

WESTERN CLARION

Official Organ of
THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

A Journal of
SOCIALIST
EVENTS

HISTORY
ECONOMICS
PHILOSOPHY

No. 225 TWENTIETH YEAR Twice a Month VANCOUVER, B. C., OCTOBER 16, 1924.

FIVE CENTS

Joseph and His Brethern

By "GEORDIE"

The Labour Theory of Value in Karl Marx. By H. W. B. Joseph. Fellow and Tutor of New College, Oxford. Oxford University Press. 4s. 6d.

THEY do not improve, these Marx critics. They're getting worse. Comes now Mr. Joseph of Oxford and I have wasted these two evenings grubbing in his particular midden and have become effectually bemerged and positively put out. One could, of course, have recourse to the vocabulary of Skatology, say what should be said and be done with it. But the "mot de Cambroune," however satisfying and, at times, effective it may be, is not argument and does not fill space. An ounce of civit, good apothecary. As the late King David once remarked, one does well to be angry once in a while and I freely confess that this fellow annoys me. There are Marx critics that one can enjoy reading and I could have almost forgiven this one if he had given expression to one generous thought or, what would be too much to expect, given any indication that he knew he was snapping at the heels of a man immeasurably greater than himself.

It appears that Mr. Joseph is of opinion that the Marxian Theory of Value "has been rejected and refuted by others" and avows that his critique is not intended to "slay the slain" (p. 17). However, whether or not he thinks he can improve on the slaying process it is evident that previous killings have not been very effective since he finds that "its actual hold on the minds of great masses of men is very strong, and that it does not a little to embitter their thoughts." (p. 15). It is also significant that he finds that "it makes their justified resentment at the working of the economic order take the form of denouncing one definite alleged injustice:" a vague, indefinite discontent can always be countered by just such sophistical nihilism as constitutes so much of this book.

"It is perhaps true," says our author, "that there are three outstanding elements in Karl Marx's teaching. One is the economic interpretation of history . . . one is his analysis of the actual course and growth of modern capitalistic industry. . . . The third is his theory of value. . . . With the first two of these doctrines this book is not concerned. (p. 7).

It is hardly necessary for me to say that, while Mr. Joseph accepts, in its "broad" sense, the "economic interpretation" of history, this is where he gets off on the wrong foot right at the start. The Marxian doctrine can only be understood and must be studied as a comprehensive whole. See, besides the "orthodox" authorities, Veblen in "The Place of Science" on this point.

Mr. Joseph also finds that Marx "identifies exchange-value with value simply," (p. 34); that Marx holds that "the value of commodities depends on the amount of socially-necessary labor embodied in them" (p. 44), "that the exchange-relations of commodities are determined by the amount of labor-time incorporated in them" (p. 56) and that, in spite of all this, Marx "admits" that commodities do not exchange in accordance with the relative amounts of labor embodied in them.

So this it is only necessary to say that Marx was very careful to distinguish Value and exchange-value; that his theory of exchange-value or Price is

quite in accordance with the facts and that he was at considerable pains to shew that prices did not, and could not as a general rule, conform to Values. All this I have already treated exhaustively elsewhere.

As to surplus value Mr. Joseph alleges that "according to Marx a capitalist makes his profit by paying his workmen less than the real value of their labor (p. 23), . . . Here lies the fundamental injustice of the capitalist system. An exchange is only just when the things exchanged embody equal amounts of human labor. When for what embodies so many hours of human labor that is given which embodies fewer hours of it, the exchange is unjust. There are doubtless many other unjust exchanges, but the constant all-pervasive form of it in a capitalist society is in wage-payment. The employer takes from the wage-earner, in the materials on which the wage-earner works, more labor, and so more value, than he gives him in his wage or the commodities to which it is equivalent. Thus he amasses surplus-value; he becomes richer unjustly by mere exchange." (p. 43).

Now, these statements, considered as an expression of the teachings of Marx, are very defective. It seems incredible that anyone could possibly have read a chapter of Marx and remain ignorant of the distinction between labor and labor-power. This is the more inexcusable as this distinction is not merely verbal or conceptual but is physical and objective. In any case, if this differentiation is not made, the theory of surplus-value can not be stated.

In the second place, these statements err fundamentally and are completely vitiated by the importation of the idea of justice into the proposition. Marx could not possibly have said what is here attributed to him. And if, as I have already observed, Mr. Joseph had tried to understand the question as a whole, he would have seen this. The category surplus-value is a fact of the capitalist system; so is the concept of "justice" engendered by the system. The wage contract and the exploitation which it implies are therefore just and equitable within the limits of that system and so long as the same is played according to the rules.

In consideration of all this I am, therefore, absolved from following our author into all the absurd conclusions that he draws from these erroneous findings of his. Mr. Joseph has not improved upon his predecessors in this field, indeed, it would be correct to say that he is merely a belated survivor of a once flourishing industry now almost extinct.

Several years ago one Vladimir G. Simkhovitch, professor in Columbia University, a man of wide reading and singularly well-equipped, essayed this same task and, incidentally, took occasion to slam his brother critics. It is no accident that in the photograph he gives of them he should have managed to give, in advance, an accurate picture of our friend Joseph. The following quotations are from his book "Marxism versus Socialism" which is not only readable but worth reading. Of course this same Simkhovitch slips up himself on quite a number of points but that does not detract from what he says in this connection.

"The literature of protest against Marxism is already vast, yet, with the notable exception of such writings as those of Bohm-Bawerk, Seligman, Sombart and Stummier, who have dealt with special aspects of the system, the bulk of that literature proves conclusively to the well-informed reader that reason is but a fig-leaf for emotion. Too obvious in most instances is the critic's desire to emulate St. George and slay the dragon, even if personal modesty clothes the brave onslaught in the humble garb of scientific research. With these critics emotions run riot. They have in their zeal attempted the impossible; to kill the dragon without seeing him. That even St. George could not have done. Such criticism, carried on for two generations, has naturally established a tradition: a man of straw has been constructed for the express use of Marx's critics.

Of the current misconceptions of the Marxian system, the most fundamental and most general is the opinion that the labor-theory of value is the corner-stone of Marxian socialism. From this is derived the equally erroneous opinion that Marx's demand for social justice stands or falls with his theory of value. . . . This ethical interpretation of the Marxian theory of value and the desire to base socialism upon this theory are characteristic of the bulk of the academic literature about Marx. . . . By making an ethical labor-theory of value the spring and center of Marxian socialism, one thereby wipes out the difference between the sentimental, utopian socialism of the first half of the last century and modern so-called scientific socialism. Most of the academic writers have attributed to Marxian theory precisely this sentimental character, but without drawing the logical conclusion. . . . Whatever the faults and merits of Marx's theory of value may be, it was not intended as an ethical basis for socialism, but as a means of interpreting economic phenomena. It is quite true that his theory of value is the central theory upon which his economic analysis of the capitalistic system rests,—in short, the foundation of his economic doctrine; but this theory plays no part whatsoever in his socialistic doctrine, which purports to be nothing more than a demonstration that socialism is inevitable. . . . How then did it happen that it was the theory of surplus value that primarily drew the fire of the learned economists; and why did most of them seem to think that in disproving that theory they had delivered a mortal blow to modern socialism? First of all, perhaps, because certain socialist agitators tried to make emotional capital out of the theory of surplus value. This circumstance cannot, however, serve as an excuse for scholars who have undertaken to criticize Marxian socialism. Even if they deemed it unnecessary to study Marx's own writings, they could have learned from many a propagandist leaflet what part the theory of surplus value actually plays in the Marxian system. Secondly—and this probably furnishes in most cases the truer explanation of their misconceptions—they were not sufficiently impressed by the peculiarities of Marxian socialism to be disposed to draw a sharp line between the socialism of Marx and the socialism of his predecessors. It seemed to them, probably, like making two bites of a cherry: socialism is socialism, and its variations are but differences in shade. All pre-Marxian socialism was distinctly ethical; every peroration against capitalism contained or implied an appeal for social justice. Whenever the word "exploitation" was used, they accordingly thought themselves justified in looking for the usual end of the sermon. When Marx, in his Capital, describes the development of the English factory system, he does not mince matters. He makes the respectable English Blue-books, to use Bernard Shaw's phrase, convict capital "of wholesale spoliation, murder and compulsory prostitution; of plague, pestilence and famine; of battle, murder and sudden death." The citation of those deplorable facts and the energy of Marx's language struck some gentle scientific souls as an appeal for socialism. Add the circumstance that the first part of Marx's bulky volume was devoted to the elaboration of his theory of surplus value—a theory anything but complimentary to the capitalistic organization of society—and how could there be any doubt that Marx's doctrine is an ethical appeal for justice, and that the theory of value is its foundation? And if the Marxian theory of value be

(Continued on page 4)

ustained, or
ply are sit
bited by the
ness on their
reconstruc
e island—to
are opposed.
e that those
ering hearts
minster were
ette and his
dical as the
productive
reach the
h the grub-
nlike Great
nd by econ-
ey like it or
acial ties or
y when con-
olution.

F. C.

ly and with-
gnals of fin-
Now we are
eter in win-
ore applica-

F. Bonman,
nnedy, Dave
Turner, N.
P. Black.
H. Maitland,

m 12 to 30

UND.

F. Cusack,

Labor Day
\$2; W. G.

