

WESTERN CLARION

A Journal of
CURRENT
EVENTS

Official Organ of
THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

HISTORY
ECONOMICS
PHILOSOPHY

No. 923

TWENTIETH YEAR

Twice a Month

VANCOUVER, B.C., SEPTEMBER 16, 1924

FIVE CENTS

The Straight Issue

THE unsettlement of peace has affected the S. P. of C. as largely as society in general. Indeed, if one may judge from recent utterances in the Clarion, if the S. P. of C. is not already defunct it has an ominous rattle in the throat. Between constitutional conciliation; waiting for something to turn up; and its "be kind to auld grannie" attitude to labor, it has surely adopted a new Joseph's coat philosophy. Com. "C." Com. Harrington, even ye editor, all vigorously ring the changes of the wider vision (and incidentally we may toll our beads in gratitude, for Marx, on whose good broad shoulders we can foist our pet predilections.)

And what is this wider vision? Apparently, that between labor and socialism there ought, or need, to be, no antagonism (H); that our attitude to labor politically should be sympathetic, as it is economically (C); and that, seemingly, the mechanics of the socialist philosophy may be resilient to conciliative introspection (Macleod). Well, another little ripple on the flowing waters can make no difference.

The real question of issue is tactics. As the nature of tactics is to be determined by the nature of the proposition, we must look at the proposition—Socialism. What is Socialism? The theory, that as the means and resource of human life are socially operated and socially necessary, they should be socially owned and administered in the interest of the whole society. The premise is not in question. Why are those means not socially owned? Because the current system, capital, signifies the ownership and control of those means of life, by and for the exclusive interests of the capitalist class. The aim of Socialism is, therefore, the transference of property right in the means of life, from a single class, to society. How is this transference to be effected? There we touch the crucial question. And its answer is to be found, not merely in the phenomenal antagonisms of effect, but in the basic fundamental of its harmonies as well.

Capital had its inception as a social protest against the obsolete restrictions of Feudalism. It took form and ideation from and amidst the conflict of developing commerce with the established aristocracy of land. It strove incessantly, in war and turmoil, against the tyranny of ancient class rule; but it was not that struggle that gave it victory. It developed the intellectual reflex of its ambitions, yet not for that was its triumph. It achieved itself because, in harmony with the developing forces of mercantile conditions, it served, vitalised and regenerated the physical, mental and moral needs of a society swathed in the bondage and servility of the fact and urged imperiously forward by the vibrant impulse of new cognitions. It did not accomplish itself by way of constitutional reform. On the contrary, it swept away the restricting laws, regulations and usages of ancient privilege; and the more completely it surveyed the field of objective the more drastic was the sweep of its activity. Under the watchwords of freedom of thought and freedom of movement it fought for its own privilege, drawing its unity of purpose from the insufferable misery of common life. And it sought and won the sympathies and suffrages of society at large, not merely because its development was consonant with the development of the social forces, but, as well, because it was the vehicle of expression of the new orientation of social operations, born from, and burning with the vivid reality of social relation.

But, while it served the interests of society in general, temporarily, fundamentally, it served the interest of a new class rule. In establishing the new freedom it also established the regnancy of its own dominion. It maintained its new law with the aspirations of society. It clothed its new institutions with the idealism of class abstractions. In its development, it built up the new property forms of "right," "justice," "freedom," "humanity," "civilisation," into its own tradition of "eternal truth." But because eternal truth violates the reality of eternal movement, because property right is fundamentally anti-social, the new progress inevitably developed new forms of conflict. The mobility of the market contradicted the mobility of labor; for the free market is the symbol of exploitation, while free labor is the satisfaction of the means of life. The former is a straight issue of capitalist class rule. The latter, transformed by social misunderstanding, into its Capitalist corollary—the travesty of contract.

Thus Capitalist society, apparently beginning as a single class with a common aim, necessarily unfolded its ever growing bitterness of class divisions. It graded and subdivided. It split into group and faction. It subdivided and antagonized. It confused the issue, and veiled the cause of the conflict. Not designedly or by collusion; but because of the tradition of freedom; that forced group, faction and division into the closed orbit of capitalist ambition, and motivated with the idealist phantasies of capitalist ideation. And as the venue of political activities widened and changed under the widening stress of trade issues, the fundamental economic of the ruling class was forced more insistently, more completely into the forefront of living life. And this constant march of life and its reality, on theory and its visionism, brought into ever increasing prominence the hurried shifts and double edged expedients of class reform. For this exploitation of the living by the dead, of need by law, demands and implies the continual redecoration of reality.

If static society is to continue in existence, if capitalist civilisation is to endure, the rude clash of interest must be softened. The struggle of section with section for the necessities of their ambitions must be alleviated; the struggle of labor for bread mitigated: the quest of man for satisfaction, modified. In the modification of these things, the force and form of the modifying influence must draw its sustenance from the energy of pulsing condition. Interest must choose and conciliate in the subservience of interest; power gloss the secret of power in the contentment of exploitation; need correlate with need in the violence of progress. And to do this they must use the forces at hand—the interactions of interest itself. Positive interest joins with its kind for a common objective. Negative interest—minor in power—is thrust aside or absorbed. Dominance sacrifices its rival—and sometimes its rivalry—for the perpetuation of privileges. While exploited subjection responds, almost mechanically, to the compelling immediacy of need. Each and all, moved by primal interest, react to its impulse. They sow as they see; they struggle as they must; they devise as they can; they bind or they loosen as circumstances decree; but they triumph only as circumstances fold her shimmering veil from the cold brow of reality.

Who inaugurated the reform era: Russell and Grey, or capitalist expansion? Who widened the

franchise, passed factory acts, repealed the corn laws—the Chartist, the Shaftesburys and Peels, or the opposing rivalries of property interests? Who made free trade, Cobden or the growth of industry? Who abrogated slavery in Britain, Wilberforce or progressive economy in production? Who abolished it in America, Lincoln or capitalist competition? What turned the liberal Gladstone of the 40s into the Imperialist of the 80s? Who determined the Russian revolution, Lenin or Czarist feudalism? Who won the war, the U.S. (?) or the exhaustion of the central powers? Who dictated the Peace Treaty, Wilson or imperialism? Is it not the same with labor organizations? What motives the S. P. C. and its vagaries? Or the A. F. L.? Or international affiliation? Or the One B. U.? Or syndicalist side stepping?—Initiative, or the blind pressure of conditions? Sympathetic reflexes, or the reflexes of an unenlightened proletariat?

True, men play their part in all those issues. But not the determining part. According as they saw the situation they struggled and influenced. And the clarity of their seeing was determined by the fecundity of their conditioning. They were the product of their times: the tools of their chances. And their power, and influence, and concordance lay not in that they were supermen or supertools, but that as they found themselves caught in the tangled tides of events they reacted to the philosophy of events as status, and class, and interest touched the chords of sympathy or aversion. And according to the extent and degree that the emotions of society were awakened, i.e., as society visualised the condition, they, as spokesmen of particular ideals, could reach out to the crowd and draw it, in virtue of its own comprehension, or, were repelled by the deadness of its unimaginative inertia.

Certainly, men, parties and issues, change,—even as the spring flowers, the abiding state, the eternal hills. Yet not by determinate volitions, but only as their conceptual incidence is proven by time, or annulled by progress. The thing that they were, the thought that they dreamed is true, or it is false. Not only relative to time, but relative to reality. That is, it satisfies not merely the exigencies of the hour, but also correlates with the essentials of being. Consequently, if false, it leaves but a memory, sepulchred in the dust of pitying eyes. If true, it stands related through all the ages. Hence it comes that the few "invariably right," that can give a reason stand, conscious and decisive in the dual relation of time and reality; while the "million who can never be wrong" maintain their cohesion by molar might only in the foaming phases of time. Who was right, Roger Bacon or medieval scholasticism? Columbus, or the mass that jeered at his witlessness? Copernicus, or the quantity that saw not his kingdom? Bruno, or the dogma that destroyed him? Darwin, or the world that derided? Marx, or the inertia of "freedom"? Lenin, or the bulk that determined his activity? Liebknecht, or the number that over-matched him? And last, but none the least to us, socialism, or the exigence of protagonism?

Conversely, what determines the right of a matter!—its exponent, or the logic of development? What decides the acceptance, its truth or the majesty of events? What sanctions the social validity, its advocacy, or its necessity? What vitalises it with the blood of life, its human appeal, or time

(Continued on page 8)

The Evolution of Industry

BL. W. McLAINE.

(Continued from last issue)

The Factory System.

