

WESTERN CLARION

A Journal of
CURRENT
EVENTS

Official Organ of
THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

HISTORY
ECONOMICS
PHILOSOPHY

No. 351 TWENTY-FIRST YEAR Twice a Month VANCOUVER, B. C. JANUARY 16, 1925 FIVE CENTS

Socialistic Reminiscences of the Klondike

By F. W. MOORE.

It has been our lot to have been impressed for the first time with the truths of scientific socialism in the far-away Klondike about twelve or thirteen years ago. We had a small fractional claim on Sulphur Creek and worked with pick and shovel, or windlass, in search of the medium of exchange with which to secure the coveted beans and lubacks. We had plenty of spare time in the two-thousand-hour summer day, or in the long winter evenings, and few there were that didn't take advantage of it.

One had to be very careful in the accuracy of his statements in those days, since capable critics in overalls seemed to be a feature of the landscape; indeed, the ubiquitous overall was the one touch of art that made the northern world kin, for underneath its every fold the distinctions of class lay dormant. It was much better so, since the custom bred in men a tendency to judge each other by what was said rather than by what was worn; and as for what was said goes, our word may be taken for it that the volume of mixed-garvality and eloquence that greeted the discovery of economic determinism had an effect similar to that of the charge of the light brigade; it made all the local world wonder, for in a good-natured way the sourdoughs were not at all backward in joining verbal battle with each other; and on such occasions the cosmopolitan character of the contestants had a most extraordinary effect in rich variety of expression.

On the particular day we refer to, however, a few ordinary individuals of various nationalities stopped to talk with a miner who was taking out a dump by the roadside. As we drew near to the group the stentorian voice of a Scandinavian floated with undulatory modulations towards our ears. "By Ynamie, Walter Thomas Mills can't tell me that the wheels of industry will ever stop. People wouldn't stand for it," said he. "Arrah, out that out!" said Pat McCann, who had arrived in time to hear the last few words. "Give the wheel-barrow a rest."

"That's right, Pat, give him 'ell!" said Cockney Jim.

"We're not talking shop," said McGregor. "Mills claims that the extension of markets cannot keep pace with the extension of production. It would be silly to produce commodities that couldn't be sold; consequently the wheels of industry could hardly be expected to revolve."

"Dat de peep would never allow the wheels of industry to stand still," said Tony, the 'Eve-talian."

"Dat's yourt it," said the Swede, "and dat's why I say dat W. T. Mills is peddling de bull." And so the row began—a row most fruitful in its results, since it was the beginning of a series of discussions on the same subject leading up to the study of "Mills' Struggle for Existence," and the acceptance by most of the group of the truths embodied in the doctrine of scientific socialism.

Enthusiasm ran high; yet no organization that we heard of was attempted on the creek. To balance this state of affairs, however, a score or more subscriptions were sent to "Cotton's Weekly" (the

Canadian "Appeal to Reason.") One of these was addressed to Mr. Treadgold, the best known and most popular representative of finance capital in the whole territory.

Some of the subscribers lived on Gold Run, and on that creek we had the pleasure of listening to a few of them discourse at a Christmas dinner subsequent to the time of their inspiration by the remarks of Mr. Cotton. One young bacchanal was thinking of sending his post office address, as he understood it, to a friend in the States. It read: "Dawson, Alaska."

"You don't suppose Dawson is in Alaska," said one of the guests.

"Sure I do; where else would it be?" he replied.

"Why it's marked in Yukon Territory in my atlas."

"And where did you get that atlas?" he went on.

"I had it sent from Copey Clarke's in Toronto," said the guest.

"I thought so," was the triumphant reply. "You couldn't have run up against a worse bunch of capitalists; surely you don't believe what they say!"

A little later the subject of kings was introduced.

"You must hand the cake to us Americans for one thing," said the barber's wife. "We republicans have no kings."

"Mon Dieu!" said Frenchy LeMaitre, scratching his head. "Of all your institusheongs you have more of de king dan any oder, every time I go prospecting I pay tribute to—what do you call him—suere—sugar I mean, your sugar king; or your beef king; or your oil king. Ma foi! you help to make your Rockerfeller, or your Armour, or a lot of other kings, rich."

"Not only do your kings make Americans pay fabulous sums to their support, but da send dere goods all over de earth and make the nations of de world pay tribute to dem."

"We, de people, are all very loyal to what we tink is our own particular realm, but we haven't waked up yet to the fact dat our realm is international an dat we pay enormous sums of money to support the international kings of finance. You yank-kays have got rid of de old feudal king, who is at present, in Europe, an official for laying foundasheon stones and setting fasheongs in hats, but in his stead you now have hundreds of money kings, many of whom could buy the palaces of a couple of European monarchs and still consider themselves rich men. De same may be said of de money kings of Europe. De ting for us to do is to find out how dese money kings become so rich. Dey are demonstrating how wealth accrues to those who own the means of life. It only remains for the proletariat to study dere metods and follow dere example."

The barber's wife collapsed at this show of eloquence. She, poor soul, knew nothing of world politics and looked at Frenchy in helpless amazement.

"You are a most ungallant Frenchman to attack a lady in such a manner," she said, "next time you come here I shall have read up on the subject and

then you look out Mr. Frenchy"; and thus did Frenchy's little speech bear good fruit.

After this we worked on our fraction for another year, and then as the Googenheimers (the dredging magnates) had bought out all our neighbours; as our dam needed repairs; and as our pay-streak was almost run out, we presented our claim to our partner who, in the first place, was instrumental in helping us to get possession of it, and sought work from the company mentioned above with the intention of making our fare out of a country where the day of the individual miner was drawing to a close.

The work consisted in thawing from twenty to thirty feet of frozen muck that rested on the surferous gravels. Men worked in pairs, and took turns at holding a "twisters" attached to a thirty-foot live steam pipe, or in standing on the top of a ladder and pounding the pipe into the ground with a maul.

There was plenty of spare time during the intervals that the pipes were thawing after each forced descent of a foot, but whenever a man talked socialism on these occasions he was not long in discovering that from the company's viewpoint he was wasting time; perhaps he was too, but however that might be he soon found himself on the night shift with a partner that spoke little English. There weren't many such men but there were a few who said just what they thought without any prospect of a reward and well knowing that such procedure destroyed all chances of promotion.

Similar action was taken by certain brothers who kept the post office on Dominion Creek, a few miles distant from Sulphur. They, a short time before, had had a dairy in San Francisco, and came north at the time of the big fire. Their particular line of work for the cause was the distribution of socialist literature. We never ran across the Western Clarion up there, but these enthusiasts subscribed to the "New York Call," "Cotton's Weekly"; "The Appeal to Reason"; "The International Socialist Review"; and some socialist magazines. These were distributed to those interested and, no doubt, did a lot of good during their stay in the country; perhaps they are there yet, but wherever they are, their work of love in trying to awaken the latent instinct of liberty that inheres in all men must be bearing fruit, more or less, in widely different parts of the earth's surface to which the former denizens of Dominion Creek have scattered ere now.

These postmasters were also successful miners; indeed, most men who owned claims on the upper part of the creek were successful, yet they say there has been more money spent on mining in the Klondike than ever was taken out of it—at least during the individual miner's day. Whatever work was wasted incidentally to this was, of course, a total loss, but the unpretentious propaganda work that the self-taught socialists mentioned in this article did in that country, can never be lost. It is like the quality of mercy: "It is twice blessed; It blameth

(Continued on page 8.)

Treaties and Murders

THE hastily conceived treaties concluded with the Soviet Power, by R. MacDonald, have been promptly abandoned by the Baldwin Ministry," writes the Victoria "Colonist" (23/11/24). 'Tis surely humped like a camel. "The prompt action was the outcome of the new mandate from the British electorate." The Colonist is wise in the use of words. It says the British electorate, not the "people". And there is a world of difference between the electorate and the people. The difference between Democracy and the Capitalist sham "made safe by the war."

The "mandate" shows who is meant by the "people" of the "Colonist". The returns—presuming them votes, not altogether a safe guide, even in Canada—show the Conservative vote as (approx.) 7,855,000; Labor, 5½ million; Liberal 3 million (nearly). The seats held are Conservative 413; Labor 150; Liberal 42. The Conservative vote is 47%; Labor 33%; Liberal 18% of the total. But the seats held show quite other proportions: Conservatives 67%; Labor 25%; Liberal 8%. In the south counties—the real home of the "highs," the Conservative vote was (approx) 1½ million; seats obtained 84. The other parties with 1 million votes got one seat. The combined Conservative and Liberal majority over Labor in the House is, 74%. In the last Parliament the combined strength was 67%. Thus the Conservatives with considerably less than half of the poll obtained 67% of the seats. While Labor with one-third of the poll has one-quarter of the seats. In the last Parliament the Conservative strength was 41%. In the present election the Conservative vote increased by 2,400,000; the Labor vote by 1,200,000. So that with a vote increase of 14% the Conservatives secured—by electoral democracy—an increased strength of 26%. While Labor with a vote increase of 1¼ million declined from nearly one-third to less than one-quarter. Obviously, there are more than treaties "hastily concluded," and more than negotiations, "lamentably weak."