30 Sept., in-

List

Per Copy
1.65
1.15
1.85
Chapters
1.00
80c
1.15

1.50
80

Per Copy

20c

10c

10c

10c

10c

10c

25c

15c

5c

25c

35c

25c

ed, P. O. Box
on cheques.

Marxism In Social Theory

THIS article is the second one, following on the first in the September 16th issue, of my reply to Comrade J. A. McDonald's article, "Was Marx a Reformer?" in the "Clarion" of August 16th. Among other matters more or less related to it, our controversy centres, as chief point in dispute, on the anti-labor party position of the S. P. of C.—its determination "to wage war on all other political parties," including "so-called labor" parties, to quote the Party Manifesto. Comrade McDonald defends that position as a sound tactic and revolutionary principle, and claims it has the support of Marxian theory and of Marx, whose authority he regards as final and definitive. In regard to my stand on the party position, on the other hand, I challenge the soundness of it, disputing it, either on the grounds of Marxism, the experience of history, or on the grounds to be deduced from the findings of science since Marx on the nature of man and the development of his societies. My stand is that revolutionary socialist parties should recognize labor parties as representative institutions of an independent movement of the working class in the practical life of political interests and struggle. And that therefore, the socialist aim should not be to destroy labor parties, but to nurture and develop them through education and criticism, thus creating opinion which those parties would reflect and express in action as instrumentalities of working class well-being and progress in the class-struggle. I am to make a series of quotations from Marx supporting my position, but first I have to review the Marxian theory of history, in which, as an element class-struggles play so dominating a part. I have already quoted Marx in favor of my position, but Comrade McDonald asserts that I quote and interpret to suit myself. Hence this review, so that the reader's memory may be refreshed on the theory of Marx and thus be able better to test my use or anyone else's use of quotations from Marx. I am, of course, again open to a similar charge in respect of my presentment of the theory, presented, inevitably coloured by the processes of my own consciousness, as "Geordie" would say. It is left, then, for the reader to use his judgment, which is what is expected for all matter in the "Clarion." Most of this article is summarily lifted from the pages of Veblen and M. Beer, to add to my own knowledge, such as it is, of the history of the intellectual movements of Marx's time, and of his life and life's work, the weight of competent authorities on that as subject matter.

"No individual can overleap his time." "Even philosophy is its time grasped in thought." Thus spake Hegel, the great German philosopher whose thought was as yeast in the dough to the intellectual world of the early 19th century. In treating of Marx and his theoretical work, then, in the manner of a critical review, the "understanding" of a mere votary is not to our purpose, because we seek to "know," not to "believe" of him and his work. I doubt everything so that I may afterwards know, said Descartes. Taking that position as our point of departure, we should say our subsequent understanding would be the result of critical thought and enquiry. Taking Hegel as a guide in our quest of "knowing" our Marx, critical thought and enquiry would be turned on the time in which Marx lived and of which, boy and man, he was the child. Marx's response to the stimuli of the intellectual influences and social conditions of his time was not one of passive acceptance. Docile he was in his capacity to learn, in the sense of being sensitive to his world, but he was also a dynamic, creative personality. Something, as with all men, though more with him than most, something in the heart of his personality, in the centre of his periphery, as it were, escaped wholesale conformity and submission to any and all influences, German Hegelian or English School of Classical Economy or what else. Something there was of him that was free, anarchic, creative,

that was the Marx we know of in the completed comprehensive system of Marxism. It is just that uncaptured fraction of our individuality which enables humanity to break through the "crust" of custom. But here again, he was still the child of the time for he could only work and be creative with the materials that lay to his hand, and he must start out with—as Engels says of the early utopian socialists—he must start out with the intellectual stock-in-trade of his time, whatever his sceptical, restlessly enquiring, sensitive disposition and creative intelligence might do with it subsequently.

The intellectual stock-in-trade of Marx's time now, alas is it, somewhat shop-worn, since the world will persist in moving. Even the laggard hemisphere of ideas moves, creating and groaning in the universal trek. Since our study is of Marx's intellectual life and output, the question arises, what were the influences of an intellectual kind, in particular, what were the schools of thought that most influenced Marx in his social theorizing? And with what "inner light" of preconceptions, postulates and standards of belief and knowledge did those schools of thought approach the problems with which they occupied themselves?

Here let me digress a little into making a few remarks that may throw a light on those "inner lights" with which all men have gone to work in their thought upon their world since man fought with monsters in the prime down to our day of emancipation (!) Darwinism. I do this because in respect of that "inner light" of our preconceptions, I have been insisting that there has been a gradual shift from those of Marx's time in the sciences. That shift has become associated with the name of Darwin who, while he and his work had largely to do with it, as has been suggested, he may be taken as only one of the noises of civilization. Comrade McDonald was scornful in last issue at my insistence on this shift of ground, and at my poor efforts to describe it. Poor enough my efforts no doubt, the subject is difficult to explain and success depends on the reader meeting the writer more than half way in the enquiry. But the shift is a fact and an important one in its ramifications. As to the shift of inner light of preconceptions, as well as I can, I here illustrate what it is that shifts: The human race has travelled a long and tortuous intellectual course since our primitive ancestors worked out their conceptions of the world on the grounds of a full blown animism. All things to them, both animate and inanimate possessed life, spirit, personality, likes and dislikes, purpose and will like their own. They saw things and natural elements through the eyes of their own personality, projecting it into objectivity, they dramatized the world in action. "There is little of impersonal or mechanical sequence visible to primitive men in their every-day life: and what there is of this kind in the processes of brute nature about them is in large part inexplicable and passes for inscrutable. It is accepted as malignant or beneficent, and is construed in terms of personality that are familiar to all men by first-hand knowledge of their own acts. The inscrutable movements of the seasons and of the natural forces are apprehended as actions guided by discretion, will power, or propensity, looking to an end, much as human actions are. The processes of inanimate nature are agencies whose habits of life are to be learned and who are to be coerced, outwitted, circumvented, and turned to account, much as the beasts are. At the same time the community is small, and the human contact of the individual is not wide. Neither the industrial life nor the non-industrial social life forces upon men's attention the ruthless impersonal sweep of events that no man can withstand or deflect, such as becomes visible in the more complex and comprehensive life process of the larger community of a later day. There is nothing decisive to hinder men's knowledge of facts and events being formulated in terms of personality

—in terms of habit and propensity and will power. . . . In modern times and particularly in the industrial countries, this coercive guidance (of the impersonal) of men's habits of thought in the realistic direction has been especially pronounced; and the effect shows itself in a somewhat reluctant but cumulative departure from the archaic point of view. . . . Of the sciences, those have wandered furthest on the way that have to do with mechanical sequence and process; and those have best and longest retained the archaic point of view intact which—like the moral, social and spiritual sciences—have to do with process and sequence that is less tangible, less traceable by the use of the senses, and therefore less immediately forces upon the attention the phenomena of sequence as contrasted with that of propensity." (Veblen).

And along comes "Geordie" with this example of "modernism" as a present to myself: "The days have gone forever when it was customary to refer any given effect to some antecedent as being its efficient cause, and when the verb 'to determine' was used more recklessly than it is today. It is probably more convenient to regard any given phenomena as being the resultant of a multiplicity of factors which form the medium in which it develops, conditioned by all co-existing phenomena and colored by the processes of consciousness." O, my good habit, O' lor! no longer it seems can I charge down the citadel of truth firmly astride one Pegasus, but must straddle a multitude. And that coloration business, does that mean that I shall be forever open to the charge of "interpreting to suit myself?" Dammit Geordie, this misery, what is out there anyway? Is Hegel, in this unintentional Pickwickian sense, is Hegel always to have the last word: "What is reasonable is real!" And does that mean, after all that whatever is reasonable from age to age "determines" what is real? I feel dizzy! At any rate, we plume ourselves to day opining that Darwinism is a mile ahead of Hegelianism on the way to an impersonal outlook on the world. Now to Marx.

Marx is of no single line of antecedents in respect of his aims, his postulates and preconceptions. . . . which afford the point of departure for all of his creative work in political and economic theory. By his earlier training he is Hegelian in his method and conception of the process (its scheme of causation) of social development. By his later training under the English classical school of economics he is an uncritical subscriber to the metaphysics of the system of Natural Rights and Natural Liberty. . . .

"The comprehensive system of Marxism, is comprised within the scheme of the Materialistic Conception of History. This Materialistic Conception is essentially Hegelian, although it belongs to the Hegelian Left. . . . (Hegel was an idealist in philosophy) . . . The chief point of interest here, in identifying the Materialistic Conception with Hegelianism is that this identification throws it immediately and uncompromisingly into contrast with Darwinism and the post Darwinian conceptions of evolution. . . . the Materialistic Conception is worked out within a transmuted framework of Hegelian dialectic.

The Hegelian romantic standpoint was wholly personal, whereas the evolutionistic—it may be called Darwinian—standpoint is wholly impersonal.

The theory of progressive misery fits convincingly into the scheme of the Hegelian three phase dialectic. It stands for the antithesis that is to be merged into the ulterior synthesis, but it has no particular force on the grounds of an argument from cause to effect." (Veblen):

Those extracts, statements to be developed, are set down as indicating to the reader the point of view of this critical review and the place of Marxism in the history of social history, as it sees it.

