



WESTERN CLARION

A Journal of
CURRENT
EVENTS

Official Organ of
THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

HISTORY
ECONOMICS
PHILOSOPHY

Number 820.

Twice a Month

VANCOUVER, B. C., JUNE 1st, 1920.

FIVE CENTS

History

DESPITE the fact that the history of the human race records many striking examples of retrogression in social development, of civilizations destroyed and of peoples fallen backward into barbarism—such examples are, in truth, more frequent and spectacular, as Veblen has somewhere pointed out, than of those where the life and culture of peoples have been saved from such a precarious institutional situation, such for instance, as now threatens the peoples of the modern capitalist world—yet, it is indisputable, viewing history as a whole, since the days of primitive man to the present, that there has resulted a progressive, if uneven, development. Whatever slowly evolving forces or sudden calamities may have operated to sweep civilizations out of existence, and their peoples out of leadership in progress, something at least of value, prior to the complete wreck of productive and cultural life, appears to have been passed over to or appropriated by other peoples, and so saved for the race as a whole.

The art of writing, for instance, survives though its inventors have passed out of the knowledge of men; the dial on our watches reminds us of Ancient Babylon, and the uses we make of algebra calls to mind a debt we owe to an Arab civilization long passed away. By means of the art of writing, the preservation of knowledge was made easier and its diffusion tremendously stimulated. The influence of this art is recognized as one of the factors featuring the beginning of civilization, and, in great degree, contributing to continuity and comparative rapidity of social progress. The slow development of pre-historic times, which practically synchronize with pre-writing times, may in part be ascribed to the lack of such a medium of preserving and diffusing knowledge; for, though should all material evidences of progress be destroyed in some calamity, yet, if knowledge is preserved the injury will not be irreparable.

Not the least of the benefits accruing from the art of writing is the preservation of past experiences of the race. This is true in spite of two extremes of opinion tending to degrade our estimation of the study of history, that of the ultra-constitutionalists, obsessed by historical precedents and that of those they have driven, in hysterics, to the extreme reaction of seeing no value in the study of history whatever.

History may be said to be the corporate memory retained by the human race of its experiences and to be as essential to methodical social progress and well-being as is memory to the individual. Reflection on these social experiences shows us the moving forces and changing material conditions which constitute the basis of historical movements and events, and which determine the nature of political, philosophical or religious ideologies, the modes of social and institutional development, and the successive forms of social organization. For the purpose of understanding present society and its problems we study the past out of which it grew organically and in which it still has roots. We study the phenomena of both past and present, not as things separated, finished and given, but as things in a cumulated sequence of cause and effect, interdependent and in ceaseless change, and, as such, impregnated with the germs of future life, with potentialities, tendencies, and the necessity of soc-

ial adjustments whether for human weal or woe.

But history, as it has been and is written, must be read with discrimination. Consideration must be given to the historian's natural bias for or against a particular country or race, to his class connections, and to his political, religious and professional affiliations. Further to be considered is the period in which the historian lived or lives; for, just as there is a history of ideas, philosophical, religious, political, etc., so there is a history of the changing methods and purposes of presenting history, as for instance, during the interval that separates the Annalist of the ninth century, A.D., to the historian of the present day.

The great works of the classical literature of ancient Greece and Rome were lost to the world during the dark ages following upon the fall of Roman civilization. Out of social disorganization slowly and painfully emerged the feudal order; and out of a welter of ignorance and superstition as painfully and slowly emerged another dawn of intellectual light and learning. Intellectualism continued to extend its influence until it began to question the truth and threatened to destroy the influence of the superstitious concepts and absurd dogmas of organized Christianity. It was then that, in the fourteenth century, all the terrors of the "Holy Inquisition" were brought into play, and all free enquiry, discussion and the utterance of speculative ideas were suppressed: bigotry and intolerance, fire and fagot, rack and thumbscrew reigned supreme. The human mind had now to struggle against more than its own natural limitations along the road of intellectual enlightenment; it had also to free itself from the poisonous cloud-vapors of authoritarian dogma, accumulated during priest-ridden centuries and enforced by ruthless political power.

For a knowledge of Europe in the centuries following the fall of Rome on to the ninth century, we have to depend on the crude records of the Annalist, mostly monks, whose aim was to set down the disconnected events they narrated as simply marks of time to prevent the confusion of one year with another. But some progress in method began to appear with the lapse of time. The chronicler, who followed the Annalist, placed the mere distinction of time in subordination to the narrative of events, though he told them in mere order of succession without reference to their causes or relations in the present or the past.

A modern historian, John Richard Green, places the birth of historical presentation, in the modern sense of the term, in the twelfth century. Says he: "The growth of civilization brought reflection with it—still more as the recovery of the greater works of classical literature suggested larger views of man's social and political relations, and, at the same time, furnished models on which new thoughts which they suggested might frame themselves. . . . In a word history had begun, but it seemed to be born only to vanish away. . . . the space from the close of the thirteenth century to the Reformation is a mere blank in historical progress." Referring to the state of historical enquiry in England, he says: "But although a happy instinct taught the English scholars of the seventeenth century to select what really were the most important records of the past . . . no instinct could teach them the true principles on which the study of these records had to be based.

On the contrary they were led away by the theological spirit, which in every department of knowledge has been the bane of all true progress, and the wider questions of national or social life were subordinated to the miserable controversies of warring sects." Nevertheless, he points out, that the very controversies which blighted historical enquiry and method in England were the means of giving birth to its development on the continent. The Jesuits, were, strangely enough, unconscious midwives when they instituted the compilation of the lives of the saints in order to "overawe the Protestant world with a gigantic panorama of the life and effort and perpetuity of the church which it defied." The labors of this enterprise developed in certain of those engaged in it a more scientific spirit than had hitherto obtained, and their influence infused fresh life and vigor into historical research, and into the presentation of history.

What is said above touches as briefly as the writer was able on methods of presenting history. Of much more importance to the student, however, are the various theories upon which historians have attempted to base an explanation or interpretation of the movement and events of history. But this phase of our subject is too important to be dealt with in the space at disposal, and brief notice only must suffice.

There is little except antiquarian value in the theories of the Annalists and the Chroniclers. Their historic horizon was extremely narrow and they viewed the world as a complexity of things ready made. The pages of their annals and chronicles are cluttered with reports of supernatural intervention, beneficial and malevolent, into what were, after all, often little more than tribal affairs. Alongside those, as worthy of even less consideration, we must place a class of histories rampant down to our day. These are the familiar, vulgarizing "drum and trumpet" histories of our schools, which are cooked to inculcate national prejudice into the plastic minds of the young. It is chiefly by means of these "histories" that the extreme forms of the "great man" theory of history are fostered.

Of higher interest to the student of history and of sociology in general, are the two modern conflicting theories of history, the Idealistic and the Materialistic conceptions.

For the former conception it may be said that those who hold it base their interpretation of history on a concept of the power and self-sufficiency of the idea, and, that thus, social progress and well-being are based upon man's better insight into supposed eternal truths and to an increase of his sense of justice. To them, history is a record of good and evil deeds, fundamentally a record of conflicts between the upper and the nether worlds of spirit and carnal desire.

In another part of this issue of the "Clarion" will be found Gabriele Deville's brief summary of the Marxian "Materialistic Conception of History," and of the interdependent theory that class struggles are the historical instruments of political progress. The reader is referred to the summary as an introduction to a study of that theory of history. Deville pays attention to the Anarchists, as a branch of the idealist school of historical thought, but also with them must be grouped all bourgeois schools of political conviction, including Liberals, Radicals, and also Socialists other than Marxian Socialists. C. S.

Economic Causes of War

Article No. 5

FRANCE entered the war for no other purpose than to recover Alsace-Lorraine, because of its valuable natural resources in coal, iron and other minerals. She was convinced that Britain would come to her aid, not only on account of the obligation arrived at in 1912 quoted in the British "White Papers," but also because of the conference between Sir Edward Grey and the French ministers, held in Paris in April, 1914.