The "Colonist" is right,—the treaties "were never dictated by the good sense of the British people;" the loan would "never have been implemented" because, lacking safe-guards, "the money would not be subscribed." True. Because the only "people" in Britain with money to lend in such amounts are the oligarchs, the owners of capitalist property. And they would not risk their sweated gold with the Bolshevik—without safe guards. Nor to any one else. But with safeguards—"the owners of money for an adequate percentage will risk even the gallows." Nowadays, however—so low is the ethic of capital—that even that risk is proxy. So low that the "people" scorned a paltry loan of £30 million for the life and freedom of a nation, but could pour forth some £200 million to Wrangel and Denikin and Czecho-Slovaks to encompass the slavery of man. So low that its lickspittle press cannot even recognise its depravity. We hope that the "iniquity" of those expeditions may tangle the feet of their Capitalist sponsors in destruction, as Brest Litovsk tangled the Germans in ruin.

However, those "sensible people," having failed by force, offered to buy an entrance into Russia. All things have their prices, is their maxim. Through their vulgar mouthpiece Lloyd George Russia was offered a £20 million loan at Genoa. Safeguarded of course. But as the only possible safeguard was Russian resource, the pledging of Russian resource meant the slavery of the Russian people. For without the slavery of the nations, profit and interests and dividends cannot be obtained. Let that fact be emphasized. Without slavery, no profit. No where, no when. Russia, recognising the "lying spirit of God in the mouth of the prophet" rejected the offer. A thing which no Capitalist kingdom in the world would ever have the honor to do. For everywhere the "honor" of capital is but the slimy mask of exploitation. Yet even if that abstemious spawn of thrift had taken the risk of the Russian loan, they

did not stand any great risk of losing, even without safeguards. Because there are £15 million to Russian Government (Czarist) credit in London. And, 'tis said, a goodly sum in N. Y. The Russian loan was mooted as some £30 million, two-thirds of which was to be spent in Britain. There was therefor only £10 million risk—and even that would be, probably, reconstruction credit. Moreover, the unpaid interest on that £15 million for 7 years, at a paltry 5%—5¼ million. So that for a risk of £10 million Britain actually held a pledge of £20 million. And yet refused? No Wonder British Israel traces descent to the Hebrew. And prosperity to its god.

There is that "notorious Zimoviev letter"—the "sufficient indication to the British people that Moscow is not to be trusted." A statement which is also sufficient indication of the worthlessness of Capitalist evidence. Well, Moscow denies its authenticity—an argument valid only as it squares with other facts. It appears that Zimoviev was not even in Moscow on the date of the signature. We know it is neither the first nor the second time that chosen "people" have been found engaged in the gentle arts of forgery; that it is a regular arm of counter-revolution; and that, as alleged, there is a regular "forgery factory" in Poland. The authenticity of the letter is still in doubt, even by the Cabinet Committee; the original has never been produced or seen by any government department. MacDonald, in his anxiety to "run with the hares and hunt with the hounds," got "hot" only over a copy. It was not intercepted in the mails. It was said to be "received" by Communist headquarters. And there denied. It is also said to have been discovered by agents of the secret service, abroad (source unspecified). The contents of the letter "leaked out" to several sources, by unknown means. And a copy was, for an unknown time, in the hands of a paper hostile to the government before it was published by the Foreign Office. Such are the facts to date. In view of the conflicting evidence; of the undoubted forgeries of recent priority, and of the undoubted hostility against labor, generally and particularly, the balance of probability is rather against than in favor of authenticity. But the point in question is: the Colonist gave editorial prominence to the letter as a "resumption of Bolshevik propaganda." If the Colonist pronouncement is not to be interpreted as a continuance of capitalist propaganda, the current complementary facts of the letter claim an equal prominence. If, for no higher reason, than to justify the claim to be "clean."

"While the present government holds power, it is safe to assume there will be no overtures from London to Moscow." If the assumption is correct, then the Baldwin government will become an efficacious means for the "spread of the pernicious doctrines of Soviet aspirations." For the isolation of Russia from the world market entails the isolation of capitalist Britain from due prosperity; the lowering of living standards; and the consequent tightening of the yoke on the necks of the slaves. By implication therefore, the "overtures" will go by the covert channels of diplomacy. And Moscow will triumph—has triumphed. For Moscow has proved itself to mean the life and freedom of man. While London—with all its golden horde of vilification—has proved itself the Philistine of privilege. Moscow to lay, after seven long years of persistent and implacable capitalist intrusions and mendacity, stands beyond challenge. While London, after the same seven years, with unlimited material and unlimited opportunity for human elevation, is confronted with revolution. Apparently invincible, with its "cohorts waving in purple and gold," proud with the prestige of exploitation, yet, like the pride of old Spain; like the armies of Hindenburg, like the political barrage of France, it will crumble like a child's sand castle before the advancing tides of the new world. Not because of Bolshevik propaganda, nor for the anguish of its slaveries. But because it has tram-

pled the aspirations of social man in the dust; because it has continually violated the founded integrity of society; because it has sapped the morale of progress and turned the moving issues of social coherency into the issues of dominion—in brief, because it has bartered the glory of life for the law of class.

"Teaching Bolshevism to mind its own business, and leave others to mind theirs," sounds very noble. But 'tis only sound. Like the forcing of the doors of Japan and China; like the forced trafficking in opium (and its diplomatic shuffling right down to date); like the Balkan treacheries; and the status quo that permitted and maintained the slaughtering of Armenians; and like forcing democracy (!) upon the "Hun." Capitalist notions of "teaching, etc.," are written over the face of the world in fire and fury. America showed Mexico and Cuba; the Phillipines and Spain, its significance. Japan carried the message to Korea and China; France and Germany propagated it in various parts of the world. "Heroic little Belgium" bore the ark of the covenant into the Congo. And Britain practices it now in India, Africa, Europe and the isles of the Pacific. And just as in the old days of chattel slavery, the Tory press and the Tory pulpit fulminated against emancipation, or ignored the festering earth; so today, like sycophants, foam in the sweat of a like greed, against the emancipation of wage slavery, or keep discreet silence in the presence of degradation unequalled; or worse still, preach homilies on the excellence of exploitation. A prostitute press and a prostitute pulpit, how fitly are they adapted to their environment of capital.

In those eventful years, when the world was being prepared for "democracy," when the Allies were struggling almost to exhaustion to safeguard the weak—all unbeknown to the "immortelles," destined for carrion, plans of reconstruction were preparing. France was ordered in universal centralization—in virtue of the service of man. Industry concentrated in higher technique—so that the leisure of the heroes might not be intruded upon. The melon cutters, scenting the piping days of peace, "engineered" the "irrigating plant." So that honest Britain, with the commendable foresight of thrift, and the usual craftsmanship of diplomacy, emerged from the war with her rivals crushed; with future oil secure; and the possible marts of the world to her hand. But alas, the "negotiations" ruptured the "eternal friendship" of the past. The ruddy soil of conquest nourished unexpected poppies for the tables of privilege. Fear cast her deepening shadows over the world market, and in its darkness died the dreams of the heroes. But not the ambitions of pestilent Imperialism. Clothed in the Prussianism it fought not to stay, but to camouflage; it storms, like Dion, across a stricken world. Mouthing the phrases of democracy, it immolates humanity in the furnace of its greed. On the bleaching bones of the last war it bids us arm for the murder-fest of tomorrow. For the perpetuity of slavery, it urges society to the verges of class war. And for the peace of its property right, it drives civilization almost to extinction. Is it the ignorance of convention, or the mumming of the Pharisees?