Continued on page 8)

Reality

COM. "C's" central thesis is, "That the social revolution must be carried out . . . by a body of full blooded workers gradually gaining strength from improved conditions of life. That the revolution is worked out, not through misery, but through improvements in working class conditions."

Well, our worthy Comrade may be right; and although we flatly disavow the theory, it is worth looking at anyway. For assuredly "Wisdom shall not die with us."

In social evolution "the means govern and determine the end," not in relation to concepts of progress, but with reference to the clashing forces of social organizations. Theory may define, but circumstances govern. Proportionately, as identity of interest is sharply conceived, so also is the "end" sharply defined. But this identity of interest moves in the plane of the fourth dimension—time-thought-equivalence—and if it is not coincident with the conceived "end," the determining means are likely to be at fault. If the end is vague, the means are vague; since the governing cause is shadowy. But if the end is clear, the means too are clear; for then the governing cause is linked relatedly to its substance.

So the revolution, the desired end of social change is socialism: the social ownership of the common means of life. And since the end in view is linked connectedly with its preventive cause—capitalist property right—the means of its achievement are patently the complete abrogation of capital. For so long as capital exists, it must control. And so long as it controls, the social "end" must be completely denied; no matter howsoever adaptation may color its spectacular orientation. To "modernize" the thought of the revolution is, therefore, to aberrate the facts of progress with the psychology of secondary changes. It is to ask the revolution to exchange its collated concepts, for the wavering images of expediency; and to deny its ideation of conditioned time, in the expectation of unconditioned revolution. For all advancements in living conditions have been the effects of improvements in social technique; and those advancements have, at the same time, tempered the steel of revolution and strengthened the rule of authority. The conditions of the revolution are the conditions that abrogate the social life of the people; the conditions that break their respect for habit and custom and authority; the conditions that void their every attempt for happiness and satisfaction; the conditions that chisel their whole life with the deepening phalanxes of necessity; the conditions that tear their being asunder with the abasements of omnipotent love and hunger, and force them in equal reaction against the abrogating cause. All history shows that. And all history shows that energy expended in attempts at alleviating organized conditions, dominant, is as fruitless as chasing the holy grail. Per contra, therefore, history implies that energy must be centred outward against the radiating cause of our social abortions;—capitalist ownership of the means of life—; that economic freedom is attainable, not proportionately with the restriction of that cause, but only in its absolute abolition; and that the only possible means of overthrowing its entrenched power is the elimination of the social misconceptions which maintain its supremacy. Consequently, if "every improvement in working class conditions is to be counted a gain for the revolutionary forces"; it is so, only in the same sense that every improvement in the brain of the fish was a gain to modern man. It is true as a cosmic ratio. But it is false as a social corollary. One might as well expect those structural modifications to transform a fish into a man, as expect structural reforms of capital to convert slavery into freedom.

Thus theory and fact posit the position of socialism. It is the consideration of those facts which holds the party to its "impossibilist" views and drives it to its political extremism. The party is not anti-reform because it is anti-labor; it is not anti-labor because it is anti-reform. It is anti-reform because it is anti-capital, and anti-capital because of its recognition of the class struggle. Conversely, its apperception of the class struggle leads it inevitably to that same field of "maturist expression"—politics—and logically to strike, not at the appearance, the effect, the shadow, but at the very heart of capitalist supremacy; its legal right of property in the social means of life. And the same unswerving logic, formulated in the daily struggle, carries it to the fact that the capture of political power is possible, not in detail and by stages, but only by resolution, governed and determined by social recognition of political organization. That is why socialism is anti-reform.

Hence it is not a function of socialism "to oppose and destroy the political organizations of the workers." Because it cannot. Nor is it a question of "permitting the workers to enter the political field." The workers are forced there and act there as they are told, because they know no other. The conflicts of the class struggle force the working masses willy nilly, to the times of their necessities, a matter with which socialism has nothing to do. But it is a function of socialism to point out that the moves the masses make, the positions they take up and the disunity that makes them ready to the hand of their masters, are forced upon them by one thing only; their complete ignorance of capitalist society: the one remedy, its abolition. Thus the opposition of socialism to labor is not directed against labor, but against affiliation with a reformism that cannot see the utility of bettering the conditions of slavery, within the frame work of a society explicitly organized for exploitation. If the ruling class is dominant the betterment of conditions will be forced through the exigencies of the economic. If the rule is weak, and the masses blind, the slave conditions may be modified by a change of servitude. And history sponsors the lurid terrors that accompany the attempt of a slave class to better their conditions against the interests of their masters. Class consciousness of our slavery, is our supremest need. It would not advance labor one pace if all the socialism in the world discarded reality and fought for the "big loaf." For in the long run the perception of that reality is still the supremest necessity. It is not the fault of socialism if the masses cannot listen to reason and cannot face the facts. That inability may prolong and embitter the struggle. But the abdication of reason can never shorten it, nor the mirage of reform hasten it on. All wealth producing capacities of society; all its leisure and munificence; all the amenities of higher civilization; all its magnificent potentialities await but the class conscious guidance of an understanding people, to make it a going concern just as it stands, "and garland the earth with the roses of heaven." It needs no other preparation. Think of it comrade.

Our Com. is not blind to all this. For, he bases his argument for labor recognition, "not on its reformist tendencies, but because of its political independence." It is the stirring of the sub-conscious, conscious of its illogicality. Reformist tendencies are here glossed over. Yet why, since reforms are regarded as stepping stones to the revolution? In his endeavor to escape the scylla of capitalist reform, our Com. is like to run into the charbydis of its laborist counterpart. To avoid that he postulates political independence. Here again our Com. may be right. But we don't see it that way. The working class came into politics; not by their own volitions, but mainly as a counter blast to the jealousies of rival rulers. They were given the franchise, because the development of the industrial revolution necessitated changes in Government control, and

for the smoother working of exploitation. And because the immediate interests of the workers were modified by the cheapening of production, by factory acts, and means of labor, they regarded—and still regard—the vote in the terms of the "consent of the governed". The great illusion of wage slavery. They were drawn into politics as pawns and traders, on the same basis as their masters. But not on the same equality. A difference which is not yet recognised. And they retain their legacy to this day. They are still pawns and traders. They tag along on the skirts of any party who speaks them fair. Their territorial organization gives them practically a bourgeois leadership. And their foremost parties today—the A. F. L.; the I. L. P.; the continental S. D. and Soc. Unions are but adjuncts to their respective ruling classes. Ruling classes which are themselves little more than vestigial relics. It requires an imagination as elaborate as the Ver. Treaty, to regard labor as an "independent movement in politics." When labor sees its interests as distinct from its masters and its representation as functional, it will then really enter the path of independence. But it will then also constitute the proof of the socialist conception. For it will then be marching straight on the citadel of property right in the social means of life.

The theory of the full blooded worker is an example of what Robertson calls "the mythopoic faculty." The worker is blooded or not in proportion to vision and opportunity. Both are complementary factors in the proposition. In the theocratic empire of antiquity, interest was visual enough, but opportunity was crushingly absent. The great slave revolts of Eunice and Spartacus were sadly handicapped by divided vision. The peasant rebellion in Germany was broken by wavering conditions: in England it was marred by wavering perception. Not at all for any reasons of anaemicity, but for the substantial reasons of circumstantial conditioning. Today the worker is "grouchy" if "success" passes him by; rebellious, if out of a job. In one, he renews his grip on "opportunity." Steady work is the lodestar of his haunted existence. For a personal advantage he will betray his comrade on the job. He will lick the spittle of humility for a prospect of "promotion." He sells his soul for a "chance." He undercuts wages; undercosts contracts; undermines conditions; undersells terms; spies; insinuates and betrays. And in the blindness of his contemptible littleness he mocks at the driven "bums" who have gone down in the crimson tragedies of slavery. Red blood is a product of red thought; and red thought is a concomitant of time conditions. and according as those conditions are correlated on the pulsing tides of change they make man sordid, abject, despicable; or they gird him in the shining armor of the sublime.

For purposes of revolution "the worker" is not merely the despised faction of society. Not the petty interest of caste. Not the artisan with his obtuse contempt for the "laborer." Not the smug complacency of borrowed propriety. Not the quill driver and petty shopman with their starched gods of respectability. Nor the braided autocrats of brief authority. Nor the "fixities" of salary. It is all of these together, welded by common conditions of oppression and growing insecurity of life and place and purpose, into common perception of purpose, and interest. It is society itself, involved in an ever keener struggle of intolerable competitions; stripped of its illusions by the insufferable meanness of its existence; shorn of its traditions by the impossibility of their fulfilment; fenceless in the accumulating exigencies of a titular property, whose necessity strains, declines, shatters, denies, the developed standards of life and need; of hope and ambition; of satisfaction and happiness. In brief, a society reduced by capitalist exploitation to proletarian circumstances, and at bay for its life. That is the only

(Continued on page 6)

Western Clarion

A Journal of History, Economics, Philosophy,
and Current Events.
Published twice a month by the Socialist Party of
Canada, P. O. Box 710, Vancouver, B. C.
Entered at G. P. O. as a newspaper.

Editor _____ Ewen MacLeod

SUBSCRIPTION:

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

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

926

VANCOUVER, B. C., OCTOBER 16, 1924.

THE BRITISH ELECTIONS.