By the time the last quarter of the 18th Century was reached, all the conditions were in being for the rise of the factory system—except motive power. Merchants with capital, specialised craftsmen, large numbers of "free" workers and a market of world-wide dimensions calling for the goods which only the machine could provide. Attempts had been made in an earlier day to set up a kind of factory, and John Winchcombe, of Newbury, who died about 1520, and was said to have a hundred looms in his house, was not the only one to attempt to gather a body of workers under one roof. Indeed the Weavers' Act of 1555 complained that "certain clothiers had set up divers looms in their houses and worked them by journeymen and unskillful persons." These early attempts were not successful, partly because legislation hampered such enterprises, but mainly because much greater profits could be made out of overseas commerce, and little appears to have been done in that direction until immediately prior to the Industrial Revolution, when many hand-loom and water-driven factories were in operation. As an instance of the kind of development that took place during the early days of the Factory System, the well-known textile firm, Barlow and Jones, may be cited. The founder of the firm, James Barlow, commenced business as a merchant travelling between the villages of South Lancashire, collecting the "pieces" woven by the Domestic Craftsmen. Later he set up a hand-loom factory at Bolton, which subsequently was converted into a steam-driven factory. This case is typical, and could be multiplied by numerous other such examples. Indeed, it is only by a study of what actually took place during the evolution of individual concerns, that the full significance of the Industrial Revolution can be appreciated.

With the introduction of the steam engine and the resultant great expansion in the demand for coal and iron, industry changed its character with astonishing rapidity. The great inventions of the late 18th and early 19th Centuries were applied at first to the cotton manufacturing process. Cotton weaving and spinning was a new industry, and it cannot be said to have passed through the same process of development as the woollen industry. But the new machines were quickly adapted to the working up of wool, and it is in this adaptation that the full effect of the social changes brought about by the mechanical and technical development is most clearly seen.

First Effects of the Industrial Revolution.

Compared with the old hand-loom and spinning frames, the new machinery was simple to operate and required no high degree of manipulative skill or training in craftsmanship extending over a period of years. Women and children were brought into the factories in large numbers, regardless of health or age considerations. They were employed in filthy sheds, old barns and such like places that had been transformed into hives of industry—and death traps for the workers. The story of the enslavement of infant boys and girls, of the buying and selling of pauper children, of their violent deaths and secret burials, has been told many times, but it cannot be told too often. Many of the captains of industry who today levy toll upon the labour of the workers, and who, perchance, adorn the gilded precincts of the Upper House, laid the foundations of their family fortunes (or their fathers did for them) during those days of the people's degradation.

The handcraftsmen could not compete with the tireless machine, worked by relays of an abundant supply of cheap labour. Hence they were obliged to seek employment in the factories or alternatively remain unemployed and take such advantage as was possible of a poor law, which, whatever the intentions of its various framers, had become little more

than a subsidising medium for the encouragement of low wages. Moreover, they could not own the machines, the engines and the factories that the new manufacturing system required. These could only be possessed by those who had large amounts of capital at their disposal, and the merchants who had exploited labour at home, or maybe the natives of India, or, possibly had made money by selling slaves to the planters in the New World, were able to turn their attention to industry, with its possibilities for unbounded profits, with the means ready to their hands.

Free competition and non-intervention by the State, the doctrines of Adam Smith, were taken up with avidity by his disciples who gave to them their most liberal interpretation. The reaction from the medieval guild, and later, state regulations created a new philosophy, in which competition was defied and enthroned. Each new profit-seeker was a law unto himself, and would brook no interference with his right to "do what he liked with his own." Production increased by leaps and bounds, and great fortunes were amassed out of the labour of the helpless workers, who, ground between the factory wheels, were used up as fuel to feed the hungry machines. The death rate increased alarmingly, disease was rife in the industrial centres, and men, women, and children were deformed and struck down as if a hideous blight had spread over the land. Thousands of families left the countryside and settled in the towns, making the conditions still more difficult for those already there. Towns that had grown but little in a century now increased in size with incredible rapidity. Factories and warehouses sprang up in a night, old buildings were transformed and filled with machinery, and side by side with them grew the foul slum districts that stand to this day, as a fitting monument to the coming of the industrial capitalist into his own.

The Rise of Trade Unionism

It was not unnatural that the hand-workers who found themselves thus displaced by machines, in many cases operated by their own children, whom they carried to the factories in the early hours of the morning, should regard the machines with suspicion and hatred. Their resentment took the form of rioting, machine smashing and attempts to set fire to the mills and the houses of the factory owners. They had been violently displaced, and violence seemed the only remedy, particularly as every attempt at combination to protect their interests was suppressed as being in the nature of an illegal conspiracy. The iron-masters sat on the local benches and fined their own workmen or sent them to prison. Others of their class legislated in their own economic interests, and forbade, under the severest penalties, any combinations for the purpose of securing better conditions. But the wiser capitalists saw the fatuity of killing off the workers in the mad quest for profits, and the pressure they brought to bear upon their class, together with the feeling of alarm at the possibility of revolutionary movements abroad being imitated at home, produced the first Factory Acts. The workers were inveigled into supporting political agitations for extensions of the franchise, only to find that their strength had been used to increase the political power of their masters. A growing recognition of the hopelessness of contending against the machine, side by side with increased opportunities for employment as the demand for machinery and machine-made goods increased, caused a sullen acceptance of the situation, and the workers turned their attention to attempts to improve their position within the new order, by securing shorter hours of labour and increased wages. To this end they commenced to form their trade unions.

The repeal of the Combination Acts in 1824 was by no means a sign that the unions were to be permitted to develop unhindered, for in 1834 the Dorset

Labourers were transported to Australia for the offence of forming a union. Still the repeal of the Act removed some of the difficulties, and a new period of industrial activity and organisation showed that the workers were beginning to realise that what they could not do individually, they might attempt in concert. For a few years—a period which is of particular interest to present-day workers—the unions were relatively successful in their operations. The employers were not organised to any extent, and where unions were formed the workers were able to make and enforce many demands upon them. The form of working-class organisation was in keeping with the industrial conditions. A new race of craftsmen had come into being as the machines were improved in character, and as the children were either withdrawn altogether or had their hours of labour within the factory greatly reduced. The isolated employer fared ill before the aeternation of an organised body of workers. But that condition of things did not last for long. The employers took a leaf out of the workers' book and proceeded to organise themselves, with such success that ere long they were in a position to impose terms upon the workers. The struggle changed its character. It was no longer a contest between groups of workers and an isolated employer, but between associations of workers and associations of employers. A strike that might have put an industrial capitalist out of business could either be broken down by a general lock-out or be allowed to drag on until the workers' funds or patience, or both, were exhausted. The employer could either send his work to be done elsewhere (sometimes by other members of the union to which the strikers belonged) or be subsidised out of a fund provided by levy subscribed by the other employers.

As a result of this combination on the part of the employers, the workers, except for the activity on the part of the labourers, from 1889, the year of the London Dock Strike, onwards, have been placed on the defensive, and obliged to tread very warily if anything in the nature of a strike was to be successfully carried through.

Ultimate Effects of the Industrial Revolution upon the Workers.

The greater specialisation which the introduction of the machine into industry made possible enormously increased the productivity of the individual worker, but that increase did not materially improve his position. Certain commodities cheapened in price, but each new invention increased the competition between the workers for employment and their price cheapened also. Substantially the hours of labour remained the same, notwithstanding that under the new conditions one man could produce as much as twenty, or, perhaps indeed, a hundred, had produced before. Indeed, the use of better illuminants meant that whereas, in an earlier time, the coming of darkness enforced a cessation of work, it was now possible for night to be turned into day and for production to continue unabated. The Industrial Revolution completed the proletarianising of the workers. Henceforth, they could neither own tools nor product, but must sell their labour power to the owners of the means of production. The great amounts of capital needed for successful industrial operation widened the chasm between "master and man." Once a worker always a worker became a reality. Landless, propertyless and tending more and more to become specialised industrial units, fitting each into one niche, the workers became as much a part of the plant as the machines they tended—while their enhanced productivity produced wealth in copious streams—streams which flowed from them and made possible the creation of that industrial monstrosity—the millionaire industrial magnate.

(Continued on page 8)

Political Representation

(Continued from last issue)

"It is an axiom of political economy that all true political representation must be, and can only be based on definite economic interests."—(Marx)

First installment of Chapter 2, Prof. Chas. A. Beard's "Economic Basis of Politics."

ECONOMIC GROUPS AND THE STRUCTURE OF THE STATE.

HAVING surveyed the theories of our six political philosophers, it is fitting and proper that we should inquire whether there has been in fact a close relation between the structure of the state and the economic composition of society. It would be interesting, if time permitted, to examine the constitution of Athens and to consider such matters as Draco's legislation and Solon's reforms or to analyse the illuminating pages in which Polybius describes the balance of powers in Rome. The result of such a study, pondered in connection with the theories we have just reviewed, could not fail to set in train a fascinating line of speculation. There are, however, limits to this undertaking, and we must confine our scrutiny to the modern state in its historical growth.