"It is well those treaties should be forgotten. They were conceived in iniquity, because there is always iniquity in shaking hands with guards." I wonder what the wisard and other super persons think of the classification. The generalisation covers a wide field. And perhaps enough. History is reported correctly—the field avouder the British. For instance, would it be shaking hands with murder to consort with Lord Reading and General Dyer? Yet there is the railroad death car; American swarms suppression, and emergency laws. Why? Would it be safe to "shake" with the power that hated to the "people" of Johannesburg in their affliction? Would the government of the Black and Tan leave a

(Continued on page 6)

The Moving Process

I SHALL call my article in last issue an end to a period in my argumentation against the anti-labor party position of the S. P. of C. That position is one of opposition to political labor parties, as a matter of principle. I have argued that that principle is not a Marxian principle, but on the contrary, that Marxian science throws upon Marxian socialists the obligation to assume the contrary principle of recognition of labor parties as representative institutions of an independent movement of the working masses on the political field. The latter principle has its roots in history whose lesson is that it is mainly by active participation in the practical political ways of life and in the struggle over the issues that changing conditions and needs force upon us that men in the mass gain increase of intelligence and knowledge and develop the appropriate dispositions, skills, aptitudes and habits that as mental forces propel and carry them forward from stage to stage. In the complex group life of social beings we perform must learn mainly by habituation. And in such a life, because continuity of its processes is essential to existence, "gradualism" is the general character which the ways of change take on. This gradual character of change becomes more and more a historically imposed necessity where the society increases in scope, in the complexity of its processes and the interdependence of its communities, regional, national and local, one with another. The advanced capitalist communities are of that kind. And their people know it. And thought does sometimes control conduct; it may intervene between primitive urge and the act; or again, it may be the initiating factor in conduct. Hungry, we must hunt for food, but may think of ways and means, or again, we may be stimulated by reflection into hunting or working to provide against a more or less remote prospective future need. Thought is as innate with man as any other of his instinctive traits, if not so strong in its urges. Its special organ is a part of his physiological make up. I set down these remarks against two extreme positions taken up by many socialists. One group rests its hopes on the irrational urges of man and despises education and science for the worker; the other group see the process of change as a wholly intellectualized one. I think both are wrong, and believe it truer to hold that the political processes, less than some others are, are

gradually becoming a little more intellectualized and at that, perhaps, without any decrease of the force of the non-rational urges. Possibly thought increases their force, though there may be less fury, there may be more real progress in the face of so difficult a situation as the present one to which, on the one hand, blind instinct could only bring wreck and ruin, and which, on the other, presents too huge a task for intellect to undertake a wholesale change.

I have reviewed the theory of history of Marx, his dialectical scheme of causation, of how the social process works itself out, through class struggles. I have made extensive quotations from his analysis of the political situations and related conditions of his time to which he applied his theory. I have also quoted the policies he recommended for the use of socialists in their relationships with other political organizations of the working class and towards progressive movements in general, as well as citing the history of Marx's own activities in the practical affairs and relationships his interest in the revolution led him into. To do this I have been reading Marx, his writings, and of his personal history, and swear that not from either can be deduced the anti-labor party position. Submitting as axiomatic the dictum, that the essence of any philosophy is the whole of it, I challenge the gentle reader, whose mind is not a closed one, to a reading of Marx—the "Manifesto," "Revolution and Counter Revolution," the "Eighteenth Brumaire," the "Civil War in France," the "Eastern Question," the "Poverty of Philosophy," "Capital," and even "Value, Price and Profit"—without fear for my case against the anti-labor party position. At any rate I rest my case so far as Marxian science is concerned, for I hope to write of what a later modern science has to say on the social problem and of what can be derived from that science that may be of use in forwarding the class struggle.

In closing, let me remark to the general reader, and as a matter of protest to my opponents, say, that I do not care what you know of or about Marxian theory, or of or about the Darwinian theory of evolution, or of and about the findings of modern science, we do not in any real sense know those theories and findings unless they govern our reasoning on the social problem and on ways and means of change. The Darwinian evolutionist whose reasoning is governed by his knowing, knows that predictions of the future deduced from an analysis of what is given in the present must be speculative in character and

are to be taken with reservations. The moving process of society is not the same as that movement within the walls of a watch case pivoting on a static or fixed base and working towards a predictable result. On the contrary, the social process moves through a cumulative change in habits of life and thought and institutions whose outcome is certain. So that, so far as the socialist future is concerned, the Darwinian knows that we have to cease to regard it as inevitable in order that we may study and plan and scheme and educate and organize in order to make it so.

Take the case of those socialists who have put all their eggs in one basket, their hopes of revolutionary change on a collapse of capitalism through economic crises. How often have their hopes been deferred. And how eloquent is that term we have left out of our calculations—the "elasticity of capitalism," we call it, to make our lazy ignorance look like wisdom. If Marx believed in the inevitability of socialism, he still believed in the struggle to lessen the birth pangs and hasten the process. And he nowhere gives expression, as "R" seems to imply he does, to the expectation of collapse. True, he saw a logical trend that way, but he nowhere rests his cause upon it. The revolution was to be worked out by a class-conscious working class. And the function of economic crises accompanied by some degree of degradation, was to aid in bringing the workers to a fitting frame of mind.

A few words on J. A. McDonald's remarks on the reprint from "The Plebs," two issues ago. In that issue I put aside my preoccupation with Marxian theory to turn on my opponents for what I considered their indulgence in word magic. I sought space for "The Plebs" article because it was devoted to the same purpose, but in a more general way and in an abler manner than my own. There is not a word in the reprint concerned with party positions, nor was it my intention to use it in that way. By the way, in his remarks, he makes this assertion of the Plebs organization: "They (the Labor Party) expect to regenerate society through democratic means while the Plebs group are irreconcilable opponents of such tactics." I am sure he is wrong in his assertion, for many of its membership were candidates of the Labor Party in recent elections, and received the Plebs endorsement. Some of them were successful. That is my information. I ask him to furnish proof in support of his assertion. C.

In Support of "C."

IN the "Clarion" issue of December 1st "C" bewails the fact that he seems to be very much alone in the discussion that has been going on; but perhaps he is not so much alone as would appear. Perhaps one reason for the apparent lack of backing for his side of the question is that the discussion has been carried on on a plane which was perhaps a little too high for the average membership; and again it was perhaps that others felt like I do, that his side of the discussion was in very competent hands and could be safely left there.

It seems to me that the positions taken by "C.'s" critics savor very strongly of the doctrinaire or dogmatic, and some of them have resorted—whether consciously or unconsciously I do not know—to unfair criticism by the method of distorting "C.'s" apparent meaning and, at least one of them clothes his thoughts (and mostly very fine thoughts too, not only in this discussion, but in other writings also) in so many words and repetitions that it is sometimes a little difficult to follow the thought through so much verbiage, and the comrade is perhaps in danger of falling into the state ascribed to W. E. Gladstone by Lord Beaconsfield, namely, that of be-

coming "inebriated by the exuberance of his own verbosity."

But, be that as it may, our avowed object is to enlighten "Jack Proletariat," who is not a very highly educated gent, as yet, so simpler language and construction might be more to the point.

So now, as a change of menu, I would like to make a statement of my conception of the positions taken by the disputants on a much lower plane (of language and very probably of intelligence) so I'll put it in the form of an analogy, although the same—like most of its breed—is liable to be pretty lame. So here goes, as briefly as I can.

In a big arena or ring two combatants face each other, one seconded, handled and coached by a bunch mostly all conscious to the full of the purpose and intentions of their principal, which is to retain—by any means, fair or foul—possession and full control of the prize (the means of life) and at the same time, even while giving his opponent an ever diminishing share of the same, trying to hoodwink him by protestations of friendliness and all kinds of false promises.

The other combatant, our combatant, we may

call him "Jack Proletariat," does not yet understand the purpose of his opponent, but is apparently satisfied to hold or maybe to increase a little the share of the prize that is being given him, and he is seconded, handled and watched by a mixed bunch whose perceptions of the other principal's purpose ranges from zero to full comprehension, this last being represented by us socialists.

Now! it seems to me that the position taken by "C.'s" opponents is like coaching our principal thus: What's the use of listening to these other guys? They don't know what needs to be done themselves, so they can only give you a bum steer with their idea that this is a friendly bout and that you can gain anything by scoring points. I'm telling you that your opponent never intends to give you a darn thing if he can help it, and the only way you'll ever get anything more is to listen to what I'm trying to tell you about his game, and knock him plum out and take control of the whole cheese.

Such advice would result as follows: Since the struggle never ceases for a moment—until poor "Jack" becomes convinced of the correctness of our

(Continued on page 4)

Western Clarion

A Journal of History, Economics, Philosophy,
and Current Events.

Published twice a month by the Socialist Party of
Canada, P. O. Box 719, Vancouver, B. C.
Entered at G. P. O. as a newspaper.