QUITE naturally the interest of the socialist movement in all its sections and sub-divisions everywhere centres upon the British election of a government, to be held October 29th. This interest arises not out of any specific issue which may have been a factor in the play of politics in turning the labor government out of office, but in the fact that the labor party has a cousinship with the socialist movement and that the response to its programme from the British working class, in whatever degree, will serve as an indicator pointing the progress of the stride toward independence from old ways of looking at things in the sham and make-believe of political issues.

Looking at the literature issued during the 1923 election by the labor party we are reminded of a statement made by H. N. Brailsford in "Current History" nine or ten months ago wherein he says the mass of adherents to the labor party have an enthusiasm with a carrying capacity which, together with their liking and aptitude for organization renders them a strong body in the political field, but that they are woefully lacking in theory. Their electioneering literature would bear this out, although we know very well that among them theory in social reform is not without its able advocates. From which it is to be supposed that knowing its British working man and his election-time mind, and seeking his votes, the labor party commissions the writing of its leaflets to the journalistically able rather than to the theory men among them. In which lies wisdom, probably, having in mind that the purpose there is to "get in," a course sanctioned by time and custom in that country. The man who knows his way about in the labyrinth of economics and political science may very well be found having his candidature promoted by a leaflet which promises to his hearers "a free breakfast table," or which threatens that the success of a protectionist policy would mean higher prices of commodities and a consequent everlasting lowering of the real wage all around. These things are apparently allowed to go for electioneering effect and it is only fair to say they are in large measure taken that way. A statement like this (Brailsford: New Leader, September 19, 1924) is never to be found in labor party or I. L. P. electioneering literature: "The class struggle is a raw fact, which no gentle idealism can disguise. It is the motive force without which history is unintelligible: it is the plain name for most of the processes which make up the practical life of every day. So long as a small minority in every nation owns the land, the machines and the banks, so long as this minority can levy a toll before the rest of us may work, so long as its uncontrolled power over machinery, raw materials and credit governs us in every detail of our daily lives, so long must we choose between slavery and struggle." By which it may be seen, incidentally, that agreement with the doctrine of the class struggle (since Brailsford is a reformer) does not necessarily imply exclusive devotion to policies of immediate revolution.

However, the labor party goes out and the electioneering battle is on. The fall of the government came not unexpectedly, apparently in any quarter, due, no doubt, really to the conclusion of the London Conference on the Dawes plan and the conclusion of the Russian Treaty. On the supposed "issue," the vote, interpreted by the government as a censure vote involving dissolution, was taken under circumstances in which the government assumed the initiative to the apparent momentary confusion of the opposition. But these rally, and if there is no other sign of the virility actually in the labor party there is a sure indication of it in the readiness of liberal and conservative to set up their candidates by articles of mutual agreement and consent where they can, as they see it, serve the inter-

ests best. Mr. Lloyd George will try to exhume his political body. The Churchill mannikin has suffered another conversion. There will be more concern shown by these queer fellows over the proposed British government guaranteed loan to Russia than they evinced over the hundred million pounds spent at Churchill's direction in shot and shell to alter the course of the Russian revolution.

British electioneering has a surface appearance of make-believe. The serious matter is better studied between times. Between times would probably be more opportune to appraise the position of the labor party. In such times, in fact, they do it moderately well themselves.

HERE AND NOW.

IN this issue our worthy friend "C," in his facetious way, illustrates to the editorial mind a fine example of a "glaring injustice." "C" says we are miserable with our space—or words to that effect—the lino-man is decoding the copy now and we can't refer to it conveniently—and the inference is that we thus prevent a well rounded out expression of his views. Thus we find room for the appearance of a glaring injustice with ourselves under injury and "C" covetously eyeing another column or two denied him by our Caledonian carefulness—so it is to be supposed—in space.

Well, there is something to be said for him in spite of his column greed, for now that he is beset with skirmishers all about him he longs to fight in a bigger ring. Now this is all very well, but if "R." and "C" get at it in real earnest, what about the spectator? Of course we know they will persist anyway. It's a way philosophers have with them. But in the midst of it all we're really in the Here and Now, which prompts us to suggest that one of these times we are going to call half-time in the argument and impose a penalty on the players by requiring from each a compelling essay which will be bound by its persuasiveness to bring forth subs., at the same time setting forth good reason why such should be brought forth. The essay that brings forth most subs.—and thus secures most readers—will of course be adjudged the best one. That's fair. Thus we are freed of the charge of being stingy with our space, because Here and Now we offer more of it! Fact is, we have more space than dollars. Just look:—

Following, \$1 each: J. H. Moon, H. J. B. Harper, M. Oulton, Mrs. Annie Ross, Will and R. F. Bayliss, J. Crow, Geo. Rossiter, E. Gallagher, C. Valley, F. C. Bliss, F. Cusack, L. T. Morgan, J. A. Goodspeed, Wm. Powis, Dan Pollitt, W. W. Lefaux, J. Mitchell, J. Dennis, G. Gemmell, Harry Grand, J. Pryde, J. H. Burrough, C. Butt.

Alf. Lien, \$1.50; G. W. Smith, \$5.16; C. Lestor, \$2.

Above, Clarion subs. received from 1st to 15th October, inclusive—total, \$31.66.

JOSEPH AND HIS BROTHERN.

(Continued from page 1)

the foundation of a social movement that is growing so rapidly, then to destroy socialism one has only to destroy the theory of value. Thus it is that we are blessed with so large a literature on the Marxian theory of value.

In vain did Marx's co-worker and literary executor, Frederick Engels, protest against the putting of such an interpretation upon the theory of value. . . . Marx himself emphasizes the same thought in different ways on all sorts of occasions. . . . Not only does Marx himself avoid appeal to ethical ideas, but the entire plan on which his system is constructed obliges him to take a non-ethical attitude toward economic phenomena. . . . How could such an attitude be reconciled with a plea for another social order on any moral ground, e.g., on the ground that the worker is not getting the whole produce of his labor?

Now I am not concerned about the accuracy in every detail of these remarks of Prof. Simkhovitch—they are perfectly sound as against Mr. Joseph. What I wish to call attention to is the fact that he could, in advance and without any knowledge of the special case, predict, argument by argument and almost word for word the exact line of hokum that our author would put up that he could do so because he was describing a type that had long been familiar.

Now for a couple of little jokes to relieve the gloom. On page 11, Mr. Joseph quotes McCulloch to the effect that "Labor is the only source of wealth. . . . An object which does not require any portion of labor to appropriate or to adapt it to our use, may be of the very highest utility, but, as it is the free gift of nature, it is utterly impossible it can possess the smallest value." Then he (Joseph) goes on to say: "Against this doctrine very damaging criticism was directed long before Marx adopted and attempted to give a scientific justification of it in his "Capital." "If," wrote N. W. Senior, "while carelessly longing along the seashore, I were to pick up a pearl, would it have no value? Mr. McCulloch would answer that the value of the pearl was the result of my appropriative industry in stooping to pick it up. Suppose then that I met with it while eating an oyster?"

McCulloch would say nothing of the kind. Let's see what McCulloch does say:—"that the Cost, or as it is sometimes called, the real value of a commodity is dependent on and exactly proportioned to the quantity of labor required for its production or appropriation. (Prin. of Pol. Econ., p. 321)

Pearls are well known and fairly common commodities in the world's markets; their production or, rather, appropriation is an organized industry which entails laborious and hazardous labor and it is certain that the pearl market is not supplied by the pearls that people find on the half-shell. This same Senior, by the way, is that "economic mandarin of high repute" who plays such a sorry part in the ninth chapter of "Capital" and whose chief claim to distinction was the introduction of the term "abstinence" into economic science wherein, however, it excited so much ridicule that it has long been dropped. The capitalist who used to "abstain" now "waits." Of late years even "waiting" is becoming unfashionable and shows signs of going out along with swallow-tail coats. But there is more of it. Mr. Joseph goes on to quote Senior to the effect that "if all the commodities used by man were supplied by nature without any intervention of human labor, but were supplied in precisely the same quantities as they now are, there is no reason to suppose either that they would cease to be valuable or would exchange in any other than their present proportions."

Even Mr. Joseph gags at this and thinks Senior "over states his case" but then: why does he use it? A man is known by his heroes.

Obviously, however, the act of exchange, which involves the concept of value, is a necessary feature of a society which produces goods by processes involving the division of labor and which possesses the institution of private property. But I am certain it is not within the power or, for that matter, within the province of political economy to predict what would happen in a society which was supplied with hats and coats, corned beef, tripe and onions, etc., straight from Heaven or wherever they might be supposed to come from.

For the rest, Mr. Joseph's lucubrations on "absolute value" and "homogeneous labor" are quite beside the point and need not detain us, while his own views on economics proper may be much more profitably read in their original setting, that is, in Marshall.

Several correspondents have called my attention to this matter and I suppose I ought to thank them for good intentions if not for the act. Next issue, if the Lord wills and whether or no if I have the time, I hope to cook up some more of that utility stuff.

CLARION MAINTENANCE FUND.

Following, \$1 each: Alf. Lien, Will and R. F. Bayliss, J. Mitchell, J. Gemmell, Harry Grand, J. Pryde.

H. J. B. Harper and M. Oulton, \$2; "Progress," 50 cents; "A Friend," \$5.

Above, C. M. F. receipts from 1st and 15th October, inclusive—total, \$13.50.