In reviewing the history of government in Western Europe, from the disintegration of the Roman Empire to the opening years of the nineteenth century, we discover that wherever the simple sword-won despotism of the war leader, prince or king, is supplemented or superseded by some form of representation, it is not the people, considered as abstract equal personalities, who are represented, but it is propertied groups, estates. We are told by that profound student of mediæval law, Dr. Stubbs, that the ideal toward which Europe was slowly working in the middle ages, was a constitution under which each class was admitted to a share of power and control, and national action determined by the balance of forces thus combined.

This was not, as he admits, a conscious design by which statesmen shaped their policies. Many forces and circumstances contributed to the making of the representative system of estates. Sometimes it was the resistance of a particular economic group to royal despotism that won for it a recognized share in the government. An example of this is afforded by the contest which ended in the grant of Magna Carta. The barons wrote their interest into the public law of England, and secured it by obtaining the right of actual participation as a class in the control of government. At other times kings, especially during wars of conquest or defence, found themselves straitened for funds, and they called upon certain classes or groups of men to fill their treasury. Such, for instance, was the origin of the English House of Commons. To the continued financial necessity of English kings, particularly during the long war with France, was due the extraordinary development in the power of the English Parliament. Whatever the circumstances in each particular case, the striking fact is that we find all over mediæval Europe what Dr. Stubbs calls, National assemblies composed of properly arranged and organized classes."

If we examine the constitution of England in the middle ages we find, in fact whatever the theory, four estates: the clergy, the baronage, the landed gentry, and the burgesses. Of these, the first three were founded, in the main, upon landed property. The first or spiritual estate in the English constitution comprised the whole body of the clergy. The clergy were invited to form a part of Parliament for two reasons. Their spiritual power was great, and even the boldest kings did not dare defy them until the days of the mighty Henry VIII. But it is hardly to be doubted that it was as holders of property of immense value that the clergy came to a large share of the sovereign power. The bishops and the abbots, who were summoned to Parliament by name, were

tenants-in-chief of the crown; in other words, they were great landed barons. As such they sat in the House of Lords. The inferior clergy in England, unlike their French brethren, though duly summoned to take their place in the great council of the realm, refused to obey the summons and remained for centuries in a convocation of their own, voting taxes on their property independent of the Parliaments of the realm. Though the clerical order was thus divided, the high authorities of the church sitting in the House of Lords and the inferior clergy dealing with the crown directly, it was mainly as a body of landed proprietors that the spiritual estate shared in the government.

The second English estate was the lay baronage, the members of which sat by their own right in the House of Lords along with the spiritual peers from the clerical estate. It is not necessary to inquire here into the historical circumstances which resulted in drawing a line between the richer barons and the untitled landed gentry, nor into those vainly disputed points of law which have been raised in the search for the origin and exact nature of the property rights which entitled a peer to a seat in the upper house. Whatever the cause may have been, the fact clearly stands forth, as Dr. Stubbs says, that in the middle ages the great land owners, tenants-in-chief, or titled lords, who appeared in person at the Parliament, were separated by a broad line from the freeholders who were represented by the knights of the shire.

According to a custom consecrated by time, it is the fashion to speak of the House of Commons as representing a sort of third estate, the commonalty of the realm. A little antiquarian inquiry, however, shows that the term "commons" does not derive its meaning, as is often erroneously supposed, from any connection with "the common people." On the contrary it comes from the vague word *communitas* which was used in the middle ages to describe a political organism such as a county or chartered town. The House of Commons, therefore, was in reality the house of the *communitates*, composed of representatives of the gentry of the counties and the burgesses of the town considered as collective bodies with their respective geographical areas. Strictly speaking, we find in the lower house of Parliament the spokesmen of two estates: the smaller landowners and the burgesses. In the early stages of parliamentary evolution, the agents sent by the burgesses were even treated as a separate house or estate, although the way in which they voted on measures is obscure. Later they were combined with the gentry.

Real Basis of Political Representation.

It was one of the peculiarities of the English system that the Parliament was not constituted of three or four distinct orders. In France, as we shall see, there were three separate estates—clergy, nobility, and third estate. In Sweden there were four orders—clergy, nobility, burghers and peasants. In both of these countries each order formed a separate chamber and acted as a collective body. In England, on the other hand, there were only two chambers in the political system, unless we treat the separate convocation of the clergy as a part of the political organism. The House of Lords combined the great landed lay barons with the great landed clerical barons. The House of Commons included burgesses from the towns and representatives of the landed gentry below the baronial line. Still, it is quite apparent, in spite of these combinations that the English constitution of the middle ages was a group system, resting upon a foundation of economic classes.

The principles underlying this mediæval system of class representation have been entirely abandoned in England in favour of the theory of abstract individual equality. They were well understood by Harrington, Lock and Burke. Indeed the British constitution of mediæval origin remained substantially unchanged until 1832, when the first of the

great series of parliamentary Reform Bills was enacted. Although nearly half a century since the French Revolution let loose its flood of liberty and equality doctrines, English reformers, even in 1832, remained unmoved. They widened the suffrage, it is true, but what they did in effect was to enfranchise, by a set of ingenious qualifications, another "estate" which had grown up with the advance of industry and commerce, namely, a body of middle class manufacturers and shop keepers. In vain did the English Chartists talk of "one man one vote," and universal manhood suffrage.

When the next generation of English reformers "shot Niagara," in 1867, they merely enfranchised another "estate"—the working classes of the great industrial centres. And when again in 1884 a new addition was made to the British constitution, another "estate" was enfranchised, the agricultural labourers. At no point was the tax paying or property notion abandoned by the English in favour of the rule that a man should be allowed to vote simply because he is what Carlyle called "an unfeathered biped."

After the era of individualism set in it was more difficult to trace the line between economic groups than it had been in the middle ages, but whoever reads the debates over the great reform bills in England can see that statesmen, at each period, had in mind not abstract human equality, but what Dr. Stubbs characterized as a constitution in which each class of society should be admitted to a share of power and control. The significance of this story for the political future of England, in view of the changed position of women in industry, particularly since the outbreak of the Great War, can readily be seen by one who has eyes to see.

Everywhere in mediæval Europe, as in England, we find constitutions resting upon estates, assemblies representing various orders, classes, and conditions of men, except the rightless serf at the bottom of society. In the Cortes of Aragon sat the clergy, the great barons (*ricos hombres*), the minor barons or knights, and the burgesses of the towns. The old parliament of Scotland was composed of prelates, barons and the smaller townsmen. In the representative assemblies which sprang up in some German principalities and in Russia, the same idea of class representation prevailed.

In the economic foundations of her Constitution, mediæval France differed in no fundamental way from the neighboring countries. The history of the French estates, local and general, offers to the student of political science an abundance of group phenomena for analysis and interpretation. The records of more than three hundred years copiously illustrate the operation of the group process; an added and very significant interest is given to the study by the role of the Estates General on the eve of the great Revolution.

As early as 1212, Simon de Montfort called a parliament to which he summoned bishops, nobles, and distinguished bourgeois. A few years later, there was held at Beziers an assembly of three orders (*des trois ordres*) to give advice relative to provincial administrative organization. In 1254, by royal ordinance, the Seneschal Beaucaire was instructed to take council with the prelates, the barons, the knights, and the representatives of the towns (*hominibus bonarum villarum*).

The first Estates General, or National Parliament, was held in France in 1303. This was speedily followed by other parliaments. Speaking of the session of 1308, a chronicler said that the king wished to have the advice and consent of men "of every condition in the realm."

Like all early national assemblies, the French Estates General met only on the call of the king, and the methods of election depended naturally upon the terms of the royal orders. Complicated and varying practices were adopted at different

(Continued on page 4)

Western Clarion

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

Published twice a month by the Socialist Party of
Canada, P. O. Box 710, Vancouver, B. C.

Entered at G. P. O. as a newspaper.

Editor: _____ Ewen MacLeod

SUBSCRIPTION:

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

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

924

VANCOUVER, B.C., SEPTEMBER 16, 1924.

THE ANGLO-SOVIET TREATIES.