Editor: Ewen MacLeod

SUBSCRIPTION:

Canada, 20 issues \$1.00
Foreign, 18 issues \$1.00

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

VANCOUVER, B. C. JANUARY 16, 1925

SCABBING ON PALMER, DAUGHERTY & CO.

LEON Trotsky, if current news items are to be taken seriously, would appear to have outlived the cat of nine lives and to have escaped attention from the cat o' nine tails, this latter being flourished by his own party kith and kin as to an erring brother. We gather from the inevitable confusion that is the reward of diligent news searching on such matters that the rule to go by in the avenues of publicity is to let the wish govern the thought and drown a man in printer's ink, not once but often, failing the final and mortal stroke to be given by those who love him.

It was said by Lenin on the occasion of the fourth congress of the Third International that the nature and content of the various Russian theses concerning communist policy and practice had not been thoroughly understood abroad, even among the members of internationally affiliated communist parties. In some such words as these he said, "They have signed our various theses, but they have not understood them." This was probably a well grounded observation and would be likely to be quite as sound applied the other way around. However, where party argumentation takes place on policy definitely directed toward application in a given country it is not strange to find the means and methods, in discussion and action, to be hard to follow by the outside world.

The outside world knows vaguely at the present time that the Russian Communist party has been active in discussion concerning lessons to be drawn from recent events in Russian revolutionary history, the interpretation of these lessons in the light of present policies, and those to be projected. Out of that discussion there has arisen prominently the figure of Trotsky, now leader of the minority side in party council, a courageous, trusted and able leader of revolutionary experience whose interpretations of events and their consequences meet opposition from the controlling elements of the Russian Communist party. Hence our current newspaper headlines announcing Trotsky's imprisonment, or death, or what not.

We do not propose to set down here any description or analysis of the discussions that have involved the Russian Communists in polemics during the past two years,—to say nothing of the years before. To do that understandingly would be almost as hard for us as for the communist press of this continent. That press, in dealing with "Trotskyism," very clearly demonstrates the difficulties encountered abroad in understanding "our Russian ways," as Lenin has it. "Trotskyism" in the present case finds its expression, without suppression in Russia, in Trotsky's book "1917" which is devoted to the "Lessons of October." In Russia the book has been received and discussed as reopening the theoretical

controversy featuring the history of the Russian Communist party and which dates back to the days of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party, divided into Bolsheviki and Menshiviki in 1903. Bolshevik policies were identified with the name of Lenin and Menshevik with the name of Trotsky. There followed the events of 1905, 1917 and the years between and after. Concerning the revival of the controversy through Trotsky's book which occasions so much concern among the faithful, we are glad to read this from Kamenev, (The Nation, N. Y., Jan. 7, 1925):—

"Nobody has ever thought of suppressing Trotsky's book, not a member of the Central Committee has ever raised or is raising the question of disciplinary measures against Comrade Trotsky." Further assurances to the same effect are given by Stalin and Zinoviev, and it would appear that the Russian way of dealing with contrary ideas is to accept them if they square with the facts, to demonstrate it if they don't, but in any case never to choke them. But "our Russian ways" are not understood abroad. We find in "The Daily Worker" (Dec. 13, 1924), official organ of the Workers' Party of America, a review of Trotsky's "1917." This review is headed "How One Should Not Write the History of October," and is translated and reprinted from the Moscow "Pravda," and presents a point of view hostile to that apparently held by Trotsky. The review is continued in the issue of "The Daily Worker" of Dec. 23, 1924, and occupies altogether about four pages (magazine section). Good. Critical and informative. It whets our appetite to read the book "1917." It would whet the appetite of anyone interested in the history of the case in hand. But behold, alongside the first installment of the critical "anti-Trotsky" review there is displayed in block the following item, headed:

"Decision of the Party C. E. C."

To all Party Editors:
Dear Comrade:

You will find attached hereto an English translation of a review of Comrade Trotsky's Book "1917" entitled "How One Should Not Write the History of October."

By decision of the Central Executive Committee all Party papers are instructed to reprint this Pravda Review within ten days time.

It is the further instruction of the Central Executive Committee that no Party paper shall reprint the book "1917" or any chapter thereof in the Party Press.

The Central Executive Committee also instructs that in connection with the reprinting of the review attached the following statement by the Central Executive Committee shall appear in the Party papers:

"The Fifth World Congress of the Communist International and the Thirteenth Party Conference of the Russian C. P. branded the opposition in the Russian Communist Party under the leadership of Comrade Trotsky as 'petty bourgeois opportunistic.' Comrade Trotsky has recently published a book '1917' in which he reopens the discussion which was closed by unanimous decision of the Fifth Congress and of the Thirteenth Conference of the C. P. of R.

"The review of Comrade Trotsky's book herewith 'How One Should Not Write the History of October' shows clearly the method employed by Comrade Trotsky to again open the discussion.

"It is the view of the Central Executive Committee of the W. P. of A. that the publication of Trotsky's book in this country would be a detriment to the work of Bolshevizing the Workers Party which is the most important task before our Party.

"The Central Executive Committee regrets to note that the Volkszeitung has already begun publication of the book serially. It has instructed the Volkszeitung to discontinue the publication and further instructs all other Party papers that neither the book as a whole nor any chapter thereof is to be reprinted in the Party press.

"The Central Executive Committee has further instructed all Party papers to reprint the accompanying review of Comrade Trotsky's book which was originally published in the Pravda, official organ of the Communist Party of Russia."

"CENTRAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE W. P. of A.
WM. Z. FOSTER, Chairman.

"C. E. RUTENBERG, Executive Secretary."
Prompt compliance with these instructions is desired of all Party papers.

Fraternally yours,
C. E. Ruthenberg, Executive Secretary.

So newspapers of the Workers' Party shall reprint Trotsky's book nor any chapter of it, but all Workers' Party papers are required to reprint the Pravda review. Come on, Toronto. Tell us if you've read the book. Nowhere do we find that "The Daily Worker" people have read it. We know we'd like to and we're sure all who are interested in such matters will want to.

So Trotsky is not yet assassinated by the Russian Bolsheviki. But the burlesque Bolsheviki of Chicago have assassinated his book. The queer thing known as "Bolshevizing the Workers' Party" must have its day.

Thus the Workers' Party turns censor, copying their betters, ancient and modern. They have little apparent sense of humor; these people, but they are very funny.

IN SUPPORT OF "C."

(Continued from page 3)

contention, in the meantime he would be getting unmercifully mauled, and growing ever weaker and less able to deliver the knock-out when he did recognize its necessity.

Here I would like to state parenthetically that, because those other handlers and coaches and their activities are a part of the struggle they cannot be ignored and, further, in my estimation our socialist education and traditions and revolutionary training does not place us in a position "anti" to them, but has merely added greater distance and increased clarity to our vision.

To my perception "C" takes the position which virtually says, as coach to our principal:—Those other seconds and handlers of yours don't see through your opponent's game and keep advising you to keep pegging away, trying to score points, but I'm trying to show you all the time that your opponent is trying to smash you to the point of submission where you will be willing to take whatever he likes to hand you, and that he will use all kinds of tactics, fair or foul, to attain his object, but neither they nor you see it yet, so in the meantime, buddy, go to it, and hit him as often and as hard as you can, for each time means a loss of strength to him and a gain of confidence to you, and you will finally force him into the position of showing you himself that I had his intentions sized up right; then you will be able to hand him the necessary knockout and take the whole cheese instead of the miserable little bit he intended to hand you.

And that's that.

J. W. D.

ECONOMIC CAUSES OF WAR

By PETER T. LEONIK

NOW READY

Preface by the Author.

128 PAGES.

Per Copy, 25 Cents.

Ten copies up, 20 cents each.

Post Paid.

MANIFESTO

of the
SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA
(First Edition)

Per copy, 10 cents

Ten copies up, 90 cents each.

Post Paid.

Is Production Social?

BY A. G. McCALLUM

SOME time ago a question was raised in these columns regarding the use of the term Social Production, Social Average, Socially Necessary Labor and Necessary Social Labor as contained on pages 8, 9, 21, 30, 31, 32, 35, 37 of S. P. of C. Manifesto.

Up to the writing of this article, one comrade has ventured an opinion on the matter to the effect that the term Socially Necessary Labor is somewhat ambiguous and may be used in a sense much more comprehensive than that in which it is used in connection with the theory of value.

While the comrade's explanation may sound plausible and serve as a truce for the time being to those who fear the reflection that things are not what they appear to be, the writer again states—that when the various social phrases are viewed in the light of commodity production it is to find they are not ambiguous terms, but rather misnomers the application of which does not fit in with our everyday slave experience. If a condition of social production prevailed it would be consistent to speak of social labor, averages, etc., but when social production Does Not Exist, it is up to the Socialist to re-instate his case with words that will express Capitalist Production correctly.