In Reply to "R." and "F.C."

AS TO "R"

I am beginning to champ the bitt and stamp the shuddering earth at "R's" repeated proddings and s'help me Darwin, I shall go after his animistic Left-Hegelian premises properly one of these times. Not that I have not already protested occasionally by writing indirectly at him, to the easement of my nasty temper, but apparently with no other effect than to stimulate my tormenter to fresh attacks. Here, then, directly to him; a preliminary courtesy swipe to his midriff, whether it reaches there or not. I think it is, more or less remotely, a return for his "Tactics" and "The Straight Issue."

An invariable distinguishing feature of a group life rich in varied interests, whose members are virile and enterprising, with a well developed group consciousness, lies in the variety and high quality of the organized institutions its people have displayed an aptitude for creating and developing to further their felt needs and interests. The history of such groups, I wish to point out as opening to my line of reasoning, shows that physical and mental wellbeing and strong group consciousness, developed hand in hand with, and to a large degree by means of the creation, growth and practice of organized institutional life. Which is to say, those activities had an unintended value to the group, as a by-product, which were involved in the creation and development of institutions to meet changing needs and purposes in the use of them as social functions, and in the adaptation of individual life to their social disciplines. This practice of institutional life entailed the acquirement and use of the group dispositions, habits, arts or skills of organized institutions and it was thus a formative means of general group development apart from the direct benefits those institutional instrumentalities were designed to bring into effect. Just so, the use of his tools and the handling of his materials and the thought entailed in his labor develops the craftsman as man, apart from the benefits he derives from the output of his labors. On the other hand, where, in any group life, there is poverty or dearth of functional institutions, it will be found also, as cause to effect, that there is also a lack of virility, weakness of group consciousness, or overmastering circumstances of a natural or social kind, perhaps altogether in combination, to defeat a well developed institutional life. I argue, therefore, that the appearance of labor parties as representative institutions of an independent movement of the working class in the field of political strife and achievement, is a historic and culturally significant and hopeful phenomenon; an appearance which might be regarded as inevitable with the growth of consciousness of class, and to be welcomed by us rather than that we should conceive it our task, as revolutionary socialists, to defeat those institutions of the producing masses and thus, in effect, according to my reasoning on the matter, set back our own class in its upward struggle to political maturity.

History, I insist, dear "R," records, if anything, that humanity does not and can not step maturely developed into its "Straight Issues." The life process is a going concern, the pace being set by material productive development. But there is lag on the personal side. Material development brings the issues to us and deal with them we must and do, however inadequately we may do so. Maturity comes only by struggle over issues, by living the life of the process. There is no other way; as we say, it is a nature imposed necessity. Neither can a new class, unless the necessary cultural development has already taken place, create a new social life and its corresponding complex of institutional ways and means for making it work, merely because the old society has become intolerable and will not even work. The history of mankind furnishes innumerable cases where peoples have been confronted with such conditions and, from the personal side of caus-

ation, they have chosen variously; some for extinction; some to retrograde back and back to begin again the upward march of progress; some to stagnate for ages with high death rates from many causes—there is a law of population to take care of surplus population; and but a very few have chosen to progress out of such institutional situations as now confront society. But, "R," it was not by a separate organ of knowledge by which they chose variously, chose worst, or badly or better or best, as the case might be. That best is likely to have been far from what is conceivably best—life affords much of leeway to the drunken sailor of a humanity between the edge of oblivion and the hard high road of an on-going prosperous life. It was their indispositions and aptitudes and habits that had chosen variously for those peoples. For it is of these by which we really know, so far as we do know, in our dealing with a situation. There is no separate organ of knowing, even if there is a separate activity called "knowing." Our "mind," says Dewey in his "Human Nature and Conduct," in another connection, is continuous with other phases of our nature, and our nature with the objective world outside us, the world of nature and of society: Our habits incorporate objective conditions. The reason a child knows little and an experienced adult knows much is not because the latter has a "mind" which the former has not, but because one has already formed habits which the other has still to acquire. The scientific man and the philosopher, like the carpenter, the physician and politician, know with their habits not with their "consciousness." The latter is eventual, not a source. Class-consciousness, for instance, eventuates out of prior habits of life and thought, unconsciously acquired, inculcated by the discipline of objective conditions, industrial, economic, institutional and social. Given that primary basis and pedagogic education has a chance; without it, there is a making of ropes of sand. In that respect, such education is developmental of class-consciousness, not creative. Whence the class-consciousness of the townsmen and burghers and travelling merchants of medieval times, and that of their successors the bourgeoisie of modern times; or where the class-consciousness of the feudal baronage and the landed gentry of those earlier and of later times? Was either that of one or the other consciously acquired, or got in class rooms where it is so easy to devote time in the manner of formal logic to the straightening out of issues, while keeping a blind eye for the intermediate steps, inevitable in actual life, to their final resolution or at least to their greatest desirable resolution? Somehow or other those peoples of the earlier period had to get along without histories and theories of history and treatises on political economy. Perhaps they were the better psychologists than we are without those aids and understood their problem better since so much of it was a human one. At any rate, we have only the advantage of later science if we know how to use it to see our problem whole.

This is certain to me, that everywhere revolutionary socialism continues to commit the worst of Utopianisms in asking of the peoples more than their human nature can perform; study shows it me and experience confirms. If we socialists are to do better, I see we needs must define afresh the limits of our problem of social change in the light of an exploration of human nature, and by taking thought of ways and means strictly in relation to the feasible in the modern situation. To return to the question of class-consciousness again. Wherever you find it, you have only to listen to some of its reasoning, or do a little introspection on yourself, to know how little it is the result of logical or calculated interest. It is in the main based on sentiment and sentiment is born of habits of life. The foundations of the class-consciousness of one or the other of the classes named were laid when each class had its own econ-

omic interests, and mode of life—town and country; the merchants and craftsmen of the towns, and the landed aristocracy and gentry of the country. Habits of the same political community, when economic interest clashed with economic interest, reserves of prior dispositions, aptitudes and habits peculiar to each class were brought into the conflict. These were, in action, concrete skills and specific kinds of moral energies to turn an otherwise fragmentary, unrelated, isolated economic issue like a market franchise or impost, like a ship's tax, like a corn tax, like a trade treaty, into an issue around which historically significant, far-reaching political and social principles contended for a footing to maintain an old or introduce a new way of life in this or that item of the social complex of ways and means. And this, whether the contending classes were conscious or not of the farther-reaching significance of the immediate issue as a link in a long chain of cumulative cause and effect. Did Marx see it so in the latter respect? Let me quote him, where, in terse phrasing, he also defines the function of teaching socialists in the struggle: "We do not," says he, "we do not, then, proclaim to the world, in doctrinaire fashion any new principle: 'This is the truth, bow down before it!' We do not say: 'Refrain from strife, it is foolishness!' We only make clear to men for what they are really struggling, and to the consciousness of this they must come whether they will or not."

The trend towards socialism is not a trend towards an objective remote and distinct, it is a progressive acquirement in the here and now. The labor movement must not only be destructive to the old order, it must also be constructive in the here and now; creative of those objective environmental conditions, economic, industrial, political and institutional, as fits us, the children of the slum called capitalism, by their disciplines with the necessary dispositions, aptitudes and habits for the life of a co-operative commonwealth. Even capitalism, in its blind way, has done largely in that respect. We are already, I believe, fitted for large changes, but our class's lack of confidence in its own powers is no inconsiderable element of the force of inertia in the social situation. We should remember: "the will to power grows by what it feeds on," and, that "nothing succeeds like success" — articles of wisdom from the rubric of racial experience. There is a social phenomenon which we know of as, a settled popular frame of mind. Such a frame of mind is a composite of habits of life and thought, and because of that, is the most enduring of social phenomena. If at times it is resistant to change, lagging behind when the material conditions that gave it birth have passed away, it is also, when it constitutes a demand, a force that is irresistible. Nothing can resist it. It creates the life it demands and makes it work. Without its living force, programmes of social reorganization and proposals either of constitutional methods or revolutionary violence, are lost causes or minority madness. Let us create such a frame of mind! And let us have a care of Labor's institutional life! The Marxian article of faith, that the conditions for the new society must be created within the shell of the old, if it is to materialize, has a wider application than many people who call themselves Marxians appear to realize.

Some of this stuff is weird stuff to read, yet something, I believe, there is in our on-going life which it resembles, near or far; which is all that the best of descriptive efforts attain to. Take it, dear "R," and the reader, as a slant or an aspect on our problem of change; it has no pretensions to being more.

Thought upon another phase of life's activities may help to appreciate the nature of the part played by disposition, aptitude and habits. Think of the history of inventions and general technological de-

(Continued on page 6)

IN REPLY TO "E" and "F. C."

(Continued from page 5)

velopment, or of the development of the specific industrial arts—of how those psychological factors were a conditioning factor from the personal side on rate of development: The creation and application of mechanical means gathers momentum and industrial inertia loses force as generation after generation take on more and more the appropriate dispositions, aptitudes and habits of life and thought of a machine age. The habits of thought of a machine age. Listen to its prosing tempo. Oh, ye romantics, listen: Politics is a branch of social engineering!

AS TO F. C.