NOW that the British and Russian delegates in conference have reached agreement on the proposed drafts of the general treaty and the commercial and navigation treaty as between Great Britain and Northern Ireland on the one hand and the Union of Soviet Republics on the other, it remains to be seen whether or not the British Parliament will provide the authorization necessary to allow the treaties to go into effect. It has been widely held, and with some apparent circumstantial justification, that in view of the unprecedented political conditions surrounding the return of the last Baldwin ministry the opportunity presented itself whereby liberal and conservative parties might encompass a definite approach toward settlement of disturbed political and commercial relationships with Russia by allowing labor to take the initiative and thus avoid, for themselves, the humiliation justly consequent upon their past actions and utterances against Russia. The appearances were there, and now that they have their bargain it remains to be seen whether they are to accept or not. Peculiarly enough, although the labor government is a minority government and is thus unable to by itself in Parliament vote ratification of the treaties it has sponsored, so also was the Baldwin government in a minority, as would also have been the liberal party had it, under the circumstances, succeeded to office. There thus arose the circumstances wherein a treaty with a foreign power cannot secure parliamentary passage without compromise among the general membership of parliament, and possibly of both opposition parties there. The press of Great Britain has been very largely denunciatory of the treaties, from which we gather that although ratification may be given they expected and hoped for a better bargain than they got.

On their part the Soviets promise satisfaction concerning the claims on their government of various categories, the amounts to be determined through further negotiations. This involves pre-war debts concerning which the old-time concept—of four or five years ago—was that they must be rightfully acknowledged and arrangement for payment made, to be done dictatorially by assembled capitalist interests. Private claims, such as confiscation of goods, are subject to arrangement under these negotiations still to be conducted, as are also claims of former property owners who have been expropriated. All this affects British nationals. On its part the British government concurs in the Soviet point of view that these claims cannot fully be liquidated; amounts and methods of payment are subject to separate negotiation. The British government takes upon itself obligation to conclude a loan to Russia. The amount of the loan will be consequent upon the amount to be determined as Russia's obligation. Although not necessarily to be of exactly the still to be agreed upon amount of these obligations the loan amount will be largely determined thereby and will in part be used for the purchase of material in Great Britain. It is not expected that the further negotiations respecting individual claims and their amounts will be speedily terminated once they are commenced nor without disagreement, but it is expected that agreement is possible. The Soviets have concluded agreements

with some other European governments, but in no such case has there been agreement concerning a guaranteed loan. Thus the position of Russia assumes a new aspect in international affairs, new that is since 1917, because with legal recognition providing the usual channels of commercial and political negotiation and with further capital investment lodged in her industrial life through the medium of one powerful outside state apparatus, by virtue of self interest on the part of that state she is afforded something of immunity from violence on the part of the latter's trading rivals and their governments. It has taken since the early part of 1919, in actual proposals, for the Soviets to reach this position with the outside world. Then, when they offered, under certain conditions, to recognize the financial obligations of the former Russian Empire, it was commonly thought by sympathisers that this offered recognition was a clever ruse on their part merely to promise and then to avoid fulfilment. But events do not encourage this convenient way of avoiding recognition of matters of fact. Trotsky, at any rate, has made it clear that all Soviet obligations are made in good faith and with the intention of observance. Propaganda by sympathisers contrariwise simply involves further protestation by the Soviet authorities to the same effect and increases their difficulties accordingly.

What lessons from these Anglo-Soviet agreements may be learned by the Socialist movement at large? Has its ideal of full emancipation from the bonds of capital helped or hindered it in its consideration of Russia's case? It is apparent that if capital is invested in Russia seeking a return Russia is conditioned to that extent by the character of capitalist exploitation. The working out of a philosophy may occasion as much argument as the philosophy itself, but it is apparent that in Russia's case each is merged in the other. A rigid ideal may be set so high that pronouncement upon it becomes a very logical formalism. Altogether, without prejudice to those who hold by the tactical values of the latter position with working class education in view it is apparent that practice imposes its claims in work-a-day affairs, big or small.

"NO COMPROMISE," ETC.

THE policy of the party is now under examination. The dynamic factor in our propaganda has eluded us. We have been looking for it in the tactics of reform. We find ourselves in the labyrinth of compromise. This step, according to Harrington, has been taken officially. Does the party as a whole approve of the stand taken in the recent B. C. election?

Does the general body of the party approve of the "New Revisionism" of "C"?

Judging from the articles in the Clarion and conversations with comrades the answer is in the negative.

What is the cause of the general apathy that exists in the ranks of the reds, old-time members of the S. P. of C? Why has the old-time vim and enthusiasm vanished?

There never was such a demand for the straight dope as now. There never was a time when the proletariat were in such a receptive mood as they are today. There is something missing in the party itself. Let us try to find out what it is.

The Russian revolution stole our hearts and we lost our heads. We were in love and blind. Like the girl in the story we loved not wisely but too well. We left the straight and narrow path of historical materialism and strayed into the highways of idealism and sentimentality. Very little good socialist literature was produced during the war. Liberal papers like "The Nation," "The New Republic," and others increased their circulation, and many comrades, not too well grounded, fell under the spell of their psychology. The advanced section of the liberal school of thought takes the stand that a new form of society is coming. In their opinion it will come very slowly. They always emphasise the fact that evolution is very slow. The effect of the propaganda can be perceived in the pages of the Clarion. The class struggle is gradually eliminated from articles written by "C," and others, and as a result

the virility of the party is unconsciously sapped away. Then we imitate our masters' quilldrivers. We become victims of bourgeois culture. Like the ivy it has attached itself to our organisation and is smothering us. Some of our writers, instead of developing a proletarian manner of expression are little more than cheap imitations of the scribes of capitalism. The slave no longer understands us and in consequence we are losing his support.

What is the remedy? Within the framework of capitalist society the co-operative commonwealth cannot be built. There is no gradual step at a time policy possible. The baby is not born a foot one day and an arm the next; it comes as a whole. After it enters the world it begins to grow and develop. We cannot successfully interfere with the development of the baby in the womb; capitalism is pregnant. We are preparing for and anticipating the birth. Therefore our policy must be a revolutionary one.

The working class cannot be educated by propaganda alone. It must see and feel; it must experience. The S. P. of C. is a political party. In our conflicts with the henchmen of capitalism during election times we are able to prove to the developing mind of the slave the truth of our philosophy. His brain is quickened in the fight. If we co-operate with reform parties we sacrifice a portion of our educational opportunities in order to further a policy which is not ours. It may be said with truth that we lack political initiative. We should explain and examine in the light of Marxism the political and economic conditions that actually exist in the locality where the election is taking place. We do not always do this. When an election is not taking place, that is during the time between elections, it may be possible to do educational work upon the platform of other parties, providing the speaker upholds the revolutionary position and speaks as a member of the S. P. of C.

This, in my opinion, should be allowed and encouraged. The criticism I have indulged in is in a kindly spirit. There is no fear in my mind regarding the future of the party. We shall do more work in the future than we have ever done in the past. We have had an experience and we shall be all the better for it. As the editor says, "we can learn." The spirit of fatalism that prevails in some quarters is to be deplored, but we shall rise above it eventually.

"It is not a question of conditions alone, but man and the conditions. Conditions can be altered by man," says Marx. Sometimes we forget this and wait for the coming of what we should work to help to bring about. If there is anything wrong it is with ourselves. The revolutionary track is ours and we shall keep on it. Our policy is to steer clear of the rocks of compromise and opportunism, and continue to be guided by the chart that has heretofore saved us from being engaged by the quicksands of expediency, saved us from the fate that has destroyed so many apparently promising movements. This discussion brought about by our friend "C," "boring from within," will, I hope, prove beneficial to us all. Something was needed to galvanise the party into life, and from the plug on the skidroad to the slave in the harvest field there comes the cry, "No compromise, no political trading."

C. LESTER

POLITICAL REPRESENTATION.

(Continued from page 3)

times and places, but the following general principles were commonly observed. The members of the two privileged classes, the high clergy and the nobility, were summoned in person. The important convents and chapters were invited to send delegates. Occasionally the regular and secular clergy of a diocese united to elect their deputies. The nobility of the lower order usually chose their representatives, but sometimes members of this group appeared in person. In the towns the delegates were elected—often under a widely extended suffrage, including, on some occasions, women voters. These orders of society were known collectively as the clergy, the nobility, and the third estate.

(To be continued)

Toward Modernization

IN this and another article I propose to deal with Comrade McDonald's attack of two issues ago upon my argumentation against certain positions and attitudes of the S. P. of C. In all my argumentation, and of this and previous articles, I am moved by a motive that goes far beyond my desire for changes in the party positions and attitudes or, at this present, to turn the tables on Mac. My motive, presumptuous enough, is to do what I think is distressingly needful, that is, to do what I can to modernize the thought of the revolutionary wing of the working class movement. Hence the discursive, moralizing character of my argument, and the use of the method of indirection in attack, no doubt so exasperating to critics. There now, I am out in the open. Passing up much that I consider disputable in Comrade McDonald's article I pass on to the main issue—the anti-labor party position of the S. P. of C. As to the question of our party's anti-reform attitude and its apathetic interest in non-violent and constitutional procedures in social change, those issues are, in my conception, secondary, though so much related to the main issue that decision upon it, one way or the other, predisposes conclusions on the others. Contrarily, the Party, I contend, elevated the question of reforms to first place. It is anti-labor party because it is first anti-reform. The reason for that will evolve as I proceed, as will also the reason why I consider the reformism of labor parties a secondary matter and not the prime criterion by which to judge those parties.

