

WESTERN CLARION

A Journal of
CURRENT
EVENTS

Official Organ of
THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

HISTORY
ECONOMICS
PHILOSOPHY

No. 917.

TWENTIETH YEAR.

Twice a Month

VANCOUVER, B. C., JUNE 16, 1924.

FIVE CENTS

Should Workers Think?

BY "PROGRESS"

SEVERAL Clarion references having from time to time been made to the subject of university-grade working class education, the above title suggests itself. What the answer shall be depends mainly on how the respondent gets a living; for, in our Capitalist society, or in any master and subject class society in which it does not pay the tyrants and exploiters to have the underlings any wiser than the former adjudge to be healthful for their continued dominance, thought is a crime to be discouraged or rigorously suppressed. "Yond' Cassius has a lean and hungry look;" says Julius Caesar in the play, "He thinks too much: such men are dangerous."

Now, it is Logic which may be roughly defined as the science and art of reasoning; and the operations of reasoning are the highest developments of consciousness of which latter function, Psychology is the science. It is significant of our decaying and corrupt society that in these days lawyers, business men, clergymen and professional lecturers and teachers are specialists not with the higher developments of consciousness, but with the lower, and the methods of treating the latter are all based on teaching just enough about the subject to enable one to work someone or other by monkeying with their internal machinery of consciousness. Even in our schools it would seem that instruction in truly practical reasoning is carefully avoided. Certainly the scholars are encouraged to debate with one another—too often on very silly subjects—but none having any logical knowledge, such debates amount to little more than glorified rag-chewing matches. As Jevons says, school children are exercised in algebra, geometry (or trigonometry) problems they will never employ in after life; and yet through total ignorance of logic—one of the simplest of the exact sciences—they know nothing of those elementary principles and forms of reasoning which enter into the thoughts of every hour.

However, logic cannot save one from foolishness, for it is a tool, a weapon or exercise to be employed by those willing and courageous enough to use it efficiently and even then—"to err is human!" Practically all those professors whom Marx and Engels ridiculed, were acquainted with logic; and as Burns says about naturally dull-witted students, they enter colleges like storks and come out asses; and that philosophers after mauling much Greek and Latin in some "logic jargon" fight, are at last compelled to turn to common-sense and appeal to that which ordinary women and weavers see and feel. The truth is that there is hardly more necessary to teach us how to think than there is to teach how to see or digest food. Hence, in England, the study of logic at one time fell into contempt and disuse from which it was only revived around 1827 by Archbishop Whately's book on the subject. Indeed, according to Prof. Minto, the true founder of logic—Aristotle, who died in exile accused of unpatriotism and atheism—had no serious intentions in perfecting it, his only purpose being to write rules for the practice of a kind of game of argument that had been in high fashion in Greece for more than a century and was much indulged in by Socrates, before those rules were devised. The professor says that to this day the modern Athenians still take a singular delight in peaceful duelling with wits, with

a calmness impossible to any other nation.

In later times the frivolous origin of logic was fully exhibited and maintained by the monkish schoolmen who had not only ample opportunity and leisure to erect those beautiful edifices so much admired by Wm. Morris but also amused themselves therein by disputations on such trivial subjects as: can a prostitute again become a virgin through the divine omnipotence; and, does the mouse that eats the consecrated host, eat the body of the Lord?

Logic is useful for two main purposes: the first, by deduction (meaning leading down) being to ensure consistency and agreement in our statements: the second purpose, as induction (leading in) is a means of getting and proving scientific truths. Down the ages the rule for thinkers developed as follows: in Aristotle's time it was, bring your thoughts into harmony with one another: in the middle ages, be extremely careful, if you don't want your tongue cut out and yourself afterwards burned at the stake, to bring your thoughts into harmony with religious authority and dogma: in modern times the demand is to bring your thinking into agreement with facts—so long as you don't tread on Capitalist corns. What Aristotle prided himself on, as his chief invention in the argument game, was what is called the Syllogism. This is a form into which all sound reasoning must be capable of being shown, and it is necessary (this is not written for, but by leave of, experts!) to put those workers "wise" to it, who don't know the nature of the beast.

As Locke points out, our knowledge is gained through three factors: first, by experience; then, by some or all of our five senses acting on what we experience; thirdly, by the mind putting together and summing up what the other two factors have provided it with. These steps involve simple apprehension; then by joining together the facts we get a judgment about them; lastly, by comparing two judgments (or "propositions") together to see if they agree or do not agree with one another, and stating the result in a third proposition or judgment called the conclusion, we complete the act known as reasoning.