Why had the antagonism between Britain and France then subsided when they had been commercial rivals for centuries? Even as late as the Boer war of 1899-1903, the British press wanted to roll France in the blood and mud in which her press wallowed, and take her colonies and give them to Germany and Italy. Tardieu in his book "France and her Alliances," tells us as late as 1903, quoting the "Temps" of December 24th, 1903, that "England has never been, and can never be, an ally for France." Why this change? Tardieu answers, page 67: "The fear of Germany was responsible for the Entente Cordiale . . . the King Edward visit to Paris, the English fleet's visit to Brest, the French fleet at Portsmouth, the Paris Municipal Council's stay in London, last of all, Mons. Falliere's visit to London . . . the strengthening of the Entente is not due to those; all such fetes have been effects, not causes. **The cause must be sought in Germany.**" Page 46: "Neither in England nor in France is the principle of understanding to be sought. **Rather was it the fear of Germany.**" Page 57: "In London, therefore, the Franco-English rapprochement appeared to be the best means of coping for the joint good of trade and the empire. On the French side economic interests counselled this rapprochement and political interests were not opposed to it." On page 59, Tardieu tells us that on the 14th Sept. 1901, the Associated Chambers of British Commerce passed a resolution advocating a Franco-British treaty basing their vote on the immense advantages to the commercial relations between the two countries. In 1903, during a visit of French M.P.'s to London, Sir Edward Sasson said: "Our aim should be to arrive at an Entente which is really stable, that based on material interests."

The whole history of the past century is a continual conflict of French and British commercial interests. The Syrian question in 1839-40 brought French and British policy in direct conflict. In Africa they were at loggerheads on many occasions, compromising by neutralizing the Congo Free State (of rubber fame) to promote their own imperialistic policies of exploitation; Britain endeavoring to obtain territory for her Cape to Cairo railroad. France utilized the Congo Free State railway and steamers to transport Marchand and his troops, munitions and stores, in his attempt to contest British supremacy on the Upper Nile. The result of these conflicting interests in that region was the Fashoda incident of 1898, where France backed down because her ally, Russia, failed her. In negotiating the Anglo-French African Convention, of June, 1898, Lord Salisbury stipulated that no differential treatment of British trade should be enforced in the French dependencies of the Ivory Coast and Dahomey for a period of thirty years. France and England's commercial interests conflicted in India, Canada and Africa, on numerous occasions. The monopolistic economic policy of France in Tunis, Madagascar, French Congo, and the French Somali coast has been a fruitful theme of recrimination between the French and British governments. Egypt is in itself sufficient to recall half a dozen acute crises between these two nations. In fact, it led to the Franco-Russian Alliance of 1891. The French loans to Russia strengthened the alliance, the first loan of 500,000,000 francs being made in December, 1888, and others as under: 700,000,000 francs and 1,200,000,000 francs in 1889.

300,000,000 francs and 41,000,000 francs in 1890. 320,000,000 francs and 500,000,000 francs in 1891. 178,000,000 francs in 1893. 454,000,000 francs and 166,000,000 and 400,000,000 francs in 1894. 400,000,000 francs in 1896. 424,000,000 francs in 1901. 800,000,000 francs in 1904. 1,200,000,000 francs in 1906.

I think this explains why France has been the greatest antagonist of the Bolsheviks.

All friction in Africa was over the great natural resources of raw material for the requirements of modern industrialism, such as timber, infinite in variety, oil palms for manufacturing oleomargarine, rubber vines, precious gums, resins, and oil-bearing plants and fibres. The method pursued was issuing charters to merchants forming companies who made treaties with the native chiefs, assisted by explorers and missionaries. Sometimes the local competition of zealous officials pulled up the flagstaves which rivals of some other countries had erected in the towns and villages, and these differences were often aggravated with disastrous consequences for the natives, by the sectarian animosities of the competing religious sects. Uganda ran red with native blood owing to the quarrels between the French party, composed of French Catholic Fathers and the British party composed of Protestant missionaries. Those were the days when Lord Salisbury sarcastically referred to the Gallic cock scratching the sands of the Sahara, when Chamberlain raspily advised France to mend her manners, and when the "Daily Mail" wanted to roll her in blood and mud. The treatment of the natives, although anything but ideal in the German colonies, has never yet reached the stage of the atrocities practiced in the French or Belgian Congos.

Friction between France and Britain was occasioned by the fiscal policy of France over any territory she acquired, because she created a special economic preserve by means of tariffs for the exclusive benefit of French trade. This differentiation cannot be charged against Germany in her colonies, as every British merchant knows who has traded with them. The great estrangement between France and England arose over their conflicting interests in Morocco, which I hope to deal with in more detail later. Britain began to court France and they entered into an agreement over Morocco in 1904. Tardieu says in the book I have mentioned, page 194: "England, who if France had been willing, would have made war in 1905." Morel, in his "Diplomacy in Morocco," says that Lloyd George issued an ultimatum to Germany when addressing the Bankers' Association in 1911, but Germany backed down because her bankers refused. France was in a quandary during the Russo-Japanese war when the Russian fleet fired on the British fishermen in the North Sea; she was afraid it might draw her into a war with Britain, as Japan was Britain's ally. Tardieu says: "Britain and Russia remained at peace. For one thing, there was to be considered the importance of the Anglo-Russian trade. . . The English sales in the empire of the Czar were from eight to fourteen millions sterling, and their purchases from fifteen to twenty-five millions. Their consuls pointed out that Russia was an admirable field opened to their commercial progress, which everywhere else was hampered with Germany. Moreover, although Japan's ally, England had no intention of handing the Far East over to her ally. Russia might be a useful counterweight against a friend that was too strong, while also offering an outlet for English industry."

The policy in colonizing is to alienate the people from the land making the natives depend on selling their labor power. France in Tunis abolished the Tunisian constitution and passed the lands, which had been previously owned collectively according to

Mohammedan custom, into the hands of the government. Then she sold the land at ridiculous prices to French colonists, thrusting the Tunisians into the ranks of the proletariat. The great abundance of manual labor has reduced wages to a very low level, with the truck system prevailing and an organized system of fines still further reducing wages. The Tunisian laborer is in absolute serfdom.

Thus we find Africa a great continent for the exploitation of native labor and natural resources, with France and Britain dominating 9,000,000 square miles out of a total of 11,000,000 square miles; France 4¾ millions and Britain 4¼ millions. It is quite clear that the flag follows trade, exploiters and missionaries. Read this, an advertisement in the "Record of the Home and Foreign Mission-work of the United Free Church of Scotland," December, 1919, page 267: "The purpose of the missions is not to develop trade, but trade is inevitably developed by missions. They steadily increase material needs; soap, oils, cloths, sewing machines, books, tools, follow hard on mission enterprise. Missions teach thrift, industry and honesty in commercial dealings. **It is worth while for business men to support missions if from no other motive than that they create new, larger and better markets for their goods.**"

PETER T. LECKIE.

HERE AND NOW.

Following One dollar each: H. Hanmer, L. R. Taylor, A. Nordin, T. Faulston, N. H. Tallentire, W. Smart, A. S. Willis, J. Smith, Mrs. Mathieson, T. J. Davies, A. J. Kivi, J. Robinson, N. T. Sachle, J. J. Albers, R. M. Alexander, Mrs. E. D., Neil Shaw, Sandy.

Following, Two dollars each: Wiley Orr, B. E. Polinkos, Hedley Metal Miners, Jack Shepherd, J. A. Harris, R. Burns, W. A. Blake, C. Bordenhagen, Roy Reid, A. A. McNeil.

R. C. McCutchan, \$3; Trevor Maguire, \$3; F. Harman, \$4; H. Roberts, \$4; H. Vindeg, \$1.70; C. C. Weelerman, \$1.50; J. A. McD., 50 cents.

Total subscriptions received, 11th to 26th May, inclusive, \$55.70.

PLATFORM

Socialist Party of Canada

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Science of Socialism

By H. M. Bartholomew.

Article No. 8.

THE SOUL OF MAN AND SOCIALISM.

RUDOLF Eucken, the great German philosopher, rejects the basic principles of Socialism because "Socialistic culture directs itself chiefly to the outward conditions of life, but in care for these it neglects life itself."

He tells us, with great eloquence, that the great aim of humankind is to pass from the natural to the spiritual plane of life, and "This particular way is not a mere development, but a self-development. The aim of the spiritual is to develop its own self through the human being. In this way man is given the possibility of developing a self, a personality in a very real sense."

This self, personality, or soul of man, is of the highest importance. Its suppression means infinite loss not merely to the individual, but to society as well.

And it is because Socialism is purely materialist and "directs itself to the outward conditions of life" (meaning, thereby, the food, shelter, and clothing which are essential to life), that Rudolf Eucken rejects Socialism. He finds in its principles the negation of all that which is noblest and best in man, the ruthless suppression of the spiritual life of the individual and of society.

This contention, so ably and so eloquently placed before the world, is considered by many to be unanswerable, and to dispose of Socialism once and for all. Let us examine the relations of Socialism to this spiritual life of man which Eucken deems to be of such paramount import.

