp was wanted to act as a ring pin to hold them together, but I could not think of its name. I searched closely throughout the packet for one that might fill the bill but there was not a suitable one there; surely C. had not forgotten to put it in. It was while making a closer search that my eye fell on a line in the "Clarion" wrapper: it read, "All written history is a history of class struggles." Ah! that was it. The Class Struggle, that was the missing imp, the Ring-pin so necessary to control and direct the others. C. had not included it in his outfit. Unknown to me its absence had unbalanced my load and caused me to fly continually in circles. It was no use my trying further to hold the otherimps in control without it, so, much to my disappointment I was forced to leave them where they were. Tell C. he will find them lying on the road leading to the local dope factory.

New Zealand 24/2/24.

A. H. G.

### ALBERTA NOTES.

S. P. of C. Local Calgary, No. 86.

Economics Class held every Tuesday, 8 p.m.

History Class held every Friday, 8 p.m.

Both at Headquarters, 134a 9th Ave. West.

Propaganda Meetings every Sunday at 8 p.m. at Empress Theatre, 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	80c
Ethics and History	80c
Germs of Mind in Plants	80c
The Triumph of Life	80c
Feurbavk	80c
Social Revolution (Kautsky)	80c
Origin of Species (Darwin)	1.15
Essays on Materialist	
Conception of History (Labriola)	1.50
Social Studies (Lafargue)	80c
Paper Covers.	Per Copy
Evolution of Man (Prof. Bolsche)	25c
Wage-Labor and Capital	10c
Independent Working Class Education	10c
Communist Manifesto	10c
The Present Economic System (Prof. W. A. Bonger)	10c
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific	15c
Slave of the Farm	10c
Manifesto, S. P. of C.	10c
Causes of Belief in God (Lafargue)	10c
The State and Revolution (Lenin)	25c
Value, Price and Profit (Marx)	15c
Two Essays on History (C. Stephenson and G. Deville)	5c
Economic Causes of War (Leckie)	25c
Civil War in France (Marx)	35c
Christianism and Communism (Bishop W. M. Brown)	25c

Quantity Rates on Paper Covered Pamphlets.	
Two Essays on History	25 copies 75c
Communist Manifesto	25 copies \$2.00
Wage-Labor and Capital	25 copies \$2.00
Present Economic System	25 copies \$1.50
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific	25 copies \$3.25
Slave of the Farm	25 copies \$1.50
Manifesto of S. P. of C.	25 copies \$2.00
Evolution of Man	25 copies \$3.75
Causes of Belief in God	25 copies \$2.00
Value, Price and Profit	25 copies \$3.25
Economic Causes of War	10 copies \$3.00
Christianism and Communism	5 copies \$1.00

All prices include postage.

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

### SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Obey that impulse and subscribe for the

**WESTERN CLARION**

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

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

Name .....

Address .....

## PLATFORM

### Socialist Party of Canada

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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