TO what am I to put such poor reasoning down as that of F. C. in his "Empire Unity" of last issue? I refer only to his references to myself in his criticism of Lester. Says he, "If, as 'C' has it, 'the progressive (economic) degradation of the working class is not in the interests of social revolution, then Lester's assertion as to the British and Continental movements being twenty-five years ahead of America, has no logical premise.' The real wages of the American workers are double that of Britain. And the standard of living—access to those feasible, immediate, material things on which 'C' bases his philosophy of proletarian progress—is correspondingly higher." Reading that last part of his sentence, I am moved to re-phrase an old saying: A garbled statement is worse than a mis-statement. As to his attempt to fasten on myself the charge that I contend the issue of the social revolution rests wholly and solely on the question of the economic condition of the working class, I say he cannot find his warrant for attributing anything so foolish to myself in anything I have ever written. I feel very indignant that Comrade F. C. does not make better use of his fine talent for criticism. In respect of myself I need it—informing criticism.

I know that he knows that I know that history must make other contributions of a material and also of an immaterial kind. And I know that he knows that America is a special case to be studied on its own merits, and that Britain is another case for a study by the case method. And I know that he knows that I wrote an article some time back, to be exact, February 16th issue, aimed at those who expected the procedures of the revolution in Russia to be followed in other countries with a different historical and cultural background of institutional and economic life. In that article I advised a case study of each particular community for the possibility of differences of such a kind between them and Russia as to make different procedures possible or even inevitable. By such a case study, I thought, we of the revolutionary wing might escape much futility. Thinking thusly of what a lot comrade F. C. and myself know, and of how stingy the Editor is with his space—he sniggers, that what I call my brain work, ought to be captioned "By the Mile" instead of "By the Way"—indignation gave way to a comfortable complacency. Whimsy also came to the rescue as I remembered that F. C. has a predilection for wandering in the land of Barnum. Hence his Barnumian comparison of America and Great Britain and his attempt to make my premise say that the strength of a labor movement is in degree of the high wages paid. He was merely hoaxing his public and gaining a momentary triumph over the "Pacifist" (1)

I will present Comrade F. C. with a more valid comparison, but still one of little use as a criticism on progressive degradation, as I shall show. I present it to him in order that he may get a fresh slant on his own single hope of revolution through this degradation of the working class, and on the value of his assertion that "The progressive degradation of the European workers is a fact . . ." Let him take for a fairer comparison, as above all others one would think a Marxian with an eye for conditions would do, the conditions of the European working class during the aftermath of the Napoleonic wars and compare them with those of the working class today in the aftermath of the late great war. I have the best grounds for saying that the workers of to-

day have the advantage. I will now show why a Marxian who knew his Marx would never take aftermath-of-war conditions as a safe criterion of the trend of progressive degradation.

The industrial and trade depressions that mark the aftermath of wars do not, nor should they, enter in as a part of Marx's handling of his scheme of analysis of the capitalist system of production, whose industrial crises and in addition, a continual augmentation of the number of unemployed because of the continual increase of aggregate capitals and use of labor saving machinery, were to eventuate in a progressive degradation of the working class. The progressive degradation, then, if any, which must be sought for, is such as can be traced, untroubled by "disturbing" factors such as war, to the normal development of the inherent contradictions of the productive system, considering the system as a technological scheme of things. The science of Marx's time aimed at a statement of the "normal" case and "trends" to the normal; it was essentially a science of statics rather than of dynamics. But life is dynamic, on-going, and there has been a shift to make use of the Darwinian evolutionary concept of cumulative causation as a basis for a statement nearer the facts of life. I understand that economics is the least progressive of the sciences in that respect. But you had better ask "Geordie."

Capitalism recovered from the long depression supervening on the Napoleonic wars and flourished. During the whole period up to 1914 there is not the slightest doubt but that a general improvement of the conditions of the working masses resulted. Will industry, trade and commerce recover again? I cannot say. But I hope for a recovery because I do not believe in working class degradation as a means to revolution, political or social. Has Comrade F. C. really any criterion on that question that is worth a hoop in Hades, other than a wish based on the theory of misery? Why does he take that degradation of the workers in Europe which is, in some part, an episodal result of the late war, and which may be recovered from, but which, not issuing out of the normal economic process, can not be considered a part of a normal trend of progressive degradation, if any? He knows better than to do so, but his "wish" is his evil genius and devil-drives him. Well, his wish and my wish subtracted from the problem of ways and means of social change, leaves—the merits of the problem to be discussed. Forward the discussion!

REALITY.

(Continued from page 3)

full blooded working class there is; the only one, steeled, and taut, and disciplined for the unimpeachable authority of revolution.

Consequently we do not see that the idiom of the "drifter" is wrong, "that things must get worse before they get better." Because before change can come before revolution can be, every shift and device and trick to live and exist will be tried; every avenue of possibility explored; every chance exhausted. Culture does not count here—even if our culture amounts to anything at all. In the struggle for life and living the individual is the first driven in on his own resources. Only as individual effort fails is association possible in the conscious polity of common interest. But in the meantime, while that fugitive process is going on, monopoly will extend its empire. It will co-ordinate the world's resources. It will gather to itself the fruits of imperialistic ambition. It will overshadow humanity with its regenancy. In doing so it will fasten its writhing tentacles on the dearest possession of life. It will waste and desolate the forces of society yet more. It will violate life for the sanctity of property. The market may extend; but automatics will far transcend its capacity. Production will not collapse; but social satisfaction will increasingly fail. Wealth may stock the bazaars; but the circulation of restricted purchasing power will be languid. Misery will not come upon all; but progressive degradation will press upon a dying civilization. While, at the same time, on the fringe of far flung empire the little brown men and yellow may fulfil

the august missions of the mandatories. Thus making society minister to the lusts of its Imperialist masters. So that war and the threat of war; hate and the pride of hate, shall predominate over revolution and the class struggle; over man and his satisfaction. In the last 70 years the world has been completely transformed. The old Liberal and Conservative, the Democrat and Republican, with all the paraphernalia of their mediocies, have followed the Whig and the Tory into the yawning underworld. And with them, their middle age populace, with its borrowed watch cries of reform. Their places have been taken by a practically international coalition of Imperial oligarchs, straddling the world with syndicate and concession. And in opposition, an international proletariat, internationally imperceptive of its identity. Hence it blunders along, in the driven stress of need, blind in the nakedness of its slavery, awaiting the quickening spirit of consciousness that shall inspire it, exalt it, and purify it with the impassioned splendor of reality.

The freedom of the working class must be the work of the class itself. And by its own representation. True. But not the representation of venial bargaining. Its representation must be the sign manual of its consciousness. It must see with the eye of fact, speak with the tongue of truth; fence with the sword of reality. Then it will not reform; it will abolish. But it is only the crowded hurrying, harrassing irremediable empressments of time progress that can open the eyes of man to the shame and sham of his servility. Not logical reason by itself; neither the reforms of habit, nor the habit of reform. The mere arguments of the verbal are as indigestible to unawakened consciousness as basalt to a lordly stomach. It is just as difficult to draw interest-sundered people into specious reform, as to draw caste divisions into socialism. Only the mighty hammering of time events can associate disunity in the concord of common interest. The condition is "the thing," not the process; impulse of reaction, not the impulse of movement. Darwin would have been as incomprehensible to the middle ages as Freud to the Australian aborigine, or Einstein to the modern philistine. Yet modern science would have been as beneficial to man 2000 or 20,000 years ago, as it is now. But it found no response in the "divine soul." Because although it existed in the process, it lacked the quickening fire of condition. Always the process responds to ripened condition; always reaction soars on the wings of necessity.

Finally, although it is perfectly true that the "end" of socialism is not "in the nature of things," it is also true that social disruption is implicit in the nature of slavery, and that the modifications of progress shall ultimately overwhelm it. It is not in the nature of things that this reaction must conform to our desires, but it is in the nature of development, in the interactions of friction and conflict, that man must think and reason, and forereach the future. And it is his undeniable capacity to reason logically from observed premises. It is on those premises that our case rests. For, if we reason from palliation, we take our point of departure from a false bearing. From a false bearing, because palliation is necessarily a mere re-conditioning of the status quo. Consequently reasoning turns on a bewildering cycle of utility, wide wandering in a veritable "milky way" of opportunist confusion; which only fortuitously can ever coincide with our desire. But if we reason from the fact of our slavery, we reason with all the prestige of development for our material, or with the nature of consequent reaction a certainty. Since the reasoning of fact generalizes the axioms of reality.

Our immediate function and urgency is to press home the fact of our slavery; to insist on the primacy of the class struggle; to counter the sophism that evolution is, of necessity, slow; to distinguish, sharp and clear, between the progressive process of biology, and the purposive transformations of society; and to strike, keen as a lightning flash, at the

(Continued on page 7)

The Evolution of Industry

By W. McLAINÉ.

(Continued from last issue)

Thus investors who have only paid 5/— for their five £1 shares will receive a share in the new company worth £6 10s. in addition, and £10 War Loan Bond, on which they will draw 5 per cent for a number of years, and all this after having drawn interest on money they have not paid into the old company for we know not how long. By this method, when profits are so large that public comment might be occasioned, and what is more important, industrial discontent might result from a too plain statement of the facts, new capital is created on paper, and the profits appear to be small because spread over a large number of shares, whereas, in reality, the new shares have no existence in actual fact.