In the first place, the Socialist contends that the most important task of men's lives is in the provision of ample food, warm shelter and adequate clothing. They further assert that until these primary needs are supplied it is useless to talk of the soul of man and to appeal to the spiritual life of human kind.

There can be very few persons who will deny the above assertion. Everywhere do we find that hunger, and squalor and misery are the foes of the highest and the noblest in human life. When the wolf of hunger stalks through the front door, the inspiration of the spiritual slinks out of the back door.

Who can say that the conditions of life and of work which obtain today are such that the highest and the noblest in man can gain supremacy? Who dare say that the spiritual in man can live and have its being under the deplorable conditions of the existing social order?

Think, for a moment, of the existing condition of affairs. The overwhelming mass of the people in every country find themselves condemned to a life of toil. Early and late do they work. They are summoned to their tasks in the morning by the strident tones of the factory whistle, and in that factory—which is often extremely unhealthy—they turn a wheel or tend a machine under the watchful eye of the foreman. Their home-life is spent in surroundings which bear the ugly impress of commercialism, and where the soul of man gives place to dollars and cents. Insufficient food, unhealthy homes; the direct want and anxiety always on the door-step—is there one man who dare say that art and science, philosophy and culture can thrive in such conditions. Modern Capitalism, in its ceaseless search for profit and still more profit, crushes beneath its iron-heel, the souls of men and women. The highest and the best, the purest and the noblest, all that which raises man above the brute beast of the forest and the jungle, all this is ruthlessly suppressed. Capitalism is the direct antithesis of the spiritual in man.

The Socialist is in the forefront of those who desire the development of the soul of man, and who want for the personality of man an opportunity for

a wider and fuller expression. And he asserts, that this development can take place and this desideratum be gained only when there is a change in the economic basis of society. He demands that the material needs of every man, woman and child be amply supplied, confident that by so doing the soul will have ample opportunity to function.

As we have seen in previous articles, the history of the human race has been the story of class-struggles. Man has been striving, practically aimlessly, to satisfy his material needs. This struggle for bread and butter has excluded, to a very large extent, music and science and art—all that which makes life worth living. Says Engels

"In every historical epoch, the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organization necessarily following from it, form the basis upon which is built up, and from which alone can be explained, the political and intellectual history of that epoch; that consequently the whole history of mankind . . . has been a history of class struggles, contests between exploiting and exploited, ruling and oppressed classes; that the history of these class-struggles forms a series of evolution in which, now-a-days, a stage has been reached where the exploited and oppressed class—the proletariat cannot attain its emancipation from the sway of the exploiting and oppressing class—the bourgeoisie—without, at the same time, and once and for all, emancipating society at large from all exploitation, expression, class-distinctions and class struggles."

Thus does Engels proclaim, in a sentence which has become classical, the historical basis of Socialism, and point the way to the spiritual emancipation of man. As long as exploitation and oppression continue, so long must the personality or soul of man be in thralldom.

The history of mankind is rich in its lessons. Since the establishment of private property in land, the history of mankind has been one long and sordid series of class-struggles. Man has been the servant of his environment, the slave of the conditions which he himself has created.

Especially is this so today. The "tool-using animal" has invented many and complex machines to do his bidding and to satisfy his needs. The last fifty years have witnessed a wonderful increase in the power of man over the great forces of nature. By the development in his power he is enabled to create mountains of wealth and to pile up riches greater far than those of Fortunatus.

Despite this increase in wealth-producing power, however, the great mass of the people are working early and late for a bare pittance, are compelled to struggle against each other for a crust of bread, are forced to become the slaves of the tools and the machines which their fellows have created.

Never in the long history of the human race, was man so much and so helplessly the slave of material conditions, the hapless victim of his social environment. In other words, the struggle for a living has become so intense and the warfare between the two classes has developed such bitterness that altruism is almost dead and the soul of man a hollow sham. Man has yielded to the gold-lust and has descended to the level of the tiger in the jungle.

There can be no manner of doubt that the personality of man would be rapidly developed were it not for the egotistic forces of economic competition forever assailing him. It is for Socialism to remove those adverse influences which have been accumulating under Capitalism to allow for a greater expansion in the spiritual life of man.

We are far too busy passing from one grey street to another grey street to add up figures or to swallow patent medicines to think that life can be lived nobly, burningly and brightly, for great ends and in great passions. We have been so absorbed in trying to gain a livelihood that we have forgotten how to live.

It is the aim of the Socialist to remove the root causes of economic oppression, and by so doing, to emancipate man from the galling slavery of material tyranny. He realises that so long as man must strug-

gle for a crust of bread, just so long will the soul of man lack adequate expression.

The action and re-action of material conditions upon mind is patent to all. There can be no question that slums, bad food, long hours of labor, and all those conditions of life and of labor which obtain today stunt the bodies and dwarf the minds of the overwhelming mass of the population. And there can also be no manner of doubt that these wretched conditions which are productive of such evil results are themselves the bitter fruits of the private ownership of land and of capital. Crime and insanity, the low (almost bestial) morality which characterizes modern life in the main—these spiritual blots upon our social life are the inevitable products of that system of wealth production and distribution known as Capitalism. Until Capitalism is abolished, the soul of man can never be free to function.

That is the duty of the scientific Socialist. Having analysed the economic structure of society and having studied the experiences of past times, he knows that there can be no material progress towards human freedom, no striking advance in the mental emancipation of human-kind so long as the essentials of wealth production are in the hands of a privileged class.

With the birth of the Socialist Commonwealth the struggle for individual existence disappears. Then, for the first time, man, in a certain sense, is finally marked off from the rest of the animal kingdom, and emerges from mere animal conditions of existence into really human ones. The whole sphere of the conditions of life which environ man, and which have hitherto ruled man, now comes under the dominion and the control of man, who for the first time becomes the real, conscious lord of Nature, because he has now become the master of his own social organization. The laws of his own social action, hitherto standing face to face with man as laws of Nature foreign to, and dominating him, will then be used with full understanding, and so mastered by him. Man's own social organization, hitherto confronting him as a necessity imposed by necessity and history, now becomes the result of his own free action. The extraneous objective forces that have hitherto governed history, pass under the control of man himself. Only from that time will man himself, more and more consciously make his own history—only from that time will the social causes set in movement by him have, in the main and in a constantly growing measure, the results intended by him.

"It is the ascent of man from the kingdom of necessity to the kingdom of freedom."

That is the reply of the scientific Socialist to Rudolf Eucken and his followers. Socialism does deal with the soul of man, does strive to re-mould the intellectual and moral life of the people. It does this, not by means of preaching an impossible idealistic morality, but by going to the root-causes of economic antagonisms, and by removing those causes, emancipating mankind from the galling servitude of economic necessity.

Next Article: "Social Control."

SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA
Local (Winnipeg), No. 3

MANITOBA PROVINCIAL ELECTION
1920

CANDIDATES:

George Armstrong, R. J. Johns, W. A. Pritchard,
R. B. Russell

Campaign funds are needed. Collection Cards can be secured from, and donations made to:

ALEX. SHEPHERD,
P.O. Box 1762

Winnipeg, Manitoba.

Western Clarion

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

Published twice a month by the Socialist Party of
Canada, 401 Pender Street East, Vancouver, B. C.
Phone Highland 2583.

Editor Ewen MacLeod

Subscription:

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

821

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

VANCOUVER, B. C., JUNE 1st, 1920.

EDITORIAL ECONOMIC CONSIDERATIONS.

NO system that shall be valid in all ages can ever be formulated by us today. The truth of this observation is thrust home to the student of economic enquiry, the history of which may be observed in three periods, the ancient, the mediaeval and the modern worlds. The earliest of our records bear witness to the need for honesty in mutual dealings, just weights and measures, the true observance of contracts and the reliability of man upon man.

Every thinker is a child of his time, and such judgment of him as we may pronounce must be tempered by a consideration of the period in which he lived and the circumstances by which he was surrounded. His conclusions, arrived at through the examination of the basis and structure of society as he found it, cannot be isolated from that period in which he lived. The institution of slavery was so entirely in harmony with the life of the Greeks that the Greek thinkers regarded it as indispensable and inevitable, and such observations as their investigators made in economics that are of particular moment to us are mainly happy, and sometimes striking, anticipations of the pronouncements of later periods, and in which the influence of geometry perhaps had considerable bearing. The Romans gave evidence of little that was not borrowed from the Greeks, in economics as a subject of enquiry.