It has been pointed out before that society is divided into two hostile camps, the capitalist class who own, but do not produce, and the working class who produce, but do not own. In this two-class nature of society, "where property is a differentiating Agent" there exists a threefold struggle between Capitalist and Capitalist, Worker and Worker, and Capitalists against Workers. Conflicts that arise between individuals of the same class are purely sectional conflicts and can be reconciled by substituting combination for competition. The merger, masters' associations and workers' organizations are manifestations of reconciled sectional interests. "Class interests" differ from sectional interests, and exhibit themselves in the form of a struggle between classes. Here the interests are fundamentally antagonistic to each other and cannot be reconciled under a system where things are produced for profit. "Where the Instruments of Production are Owned and Used by One Class to Enslave the Other."

The fact of workers and employers, trade unions and corporations, entering into certain definite relations over the buying and selling of labor-power does not make production social or the sale of labor-power a social transaction, but a "Class Transaction With Distinct Class Results." As Buyers and sellers they are classes apart, with nothing in common. The seller only becomes a buyer by becoming a possessor and passing into the propertied class. The buyer only becomes a seller by becoming dispossessed and by being precipitated into the propertyless class. Here we have two distinct classes with distinct class functions.

When a strike or a lockout arises over a question of wages it reflects the antagonism of interest existing between those who control and those who operate industry. How often has the gun and the club been used to demonstrate that the interest of masters and slaves are not identical. What greater evidence could be found than that furnished by the strike and the lockout to show who supplies the active factor "Labor Power" that makes commodity production possible? When the miners vacate or are ejected from the pits, coal remains at the bottom of the shaft until the Miners return. When the railway, trolley and steamship systems become affected, transportation comes to a standstill until the Transport Workers set the wheels in motion again.

If we accept the axiom that coal beds, mineral veins, timber limits, etc., have no value until the hand of labor is applied and converts them into things useful to man, it is then very obvious the sum total value of the world's commodities therefore, represents the sum total of labor expended in its pro-

duction. While it is all too apparent there can be no value without labor it does not imply that the labor applied to the natural resources is social labor, but "Wage Labor" performed by wage workers. Capitalists do not produce or acquire their wealth by plundering it from other capitalists, but by abstracting it from the workers at the point of production. Marx clearly shows how this is accomplished in his analysis of Commodity Labour Power, and which, briefly stated, is as follows: The workers having nothing tangible to sell like lumber, steel, rubber, etc., are forced into the labour market "Where all propertyless persons must go" to sell their labor power. In selling their mental and physical energy, the man-power to build up and tear down, the workers not only produce a value equivalent to their wages, but also produce a Surplus Value. If the workers only produced a value equal to the cost of their substance, wages, no profits could exist. In other words; the wealth the wage workers produce must, in order to satisfy the employers, exceed the amount of their wages, and, therefore, must exceed the amount they are able to buy back and consume. For no other reason are workers employed, and a review of statistics dealing with wealth production in all capitalist countries shows Marx's analysis to be correct.

While it is not the intention of the writer to monopolize space on the contradiction arising out of the disposal of the "Surplus" which costs the capitalists nothing, and which finds the workers with no means to buy back, it may be mentioned here that while the workers collectively produce the world's wealth they have no voice in the conditions surrounding its sale or exchange. The utter lack of interest shown by them in what they have created leaves no doubt as to the question of its "Ownership" under the wage system.

In further urging the point that the production of commodities is the function of wage slaves, and that the ownership therefore is the function of their masters, we will now view the issue from another angle.

When the production of wealth was carried on with simple hand tools the share that was taken by the employer did not appear as surplus value plundered from the worker, but as wealth the master had co-operated in producing. At this stage, private property in the means of production was a surmountable barrier, consequently, the distinction between exploiters and exploited was not very noticeable. The branch was there nevertheless, and with the invention of the machine which has kept on growing in size and costliness, the breach between possessor and non-possessor has also widened, "kept pace with the machine," up until today where we now find that the crude tools which were at one time within reasonable reach of the craftsman has passed far beyond the reach of the individual capitalist.

Such is the significance of the trust and syndicate which tell us that property is now collective and international, just as is the process of production. As a class, the workers produce the world's wealth by their collective labor. As a class the capitalists own collectively the means of production and distribution and collectively exploit the workers of the wealth they produce. While the rise and development of the machine has had the effect of banishing individualism and private property, it has also had the effect of freeing the capitalists from the arena of production. The personal command, directive ability, that was at one time exhibited by them in the productive process has now given place to personal command over stocks and shares. Having been removed from the industrial process their position now is that of parasites living on the backs of the workers.

In summing up the foregoing, it is very evident the production of things essential to sustain life is not a social function, but a class function. The cap-

italist class do not contribute towards the labor process, therefore, it is the working class alone that give wealth its value. In the course of our reasoning on general principles, we find that social production, average social labor or necessary social labor does not apply or prevail in the present economic arrangement of things, let us then confine ourselves to the use of terms that do express the mode of production and theory of value correctly.

Leon Trotsky's ill-health and retirement to a rest-cure in the Caucasus coincide with a bitter struggle in Russia against what the Soviet newspapers have come to call "Trotskyism." The dominant members of the Communist party executive and the Government of Russia have recently issued voluminous disquisitions against Trotsky's views as expressed in articles and in his latest book, "1917."

They call him opportunist and petty-bourgeois; they charge him with opposing the closer union of town workers and peasants; they say that he seeks to undermine "Leninism" and say his words serve the cause of Menshivism. To the world outside, however, unversed in the intricacies of Russian Communist exegetics, Trotsky has seemed quite as often to stand to the Left as to the Right of Bolshevik orthodoxy. It was not to be expected that the leadership of the Russian Communist party would work in easy harmony after Lenin's death. Trotsky is a difficult person; he makes mistakes with an almost triumphant gusto and vigor.

Coupled with, and often opposed by, Lenin's cool and flexible statesmanship, Trotsky's flashes of genius have produced amazing results, as in the creation of the Red Army—a tremendous feat of human engineering. With Lenin gone, he has doubtless become a problem. Too prone to seize personal power, too ready to play a lone hand, if necessary in opposition to his associates, he has become a person to be controlled if not suppressed. In official statements, republished in our International Relations Sections this week, the Communist leaders explain on doctrinal grounds their opposition to Leon Trotsky, though they deny absolutely any intention of adopting disciplinary measures against him. His ill-health may be as real as it is opportune, and undue significance should not be attached to any aspect of the controversy; internal opposition is probably a sign of political health rather than imminent decay. But a conflict of forces more human and concrete than the documents suggest is likely to lie at the bottom of the sea of dialectics in which the subject has been submerged by the Russian leaders.—The Nation (N.Y.)

HERE ARE NOW.

Following \$1 each: T. De Mott, A. M. Neelands, C. Lestor, F. A. Charters, W. Lewin, O. Amundsen, C. L. Sallstrom, F. Neale, O. Rayner, T. Twelvetree, F. J. McNey, Tom Erwin, A. F. McCallum, J. C. Blair, B. W. Sparks, Sam Buch, H. C. E. Anderson.

Following, \$2 each: G. Lee, Wm. Craig, Miss Bell, Dr. Curry.

Wm. Dorney, \$1.50; C. W. Allsop, \$3; C. C. Wellerman, \$1.50; D. McTavish, \$3.

Above, Clarion subs. received from December 24th to January 16th, inclusive—total, \$34.

CLARION MAINTENANCE FUND

Following, \$1 each: T. De Mott, W. Lewin, F. J. McNey, A. G. McCallum, J. Chrystal.

Wm. Clarkson, \$2; C. W. Allsop, \$5; C. C. Wellerman, \$3.50.

Above, Clarion Maintenance Fund receipts from 24th December to 16th January, inclusive—total \$15.50.

Karl Marx and Value

BY F. J. McNEY.

Poor old Marx, he certainly does catch hell from all sides these days. As a prophet and philosopher he was a fizzle. His theory of the class struggle was a fallacy, and he never did know anything about economics. He copied his dialectics from Hegel, and Hegel was a humbug. And the materialistic conception of history, well, it does not amount to anything anyhow. We are assured, however, that in spite of all his fallacies and failures, it is no more than fair to state that Marx was an honest and sincere, even if deluded, champion of the working class. That is all.

The foregoing paragraph represents the conclusions a man must arrive at if he credits everything that has appeared concerning Marx and his theories in all kinds of publications during the last few years, and up to the present time.