These financial devices which prevent the workers from seeing how much they are robbed of in factory and workshop and mine, have been extended by the methods adopted to finance the war. Everyone is, or ought to be, familiar with the fact that old national debts have been paid back over and over again, and yet still remain at a greater figure than ever because of the accumulated interest upon which the descendants of investors of a bygone age are able to maintain a tolerably easy standard of life. For the present, overseas investments have been very largely cut off, profits have been abnormal at home, and the investing class has been unable to get rid of its extra superfluity through the ordinary channels. The War Loans have provided an excellent opportunity and at rates of interest fixed by themselves the "interests" have mortgaged in their own favour the future productivity of the working class to the extent that they are guaranteed in their position as a permanent dominant class, a position in which Labour is now being asked to confirm them by means of alliances between Capital and Labour.

What do the War Loans represent? Labour uses the manifold means of production and produces from day to day a great mass of commodities of varying degrees of usefulness. For the duration of the War, the military organisation has called for large quantities of these commodities, and the owners of the product of labour, have handed the goods over to the State. But during the transaction, because Labour does not receive in return for its expenditure of energy as much as it produces, the value of the products in relation to their cost of production, have become enhanced. This greater value, this surplus value, the toll of capital upon the toil of the workers, has been registered in terms of money, though in actuality it has been in goods produced, in the books of the banks, and in the accounts of the State. It represents services that, for the time being, must be diverted to the production of war materials, but for which full credit plus interest is given to the dominant class, and by means of which they will be able to draw greater supplies from the labour of the workers when more favourable opportunities present themselves. Labour, then, in the future must work with increased intensity to provide motor cars, houseboats, racing yachts, &c., &c., for the class that has robbed them during the war, and that is why schemes for harmonising industrial relationships, schemes for increasing the output, schemes, in short for helping the employers to improve their own position by giving the workers small rewards in the shape of bonuses, and so on, figure so largely in the reconstruction proposals of a wide-awake and powerful oligarchy. Increased specialisation has brought increased profits to capital, increased the power of finance, and destroyed any possibility of a compromise between exploiter and exploited.

Increase in the Power of Capital Politically.

Throughout history each economic class that has been brought to the front by economic development has, sooner or later, been forced to enter into political warfare in order to clear the ground of the

various obstacles to its full development. The town Guildsman was hampered by the regulations imposed upon him by the town merchants, who desired to maintain the status quo in their own interests, even when forces greater than they were taking their real power from them. The Guildsman was obliged to organise with those whose economic interests were akin to his own, and was obliged, in company with his fellows, to become the town authority. But his was not the last class to come to the front. As industry changed its character, the townsmen attempted by means of the pressure they brought to bear within the town and in the National Assembly, to keep back the new class that was being brought to the front, until at length the leaders of country industry were powerful enough to combat the town influences. Similarly the modern industrial capitalist and financier having reached his place in the sun, would find place obstacles in the way of the working class, which propertyless and landless, has been produced as a class by the very movements that produced other classes before it, and that in turn have destroyed those classes. The new plutocracy that controls the State, that is the State, consists of just those representative members of large capital that industrial development has brought to the front. Financiers with a finger in every pie, interested in coal, iron, oil, shipping, railways, and what not, dominate in the State executive. The names of Lord Rhondda, Earl Cowdray, and Sir Joseph Maclay are sufficient indications of how the interests concerned have secured control over the Governmental machinery.

The semi-national control that is now being exercised over the Railways, while it has proved the Socialist contention that vast economies can be effected by the cutting out of competing services, has demonstrated how efficiently capital is able to take care of its own interests. The Railway Executive functioning ostensibly in the public interest, is concerned mainly with safeguarding the property rights of the railway shareholders, because it is composed of their representatives—directors and managers of railway companies. The Ministry of Munitions, supposedly existing to control armament production, consists of nominees and "temporarily loaned" (a good phrase, with a special significance) agents of the very firms the department declares it is holding in check. The Food Control Board, the Shipping Ministry, in fact, all the departments of the State, whether of pre-war existence or of recent creation, function to safeguard the interests they represent, even though it be to the extent of sending a million men or a naval squadron to the uttermost ends of the earth in order to accomplish that task. Well might the bankers come away from their interview with Mr. Lloyd George (then Chancellor of the Exchequer) on August Bank Holiday, 1914, able to remark, "He did everything that we asked him to do." He could have done no other. They dominated; he obeyed.

The increase in the power of capital, actual and relative, economic and political has given the employing class the opportunity of strengthening its position in relation to the workers. Under the guise of patriotic necessity, it has imposed conscription, industrial and military, upon the working class. It has regimented them both at home and abroad, and has striven to crush every attempt to rouse the people to a sense of the greater danger. Active workers in the working class movement have been imprisoned, deported, or threatened. Others have been spied upon by secret provocative agents employed by the State to provoke disturbances in order that things might be said and done that were contrary to the letter of the regulations drawn up by subsidised politicians. By every kind of trickery it has sought to set one section of workers against another in order that attention might be diverted from the main issue. It seeks now to use the whole ma-

chinery of the State, its own executive, to erect barriers to safeguard it against fate that inevitably must overtake it, the fate that has overtaken every class in history whose usefulness has passed away. It cannot prevent the Social Revolution, but it can prolong its own existence as a class by blocking the way to the Socialist Commonwealth.

The Rapid Decline of the Middle Class.

The self-made man, the industrious bargain-driving, grasping middle-class man, who began business in a small way, and fought for his own hand against all competitors, belonged to the early days of capitalist development. He may still be found occupying a place on the social stage, but he no longer is the characteristic figure in industry. Competition does not pay, in fact, it is impossible on a small scale, and "big business" rules the roost. The small shopkeeper is not only undersold by the multiple shop concern or driven out of business by the Co-operative Societies, but he finds it increasingly difficult to obtain supplies. The distributive store is only a part of a great productive concern, cornering supplies, or producing directly for itself. Similarly, the iron and steel combinations own coal mines, oil wells, and by combined action, monopolise the whole output of a given commodity. The combinations and arrangements made by the banks and the shipping deals and purchases made recently are fresh in everybody's memory. The calling up for military service of the small middle-class man has closed many thousands of small concerns and has driven large numbers of middle-class sons and daughters into the ranks of the industrial workers. The doctor and the lawyer tend to become more and more employees of companies or of the State, and as such are wage earners in the fullest sense. The divergence between the owners of the tools and the working class becomes ever more pronounced, and side by side with it the capitalist passes away from participation in industry. The industrial capitalist who used to direct the affairs of his own factory has abandoned that function. His duties are performed by salaried managers and foremen and all that the actual owners of the means of production now do is draw the dividends made for them by the working class. The capitalist class has ceased to exist as an integral part of industry, but its power to draw supplies is greater than ever.

(To be continued)

REALITY.

(Continued from page 6)

hoary lie that master and slave can ever prosper together. To do that we have all we can do. And to do it well is to negate the sophistries of social psychology, superficial within the system; to stimulate the subconscious with the impress of the real; to smooth the way and clear the mind for the hastening revolution. We submit therefore that reform is not the way of revolution; that such tactics are fugitive and obfuscatory; and that who so hopes to reform capital for the benefit of slaves, or reform slaves for the benefit of socialism, dreams dreams in the fairy meads of wonderland. R.

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 _____

MARXISM IN SOCIAL THEORY.

(Continued from page 2)

Now for a rapid narrative of Marx's personal history in respect of its points of contact with the intellectual influences that played upon him in the formative years of his youth as a student, and during the creative years of his theoretical output and activity in the working class movement.

After quitting public school, Marx (at 17 years of age) went to the University of Bonn to study jurisprudence. A year later, in the fall of 1836, he entered Berlin University, throwing himself into the study of philosophy, the then great exponent of "new-thought" being Hegel, jurisprudence, history, geography, literature, the history of art, etc. In 1841 he had the degree of Doctor of Philosophy conferred upon him at Jena. His desire was to follow up an academic career, but the universities were no place for free enquirers, and Marx was too violent in the expression of his opinions to find such a career open to him. Marx then took to free-lance journalism as a way out of this blind alley. This profession led him into the arena of public affairs in which he entered into the struggle for freedom agitating the continent of Europe by which he, at this stage, understood freedom in religion and liberalism in politics. Marx entered public life with a thorough philosophical training and as a member of the group of Young Hegelians, criticism was the great weapon used against the old order to force the positive and rigid which had become ineffectual to make room for a living stream of thought and being, or, as Marx expressed it in 1844, "to make the petrified conditions dance by singing to them their own tune." The tune, of course, being the dialectic. In 1842 he became editor of the "Rheinische Zeitung." Marx, in his position as editor, found the need of a thorough study of political economy and socialism. A short sketch of his editorial life by himself may be found in the introduction to his "Critique of Political Economy."