The main issue, the anti-labor party position of the S. P. of C., Comrade McDonald supports and I argue against. As to reforms, I contend the Party attitude is anti-reform and argue against the attitude. Comrade McDonald, however, denies the Party is anti-reform and asks me for proof in Party literature. Later I shall quote the Party Manifesto in support of my contention. Moreover, aside from my own experience of twelve or fourteen years' membership, I think it is common knowledge that Party propaganda and Party sentiment has been anti-reform as a corollary to the anti-labor party position. Against my charge of anti-reform, Comrade McDonald erects a barricade, his defence reaction, from behind which he fires his denial. This is his creation—"if," says he, "we find them (reforms) useful, we adopt them to our needs as a class. . . ." though, (laying down his conception of the position of Marx) "we leave the extension of reforms to the ruling class. . . ." So the working class adopt ruling class reforms if they are useful, do they? How handy words are for elevating a necessity into a virtue. What then is implied in Comrade McDonald's revolutionary-position-according-to-Marx? Just this, that the sole initiative and source of reforms, speaking politically, shall rest in the ruling class; and that a function of the Socialist parties is to maintain this state by opposing and, if possible, destroying all reform political organizations of the working class, though struggling for reforms on the very field where the class-struggle must find its maturist expression. Not, apparently, until the working masses are fit to subscribe to the single plank of revolutionary overthrow are they to be permitted to enter as an independent movement into the most vital of all mediums of development, that of open and direct political struggle. I contend that is what the Party position of anti-labor party amounts to. Is that position the position of Marx? I, at least, deny it.

No wonder so many socialists are so barren in their theorizing on the problem of change, for, holding that position, they are thrust back ever and again upon that blighting theory, from whence the party position derives, doctrinally, of progressive misery, social collapse and violent overturn as the sole hope and efficacious means of social revolution. How commonplace that theory sounds when put in the idiom of the drifter—"things must get worse

before they get better;" and how it spreads its paralyzing contagion because the sentiment is so pervasive in the underlying community. What does a man want with science who has once got possessed of that theory, except perhaps to fortify his prepossession. He ceases to push forward his frontiers of knowledge, he dangerously near becomes an anti-social ghoul, anticipating and taking a cold-blooded delight in social calamities. Thus segregating himself, breaking the ties of sympathetic interest in their struggles, he loses the chance of a real understanding of people; and his interest in political affairs tends to be cynical, perfunctory and superficial. I meet them, socialists of bitter conviction, real logical anti-reformers, lost to the active life of the labor movement, centers of radiating apathy and despair, looking forward to the next great war or economic crisis. Uncompromising anti-reformers, they see in improved conditions for the working masses nothing but prolongation of the system. The Labor Party in Great Britain is saving the capitalist system for the capitalists; that is how they see it. And logically so, since their premise is the theory of increasing misery and progressive degradation. There are others again who, while holding to the theory, compromise grudgingly. The theory has its ridiculous side, for to be logical, the working class should be advised to cease struggling. Both animal instinct and their reason run contrary to the advice, however, since it is an invitation to suicide. So there is compromise first with the trade union movement. But there is no interest in reforms and ameliorations, as such, they hate them, it is the struggle and the use that can be made of it and of the organizations for ulterior revolutionary purpose where the interest lies. And now they are at the political labor organizations in the same fashion, inspired by the same animus, and the same ulterior purpose. And it is all wrong except the revolutionary purpose. All that reasoning is wrong and all that activity is wrong that is based on the theory of misery. The theory is a fallacy. The experience of history is that abject misery carries with it deterioration and abject subjection. On the contrary, I subscribe to this theory: "That the social revolution must be carried out, not by an anaemic working class under the pressure of abject privation, but by a body of full blooded working men gradually gaining strength from improved conditions of life. Instead of the revolution being worked out through the leverage of desperate misery, every improvement in working class conditions is to be counted as a gain for the revolutionary forces." "This," says Veblen, "is a good Darwinism, but it does not belong to the neo-Hegelian Marxism." If I may use those barbarisms, the latter tag describes the Party position. Mine, I am a neo-Darwinian Marxist. Which means to say that the mechanics of my scheme of causation is Darwinian, as the primary position of my outlook on the social process, that no end, no good, no socialist commonwealth governs and determines the line of development of the process. That is putting the cart before the horse in Hegelian fashion. Socialism is not inevitable by virtue of a trend "in the nature of things." Man is the only purposive factor in the process. In the Darwinian scheme, the process is the thing. And the "end," the resultant at any particular time, evolves out of the struggle, out of the clash of the forces engaged. Therefore, as I see the social process, the means govern and determine the end. That is, I must not be continually occupied with dreaming of my ideal, thinking it will come in its "own" time, but must concentrate on the "means" to the "end" if it is ever to be realized. Reforms are such means, reforms for better conditions for the working masses, reforms for social controls over social processes, and reforms institutional in character, instituted with the socialist "end" in view. "The emancipation of the working class is the work of the working class itself," through

their representative mass organizations, economic and political. The function of socialist parties is such as to prevent them ever being representative, it is to keep ahead of the masses intellectually, to educate, to criticize, to create socialist opinion, which, by the initiating force of the mass organizations may be translated into practical effect in and during the transition to a new order.

Comrade McDonald's article leads me to think that in some particulars he misunderstands me, due partly no doubt to my wretched presentation of my point of view, and perhaps also because he has read me in too hostile a temper, jealous for the integrity of the old standards of the party. Allowing, however, something for those causes, there are still differences in our outlook that I can only put down to his not having given sufficient consideration to certain features of the Marxian theory of history, on the one hand, and on the other, to wide areas, as it were, of the problem of change, comparatively recently opened up, not having engaged his interest. On the latter point first: I fail to detect any influence of the later modern science in Comrade McDonald's thought, or even a hint of curiosity as to what it has to say about the problem. Apparently it was all thought out, the last word said, years and years ago and all we have to do now is polish up the old ideological furniture. Even the virtue of an occasional suspended judgment seems absent from his philosophy; he betrays no doubts; his discussion runs easily in the vein of the untroubled, complacent, ante-bellum period—Yea! Yea! and Nay! Nay. as though it were given to any generation of men to grasp the whole truth. How is that? for I hear it admitted on all sides that the social sciences—sciences, so-called by courtesy—are still only in their infancy. While how vast and complex the capitalistic world today, with its problems of modern complications reaching far down into the remoteness of history and entwined in the roots of our refractory human nature. A terrible thought intrudes itself here: You and I, Mac, are doomed never to meet on common ground, therefore never to reach approximately similar conclusions or matters in dispute, without terrific strain of sacrifice in compromise, unless you move over, intellectual bag and baggage, into the twentieth century, or better, not to leave me behind, strive as I do, to pay it a visit now and then and make a feint at being up to date.

Enough of graceless chiding on that score; its bumptious air irks my guts, and there is the matter of Marx's science yet. Comrade McDonald claims to rest his case against me on the grounds of the Marxism of Marx and in favor of the anti-labor party position. I have, in previous articles, been arguing against that position and for the recognition of labor parties, partly on the grounds of modern science, calling in Marx as auxiliary support, as it were, because of the weight of his name. Nevertheless, though modern grounds for my point of view are the strongest, I am confident to rely on Marx and intend to present a series of quotations from him supporting my position. Let me state my basis for recognition of labor parties again, clearer if I can. I hold that recognition of labor parties does not hinge on the matter of their reformist character, but on whether they are representative of an independent movement of the working class in politics. So long as Marx held to the tenets of his theory of historical development and its scheme of causation, he would have supported labor parties on the latter ground; he could no other, though a thousand years instead of thirty rolled by. This contention I propose to support by quoting Marx.

But, by reason of the treatment already accorded my previous quotations from Marx by Comrade McDonald and other critics, I have no confidence in their power to grasp the bearing of those that are to follow on the question at issue. So, for the rest of this article I will consider they are rusty on Marx's

Continued on page 8)

Recognition

SINCE it set up as a Socialist Republic, the activities of Soviet Russia have centred around the question of recognition. At first, from the various outside capitalist-backed white armies, Russia got the kind of "recognition" it didn't want—in the neck! Then, having managed to survive that treatment usually accorded to doomed chickens, it continued to gain, one after the other, with increasing success, the sort of recognition it really needs; until there are now few important countries that refuse its propositions.

Russia's experience, in this respect, is neither new nor extraordinary, the only novel feature being the fact that it, a modern Revolutionary Communist society which, upon one of the largest of national and international scales, is seeking recognition from many of its deadly and avowed enemies: for the same struggle, but played upon smaller national stages, has always accompanied the class-war-provoking conditions of every master and subject class society.