Now I am not a hero worshipper, and I never did hold that Marx was infallible; consequently, I have a hunch that he did make quite a few mistakes and peddle a lot of bunk in the course of his lifetime; everybody does that, but there is no reason to assume that because a man makes some mistakes and peddles a certain amount of bunk that everything he says is bunk, and all his theories are fallacies. Many of the critics of Marx appear to have the idea that if they can just get the old man down, and keep him down, they will have abolished for all time, not only his theories, but also the material facts upon which those theories are based. In other words, they seem to ignore the possibility that at least some of his theories may be based on material facts, and that is where they make their little mistake.

To illustrate what I mean let us take the heliocentric theory. That is, the theory that the sun is the centre of the solar system, and that the earth and the other planets revolve in orbits around the sun, not the sun around the earth, as was supposed at one time. When Copernicus published his book announcing this theory he was an old man, and he croaked before his critics could get him, but they collected every copy of the book they could find and burned them. That should have stopped the planets from gadding around through space, but it seems it did not, because a little later Bruno noted that they were still at it. So they tied Bruno up to a stake and burned him to death. They thought that would put a stop to the capers of the earth, at least, if it had any sense of decency at all, but a little later Galileo announced that the earth was still jazzing around the sun. Then they grabbed Galileo and made him swear on a stack of Bibles that the earth never moved an inch in its life. Nevertheless in spite of everything that was done to stop it in the interests of priestcraft, everybody with as much sense as a jack-rabbit knows that the earth is still revolving in its orbit around the sun, and that the theory of Copernicus was a statement of fact. All of which is good and sufficient proof that a theory is not necessarily a fallacy just because it is opposed by certain interests.

Our first question then, is, are all the theories of Marx fallacies? Or, as value is the subject of interest here, are his theories concerning value fallacies? No doubt the old boy talked through his bonnet at times, so I am not moved by the argument that a thing must be true just because Marx said so, but if his theories concerning value are in accordance with facts, then it is possible to prove that such is the case regardless of what he himself has said or left unsaid, and that is the correct method of dealing with any subject. Instead of talking about what Marx said, and what he meant regarding his theories, let us take up the theories themselves, analyze them, compare them with known facts, judge them on their merits and explain the conclusions we arrive at in our own words. What modern astronomer would attempt to describe the solar system merely by telling what Copernicus said about it?

Well, to make a long story short, I hold that the

theories of Marx concerning value are correct, and in accordance with facts, and that no other theory is necessary even as a supplement, but I claim that he made a rotten job of explaining his theories. He solved all the problems connected with the labor theory that had puzzled the classical economists, but his method of presentation was so vague and complicated that he made a profound mystery of a comparatively simple proposition. He wrote three large volumes for the purpose of applying his theories to the capitalist system as a whole, and he buried them so deep in a deluge of words that it requires an expert diver to bring one of them to the surface, and many a good man has died, figuratively speaking, in an attempt to salvage one or two.

If this is not so, why is it that there is so much confusion concerning the works of Marx? Why is it that the best the average exponent of Marx can do is to quote him, tell what he said, and speculate as to what he meant? Why is it that his opponents do not understand him well enough to criticize him intelligently? In my opinion, if Marx had stated his theories concerning value in a clear and concise manner and in the least possible number of words, and had published them in one small volume, leaving the details and particulars to others, he would have accomplished far more than he did by writing "Capital." Then his work would have been easier to understand, easier to explain and these would have been less to criticize, and if his theories are in accordance with facts, as I have a hunch they are, they would have taken care of themselves just as the theory of Copernicus took care of itself. To show the vague and complicated method Marx had of explaining a point at times, I will quote one passage from "Value, Price and Profit." In chapter seven dealing with "Laboring Power," in which he points out that it is labor power, and not labor, that the worker sells, the first paragraph reads thus:

"Having now, as far as it could be done in such a cursory manner, analyzed the nature of value, of the value of any commodity whatever, we must turn our attention to the specific value of labor. And here, again, I must startle you by a seeming paradox. All of you feel sure that what they daily sell is their labor; that, therefore, labor has a price, and that, the price of a commodity being only the monetary expression of its value, there must certainly exist such a thing as the value of labor. However, there exists no such thing as the value of labor in the common acceptance of the word. We have seen that the amount of necessary labor crystallized in a commodity constitutes its value. Now, applying this notion of value, how could we define, say, the value of a ten hours' working day? How much labor is contained in that day? Ten hours' labor. To say that the value of a ten hours working day is equal to ten hours' labor, or the quantity of labor contained in it, would be tautological and, moreover, a nonsensical expression. Of course, having once found out the true but hidden sense of the expression 'value of labor,' we shall be able to interpret this irrational and seemingly impossible application of value, in the same way that, having once made sure of the real movement of the celestial bodies, we shall be able to explain their apparent or merely phenomenal movements."

What Marx means to say in that long complicated passage, and what he does say in his own obscure way, is, that it is nonsensical to speak of the value of labor, because value and labor are one and the same thing. And that is all he says. But I doubt if one out of twenty readers arrive at that conclusion after reading it. True enough, that conclusion is implied whenever the labor theory is dealt with, but it is seldom definitely stated. The idea that the average reader gets from the above quoted passage, is that Marx said labor had no value, and therefore, labor is valueless, but labor power possesses value. I have heard several argue to that effect. Now it is obvious that if labor is not itself value, and possesses no value, it cannot possibly confer value on anything else, and note, that it is labor, and not labor power, that is crystallized in commodities. This shows how easy it is to misunderstand Marx unless

a person reasons a little for himself. And there are many passages in the works of Marx that are more difficult to understand than the one just quoted.

As this article is something in the nature of what Bernard Shaw would call "First Aid to Critics," that is, a kind of introduction to a few remarks I intend to make later, if I find it convenient, it might be well to adjourn for the present.

TREATIES AND MURDERS

(Continued from page 2)

smudge on one's hand? Was it shaking hands with murder to recognize Kolshak? This—specimen, shall we say—was quite intimate with Britain. With the help of British gold and troops, it seems, he upset the elected assembly of Western Siberia, and organized a new one, on the basis of real "democracy." Was that minding one's own business? And when Kolshak promised immunity to the members of the assembly he had destroyed, if they gave themselves up, and shot eight of them who did so, on the spot—was that shaking hands with murder? When Britain and France and Japan, those gallant defenders of the small nations, controlled the elections in Vladivostok—was that minding one's own business? When Siberian prisons were groaning with the victims of Czarist "freedom," when bloody Sundays, red squares and strike massacres were the commons of the day, when even the members of the Duma were arrested—who then shook hands with murder, and sacrificed for democracy? When British gold—and probably French—and German bayonets raised and supported the treacherous Rada against the choice of the people,—was that leaving others to mind their own business? When British and German troops marched into the Baltic Provinces in support of the most reactionary gang of landlords in the world, and forced the people to accept their tyranny was that the lesson of one's own business? When Finland lay prostrate to the "White Terror," who recognized that "government"? Who shook hands with murder? When Britain and France and Germany ringed Soviet Russia with "fire and death," when the poisoned propaganda of capital ravished the mind of the nations; when churches poured those tainted millions into the service of Czarist generals, all of them free by Soviet clemency, all of them dishonored with broken faith; when Britain—and the shame of it lies black as ink on the shield of her vaunted "honor"—prevented even necessary medical supplies into Russia in her dire distress, and closed her ports in the days of her famine; when she sailed into the Baltic and prohibited neutral trade with Russia—who then left others to mind their affairs? Who then shook hands with murder, or with things more deadly than murder?

We have no brief for the labor government. We like it as little as the "Colonist" does. Still, inept and clumsy and unimaginative as it is, torn asunder with confusions! and the barren restrictions of bourgeois responsibility; nevertheless, somewhere in the remote future, its hope is the emancipation of humanity. While all other governments with their dissembled leagues, and crafty diplomacy, and poisoned news, stand for the eternal slavery of man. And while we do not rejoice in calamity, we are still glad that it is a government of the iron heel that is now faced with the impossible task of reconciling intensive exploitation with a market forever vanished. In the depths of the struggle there shall be wee and death. But there shall also be a mighty harvest of experience. And out of it shall come the new government of the proletariat, clear with the issues of reality, unwavering in the deliberateness of its design. A government that shall no longer hold carnival with Korah, and go no more smaying with Cain and Tago. A government dallying no more with expediency, but conscious and aroused, sweeping away with the strong arm of fructifying labor, the guile of a privilege, and the ethos of a property that stand, amidst the seeming treasures of our socialized life, like a puff-ball amongst autumn corn.