Let us take an example. In youthful days, we experience certain small copper coins, and also a certain smaller coin of white metal. We then get to apprehend that each one of these copper coins is called a cent; and that each one of the white metal coins is called a dime. Next we join these ideas ("terms" or ends) together and get this: ten copper cents is the amount of one dime. Next having painfully gathered together, one after another, ten whole copper coins, we then pronounce them to be really, truly and actually the full ten cents in number. We therefore argue that these—our ten copper coins—is the amount of one dime. That is the end of one argument; and as it will be used to build up another, it is called a "pro (for)—syllogism". We next apprehend that a dime is the entrance price to a movie matinee show. We join this judgment to another judgment that the copper coins we possess is the full amount of one dime. We then reach the end of our second argument (which, as it is built upon the first, is called an "epi-syllogism") that—we are at perfect liberty to enjoy the movie matinee!

Now this kind of deductive argument—the syllogism—may be exhibited by letters of the alphabet,

and the logic that deals with it is called Formal Logic, because the conclusions follow from the mere form that the ideas appear in. For example, lump the idea together and call "ten copper cents" Y; do the same with the idea "the amount of one dime" and call it X; next call the idea "these our ten copper cents" Z; and you may finally show the first argument above by the following form, the joining word "is" being called the "copula"

Y is X
Z is Y
therefore
Z is X

The soundness of the argument being based on the geometrical truth that if two things are each equal to the same third thing, then the two are equal to each other. In the above Z is equal to Y, and X is also equal to Y, and so Z and X are equal to each other; just as a carpenter might take a piece of pine plank to a fixed measure and find it was 4 feet long, and then carry a bit of spruce plank to the same measure and find the spruce also was 4 feet long. He would then know that the pine and the spruce planks are equal in length to each other.

Once you can be persuaded to admit that the first two statements of a syllogism are true, then you are also bound to admit that the third statement is true; because the third must follow from the other two. Each of the first two statements is called a "premiss" (or premise) and the third is called the conclusion. Now suppose we make the letter Y stand for "all birds," the X for "fly" and the Z for elephants and imagine that by some slick psychology business trick I can get you to admit that an elephant is a bird. Then you would have to admit that Z is X, that is, that all elephants fly. Silly, you say? Sure! But the above is a purposely exaggerated example. Yet, in forms much more difficult to detect, it is a common trick played hundreds of times upon the workers by labor fakirs, capitalists, and their K.C.'s and politicians, and by Preternatural Bible stupifiers, etc., etc.; so get wise to it! It might be mentioned that Aristotle's system of syllogism may be in all legitimately tortured into nineteen different forms—go to it!

Now though J. S. Mill to start with had a high opinion of the formal syllogism, in his later master work on logic, he relegates it to a very inferior position indeed, because he did not consider it a scientific instrument. However, as all spoken and literary thought and argument is based upon the syllogism, it would be foolish to underrate its value, because it brings out many a startling truth undreamed of by readers or hearer. For instance, in the days of the belief in the Divine Right of Kings, the simple proposition sounds harmless that all human beings are animals; and it might even be allowable to say that King John, Henry or George, as the case might be, is a human being. But Lord help you if you made the public grasp the valid conclusion flowing from your premises that King John, Henry or George is an animal, for that would have shot the Divine Right idea all to pieces.

Here's another case. Robert Burns, while he was wallowing in the luxury of a seventy pound sterling a year job in the excise, wrote a song in

(Continued on page 8)

Jurisprudence and Laws of the R.F.S.S.R.

BY J. BRANDENBURGSKY (Moscow).

AT the present time, now that the administration of justice in the Russian Federal Socialist Soviet Republic is not only determined by separate decrees issued by the All-Russian Central Executive Committee and by the Council of Peoples Commissars, but also by codes of law, as for instance the code of criminal law, the code of civil law, the code of land laws, the labor code, etc., it is of essential importance that every worker and every peasant should clearly understand the fundamentals of our Soviet law and its difference from the law of contemporary bourgeois states.

It would be a mistake to suppose that the Russian workers' and peasants' government ever held it to be possible, even immediately after the great October Revolution, for state and economic life to be normally developed otherwise than with the aid of legality, that is, with the aid of the organized intervention of legal justice in the life of the country. During the first critical moments of the revolution the immediate application of armed might was naturally the sole criterion of right. Might was right. But as soon as social relations began to settle down, the new society arising out of the revolution began to feel the need of stability and security. Stability and security can however only be impaired to a society recognizing a certain law of justice as an established force.