While it is essential that we examine the past records of investigation in this study in order to quicken our comprehension, and awaken our perceptions to its position today, we must bear in mind that circumstances, co-existent and sequent, must have existed in proportion great enough to permit of scientific generalisations being laid down, and the investigators must have been equipped with the aids and instruments essential to proper research, before conclusions could be reached that would affect our present-day life and aid us in understanding present-day problems. The march of all science is marked by the interdependence of each of its branches upon the other, and the relations they bear to the changing needs of man, the practical exigencies required to be met by him, and the organs he produces to the conservation, maintenance, and perpetuation of society.

Co-existent with the ancient, mediaeval and modern periods of human development we have the records of their enquirers into economic research, and not until the last mentioned period is reached do we meet what has come to be known as the historical school. The gradual unfolding in the middle ages of a civil system was occupied with direct military organization and control, and the final elaboration of feudalism was characterized by institutional forms devoted to public defence, based upon territorial property. Its dominant class was unsympathetic towards the industrial arts and held the handicrafts in contempt, except those subservient to war or war-like sport. There was within its bounds little room for manufacture, less for commerce, and family needs constituted the essential factor underlying production. In such a society economic research must necessarily reflect the restrictions imposed by its field of examination.

The modern period is filled by a development of successive phases which, in their gradual approach to the age of machinery, commercial relations, and

the well established features of commodity production generally, somewhat characterize our own time. A wider field of investigation has brought in its train a broader application to the investigation of affairs of human concern, and necessarily, the field of economic research has occupied the attention of increased numbers of investigators, so that, while in the first confirmed appearance of capitalism as a generally operative system, economic research has been characterized in its method by almost wholly abstract considerations, its later characteristics have betrayed a leaven of human interest, as its problems have gradually unfolded an explanation of the true nature of the institution now understood as capitalism.

The succeeding phases have produced succeeding schools of thought, and, otherwise than its name might suggest, the historical school has its work outlined, not in confining its interest to the work of former investigators but to the furtherance of endeavor toward the same stated objective, which is to find the laws underlying the industrial progress of human society, and to formulate an outline of the processes through which they must operate.

The valuable work done in economics in the last fifty years has been accomplished by men who are directly under the influence of the historical school, whether they are professed adherents of that school or not.

However earnest may be our interest in any subject of interest to mankind, and however far removed may be our personal interest in sectarian strife, if we proceed along the way that generates knowledge of the conditions of human existence there arrives the moment when we surely must take issue on behalf of one side and against another. And, mainly, the real obstacle that has always obstructed the way to open acceptance by the economists of today of the outstanding principles featured by the historical school in its dissection of the economic laws of capitalism, lies in capitalism itself, as an institution based upon private property and the exploitation of labor. In such a society—a society of private gain through private ownership, there must arise private prejudice in the custodians of its institutions of learning, which, in turn must be supervised for its defence and maintenance. The positive nature of the historical method in explaining human society practiced by the strong influences that now assail our houses of learning, so incontrovertible, so sound, and so completely are they in accord with the gathering array of sordid facts presented by the active life around us that they pronounce their opponents as mere quibbling apologists who are subject to the suspicion of interested conservatism, if not to private personal gain. Political economy today, for a clear analysis of the stage of society we find ourselves in must lay down its principles, upon its fundamental basis, and its problems must be stated in the terms of the contradictions and antagonisms arising from it. A system of private ownership means propertyless people; a people exploited in production means a slave class and a master class and a master and a slave class constitute a class antagonism, and that cannot be eradicated until the circumstances that breed it are overcome and abolished forever. And not until then can we expect disinterested research in this field to be advanced.

TO THE UNEASY STUDENT.

THE recondite profundity of some of our present day savants is so overwhelming that we are sometimes reduced to a state of hopeless despair, induced by the thought that we can never hope to appreciate (much less understand) the processes, or in plain words, the steps and stairs whereby they reach their altitudinous pinnacle of learned isolation. From that eminence they propound their theses with a scholastic adroitness, the objective of which is as elusive to the hungry truthseeker as its wordy dressing is repellant in its undesirable, and obviously sacred obscurity.

In our endeavor to follow the pronouncements that emanate from some of our labyrinthian institutions of learning however, we are sufficiently earnest in our quest to arrive at a point where we become bold

enough to take issue with the sage in his conclusions, that is, with the reservation advanced that the conclusions are by us properly understood, in patient toleration of their circumlocutory and pedantic wearisomeness. Indeed, just at this point the obscurant influences bear so heavily upon us, that a plain word of evident meaning looks threadbare and hungry if released without a multiple qualification, and a sentence that is easily distinguishable from a clause in a drug-store prescription is too easy to swallow.

The consideration that between science and common knowledge there exists a fundamental difference, we hold in dispute, but that they manifest different degrees of complexity in the processes whereby they achieve their previsions we readily agree. Common knowledge is in many respects exact and precise, and science does not thereupon impose any increased definiteness or precision; it but reduces other knowledge to the same degree. Common knowledge, however, is in general derived from the surety of direct perception respecting simple matters of easy accessibility, whereas science extends its researches into, and lays down its consequent pre-science upon dependent complexities that are inaccessible to immediate observation. And in science itself there are wide degrees of difference between its positive stages, differences that, again, are not fundamental, but that are manifested in the interrelations between certainty and completeness of prevision, and that are precisely identical as stages along the pathway of science with that common knowledge which results from the observation of those objects or combinations directly cognizable and invariable in their nature. The surety of the scientist's foreknowledge may be measured by his knowledge of the laws governing the subject matter of his observations and predictions.

Any effort to outline the important and essential bearing science has upon modern life must trace its affiliation with common knowledge and show the manner of its extension from it. It must recognize the inevitable stages of its progression and its dependence upon the changing requirements and accomplishments of man towards his material well-being. Without that it must remain enclosed within those gray walls resting upon arbitrary standards that cradled the outworn illusions of the past; its teachers must look not for reverence but rather for appreciative understanding from the great mass of the people, from whom in the long run its sustenance is gained, and by whose interested co-operation its advancement may be furthered.

EDUCATION IN RUSSIA.

N. Lunacharski, at the recent Soviet Congress at Moscow, gave a detailed report of the position of education amongst the people. We give some points from his speech.

"The idea of a uniform workers' school has been abandoned. There are in the Soviet Republic, schools which are accessible to all workers. The schools are of two categories, those of the first category for children of 8-12 years old; those of the second for students from 13 to 16 years old.

"A gigantic programme has been worked out which will involve considerable expenditure. The results already obtained are, in spite of great difficulties, very good. The number of schools grows continually, and at the present time there are of the first category almost 50,000, and of the second category 2,000.

The number of scholars in the schools of the first category reaches 2,618,000; that in the schools of the second category is 200,000. Of 9,000,000 children of obligatory school age 27 per cent. attend school. The Budget is always growing, and at the present time each Government receives for educational purposes approximately 140 million roubles yearly. Legal faculties have been replaced by faculties in social science.

"The Commissariat has authorized for the current half-year an expenditure of 400 million roubles for the higher schools. The number of students is about 158,000 and the number of professors about 5,500.

"In Moscow there are nearly 2,000 new students. In a few months they will be sufficiently far advanced to move into the University with the other students. In Petrograd, Moscow, Voronesh, Kasan and Saratov there are numerous 'Free Art Schools' attended by nearly 4,000 students."

—"Internationale Jugendkorrespondenz,"

April 3, 1920

What Commerce Means

IN accordance with the rules of the game of exploitation, the wealth produced by the workers passes first into the possession of the industrial capitalist. The division of the spoils is in his hands. In order to occupy this position, and maintain the system of production as a properly functioning organization, he must share the surplus-values extracted from his laborers in the sphere of production, with other sections of the dominant class called landlord, financier, merchant, etc. The portion of the wealth contributed to these various factions is determined by their legal status in modern society.

When all just claims have been satisfied, the industrial capitalist still has at his disposal a goodly share of the wealth produced, granting, of course, that the capitalist in question is a fair representative of the owning class. Part of this can be consumed by himself and his family in the form of necessities and luxuries of life such as are commensurate with his social position. The remainder is offered for sale.

At this point we have the condition necessary for commercial transactions. Unless a surplus remained after the wants of producers and owners had been attended to in conformity with the laws governing the distribution of wealth, there could be no complex mechanism of trade and commerce such as we find today in capitalist society.