The latest instance of the kind took place last month in connection with a Winnipeg branch of the Canadian National Railways One Big Union. Two members of the O. B. U. having been discharged from the Transcona shops, the Union officials endeavored to get a board of conciliation appointed to settle the dispute favorably to both the Union and the men, upon whom sentence of death by starvation (through loss of employment) had been passed. The Hon. James Murdock, "Minister of Labor" has further informed the O. B. U. that they will not be recognized, either by the C. N. Ry., or the Government, as a true labor union, and laughs at their threat of retaliatory action; and should such threats materialise, promises the dismissal of all individuals concerned. Under the decision of the Department of Labor, the only recognized union in the Transcona shops, is Div. No. 4 of the American Federation of Labor.

No other master-class attitude than the above, could or should have been expected; as supposedly class-conscious union men ought to have been aware of and fully prepared for. As well might the lamb in the fable have looked for reason and mercy in the wolf, as a minority class-conscious Socialist organization expect favors from a master-class secure in the knowledge that servility and disunion prevailed in the ranks of the opposing labor armies. To the dominant class, the workers are always a nuisance, a necessary evil, which they unhesitatingly get rid of whenever machines—those other means of wealth production—can more profitably take the place of the living creature.

But to appreciate the true inwardness of the gentle master-class heart and spirit, the pages of history must be referred to, at the time when, subsequent to 1785, the invention of steam, introduced into British factories, made full-blown Capitalism possible. The result of this economic revolution was that a number of dirty, smoke-begrimed factory towns arose, whose machine-made commodities caused the decay of the rural iron trade, cloth trade and other village industries. Therefore, in 1795, many food riots took place and in the same year the country landlords of Speenhamland in the south of England, thought up or, rather, developed—for it was not entirely original—an elegant scheme to help themselves out at the expense of the workers and other sections of the community. The great idea was to grant relief from the poor rates to married laborers whose wages were not enough to support them, their wives and families; and this policy was adopted from end to end of the land. Thus, the masters profited by the low price of labor-power by shifting the burden of the subsistence wage onto the shoulders of other people.

The result was to pauperise the workers. In one parish three-quarters of the inhabitants were receiving relief. "The meshes of the Poor Law," writes Mr. and Mrs. Hammond, "were spread over

the entire labor system. The laborers, stripped of their ancient rights and their ancient possessions, refused a minimum wage and allotments, were given instead a universal system of pauperism. This was the basis on which the governing class rebuilt the English village."

In 1812, the scale of allowances from the rates began to be reduced and therefore the position of the laborer declined and poverty became more intense. In 1830, as a result, the English peasants broke out into open, threshing-machine and rick-burning revolts. But, so far as government relief to the laborers was concerned, the risings were an utter failure; some of the leaders were hanged and several hundred men and boys were transported overseas.

Three years later, in 1833, the first English Agricultural Laborers' Union was formed in Dorsetshire and though merely a friendly society, it was, in a few months, brutally suppressed by an alarmed government; although the laws against trade union combination had been repealed since 1824. But, further, as this harmless laborers' society had administered, in accordance with the then general trade union customs, an oath of secrecy to its members, a kind of oath which, by an out-of-date statute of George III. was held to be illegal, six members of the union were arrested, gaoled, sentenced to 7 years' transportation and then hurried out of the country to avoid public protests.

This protest came in due course in the shape of a petition signed by over 250,000 persons and organized by the whole trade union movement, and enormous processions and demonstrations took place in London. Still, three years passed before the government issued a free pardon to the victims; and they and their families could return to "their" native land; where a sum of money had been collected sufficient to settle them on farms of their own where that famous British love of fair-play, as exercised by the British master-class, couldn't get at them!

The moral of it all is, that when masters or workers really ACT in harmony with their true and undisguised economic interests, mutual recognition is utterly impossible by either party to the transaction. It is only when the actions of both classes, through fear or policy, fail to openly realise, that a sort of hypocritical and ironical truce can be maintained.

"Government," we are told, like the poor, we always shall have with us. That is a vulgar mistake, for government is a late arrival on the human scene. The first thing mankind realised was that co-operation was a prime necessity and benefit, and therefore strictly and universally practised it. Although the average white man on this continent considered the Redskins mere "varmints," it is to Morgan, the American student of Red Indian communities that we are indebted for an insight into these tribal societies, as the type of the entire social system of primitive man.

These Indians lived under a condition of Communism, wherein they co-operated to their mutual advantage. For all that, they, too, had their "rulers" consisting of a Central Directing Authority—the "Sachems." As the common property basis of their society meant the absence of rival economic classes, the Sachems' work was necessarily confined to sharing in and managing the collective efforts and welfare of the whole community of which they were members. They were not, like the Capitalist State Executives, an oppressive and repressive institution directed against some under and economically weaker class.

A Central Directing Authority is essential to any society or social project which intends to produce definite results; as Marx points out with his illustration of the need an orchestra has for a leader, as compared with the superfluity of such a functionary in the case of a solitary musician.

The Capitalist system of production, with all its

faults is in its way, like an orchestra, although it tries all it can to be independent of everyone. Hence even it needs its leader, its Central Directing Authority. The trouble is, however, that the general competitive profit-seeking and class antagonistic character of its make-up, breeds anarchy; and therefore, tyranny, the companion of anarchy, is bound to rear his ugly head.

Is it strange, then, that wherever, under Capitalism, the functions of rulership must be exercised, whether in the factory, the shop of the State; these functions are constantly and inseparably linked up with and adulterated by the evils of injustice and tyranny?

But modern Socialism, like the Primitive Communism of the Red Man, implies the common ownership of the means of living, which involves organization and that spells a directing authority. Having no dispossessed under dogs and classes to dominate and bully, such Central Directing Authority must perforce work off its steam and operate solely with Industrial Processes. Hence, Communist authorities will be simply committees of industrial and economic experts—not C. N. R. nor any other kind of financial magnates or Hon. Ministers of Labor.

Under such conditions, the more brains and efficiency we can command and set in motion in our managers, the better and merrier for all of us; and internal labor wars and Capitalist feuds, as well as other forms of competitive, anti-social jealousy, would, like the "State" die a natural death.

Armed and imbued with this knowledge, it is a gross and glaring absurdity to expect any worker or other intelligent person, to respect and "recognise" him or them who profess to do the work and carry the ideology of private property or private Reform Government, owned and operated Capitalism, which belongs to the dying past, from which, as the last bondage of the Kingdom of the Brute Socialism is destined to free the Human Race.

Anarchical Capitalism and its human instruments will never give rose water treatment to those who, unlike the A. F. of Labor, dare to criticise and challenge its waning and discredited authorityship.

So, when we say, give us Socialism; that means give us genuinely helpful men and women whom we can and will respect and recognise; for the former implies and creates the latter, and the latter—if they are justifiably included in the foregoing classification—will surely not be long in granting themselves, the former. PROGRESS.

HERE AND NOW

IT is a tremendous pleasure Here and Now to record an advance in the financial returns and to express appreciation of the efforts of those excellent and industrious ones who have made that possible. On the other hand it is necessary that while broadcasting our joyfulness we be not altogether ebullient, because thus there may be others who will consider us content. And so we approach the condition of Gilbert's character who, through character complexities, became "a living ganglion of irreconcilable antagonisms."

Therefore we fall back upon the condition of Oliver Twist: Encouraged by what we've had we ask for more. Here follows what we've had:—

Following \$1 each: J. Aconite; A. Solis; H. W. Speed; R. Temple; "Progress"; W. J. Sim; Sam Guthrie; G. H. Powell; M. Farrell; G. Lester; E. Antijuntti; Wm. Morrison; S. G. Evans; F. Neale; H. Asson; A. E. Faulkner; L. T. Morgan.

Following \$2 each: George White; G. Alley; Oscar Motter; T. Twelvtree.

Robt. Inglis \$3; J. Pettie \$2.50. Above, Clarion subscriptions received from 29th August to 11th September, inclusive, total \$30.50.

CLARION MAINTENANCE FUND

R. Temple \$1; Robt. Inglis \$2; Local Names No. 111 (per Arthur Jordan) \$50.

Above, C.M.E. receipts from 29th August to 11th September, inclusive, total \$53.

Tactics and Other Things

BY J. A. McDONALD.

SOME weeks ago, due to the freakish propaganda emanating from the Clarion, I was prompted to ask for a definite official reply to the question, Has the S. P. of C. changed its attitude towards reform parties?

Answers to the query were furnished by three members of the Party. In his Secretarial Notes the editor wrote, "Comrade McDonald asks for an official answer to the question as to whether or not the Party attitude has changed towards the British Labor Party. The answer is that it has not changed its attitude towards reform parties."