Materialism

A GAINST materialism, as a word or a principle, considerable prejudice exists because of imperfect knowledge of what it stands for. Generally speaking, materialism is supposed to mean everything sordid, selfish, sensual, criminal and degraded, as opposed to the noble, uplifting features of what is hazily described as idealism. Neither the one nor the other conception is satisfactorily complete.

As an acceptable philosophical tenet, materialism dates from the middle of the nineteenth century: its most original and brilliant exponents being the socialists, Marx and Engels with their generalisation known as the materialistic explanation of history, which regards the "bread and butter" conditions of any social period as determining the various thoughts and actions most strongly marking it off from any previous or subsequent one. Buckle, the English historian, was also a thinker along materialistic lines; but he inclines to explain national phenomena as arising from the environmental influences of natural factors, such as climate, earthquakes, etc., or the attacks of enemies, animals or human. Then there are the scientists who prove the dependence of mind upon body, from the effects upon the former of disease, accident, injury or growth development upon the latter. But at this stage of the game materialism may ignore both praise and blame for, as a proven hypothesis it is quite independent of either; and can be satisfactorily and correctly applied in many different ways.

For instance, the unscientific and bigoted religionist maintains that Protestantism arose victorious over Catholicism because the former harmonised with the revealed Divine truth, and the latter didn't. The materialist Socialist, however, can assure the Protestant that it was really the coming of the veritable age of "busy"-ness (business) which knocked the feet from under its rival, because, for one thing, the great number of Catholic religious holidays interfered too much with the newer regime. Even under Czarist Russian capitalist rule it was enacted, some twenty years ago, that instead of, as of old, the Greek church holidays being compulsory, they might, in future, be merely optional. And that Protestantism's objections to religious interference with "beesiness" are not confined to attacks upon its powerful rival, was once borne in upon the writer in a workshop where he gained a more or less useful honest livelihood in the classic land of John Knox.

His boss, who was a Bible-quoting, strict church-going Scot of the old school, employed in one of the departments a Jewish lad as an apprentice, who, in the fall of the year, required to take several separate days off, in order to dutifully fulfil parental wishes regarding religious observances. But his covenanting employer latterly raised such a terrific howl, especially as his bound apprentice could not be docked, that the lad had to cut his holidays down to even below the bare minimum necessary to keep on the right side of the God of Moses and Aaron, not to mention that of his pious gentile benefactor! So the Socialists are pretty sure of their ground when they avow themselves materialists; for on all sides, one can trace materialism's dominating influences; sometimes for progress, for good, at other times, like every natural or human force when unrestrained, crushing or crippling those who must submit to its yoke.

As regards that wage-slave class, the workers, in their present battle for existence; material conditions are, of course, their masters. It is when employed by typical large scale capitalism and in the enjoyment, as the poet says, of youthful prime or manhood's active might that they sometimes extract the greatest happiness out of life. Under such conditions, large numbers—a great socialised factory army—are brought together as a smoothly working, organized, disciplined mass; giving cheerfulness, comradeship and humor an opportunity to flourish. With productive and profitable efficiency as the aim,

and competition as the driving force, their employers, as far as they can, supply the best of machinery and equipment; and the bigger the concern, a la Henry Ford, unlike the small middle-class ones, the easier and the more pleasurable are the conditions of exploitation.

But that period is as comparatively short as is the career of a professional athlete. In many trades, the elderly worker is as rare a sight as is that of the proverbial dead donkey, because the older men never get a chance to remain on the job. In addition to these drawbacks the shadow of wholesale layoffs is ever present, for it is common to read press reports that thousands of workers at a time have been discharged from some large concerns, followed by the announcement that, on enquiry being made no definite reason therefor, could (or would) be given by those at the head of affairs.

Disgusted with these unexpected layoffs over which he has neither control nor protection, or discharged owing to the silent inroads made by increasing years; the worker gravitates to a smaller town and adapts himself to some calling where he may be "independent." He certainly becomes independent of his previous fate, but at what a cost! There are several kinds of competing "independents" to be found in such places, whose instruments for producing a livelihood are so feeble and deficient, that they have to beg, borrow, yes and steal, to complete their outfits! Who has not been impressed on seeing that significant and gloomy notice hung up—like Dante's "Abandon hope all ye who enter here" where it is most needed—"No tools lent." And as another result of such "independence" we meet with an expression which has secured an impregnable position amongst us, as strong as that famous irritating remark, "Well, is it hot enough for you?" Coming from a prospective patron, that expression is "Are you busy?" Upon analysis, the meaning is that the aforementioned independents who, upon the whole, can barely make ends meet, are sometimes idle for days, weeks or months, and at other times are so rushed with work and possess means and help so insufficient to cope with such "prosperity" developments, that neither they nor the community can be satisfactorily served. Under Socialism, efficient organisation and ample labor-force supply, would bury this idiotic "Are, you busy?" as deeply as the discarded and unnecessary "State" itself.

It has already been above said, that a strong prejudice exists against materialism; and it might be further remarked that many people can never realise, nor reconcile themselves to, material limitations. That applies particularly (as the comic strips remind us) to women who are divorced from and so have no practical knowledge of the daily economic struggle for filthy lucre. This applies even more so (alas! when these innocents suffer the pains of disillusionment) to children. Was it not Marie Antoinette who, when told that the poor of France could not get bread naively enquired "Then why don't they eat cake?" When a little child, the writer used to accompany his mother out shopping. At the bakers his parent would often hand him a bun, apparently without money and without price figuring in the transaction; but only accompanied by the invariable remark "Put it down to Mrs. —'s account"—of course, to be paid for at the week-end settling. So the youngster, having learned the trick successfully practised it alone on his own initiative upon himself, by merely adding the mystic and yet not unreasonable "open sesame" passwords about Mrs. —'s account; until investigations and explanations followed and he was informed that, after all it took real money to buy and enjoy a real bun—and then it was all over with his earthly paradise!

Similarly with those children of a larger growth—mankind. Has their career not been a continual chafing against and victory over the hampering brute forces of the material world? If not, what, then, do all these inventions for dominion upon

land, wafer, and now, over air signify? And yet, side by side with all such triumphs we still endure an irrational system of production with profit and not usefulness in view; the slaves of what we intended should be our servant—money. What this condition of things logically results in, was recently well illustrated by one of Ring Lardner's inimitable plebian, ungrammatical and ill-spelled stories, about a theatre proprietor who was persuaded to join his village volunteer fire-brigade. After waiting for long in vain for a fire alarm, the joyful sound was at last heard summoning them to the home of a (\$200,000) "millionaire;" only to find it a false alarm. However, that didn't worry the gallant heroes much, whom the theatre man discovered in every room, deliberately wrecking everything they could get a smash at. Finally, each volunteer member of the brigade, which comprised plumbers, furniture dealers, glaziers, etc., leaving more of their business cards with the "millionaire" than he could hold in both hands; quitted the house. But their latest member, being merely a theatre man with nothing saleable to fire victims, thought it about time he resigned from the bunch! A funny yarn, no doubt—but certainly no funnier nor sillier than its parent capitalism, of which it is a portrait in miniature. That Lardner's story really contained elements of truth is proved by an occurrence in connection with a Toronto volunteer fire brigade; three members of whom were arrested on September 29th, 1924, upon charges of "arson and conspiring to burn," the object of the fires being said to be a desire to show off efficiency and also to influence the community to purchase a more up-to-date equipment.

So, it would seem, there is something at the bottom of these illusions about impatience under and victories over materialism, which have for so long marked the career of the human race. There is something anticipatory in all this, something distinctly prophetic of overwhelming mastery. For thousands of years, mankind have been idealists; and, in the words of Hegel—himself the mighty idealist teacher of materialistic Marx—"everything which is real, is reasonable." It was only, as above remarked, towards the middle of the nineteenth century that materialism's claims were discovered and justified. If the age-long misconceptions were entirely without some basis in fact, why did the misconceptions prevail? Even the flat earth misconception is based on the fact that, relatively to its inhabitants, the rotundity is negligible—do we not use spirit-levels?