In previous systems of production there was no incentive for commerce on a large scale. The great problem was to produce enough of life's necessities to satisfy the simple needs of society. It is true that even as far back as Grecian, Phoenician, and Egyptian societies commerce was carried on to a certain extent. The tin taken from Britain was shipped to Greece and exchanged for ornaments or pottery, or else traded for cutlery from Damascus, or gold and pearls from the Orient. But still production was essentially for use, and commerce never extended beyond the stage of being a side issue.

Through the middle ages, while merchant's capital dominated the channels of civilization, and invaded the sphere of production as well, nothing more than the rudiments of manufacture for sale had been noticed. Only with the aid of machine inventions, geographical discoveries, and an abundant supply of propertyless proletarians could we have the inception of modern industrialism.

Under our present mode of production, then, we produce things in excess of what we are able to consume to such an enormous extent that the greatest problem confronting the international capitalist class is the discovery, or acquisition, of markets in which to stow away the surplus commodities. We think we are safe in saying that, even with our present state of efficiency in agricultural and manufacturing industry, were the producers of the wealth given an opportunity to satisfy their needs out of the mass of things produced there would be little difficulty in finding ways and means to dispose of the residue. Certain it is that such elevating campaigns as have been waged in the past few years would have been quite uncalled for.

However, the access to the pie-counter of those who toil in field, forest, factory, and mine is entirely out of the question. We live in a form of class society where the wealth producers are wage-slaves of those who control the means of production and distribution. They have no rights and privileges excepting the limited-ones allotted them by the ruling class. Every institution in existence functions as a prop to maintain intact this system of class ownership, and to extract, through force, the major portion of the things produced by the occupants of the lower strata.

Overproduction is the scientific appellation given to that state of affairs where the workers are, not allowed to consume, and the owners cannot possibly consume, the mass of products that remain on the market. Some aspiring economists have classified this phenomenon as **under consumption**. This is erroneous. In all the slave empires of the past there

was less consumed than would keep the producers in even a considerable degree of prosperity. Their expenditures never expanded beyond the bare necessities of life. Still, before the appearance of modern capitalism, industrial crises and financial panics were altogether unknown. It is impossible to attribute their existence to a condition that prevailed throughout the ages without any such result. They must be regarded as the logical sequence of those changes in the mode of producing and distributing wealth peculiar to an epoch of machine industry. The replacing of the tool by the machine was speedily followed by the liberation of many thousands of manual laborers whose function could be performed by comparatively few machine hands. With a decrease in the numbers employed went an increase in the commodities produced. So well had the machine acquitted itself, that soon the discovery of markets failed to keep pace with the progress of production. Something now took place that could never happen in past societies—the workers became too productive, and industry must cease till markets are relieved.

But in this frenzied attempt to find corners of the earth where the product of our toil can be safely stored has the capitalist class solved the problem of over-production? Let us see! When capitalist England exports a consignment of goods to capitalist America, true, the market is relieved for the moment. But this consignment is not a gratuitous contribution to the coffers of her altruistic colleague. Another shipment approximately equal in value must be made in turn on the part of America. The proposition is in no degree modified by changing the port of call for the British cargo from New York to Calcutta. The commodities purchased by the Hindus, Chinese, Hottentots, or Patagonians can only be paid for by trading off some other commodities of which they have an excess supply. Value for value is the basis of exchange.

Even should some secluded corner be discovered, by penetrating the astral planes or milky way, where an insatiable desire on the part of the ethereal inhabitants for earthly goods was manifested, then, the problem would still be the same. Shipping successive consignments of cotton, shoes, copper and wheat, without getting something in return might have a favorable result from the standpoint of recreation but as a business policy its efficacy is easily exploded. Then again should these Martians or Jupiterians, possess an inexhaustible supply of acceptable materials to give in return for the commodities mentioned, the whole transaction would result in our capitalists having as great a surplus as ever on their hands, providing that our supposed customers were acquainted with the law of value and, if not, the over-production malady would obviously be augmented rather than relieved. The shipping of gold in payment, in lieu of raw material or manufactured articles, would in no wise render a satisfactory solution, as the gold, while it may from surface indications appear to be in a different category from shoes and wheat, is yet a commodity whose value is determined by the socially necessary labor time required for its production, and consequently its presence would spell a surplus of goods on hand, precisely as in the case of other commodities.

Looking at the matter from any angle we will there is no possibility of foreign markets assuaging the growing pains of over-production. So long as industrially undeveloped areas exist, these can always afford an outlet for capitalist investors from thoroughly exploited centres to get rid of a portion of their surplus through extending the means of production, transportation, communication, etc. But from the standpoint of solving the market problem, this investment merely serves as a palliative measure that can, at best, only stay for a brief period the inevitable collapse. Undeveloped areas soon become developed ones with all the requisite equipment for competing with the others, and the earth's surface

being extremely limited, new fields for development are becoming harder to find.

It is well known to those who have outgrown their economic swaddling-clothes that the export and import trade of any capitalist country do not necessarily coincide during any given period. Conditions have changed since the days when handicraft workers traded the products of their shops for articles of food, clothing, or other necessities required for their personal consumption. Even though this transaction was consummated through the medium of gold or silver, it was still an equitable exchange of values with no holdovers left in the balance 'till a future day of reckoning.

In the modern system of credit economy, much buying and selling is done between individuals and nations on the strength of being able to equilibrate transactions at a more propitious season. In those countries where the natural resources have been fully exploited, and surplus capital is seeking investment in foreign channels, the balance of trade is generally found to be what is termed **adverse**. Britain, for instance, has long operated under a decidedly adverse balance of trade. During the year just past British imports were three and a quarter billions of dollars in excess of the exports, and a somewhat similar condition extends back over the past century. But there are plausible reasons why the accountant's figures should show this result. Billion of dollars were invested in foreign fields from which was an enormous interest return. With almost half the merchant tonnage in the world to her credit, Britain has long been regarded as the international sea carrier, and her insurance and banking houses carried on business in all sections of the globe. These, and other items, more than suffice to offset the trade balance. These "invisible exports," far from showing signs of abatement, are more substantial today than ever. The British Board of Trade Journal estimates the net income for 1920, from foreign interest, at close on 500 million dollars. Deducting the 1919 invisible exports, and making a conservative allowance for increased income this year, leaves the score practically evened between imports and exports.

On the other hand, those nations that possess rich untapped resources, offering ample security and returns on invested capital, are found to enjoy balances of trade considered as **favorable**. The United States is a typical example of this class. For upwards of forty years the exports of raw material and manufactured articles, have been considerably in excess of what was imported, in the form of commodities, from other lands. The favorable position of the United States during the early years of the war added materially to the advance in this direction already registered. But selling without buying cannot proceed beyond certain defined limits. The enormous business advantage accruing to American capitalists in the war period has reached the end of its tether, and recently there has been noticed a marked increase of imports relatively to exports. This readjustment of the trade balance could be temporarily modified, and postponed, by further grants of foreign credits; by investments on a large scale in foreign securities; and increased expenditures of American travellers abroad. The nature of the imports on which there has been an increase during the past year is worth observing. The greatest increase has been made on diamonds, art works, laces and embroideries, silks, high grade cotton and woollen goods, kid gloves, and olive oil. These importations can scarcely be attributed to abnormal desires, and fastidious tastes, on the part of the proletariat. They rather serve to emphasize what we have already contended—that all the workers can hope to obtain so long as class society exists, whether periods of prosperity or depression prevail, is barely enough to keep their labor-power on the market in a suitable condition for their masters' purposes. The huge bulk of the wealth produced finds its way into the

(Continued on page 8)

The Materialist Conception of History

Gabriel Deville's preface to his "The People's Marx." This work was Deville's epitome of the first volume of Marx' "Capital," which as he states, was undertaken on the invitation and executed with the encouragement of Marx himself.

By study, and by observation of the phenomena of ignorance and organic Nature, Man becomes conscious of their relations of cause and effect and becomes more and more the master of his own development.

"Before co-ordinating his ideas and grasping their different relations, man acts. This is true, both in the childhood of the individual and the race. But it is only from the time that it becomes subordinate to deliberate thought that his action ceases to be incoherent and becomes really and rapidly effective. And what is true of every other kind of action is true of revolutionary action. It must have science for its guide, or its puerile efforts will produce only abortive effects.

"No matter what the subject may be, to maintain that science is useless or that study has had its day, is only an idle pretext to avoid study or an attempt to excuse wilful, persistent ignorance.

"It is evident that the study of social life, alone and of itself, will not modify the social form and will not furnish, elaborated in the smallest details, the ground-plan and elevation of a new society; but it will disclose the constituent elements of the present society; their essential combinations and relations, their tendencies and the law which presides over their evolution. This knowledge will put us in a position, not 'to abolish by decrees the natural phases of the development of modern society, but to shorten the period of pregnancy and to mitigate the pangs of child-birth.'