In the same issue Comrade "C" contributes the following, "At the outset I hasten to inform him there has been no alteration in the official position of the S. P. of C. as he is familiar with it, as laid down in the Party Constitution and Platform and its Manifesto."

In the next issue Comrade Harrington tells us that "The Canadian Labor Party and our attitude towards it is another matter and we are bound to meet the issue without equivocation. The plain fact is that officially we have taken a new stand on the matter. We have recognized them as a working class party and have co-operated with them in an election. We have done this before but never officially." (Emphasis this).*

Now, could confusion ever be worse confounded than here? Were it not for the fact that I have watched Party affairs somewhat carefully during recent times I would still be at sea concerning what the official attitude is. However, I am able to accept Comrade Harrington's statement because it happens to be the only one that squares with the facts.

When I wrote my article, "Was Marx a Reformer?" the Harrington contribution was not yet published. I wrote under the mistaken impression that "C" and the Editor provided me with correct data. Had I then known what I know now I scarcely should have interrupted the smoothness of the Party machine. The change in attitude was officially made, and a working agreement entered into with the C. L. P. and, then, the membership was invited to discuss the new policy. Truly, a democratic procedure!

I am not quite egotistic enough to postulate a reversion to type by the S. P. of C. because of any effort of mine. I can see no other alternative but to allow the Party to wallow in the mire of reform till the undertaker duly arrives. Once an organization reaches such a stage of tolerance that it refuses to attack any of its rivals, then it has by such a position taken its first decided step in the direction of the morgue. That the S. P. of C. has about completed its journey should be obvious to all.

I asked "C" to point out where any official statement was ever rendered to the effect that the Party considered all reforms inimical to working class progress. In reply he invites me to read the final paragraph of the Manifesto. The item in question has been thoroughly perused and no such statement nor even an implication of such has been found. Here is the paragraph:

"The Party platform—a short and scientific exposition of sound working class principles and tactics—is broad enough to embrace all who are Socialists and narrow enough to exclude all those who are not. Since all political parties must be the expression of certain class interests the S. P. of C. enters the political field determined to wage war on all other political parties, whether openly capitalist or so-called labor. Understanding the futility of reform and the danger of compromise, it stands

square with science and practical experience, wasting not its time and energy on mere effects but dealing only with root causes. Realising furthermore, that no "step-at-a-time" policy, no remedial legislation or political quackery can be substituted for working class knowledge its propaganda, therefore, is one of enlightenment and education."

Anyone who reads the English language for the purpose of understanding it should have no difficulty in seeing that this paragraph contains precisely what I contended in my article was the Party position. It explains that we were concerned with revolutionary means rather than wasting energy in pursuit of petty reforms. But it cannot be construed to state that each and every reform measure must necessarily militate against social progress.

Of course, the Manifesto is now a thing of the past. It does not sponsor the universal brotherhood of the new policy. It was written to apply exclusively to social affairs of the ante-bellum days, and now must surely give way to a broader and nobler document which I trust we shall soon have the pleasure of perusing.

In his keynoting campaign "C", like every opportunist that comes down the pike, claims for himself a monopoly of all the intellectual virtues. He possesses the only open mind, the only broad comprehension, the only powers of analysis worth having, while all his "left wing" opponents are afflicted with "closed minds" and "fixed ideas."

There are many who take a stand directly at variance with that of "C" who keep abreast of the times in all departments of science. Who study the latest literature in regard to anthropology, psychology, economics, biology, anthrope and economic geography, etc. And, what is even more to the point, they have a capacity at least equally great to assimilate what they read.

This does not imply that they should change their philosophy every time they read a book. Neither does it follow that because of their efforts in the field of social and psychical research Marx must be replaced by Veblen and MacDougall. That "habit" is a factor of great importance to social progress no student will deny. But that it possesses the great influence accorded it by "C" no Marxian worthy of the name will concede. He has made a fetish of habit.

When the O. B. U. movement was launched in Canada a few years ago many members of the S. P. of C. rushed to its sheltering wing. They had naught but compassion for the obtuse minds that could not see in that organization the harbinger of all progress. New intellectual avenues were being opened and they, the favored of nature, with their keen, scintillating thinking equipment were called upon to be the pioneers of a new era.

But where is the O.B.U. today? The "common as muck" minds refused to be serenaded into its folds. In their imbecility they anticipated its ultimate failure. They saw greater results in the political educational movement. The wise brannigans eventually dropped their plaything and returned to the status quo.

The present immigration into the domain of labor politics will meet a similar fate. It may provide some of our political exhibitionists another opportunity to sublimate the libido but it will not serve to enhance the class struggle. Even if the S. P. of C. group maintained an "impossibilist" attitude in the Labor Party (which is altogether unlikely) it would spell no more advance than if they remained outside. The tail is not going to wag the dog. The incessant conflict of opinions would tend to obscure the issue for the average worker.

True, a small educational organization in opposition to all other parties means labor and inconvenience to those who carry the war into Africa. But this is the work that really counts in the revolution-

ary movement. The progress may appear slow but we must realize that, despite the revolutions and abortive revolutions, the collapsing of national exchanges, and the switching of boundaries that have juzzed our existence since the war, the movement on this continent is still in a study class stage and will likely remain there for several moons yet.

"C" tries to make it appear that we are simply waiting for the system to collapse and then trust to luck in the consequent confusion. This is not the attitude and "C" knows it is not. There is much work to do right now and some of us are engaged in doing it.

Personally, I do not lay claim to being the only one who reads and studies Marx. Neither do I feel a fondness for "C's" method of eulogising Marx when he finds a quotation that appears to coincide with his twaddle, and, again, when the evidence is against him he suddenly discovers that Marx is half a century old. But, still, I expect that this is an attribute inherent in the new universal mind.

PLATFORM

Socialist Party of Canada

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Obey that impulse and subscribe for the

WESTERN CLARION

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

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

Name

Address

* Editor's Note: This recognition was given in our correspondence with the B. C. Section of the C. L. P. Concerning official affiliation with that body the actual state of the matter, as it stands today, was given there. The correspondence was published in the Clarion of June 2.

THE STRAIGHT ISSUE.

(Continued from page 1)

condition? Practically in all cases, the latter. If so, then, we come to the fact that social movement is primarily dependent on social necessity, and that until the emergent condition kindles the sense of perception we cry "woe to Jerusalem," in vain. And it negates the idea that, however it may have been in the slow moving societies of old, developing custom can play but a relatively insignificant role in the quickened sweep and change of an age and civilisation, dancing to their doom in the driven frenzy of imperialist finance.

Furthermore, it implies the improbability of revolution by "the constitution." Indeed, "constitutional means" is being itself abolished, as Russia, Italy, Ireland, Hungary, etc., have shown. Not to speak of the great freedom to the South. Naturally. For constitutional means is only capitalist opportunity, sacred only so long as capitalism can avail itself of its abstractions. And as society, by the nature of its capitalist organization, and its misinterpretation of the status quo, accepts the sanctities of its ruling class, it can, unconsciously, achieve no reform dangerously detrimental to the power of the ruling class. As vision rarely anticipates demand, its demand can be but the specific of time condition. And the ruling class can accede to almost every such specific reform—except the basis of its political democracy, territorial electorates,—and still retain its power. When we come to that final demand, we come to revolution. For beyond that we cannot go, without the overthrow of the powers that be. But it will be the development of the system that will bring us there, and keep us there, tempered and steeled with common purpose. Neither reform, nor custom. It will be the capitalist abnegation of its vaunted principles, and the intolerable conditions of our life which will, at one stroke, stiffen us with the power to will, and the will to power. And by the same reasoning, the revolution cannot come about us a sectional tour-de-force of the barricades. Numbers do not avail here. Machinery and chemistry have discounted them: rendered the "old traditions" void. And the development of the proletariat has made it an absurdity. The powers of the state are irrevocably in the hands of the class that rules; and they will be used by that class for the protection of its privilege, to the limit of social tolerance. The proletariat can capture the state only when it understands the significance of the state. Not before. No, not though desire should thunder like the gods of Sinai, or plead with the tongues of angels.

The standard of socialism is an unshaken by war or device as the rocky crests of time. We are, wage slaves, because capital exists. In no wise can we be free without its overthrow. We are in poverty because the capitalist class owns the means of our life. We are subject to their state, because the state is the protection of their privilege. We are nurtured in their law, for by their law we are exploited. We are educated in their schools, for their teaching is the ethic of slavery. We have freedom of the press, because the press is the sanctity of property. We have freedom of thought, for our thought is the cult of success. We have political democracy, because their parliaments are the safeguards of power. We have freedom of speech, for our speech is the safety of wealth; freedom of initiative, for initiative is the foundation of profit; and liberty of conscience, for conscience is the ground of their supremacy. We are suckled on the verbiage of "right," "doped" with the bondage of "justice," distraught with the vanity of "eternity." We toil when they require; we go idle to their need; we sacrifice to their ambition; endure for their glorification; by millions we perish on the battlefields of their imperialism. And we toil, and starve, and sacrifice, and suffer and die, because in our dire ignorance we are the pawns of capital and its vicissitudes, knowing not whence to turn for relief.