As a social revolution, the October Revolution cut deeply into all the economic relations which had existed under the Tsar's regime and under the provisional government, and as all jurisprudence is inevitably a mirror of social and economic reciprocal relations, the collapse of such relations involves the simultaneous collapse of the old law, so that in October 1917 there ceased to be a justice to administer.

It was unavoidable that the revolution should bring new economic relations with it, and consequently the need of new legislation without which it would not have been possible to establish the revolutionary cause on a firm footing. The October Revolution, as a proletarian revolution, had to form and establish a system of legal justice diametrically opposed to that hitherto existing, and it is thus not surprising that its first task was to destroy the whole existing legislation, for this was built up on the principle of defending the interests of the large landowners and capitalists. The whole of the old courts of Justice, beginning with the local courts of the justices of the peace and going up to the governing senate, were abolished, and the whole of the 16 books of consolidated laws of the former Russian Empire were scrapped.

It was necessary to approach the question of a legislative regulation of the new social relations now replacing the former social system. It will only be possible to maintain a state of human society without laws when the proletariat has been able to follow its class victory with the abolition of the old productive relations, and has simultaneously abolished the conditions giving rise to classes, so that classes and class rule cease to exist. These conditions will come to pass under socialism, when the harmonious common life of humanity will no longer be based on social compulsion and social necessity, a state of affairs premising all law-making, but in a harmony based on complete social freedom.

For eight decades the working people of the whole world have been fighting under this banner of a free harmonious socialist society. Beneath this banner the heroes of the Paris Commune died a glorious death. Beneath this banner the Russian proletariat consummated the great October Revolution, whose victory opened out the path to communism. But every worker knows that we are divided from communism by the transition period of political dictatorship of the proletariat, and that this involves

economic relations of the most complicated nature. The classes still exist; society with a definite economic structure still exists; and consequently the state power inevitably bound to exist under such conditions must be adapted to the economic organization of this society.

When the workers and peasants seized power in Russia, they were obliged to take up the organization of their state apparatus, and the judicial structure of the new state, immediately and without the loss of an instant. And indeed, who is not aware that those forms of administrative justice and people's courts, now so popular among the broadest masses of the working and peasant population, were already proclaimed in the year 1918!

The VI All Russian Congress of the Soviets unanimously passed a resolution relating to exact definition of the law. The idea of a uniform people's court of justice also made its appearance, and was carried out, in the year 1918. It would be of no purpose to explain here the reasons which have prevented us, for more than three years, from systematizing our jurisprudence and establishing our administration of justice on a firm footing.

The reasons are already too well known. We are compelled to accept the challenge of the bourgeoisie. The civil war forced upon the victorious proletariat obliged us to devote our whole attention to organizing a powerful apparatus for carrying on the immediate struggle against counter-revolution. All other tasks, even that of legislation, were pushed into the background for the moment. It was not until the victorious liquidation of the battle fronts, that we could return to the tasks which the young Soviet republic had set itself in the year 1918. Our military victory over the bourgeois world which has exerted itself to the utmost for three years, to destroy the first socialist republic of the world, enabled us to return with full energy to the work of creating a code of administrative justice, and the IX. All Russian Congress of Soviets passed the word of revolutionary legality.

Revolutionary legality has been directly called into existence by the development of civil life arising from the development of the new economic policy: "The more we attain to conditions which are those of the strong and firmly established power, the further we proceed in the development of civil life"—these words are from comrade Lenin's speech—"the greater must be our emphasis on the proclamation of the watchword of revolutionary legality."

The IX. All-Russian Congress of the Soviets marks a turning point in our lives; but the fundamental aims of revolutionary jurisprudence were established long before December 1921, when this congress took place. What then, is the essential import of all the decrees and decisions of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee and of the Council of People's Commissaries, issued during the first 3 to 3½ years of the existence of Soviet power? These decrees and decisions contain a rich store of material in fundamental revolutionary and socialist principles, and show a slow but persistent endeavour to clear the way for socialism, to facilitate and shorten the way. In the future our decrees will be studied and placed in a system, and it will be surprising, how much that is essentially useful for the proletariat, and necessary for socialism, has been accumulated by the Soviet power within a comparatively short space of time in these separate decrees, although these have not been issued in any connection, and are frequently bare even of external connection. It was possible to collect a number of decrees into a code of laws long before the official proclamation of legality. Before the first anniversary of the October Revolution we possessed a code of marriage, family and trusteeship laws. This was accepted on September 16, 1918, by the All-Russian Central Ex-

ecutive Committee, and with it a code of Labor Legislation. A further development of our legislation did not then take place until 1921 and 1922, when the further development of civic life based on the new economic policy began to be apparent in our public life, and called for greater legality on revolutionary lines—as rightly characterized in our quotation from comrade Lenin's speech.