"By preaching the thorough study of society, Karl Marx did not pretend to be the creator of a science unknown before him. This is proven by the numerous notes to his work, which is on the contrary, based on the labor of the economists who preceded him, and he had the courage and candor, in the case of every proposition, to cite the author who first formulated it. But no one has done more than Karl Marx to make plain by their analysis the true meaning and tendency of social phenomena. No one, therefore, has done more for the emancipation of the working-class, for the emancipation of humanity.

"Yes, without doubt, others, before him, felt the social injustices and grew righteously indignant. Many were those who dreamt of remedying these evils and drew up on paper admirable projects of reform. Inspired by a laudable generosity, having in most cases a very clear perception of the sufferings of the masses, they criticised with as much justice as eloquence the existing order of things. But as they had no exact conception of its causes and its evolution they constructed (on paper) model societies that were none the less chimerical because their architects had some correct intuitions. If they had the universal welfare as a motive, they did not have reality as a guide.

"In their projects of social renovation, they entirely disregarded facts, pretending to have recourse only to the pure light of reason, as if reason, which is only the co-ordination and generalization of the ideas furnished by experience, could be, in itself, a source of knowledge—knowledge external and superior to the cerebral modifications of external impressions.

"In a word, they were idealists, just as the anarchists are today. Instead of making reality the starting point of their reasoning, they attribute reality to the fictions born of their particular ideal of absolute justice.

"Finding, from the speculative point of view, that the most agreeable of all social regimes would be that which would permit the most unrestricted freedom to the blossoming of individuality, and which would have no law save the free will of individuals, the anarchists preach its realization without troubling themselves to enquire whether the economic necessities permit of its establishment. They do not suspect the retrograde character of the extreme individualism, the unlimited autonomy, which is the essence of anarchism.

"In the various order of facts, evolution is invariably accomplished by the transition from an incoherent form, from a state of diffusion to a state of concentration. And, as the concentration of the parts becomes greater, their reciprocal interde-

pendence increases, that is to say, that more and more they cannot extend the range of their own activity without the co-operation of the other parts. This is a general truth that the anarchists do not suspect. Poor fellows! They pretend to see further than anyone else, but they do not even perceive that they are marching backwards.

"For all these fanciful conceptions—although more or less well meant—Marx was the first to substitute the study of social phenomena based on the real conception—the materialist conception. He did not sing the praises of a system more or less perfect from the subjective point of view. He scrupulously examined the facts, methodically arranged the results of his examination and drew the conclusion, which was and is the scientific explanation of the historical progress of humanity, and, particularly, of the capitalist period through which we are passing.

"History, he has shown, is nothing but the history of class conflicts. The division of society into classes, which made its appearance with the same social life of man, rests on economic relations—maintained by force—which enable some to succeed in shifting on to the shoulders of others the natural necessity of labor.

"Material interests have always been the inciting motives of the incessant struggles of the privileged classes, either with each other, or against the inferior classes at whose expense they live. Man is dominated by the material conditions of life, and these conditions, and therefore the mode of production, have determined and will determine human customs, ethics and institutions—social, economic, political, juridical, etc.

"As soon as one part of society has monopolized the means of production, the other part, upon whom the burden of labor falls, is obliged to add to the labor-time necessary for its own support, a certain surplus labor time, for which it receives no equivalent,—time that is devoted to supporting and enriching the possessors of the means of production. As an extractor of unpaid labor, which, by means of the increasing surplus-value whose source it is, accumulates every day, more and more, in the hands of the proprietary class the instruments of its dominion, the capitalist regime surpasses in power all the antecedent regimes founded on compulsory labor.

"But today, the economic conditions begotten by this regime, trammelled in their natural evolution by this very regime, inexorably tend to break the capitalist mold which can no longer contain them, and these destroying principles are the elements of the new society.

"The historic mission of the class at present exploited—the proletariat—which is being organized and disciplined by the very mechanism of capitalist production, is to complete the work of destruction begun by the development of social antagonisms. It must, first of all, definitely wrest from its class adversaries the political power—the command of the force devoted by them to preserving intact their economic monopolies and privileges.

"Once in control of the political power, it will be able, by proceeding to the socialization of the means of production through the expropriation of the usurpers of the fruits of other's toil, to suppress the present contradictions between collective production and private capitalist appropriation, and to realize the universalization of labor and the abolition of classes.

"Such is a summary sketch of the irrefutable theory taught by Marx. His constant aim is to enable every reader to judge of its truth and validity for himself.

"As thought is nothing but the intellectual reflex of the real movement of things, he has not for an instant departed from the material foundation of his thought, from external phenomena; he has not separated man from the conditions of his existence. He has observed, he has stated the result of his observation, and purely by the depth of his analysis he has complemented his positive conception of the present order by the knowledge of the inevitable dissolution of this order."

Supplies to Locals.

Dues Cards, per 100, \$1.00.
Letterheads, per 100, 60c.
Platforms, per 100, 50c.
Constitutions, per 100, \$1.50.
Western Clarion Sub. Cards, free.

The Essence of Morality

THE historian and ethnologist have uncovered the past sufficiently to reveal the fact that codes of morality have been, as varied and numerous as the different forms of society under which man has lived. We have only to compare the rules of conduct prevailing in different sections of the globe today to see that there is no eternal standard of morality, but on the contrary that ideas of morality vary according to time, place and conditions. A code of conduct only becomes necessary in group association, for, obviously, if man could live alone and apart from others of his race, it would not be necessary to respect or recognize anybody's desires but his own. Out of mutual dependence, however, grew the recognition of mutual needs.

Man's primal needs remain constant throughout the ages. The instinct of self-preservation demands a certain amount of food, clothing and shelter, and the needs of race preservation force man to seek sexual companionship. Where a state of society exists that is controlled by every member, and rights go hand in hand with obligation, there the individual needs of each man become the social needs, and there is no conflict between the social code of morality and the individual's requirements. We have an example of such a condition in a few savage and barbarian tribes still existing on the globe where private property has not come into existence; and in the researches of L. H. Morgan, it is clearly shown that most of the Indian tribes living on the American continent at the time of the white man's arrival lived in this state—which is termed primitive communism, the social unit being the gens, an association of kin.

Socialists do not look back upon the days of primitive communism with futile regret or wish to wipe out of existence all the material progress that has been made, and hark back to the days of primitive simplicity. The foundation stone of all slave societies (including capitalism) has been the right of private property, and while the time has come when private property is no longer essential to the needs of society in general and actually a clog in the wheels of economic progress, this advance in the means of supplying the necessities of life, could not have been accomplished without the private initiative and unrestrained greed for individual power obtaining in the past. When we understand the foregoing, then we are better able to inquire into the subject of morality, for the morals of any society reflect its point of economic development, and in class society are necessarily fashioned by the dominant interests in order that the existing social relationships may be maintained.

Perhaps no greater revolution in morals occurred in the world's history than at the inception of private property. The idea of the exclusive and permanent right of one man to one woman supplanted the sexual freedom that formerly prevailed, and by sexual freedom is not meant a state of chaotic sex relations, but of voluntary sexual association. The monogamic marriage was desired and instituted by the first property owners in order that their children (and their children only) might inherit their property, and religion, pliant servant of those in power, early incorporated the doctrine of womanly chastity, and monogamy then, as now, implied the faithfulness of the wife, but not necessarily of the husband.

Within the old gentile group, there was no law against stealing, as such a thing was impossible, owing to the fact that the wealth of the members was meagre and used in common. But when man reached the stage of the domestication of animals, an enormous addition of wealth was thereby added to the group, who at first owned the early herds in common. Private appropriation soon showed its avaricious head, and then a struggle took place which broke up the cohesion and unity of the group, and new associations based on property qualifications usurped the authority of the kindred group.

"Thou shalt not steal," was the pronouncement of the propertied class, who imposed themselves upon the rest of society as a ruling class, and religion took up the cry against stealing, which was placed in the category of divine proscription.