If we only commingle with our kind in the daily struggle, it is not because we are opposed to our class, but because, although that struggle is immediate, it is still subsidiary to our main problem. Reform is the issue of the capitalist class that must quieten the murmuring of its slaves. And if the

stirring of the slaves is one of the forces of its becoming, it is, nevertheless, in the last analysis, a majority incidence, and is usually either obsolete in time, or ineffectual in practice. The gradual improvements in working class conditions is due, in general, to improvements in technical production. Only secondary are they the fruits of labor struggles. And they materialise as sequels of economic pressure. Only fortuitously are they measures of relief. And the proof of their essential subjectivity is to be found in the gathering oppressions and intensification of exploiting efficiency. The daily struggle is only the haggling of the market—a market at all times against us, because we are slaves and know it not. And to carry the commodity struggle into the political arena does not alter its complexion one whit. For there, too, for the same reason—our ignorance of our slavery—the dice is loaded against us. We are drawn into politics by the gravity of the capitalist market; and for the simple reason that capitalist maturity involves our whole life in the exclusive realm of economics. Yet we cannot champion the commodity struggle, or its clamorous appeal. For our only relief is not the enhanced price of labor, but the abolition of capital; and our only hope of success the unity of revolutionary comprehension.

Thus the issue is straight and clear between the owning class who have all the wealth and luxury and leisure, and benefice of production; and the working class who have all the toil, all its class degradation; all its unending anxieties of doubt and fear; and over and above, its poverty and the soul destroying pinching of its penury. Out of that inevitable class conflict and the inevitable restrictions of capitalist maturity will come the knowledge of our slavery; the apprehension of its cause, that must be known before the cure can be applied.

The abolition of capitalist society: the establishment of socialism: that is the clear drawn issue. And whoever is striving for the immediate appearance, the tempting reform, the luring promise, the inviting conciliation, has no common aim with us. For unless it can be shown that the abolition of capital will not give us economic freedom, will not abolish poverty,—is not in a word—slavery, then we are confident that, strive as it may, reform as it may, before labor can co-operate with unity of purpose it must first acquire unity of thought. That is our great necessity, and come it as it will it is the necessary antecedent of revolution. All else is illusion. We submit, therefore, that by their very nature there must be political antagonism between the clearest issue of socialism and the commodity policies of labor; and that fraternal attempts at fusion and conciliation confuse the issue; confound our energies; conceal the reality; veil the contradiction of aim; and impede the imperious necessity of social understanding. R.

THE EVOLUTION OF INDUSTRY

(Continued from page 2)

Greater Development in Industry.

Just as the Industrial Revolution of the 18th Century was the culmination of a long series of developments that preceded it, so may it also be regarded as the starting point for a greater and wider industrial development. The production of myriads of machine-made commodities for a world market made it necessary for other and contributory lines of advance to be made. New roads, canals, railways and steam ships were called into being in order that goods might be swiftly transferred to any part of the country or any part of the world. Local industrial specialisation, which began when industry was in the domestic stage, became more pronounced as the means of conveying goods and passengers improved, and even countries began to specialise on the production of certain commodities. Invention followed invention, and a discovery that was applied to one industry affected many others. The need for a harder metal than iron for making railway lines led to the discovery of the Bessemer process of steel-making, and that in turn meant that the machines—previously great ponderous masses of wood and iron—could be built up of high quality steel, and, as a consequence, could last longer and be more efficient.

In the textile industry each improvement in either spinning or weaving had to be followed by an improvement in the other and complementary branch. Chemistry came to the aid of the manufacturer, and waste products were found to be valuable as the raw materials for new industries. The use of high speed steel made possible the automatic lathe with its revolutionising of output. The production of machinery by machinery, the manufacture of modern capitalism brought wealth untold to the employing class, and changed the character of the struggle between the workers and their employers.

(To be continued)

TOWARD MODERNIZATION.

(Continued from page 5)

theory of the historical process and refresh their memories with a review of it. The quotations will fill in another issue, if I am so privileged.

No proper critical understanding of Marx's theory of history, in which class struggles play so prominent a part, is possible, unless first an understanding is had of the intellectual influence, the winds of doctrine, that swept through the Europe of his time and played upon him during his formative years and the years of his creative work. Though I shall attempt a brief sketch of these influences I have little faith in my capacity to be informing on the matter, but I may turn thought in that direction. To those who care to follow up on the subject I recommend the three essays on Preconceptions and the two essays on Marxian theory in Veblen's "The Place of Science in Modern Civilization," and also M. Beer's "Life and Teaching of Karl Marx," the latter published by the National Labor Press, Johnsons Court, E. C., London, England, and the former by Huebsch, New York.

Here is a tempting place to make an end for this issue. I am an amateurish, undisciplined scribe. I am in camp, furthermore, under such difficulties as you will imagine. Starting out with this reply I proposed to make it in two installments. The quotations will take up my space for one Clarion, but now I have reasoned myself into thinking I can't get along without a review of Marx's theory of history. What to do? Do it! Well, next issue the theory of history. I wilt in anticipation of what Mac will do to me for this reply which is not a reply. C.

Literature Price List

	Cloth Bound.	Per Copy
Critique of Political Economy		1.65
Revolution and Counter Revolution (Marx)		1.15
Ancient Society		1.85
Capitalist Production (First Nine and 32 Chapters)		
"Capital," vol. 1, (Marx)		1.00
Vital Problems in Social Evolution		80c
Science and Revolution		80c
The Militant Proletariat		80c
Evolution Social and Organic		80c
Puritanism	10c	80c
Ethics and History		80c
Germs of Mind in Plants		80c
The Triumph of Life		80c
Feuerbavk		80c
Social Revolution (Kautsky)		.80
Origin of Species (Darwin)		1.15
Essays on Materialist		
Conception of History (Labriola)		1.50
Social Studies (Lafargue)		.80
	Paper Covers.	Per Copy
Evolution of Man (Prof. Boische)		30c
Wage-Labor and Capital		10c
Independent Working Class Education		10c
Communist Manifesto		10c
The Present Economic System (Prof. W. A. Bongor)		10c
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific		15c
Slave of the Farm		10c
Manifesto, S. P. of C.		10c
Causes of Belief in God (Lafargue)		10c
The State and Revolution (Lenin)		25c
Value, Price and Profit (Marx)		15c
Two Essays on History (C. Stephenson and G. Deville)		5c
Economic Causes of War (Leckie)		25c
Civil War in France (Marx)		25c
Christianism and Communism (Bishop W. M. Brown)		25c
Quantity Rates on Paper Covered Pamphlets.		
Two Essays on History	35 copies	75c
Communist Manifesto	35 copies	\$2.00
Wage-Labor and Capital	25 copies	\$2.00
Present Economic System	25 copies	\$1.50
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific	25 copies	\$1.25
Slave of the Farm	25 copies	\$1.50
Manifesto of S. P. of C.	25 copies	\$2.00
Evolution of Man	25 copies	\$2.75
Causes of Belief in God	25 copies	\$2.00
Value, Price and Profit	25 copies	\$1.25
Economic Causes of War	10 copies	\$2.00
Christianism and Communism	5 copies	\$1.00

All prices include postage.

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

A Journal of
CURRENT
EVENTS

No. 924.

TW

THE Clarion Guest's letter Inter-Emphatically exhibited a comprehensive

Contrasted with "ist Review" and the Scurr's views on Ecates the illusion Party as a whole on ticularly Canadian—

Newbold, Johnston granted that there solidarity between and Great Britain, the strain of develo cal revolution. Wh had prior to 1914 it foundation, due to ment.

The illusion to v fined to the averag the wish is father whose understanding look on Empire pr visit to Canada—the the hierarchy of th but it also colors t socialists, who have

In an article wh letin (Aug. 21) und ers and Wars," Cha cal outburst, quite bold, Johnston, et a tor's article deals tween Japan and th tary journal to the the part of Belgium pire fights or no."

While agreeing principle, it is more cockpit of the Ori Lester goes on to s ental movement ar I presume he mean impossible to cons Canada, as havin Lester asserts that Canada can best be the A. F. of L. an Continental movem it is "our duty" to Commonwealth; " world over," says i

This view of the part among those little island" as th of proletarian cultu periment in social cation from the new among some of " tutelage of "C."

Still, Lester has is not quite the big For he says: "The back the better. A has no past and n destroy itself. W