Let us consider another of man's illusions. As is well known, it was once the universal belief that it was the sun that journeyed around the earth; instead of the present view that, in both its daily and yearly progress, it is the earth that moves around the sun. And so we modern smart Alecks look down with pitying superiority upon our ignorant, simple-minded ancestors, who actually "saw" the sun's motions. Yet, maybe after all, our ancestors were not so much in the wrong as we imagine. Take the question of wages, for example. As the sun supports every earthly life-form, so the worker's wages is the sun of his capitalist existence, because it sustains and fructifies the entire life of him and his dependents. But wages are socialistically considered under three aspects. First—the nominal wage is the money-name of what the worker periodically gets. Second—the real wages is what that sum of money can periodically purchase in accordance with the rise or fall of the prices of commodities the worker needs. Third—the relative wage measures the changes that occur in the capitalists' profit receipts as compared with the share the worker receives of what he produces. Now, the worker's wage may apparently remain stationary at, say \$20, and yet all the time it may be continually fluctuating by rising or falling; as explained by the three terms, nominal, real and relative wage, as Marx shows in

(Continued on page 8.)

MATERIALISM.

(Continued from page 7)

his "Wage-Labor and Capital." In effect then, the worker's "sun"—his wage—although remaining stationary in itself, is considered to be in motion in relation to objects that actually have moved. Hence, our ancestors, in asserting that their sun moved around an object—the earth—which was the real mover, were relatively right and, consequently, not absolutely wrong!

Apply this analogy to the questions of idealism and materialism. Undoubtedly, materialism is the correct theory; but don't let us therefore altogether despise and reject idealism. Materialism is the hidden, vitally essential, strong, rock-set foundation that supports the whole superstructure. But idealism is the lovely superstructure itself, which charms and satisfies both eye and soul! Mankind's anti-materialistic instincts, as we said, are prophetic; for capitalism already offers us the basis for rendering any anxiety about matters material, ridiculous—"Consider the lilies of the field," etc.

Capitalism not only supplies the basis for mastery over material affairs, but it has also furnished the proofs of such supremacy; and Karl Marx gave us the means to understand these proofs in his theory of surplus value which he discovered in the mid-nineteenth century along with his two other discoveries—the materialist explanation of history and the class war principle. His analysis of surplus value lays bare the source of profit and the exploitation of the working-class. A hazy idea still prevails that profit is made by selling goods at a purely artificial price fixed by the will of the seller, over and above their true value. But Marx, in his "Value, Price and Profit" shows that this idea is incorrect. And yet so truly is the theory of surplus value a genuine discovery that even Marx himself can only prove it in this lecture, indirectly: just as the roundness of the earth, contrary to its appearance of flatness, must be, like many another scientific truth, proved indirectly or, as it is called in logic, "symbolically" and not by instantaneous direct observation, i.e., "intuitively."

Now surplus value is what the workers create over and above the value of their labor-capacity; for which latter they get, on an average, just enough wages to maintain it in condition and to rear up fresh labor-powers embodied in their children, to replace the adult powers when worn out and useless. The labor that the worker must do to earn his keep is called necessary labor; and the labor which he performs over and above this necessary labor, as a free gift to his employers, is called surplus labor. It is from this surplus labor that all profit is derived, and the subject is fully treated in "Capital," vol. I, chapter 18—"Various Formulae for Rate of Surplus Value."

There are figures available (for the United States, for example) which give us an insight both into the amount of surplus labor imposed upon the workers, and also the degree of their exploitation. The statistics from 1860 to 1919 indicate that the workers' share in wages in the total wealth produced in the U.S.A., average seventeen per cent. H. Cahn, page 237 of his "Capital Today" produces figures which show that, in a ten hour working day, the necessary labor time, during which the worker produces his own keep is two hours and twelve minutes, and the surplus labor time that goes to the employers, is seven hours and forty-eight minutes.

Of course, under capitalist conditions, wages merely represent, on the average, a subsistence standard. So, if something more than subsistence wages is demanded, under Socialism, somewhat longer hours than the necessary labor time would have to be worked; especially as communal expenses would then be directly borne by the working class. But then, under Socialism, an increase of working powers would be gained by the abolition of those capitalist occupations, such as commercial travelling, advertising agencies, etc., etc., permitting a large addition being made to the necessary productive army.

As regards agriculture, a section of prairie farm land is said to be capable of supporting from 40 to 50 people. A township containing 36 sections would,

therefore, maintain 1440 people. As the prairie provinces alone contain thousands of such townships, one can understand how small a farming population could sustain billions of people. Already the cry is heard that farming "overproduction" is annihilating the prices of farm commodities. The following (newspaper comment) refers to the Canadian crop of 1923:—

"The prairie provinces, with less than two million population, produced enough wheat and meat this summer to feed about fifty million people, yet thousands of families are very poor, their children cannot attend school for want of clothing, and hundreds of families on the treeless prairies, it is stated, have not sufficient money to buy coal. Why, with such great production are there so many in want?"

Therefore, the Socialist contention is well within the mark, that with proper organization the full labor day need not exceed four hours.

All this is proved to be possible. We have the means, material and physiological, to make it possible. Only the requisite knowledge, the will and the organization are lacking. When this trinity do get together and become as one, the Mastery of Materialism over us will be altered into our Mastery over Materialism; which will then be reduced to virtual nonentity, and the Age of Idealism, the Golden Age, the Millennium will at last, a welcome guest, have come to stay with us!

PROGRESS.

SOCIALISTIC REMINISCENCES OF THE KLONDIKE

(Continued from page 1)

him that gives and him that takes." Some of them perhaps, have made money. We may take it for granted that they are all happy and, we hope, living in peace.

But even if they made no fortunes we venture to say that each still won a very valuable prize. Is not knowledge a glorious reward? and does not our particular kind of knowledge make us superior to those petty jealousies incidental to class-interests and born of economic necessity entailed by our present competitive system?

Plutes and barons may feel a temporary superiority over the unfortunates from whose hard work

Literature Price List

Cloth Bound	Per Copy
Revolution and Counter Revolution (Marx)	\$1.15
Ancient Society	1.85
Capitalist Production (First Nine and 32 Chapters "Capital," vol. I, (Marx)	1.00
Vital Problems in Social Evolution	80c
Science and Revolution	80c
The Militant Proletariat	80c
Evolution Social and Organic	80c
Puritanism	80c
Ethics and History	80c
Germs of Mind in Plants	80c
The Triumph of Life	80c
Social Revolution (Kautsky)	80c
Essays on Materialist	
Conception of History (Labriola)	1.50
Social Studies (Lafargue)	80c
Paper Covered	Per Copy
Evolution of Man (Prof. Bolsche)	20c
Wage-Labor and Capital	10c
Independent Working Class Education	10c
Communist Manifesto	10c
The Present Economic System (Prof. W. A. Bonger)	10c
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific	15c
Slave of the Farm	10c
Manifesto, S. P. of C.	10c
Causes of Belief in God (Lafargue)	10c
The State and Revolution (Lenin)	25c
Value, Price and Profit (Marx)	15c
Two Essays on History (C. Stephenson and G. Deville)	5c
Economic Causes of War (Lenin)	25c
Civil War in France (Marx)	25c
All prices include postage.	
Christianism and Communism (Bishop W. M. Brown)	25c
Quantity Rates on Paper Covered Pamphlets.	
Two Essays on History	25 copies 75c
Communist Manifesto	25 copies \$2.00
Wage-Labor and Capital	25 copies \$2.00
Present Economic System	25 copies \$1.50
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific	25 copies \$2.25
Slave of the Farm	25 copies \$1.50
Manifesto of S. P. of C.	25 copies \$2.00
Evolution of Man	25 copies \$2.75
Causes of Belief in God	25 copies \$2.50
Value, Price and Profit	25 copies \$2.25
Economic Causes of War	25 copies \$2.00
Christianism and Communism	25 copies \$1.00

Make all money payable to W. H. Jackson, P. O. Box 770, Vancouver, B. C. Add discount on cheques.

they draw their sustenance, but a socialist knowing the meaning and historical import of it all looks out from the window of reality at the ephemeral numery of a passing show. He knows full well that the figures that now occupy the world's stage are like the masked Santa Clauses who diffuse universal pleasure during the years of our childhood by presenting to the families as gifts articles that some of the members earned by their own hard work. Humanity, like the child, is growing. In another sense we might say 'they' are growing. They will soon get rid of their pet delusions. The plural is here used advisedly since we are thinking of humanity as two babies born with every attribute that will make of them an invincible man to be admired and trusted, and an enlightened woman to be loved and honoured.

Surely the acquisition of this truth is more to be desired than all the gold of the Klondike.

Let us hope that those of our cosmopolitan friends who were unlucky financially have the grand consolation of possessing the treasures embodied in the momentous truths that are crystallized in the doctrines of scientific socialism.

PLATFORM

Socialist Party of Canada

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Obey that impulse and subscribe for the WESTERN CLARION
Address P. O. Box 770, Vancouver, B. C.

Enclosed find \$ _____
Send the Western Clarion to:

Name _____

Address _____