But hunger and love are not suppressed by man-made morals. Those who glory in the fact that monogamy is the only sexual association sanctioned by the state surely shut their eyes to conditions that exist beneath the surface. The favorite charge hurled at socialism is that of "immorality"—yet if the mask of monogamy as it exists today is torn aside, we see among the rich, unrestrained adultery, and among the working-class the distinctly capitalistic contribution to human progress—prostitution controlled by the trust or syndicate. Because Socialists would sanction and make possible voluntary sexual association, where capitalism erects a barrier against it in the form of economic considerations, Socialism is branded as immoral. Socialists know that the marriage institution under capitalism is merely a property relationship—a means of acquiring more wealth and of bequeathing it to the children of the possessor—who thereby acquire the privileges and power that go with wealth. The essence of all morality is proscription, but the motive that inspires it is not always the same. Under primitive communism, sexual relations could not take place between the members of the same gens, which was composed of blood relations. The proscription was undoubtedly founded on the recognition that inbreeding lowered the vitality of the new generation, and as strength was indispensable in primitive society, the limitation was really beneficial to the group.

It is more than likely that the early morality or code of conduct of primitive society will in a great measure be restored when private ownership has given way to social ownership. Then once again will the needs of each member be the interests of the whole, for no group will be economically more important than another. The social tools which private greed and quest for gain have brought to perfection call for co-operative effort and mutual dependence. The wealth of the whole, being produced and controlled by the whole, shall benefit the whole. Economic influences will no longer play a part in the individual's sexual relations. The morality of the future will again be based on the welfare of the whole.

A. C.

Literature Price List

- Communist Manifesto. Single copies, 10c; 25 copies, \$2.00.
- Wage-Labor and Capital. Single copies, 10c; 25 copies, \$2.00.
- The Present Economic System. (Prof. W. A. Bonger). Single copies, 10c; 25 copies, \$1.50.
- Capitalist Production. (First Nine and 32nd Chapters, "Capital," Vol. I. Marx). Paper, single copies, 50c; cloth, single copies, \$1.00; cloth, 10 copies, 75c each.
- Socialism, Utopian and Scientific. Single copies, 15c; 25 copies, \$3.25.
- Slave of the Farm. Single copies, 10c; 25 copies, \$1.50.
- Manifesto, S. P. of C., single copy, 10 cents; 25 copies, \$1.50.
- Red Europe. (F. Anstey, M.P.). Single copies, 50c. Ten copies or more 30c each.
- The Story of the Evolution of Life. (T. F. Palmer). Single copies, 10c.
- Evolution of Man. (Prof. Bolsche). Single copies, 20c; 25 copies, \$3.75.
- The Nature and Uses of Sabotage (Prof. T. Vebelen). Single copies 5 cents, 25 copies \$1.
- Ten Days that Shook the World. (John Reed). Per copy, \$2.00.
- The Criminal Court Judge, and The Odd Trick (E. B. Bax). Single copies, 5 cents; per 25 copies, 75c.
- Evolution of the Idea of God (Grant Allen), 55c per copy.
- Capital (Marx), vols. 1, 2 and 3, each \$3; the set complete, \$8.50.
- Ancient Society (Lewis H. Morgan)\$2.00
Make all moneys payable to E. MacLeod, 401 Pender Street East, Vancouver, B. C. Add discount on cheques.

A Philosophical Retrospect.

WITHIN the capitalistic system the inequalities are of so glaring a character that even the veriest dabbler can observe them. Dull as are many workers, this glaring inequity is being brought to his notice more plainly as the system develops. But while it is easy to say "it isn't fair; it's not right or just," it takes a little study and mental exertion on the worker's part to know that he is the one who helps produce the surplus wealth, evidences of which we see on every hand.

Due to the works of Marx and Engels on the one hand, and men like Dietzgen, Labriola and Lafargue on the other, we are able to call Socialism a science.

Marx in his works on Capitalist production, laid bare the honey-pot from which the parasitic drone of society sucks his honey. By pointing out how surplus values are extracted from the workers, he laid bare the secret of capitalist "accumulation," and "thrift." For such a breach of etiquette Marx was ostracized, and was on the verge of starvation more than once.

The joint production of Marx and Engels, i.e. "The Communist Manifesto," written in 1848, contains the key to the socialist's method of explaining social phenomena and the ideas that permeate any given stage in the development of society.

The proposition set forth therein is: "That in every historical epoch, the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organization necessarily following from it, form the basis from which is built up and from which alone can be explained the political and intellectual history of the epoch."

This is the lense through which the socialist views past and present social phenomena, and as long as we adhere to it, we need have very little fear of being led astray. At the same time, in order for us to use it correctly, we have to analyze the methods of production and exchange of the essentials for human existence.

No more do we look upon the great man as the Moses to lead us out of the land of Egypt. Herein we differ from our bourgeois metaphysicians, who are always looking for the Man, witness the attempts of the American bourgeoisie in their efforts to elect as president "Hoover, the man who knows how."

Our method of dealing with the history of mankind causes us to divide them in ethnological and political periods. Engels' "Origin of Family and State," Morgan's "Ancient Society," and Jenks' "History of Politics," will give anyone who cares to take the trouble of reading them a far different insight and understanding than will the history books used in schools. From the stage of primitive communism down to the present method of capitalist production, we are able to show the property basis of the different political states. Chattel slavery, feudal serfdom and capitalism are the names by which these political societies are known.

The Roman Empire is the classic example of a system based upon chattel slavery. Following upon its decay, and between our present period and theirs. Europe and the domination of the Roman Catholic Church typifies feudalism. The evolution of England since the days of Cromwell displays to our view all the stages of the development of capitalism and its attendant superstitions, from the Protestant faith to spiritualism. By analyzing these different systems we can see the contradictions which lead and are leading to their destruction.

Marx, by analyzing capitalism, has shown us that the inherent contradictions contained within it must bring about its fall. Private ownership of the machinery of production and distribution, once necessary for progress, have now become a fetter upon production and now retard progress. The bourgeoisie, once a revolutionary class, have now become reactionary.

Joseph Dietzgen, in his "Positive Outcome of Philosophy," says: "Progress is moral, and morality is progressive" (page 154). Hence our ideas as to the

right and wrong of certain social phenomena, which have their origin in the class ownership of the machinery of production.

Social production on the one hand, and private ownership by a small and ever diminishing few, of the things produced, on the other, are bound to lead to a state of affairs whereby our moral impulses are outraged.

When the state, which is controlled by the owners of the wealth of society, acts in such a manner as to imprison individuals because of their activities among those of their class, such actions are to be fully expected. We can hardly expect them to bestow bouquets upon those who are detrimental to their interests. If the powers that be think that by eliminating an individual here and there, they can stop the surging tide of discontent they do but express their bourgeois ideology, which still lauds the individual and individual enterprise. By virtue of this hero-worship, its opposite expression is bound to be given vent, and the individual is blamed for all the ills of society.

(To be concluded in next issue).

ORIGINALITY.

Frequently the writer has the painful experience of meeting superficial "thinkers" who deem it their bounden duty to question the originality of some articles appearing in the "Western Clarion."

These carping critics usually have anything but a profound knowledge of the subjects on which they are wont to dilate, yet they assure us that the articles are plagiarisms, evidently forgetting the ancient dictum "There is nothing new under the sun."

Although the subjects are admittedly not new, their mode of treatment not infrequently gives the reader a more or less original presentation which usually proves most helpful to further study.

View-points are important factors; the authors of these much criticised articles supply us with most acceptable perspectives.

Moreover, they are not generally written with an exhaustive intent; they customarily take the form of "digests," leaving the reader to amplify and verify the author's arguments.

A word of advice to the critical—study! When you consider yourselves competent, pray grant us the boon of perusing the product of your original thinking—your original thought. J. S. L.

"CLARION" NEWS AGENCIES.

The "Western Clarion" is on sale at:—
W. Love, Hastings St. E., Vancouver, B. C.

Columbia News Stand, cor. Hastings and Columbia Streets, Vancouver.

John Green, Carall Street, Vancouver.

News Stand, B. C. E. R. Depot, New Westminster.

Alexander News Stand, 204 Eighth Avenue West, Calgary, Alta.

S. Feigleman, 421 St. Lawrence Bldg., Montreal Quebec.

Frierman and Baranowski, 12 Ontario St. E., Montreal, Que.

Onward Book Store, 196 Gold St., Buffalo, N. Y.

Raymer's Old Book Store, 1330 First Avenue, Seattle, Wash.

Viking Book Store, 264 Bay Street, Port Arthur, Ont.
Raymer's Old Book Store, 1317 Pacific Avenue, Tacoma, Wash.

D. Goodman, Blind News Agent, Queen and Chestnut Streets, Toronto, Ont.

Labor Lyceum, 580 St. Paul Street, Rochester, N. Y.

Labor News Stand, 814a—2nd Street East, Calgary, Alta.

Reformers' Book Agency, 222a Phoenix Block, Winnipeg. (Open evenings).