Between the years 1843 and 1844 we have the second, and probably the most important critical period in the intellectual development of Marx. In 1837 he had become a disciple of Hegel, into whose philosophy he penetrated deeper and deeper during the two years which ensued. Between 1843 and 1844 he became a socialist and in the following two years he laid the foundations of those social and historical doctrines associated with his name. The most productive years of Marx's life were between 1837 and 1847, the first period, and between 1857 and 1871. All his valuable work falls within these years: "The Poverty of Philosophy," 1847; "The Communist Manifesto," 1848; his activity in the International, 1864; "Das Capital" and "The Civil War in France," for the later period, to name a typical example of his public activities and some of his best known works. From 1845 to 1848, as an exile in Brussels he was mainly occupied with economic studies for which Engels placed his library of works on political economy at his disposal. The immediate result of these studies was the "Poverty of Philosophy," a reply to a work of Proudhon, the anarchist. English political economy henceforth occupied the place with Marx which German philosophy had held. The years during which the elements of his conception of society were accumulating in his mind and shaping themselves into a system were involved in a revolutionary atmosphere. Marx's writings during these years are, of course, the favorite recourse for those who wish to quote him in support of violence. In June 1848 appeared the "Neue Rheinische Zeitung," of which Marx was called to be editor to defend and advance the cause of the revolution in Germany, a cause which had been successful temporarily at least, in France. The revolution in Germany proving abortive, Marx proceeded to Paris in 1849, where he witnessed not the triumph of the Red Republic but that of the counter-revolution. In July, 1849, he was banished by the French government to the boggy country of Morbihan, in Brittany; he preferred, however, to go over to London, where he remained to the end of his days.

Let us now turn to Hegel and his philosophy and its then influence on the world of thought in order

to appreciate that training of Marx's during the early formative youthful years of his intellectual life as concerned with the problems of social life and destiny. At the same time we may bear in mind my opening remarks in which I attempted to define the limits of the creative powers of man. No matter how exalted or fantastic the elaborations of a philosophical system in particular hands may be, such systems are significant in their essential features of their times—they are their times grasped in thought, the informed, confused thought of dumb multitudes made articulate. Says Hegel: "... But if it is as good as granted that every philosophy has been refuted, yet at the same time it must also be asserted that no philosophy has been refuted, nor ever can be refuted... for every philosophical system is to be considered as the presentation of a particular moment, or a particular stage in the evolutionary process of the idea. The history of philosophy... is not, in its totality, a gallery of the aberrations of the human intellect, but is rather to be compared to a pantheon of deities."

"What Hegel says here about philosophy is true also of systems of social science, and styles and forms in art. The displacement of one system by another reflects the historical sequence of the various stages of social evolution." (M. Beer). And so, critics, in the correspondence of your or my conclusions, on the social problem and on ways and means of forwarding the working class cause, with what lies in the social situation of our time constitutes the real issue between us. What intellectual influences we are under or what we read, is another matter.

"Until towards the end of the eighteenth century, learned and unlearned people had some such general notions as the following. The world has (either been created, or it has existed from eternity. It is either governed by a personal, supernatural god or universal spirit, or it is kept going by nature, like some delicate machine. It exists in accordance with eternal laws, and is perfect, ordained to fulfil some design, and constant. The things and beings which are found in it are divided into kinds, species, classes. All is fixed, constant, and eternal. Things and beings are contiguous in space, and succeed one another in time, as they have done ever since time was. It is the same with the incidents and events of the world and of mankind. Such common proverbs as "There is nothing new under the sun," and "History repeats itself," are but the popular expressions of this view. Correlative to this philosophy (of a "fixed" world) was logic, or the science of the laws of thinking... (first) founded (as a science) by the Greek philosopher Aristotle (384 to 322 B.C.)" (At this point M. Beer illustrates the method of this logic, for which I have not space) "... It is at once apparent that this logic operates with rigid, constant, unchanging, dogmatic conceptions, something like geometry, which deals with definitely bounded spatial forms. Such was the rationale of the old-world-philosophy.

"By the beginning of the nineteenth century a new conception of the world had begun to make its way. The world as we see it, or get to know it from books, was neither created, nor has it existed from time immemorial, but has developed in the course of uncounted thousands of years, and is still in process of development. It has traversed a whole series of changes, transformations and catastrophes. The earth was a gaseous mass, then a ball of fire; the species and classes of things and beings which exist on earth have partly arisen by gradual transition from one sort into another, and partly made their appearance as a result of sudden changes. And in human history it is the same as in nature; the form and significance of the family, of the State, of production, of religion, of law, etc., are subjected to a process of development. All things are in flux, in a state of becoming, of arising and disappearing. There is nothing rigid, constant, unchanging in the cosmos.

"In view of the new conception, the old formal logic could no longer satisfy the intellect; it could not adequately deal with things in a state of evolution. In ever increasing measure it became impos-

sible for the thinker to work with hard and fast conceptions. From the beginning of the nineteenth century a new logic was sought, and it was G. W. F. Hegel (1770-1881) who made a comprehensive and thoroughly painstaking endeavor to formulate a new logic in accordance with the universal process of evolution. This task appeared to him the more urgent, as his whole philosophy aimed at bringing thought and being, reason and universe, into the closest connection and agreement, dealing with them as inseparable from each other, regarding them as identical, and representing the universe as the gradual embodiment of Reason. 'What is reasonable is real; what is real is reasonable.' The task of philosophy is to comprehend what is. Every individual is the child of his time. Even philosophy is its time grasped in thought. No individual can over-leap his time. (Pref. to Phil. of Law.) It is evident that, in his way, Hegel was no abstract thinker, divorced from actuality, and speculating at large. Rather he set himself to give material content to the abstract and purely ideal, to make it concrete, in fact. The idea without reality, or reality without the idea, seemed to him unthinkable. Accordingly his logic could not deal merely with the laws of thought, (formal logic) but must at the same time take account of the laws of Cosmic evolution. Merely to play with the forms of thought, and to fence with ideas, as the old logicians, especially in the Middle Ages, were wont to do, seemed to him a useless, abstract, unreal operation. He, therefore, created a science of thinking which formulated not only the laws of thought, but also the laws of evolution, albeit, unfortunately in a language which offered immense difficulties to his readers.

"The essence of his logic is the dialectic." (M. Beer.)

Further description will be given of this Hegelian dialectic in next issue in which I also hope to carry on my review of Marx's theory of history to its conclusion. I proposed to confine my reply to one issue or two, but my argument spreads itself out when I sit down to plot and plan how the controversy shall be made educational and stimulating to thought for those who are interested, whether they, in respect of the points in dispute, agree with me or not. Otherwise, controversial strife is sheer waste of time and energy needed for educational work and social reconstruction. C

Literature Price List

Cloth Bound.	Per Copy
Revolution and Counter Revolution (Marx)	1.15
Ancient Society	1.25
Capitalist Production (First Nine and 22 Chapters "Capital," vol. 1. (Marx)	1.00
Vital Problems in Social Evolution	90c
Science and Revolution	30c
The Militant Proletariat	30c
Evolution Social and Organic	30c
Puritanism	30c
Ethics and History	30c
Germs of Mind in Plants	30c
The Triumph of Life	30c
Social Revolution (Kautsky)	30c
Essays on Materialist	
Conception of History (Labriola)	1.50
Social Studies (Lafargue)	.30
Paper Covers.	Per Copy
Evolution of Man (Prof. Boische)	50c
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	10c
Slave of the Farm	10c
Manifesto, S. P. of C.	10c
Causes of Belief in God (Lafargue)	10c
The State and Revolution (Lenin)	10c
Value, Price and Profit (Marx)	10c
Two Essays on History (C. Stephenson and G. Deville)	10c
Economic Causes of War (Lockie)	10c
Civil War in France (Marx)	10c
Christianism and Communism (Bishop W. M. Brown)	10c
Quantity Rates on Paper Covered Pamphlets.	
Two Essays on History	25 copies 1.25
Communist Manifesto	25 copies 1.25
Wage-Labor and Capital	25 copies 1.25
Present Economic System	25 copies 1.25
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific	25 copies 1.25
Slave of the Farm	25 copies 1.25
Manifesto of S. P. of C.	25 copies 1.25
Evolution of Man	25 copies 1.25
Causes of Belief in God	25 copies 1.25
Value, Price and Profit	25 copies 1.25
Economic Causes of War	25 copies 1.25
Christianism and Communism	25 copies 1.25

All orders include postage.

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

A Journal of
CURRENT
EVENTS

No. 228 TW

N

A OFFICE

Marx is of no single
his aims, his postulates
afford the point of dep
in political and econom
he is Hegelian in his
ness (his scheme of caus
By his later training an
economica he is un
physics of the system
Liberty... (Vollen)

It is fairly safe to
history of mankind
ation to which the te
could be so justly ap
der the machine pro
Coincident with this
social situation, mo
with the conception
world an dthe unive
process of evolution.
ient practice, the rea
the demands of the
process, whether o
various benefic
evolutionary process.
how it happened."
ation group themsel
gical, of which Heg
non-teleological char
ated with Darwinism
strictest expression
used as a working h
omena of existence
science of our day.
evolution means dire
ving purposive direct
generally, in the app
utionists, a meliorat
eating a belief in a b
ception is shot throu
ism" referred to in
sonality is projected
teleological Darwinis
anical play of brute
claimed that that sci
of the phenomena of
mal" or of states of
"trends" to those st
mains of the animis
may, let us ask wha
trend in things to a
ent of Hegel's philo
have to consider ne
Hegelian dialectic
tion. I suggest, fo
we peer behind Heg
ses for some irration
his belief.

"Hegel was an ideal
process of growth wa
in material forces, bu
universal spirit, the al
ated—God. Before He
ended as an idea, or
being, which it develo
the least a material e
in the objects of thou