The Cause of Social Change

HISTORY is not a mere chronology—a table of doings of political factions, successive royalities, conquering heroes or struggling patriots. It is an infinitely weightier matter, and carries a far deeper significance. It is, in reality a record of man's social development, the processional of economic progress which is the cause of the continual shuffling on the checker-board of society.

Our classical histories, unfortunately, deal largely with the spectacular in the march of events, and ignore, or are ignorant of the gallant deeds they relate. Harold Fairhair vowed to cut neither hair nor nail (or some such rash oath) until he was ruler of a majesty sufficiently attractive to his ladylove; but the imposition of "scot" upon the surrounding tribes was a more cogent reason than the favor of his Norse maiden. The "romance" and "misfortune" of Queen Mary has awakened many a tale of imagination, yet the "romance" lay in the preservation of the *status quo* of privilege, i.e., living on plunder, and the "misfortune" was her inability to co-ordinate the various factions around her, all striving in the same "romance," the continued slavery of the Scotch peasant. Urban II. preached the first crusade for the capture of the Holy Sepulchre, but he cared as much, really, for the Holy Sepulchre as I for Mahomet's turban. The subjugation of Leo in the Eastern Empire was nearer his heart. Napoleon drove the Austrians from Italy in the name of "freedom," and made excursion on Egypt on the same pretext, but possession of the trade route to the east was more like the fact. Germany, in our own day entered the lists for the same far east, under the banner of "freedom" for Russia from Czardom. Britain, and, later, America, contended for the same east, one under the flag of "the rights of small nations," the other, to "make the world safe for democracy." One can have nothing but the bitterness of scorn for the miserable subterfuge of statecraft.

To live, man must eat, and the manner in which he gains that livelihood mainly determines the character and institutions of the state of society at any period of time prevailing. But the same state of society cannot maintain itself forever. It may endure a long time, but that particular form comes to an end. Slow as evolution seems, it ever goes on, bringing in its train new modifications, new energies, and in consequence, new ideology. And because of the disintegrating effect of new forces proceeding out of its inevitable growth upon the form of society which generated the new form, the urgent need of new exigencies compels the dissolution of the old social life as inexorably as the bursting bud displaces the withered leaf. The conflict cannot be staged; it is the law of the cosmos—the law of being and becoming, and that conflict will hurl down to disaster whatever form of society is not in conformity with the productive forces within itself.

But how do the productive forces become out of harmony with the society in which they grew? How does natural law abrogate what it has brought into being? And the answer is: cosmic progress: the throbbing and urge of the passionless law of change.

The inception of the political state synchronizes with military aggression. The appearance, therefore, of government, not only broke down the old tribal associations, but also introduced new impulses of social being, new ideas based upon the new historic environment through which arose another manner of life—foreign to the old society. The military conqueror had to secure the object of his aggression—tribute, thereby changing the current of the thing produced. He had to defend himself from other aggressors who coveted that tribute. Hence, troops had to be levied, armed, fed and clothed. But levying troops involved official organization, a new feature in the social life. Equipping them with arms and clothes generated forms of production. As fighters, they were, not producers, yet, being mortal, their physical needs had to be appeased. All of

which not only created further division of labor, but further divisions of classes in the social body. Increase of population, itself a result of improvement in production, demanded yet more efficiency. Organized religion created still further divisions in society, and still further necessities for wider production.

In this manner, out of the material conditions of the day a particular political superstructure was built up, based upon the prevailing methods of wealth production. And because the old tribal usages clashed with instant necessities and menaced the safety and stability of the new social organism and its own necessary and particular method of life, tribal associations became a thing of the past. The tribal chief was transformed into the feudal lord; the village moot into the national parliament; the wandering tribesman and his tent into the local yeoman and his house; the whole fabric of society utterly changed.

But society did not stop growing. Excess population overtaxed the skill of the pastoralist, and agriculture received a forward impulse. Mineral deposits were discovered, bringing a new demand for labor. The historic voyages of the 16th century offered new necessities of conquest and labor. The crusaders touched the culture of the Saracens, thereby widening immensely the mental horizon. Printing became known; gunpowder was discovered; growth in every direction. Contact with strange peoples brought intercourse of new product; exchange of ideas, refinement of method, invention of mechanical appliances increased the volume of production; widening markets became a necessity, competition keener and sharper came to being; capital arose; change upon change, each one the effect of prior cause, each one the cause of subsequent effect.

But while all this social growth of production was progressively and continuously pressing onward, the old political organization was not. And just as before, the military aggressor found himself utterly at variance with tribal usage, founded on immemorial custom; so the new industrial aggressor found himself at variance with the law of the fief, founded upon the necessity of the conquering hero. And just as the military state collided with tribal organization, because of the imperious condition under which advancing society was compelled to procure the means of life, so, in the same manner, and for precisely the same reason capitalist democracy clashed with the feudal regime. And the feudal regime, of necessity, went down—because the nature of capitalist production was consonant with the developed social forces—by absorption as in England, by the red fury of '89 in France, both methods the result of the same force but differently influenced by local circumstances.

Capital hurled away feudal restrictions; tore down its trade barrages; trampled its charters and its rights; violated its institutions, threw its laws into the discard. And instead, it built up its own political superstructure, using its own methods, fighting with its own developing weapons, in accordance with its own ideals and necessities.

But again society stayed not. It progressed. Ownership passed from the man to the class, production from the individual to society. Collectivism became the new necessity of society, of its manner of living, social production displaced national society, with its narrow prejudices, its limited ideals, and forged the whole world into an international unity, with one single aim, economic freedom. But while production has become social, the distribution of the thing produced is still on the ancient terms of its now obsolete political superstructure. The statutes and constitutions of an ancient social form hamper the further progress of the new social development; bound it on all sides and directions, producing of course, its inevitable bitter fruit of social conflict,—the class struggle.

This struggle is, in reality the urgent necessity of society, under the compulsion of its evolved economic progression, of satisfying the material needs of life in a method or system of production which denies all access to the means of that satisfaction, unless under the terms imposed by capitalist production for profit—or in other words, unless the social forces of production yield to the capitalist class—which has appropriated the material and machinery of production—the entire product of industry, receiving in return the puny requisites of necessary life, food, clothing and shelter, society shall be denied all means of acquiring even that puny necessity. And since capital has no market, and therefore cannot produce the necessities of life, and since society has no access to the means of life, which are capitalist property, society in the midst of the bounteous plenty of its own industry, faces starvation.

This, then, is the cause of the coming social change. Socialized industry has brought capitalist anarchic profit production to an end, because the productive capacity of that industry has created a surplus far in excess of the world market demand, developed and exploited to its limit by capital. Hence capital without this market cannot feed its slaves. Yet since physical necessities must be satisfied the mighty and complicated machinery (political) of capital, now become a menace to society, must disappear before the new potency of the social society, the civilized commune, the only means under the historic circumstances of satisfying the life demands of modified society.

The historic condition is ripe for the change, the crucial hour has come. And while everywhere our masters are like the men among the tombs, groping along in the darkness of ignorance of their own system and its tremendous forces, frantic with fear of impending change striking, purposeless, like a rattlesnake at whatever comes within reach, for us, the producers, the future opens out sweetly as flowers to their life fountained sun, smiling with the teeming abundance of our skill and handiwork.

R.

Labor Defence Fund

Send all money and make all cheques payable to A. S. Wells, B. C. Federationist, Labor Temple, Vancouver, B. C.

Collection agency for Alberta: A. Broatch, 1203 Eighth Avenue East, Calgary, Alta.

Central Collection Agency: J. Law, Secretary, Defence Fund, Room 1, 530 Main Street, Winnipeg, Man.

CLARION MAINTENANCE FUND.

D. Campbell, \$1; Dick Burge, \$2; N. Schacter, \$1; G. R. Ronald, 45 cents; Jack Chapman, \$1; W. R. Lewin, \$1; Robert Burns, \$1; S. Wagner, \$1; Neil Shaw, \$1.

Total, 11th to 26th May, inclusive, \$9.45.

WHAT COMMERCE MEANS

(Continued from page 5)

possession of those who have contributed nothing to its production. When too large a balance results to the exploiting section of one nation, as we see in the case of the U. S. and Europe, there must be a consequent cessation of trade for a period, together with a vast increase in the importation of articles of luxury, until what goes out approximately equals what comes in.

The whole system of trade and commerce, as well as all the pomp, glory and magnificence emanating from class ownership of the means of life, hinges on our ability to produce, and our inability to understand our miserable position.

J. A. McD.