The need of a code of criminal and civil law was strongly felt. Both have since appeared. What peculiarity do they possess? In what do they differ from the corresponding codes of laws of bourgeois countries?

A result of three years of civil war has been the strengthening of Soviet Russia not only in its external relations, but also within its own frontiers. Conditions were created ensuring greater firmness and security of power, and the extraordinary fighting against counter-revolution began to play a considerably less important role than during the years 1918-1920. It became possible to leave the combat against lawbreaking within the country with a calm conscience, to the normal administrators of justice, and small concessions to bourgeois ideology now constituted no great danger.

The second circumstance which must be taken into consideration is the nature of the new economic policy, which has called private enterprise into being, and has led to the creation of new forms of economic relations: to private trade and small private industrial undertakings outside of state trade and large state industrial undertakings.

These new economic relations, with their concessions to private capital and to petty bourgeois ideology, emphatically demanded a new legal superstructure. From day to day it became more apparent that it was necessary not only to regulate single parts of the new organizations of national economy by separate decrees, but also to create a more systematic and more firmly established superstructure for criminal and civil law.

The Soviet power created its own definite, uniform, centralized legislation, a mirror of our new economic policy. If our new economics are wrongly understood, it is inevitable that our justice will also be misunderstood. The new economic policy does not in the least represent even the slightest return to former pre-revolutionary conditions. Neither therefore does our justice represent any restoration of the past. But the new economic policy is the rebirth of capitalism in a limited form, and this limited character of restored capitalism affects our law-making in general, and our civil rights of property in particular. (To be continued in next issue.)

SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

EVERY SUNDAY

THEATRE ROYAL

SUNDAY, JUNE 15.

Speaker: J. D. HARRINGTON.

Socialist Candidate, Vancouver City Electoral District.

The candidates of the Canadian Labor Party will address this meeting.

All meetings at 8 p.m.

Questions. Discussion.

A Criticism

"COMRADE" G. R. Stirling Taylor, whose article appeared on the front page of the Clarion of last issue, presents to us in a most striking and vivid manner, a total ignorance of his knowledge of "The Importance of History." The article in my estimation, should never have been published in a paper such as the "Clarion" which is supposed to be a Socialist organ; anyway the article when examined thoroughly presents to us a position directly opposed to "Marxism" in general and the radical movement in particular.

I will endeavor, by extracts from his article, however tiresome it may be, to show that he is devoid of any understanding of history, as well as the labor movement.

He tells us that, "When the Labor Government took office a few weeks ago, there was a triumphant satisfaction in the minds of its supporters, that at last they had ceased to be a backwater and (mind you), were now flowing in the main river of history."

Now I want to ask the Clarion readers, or any self-respecting man, if they can in the whole history of the British Labor movement show one instance where the B. L. P. has been anything else but a backward movement. We will agree with our friend that the Labor Party has written many pages to the annals of history, but far be it from us to sanction the lessons they have acquired from history, let alone the way in which they applied their experience to the labor movement. One can recall, and it was just recently, that the recognized leader of the Labor Party, Ramsay Maedonald, with his political and economic adviser, Karl Kantsky and a gang of lesser lights, were manoeuvring with the peoples of Georgia, to place them under the dominations of British Imperialism, and after Ramsay's and Karl's endeavors arrived at maturity, what did we see? A wholesale butchering of Georgian Communists and imprisonment for those that dared to assert their historical mission. Also, since the Labor Party has come to office, it has proved that it is a reactionary movement and demonstrated its ability to manage the affairs of His Majesty's Government very effectively and very much to His Majesty's astonishment. It is apparent to "George" himself that Ramsay is holding office by trying to please both the Liberals and Tories.

Our learned "Comrade" goes on to say: "Those political and economic and ethical desires of man, which all together make up the creed, which the new government represents, have been continually expressed in human affairs, since anything like civilization began." All Clarion readers are pretty well informed on British politics and I am sure will reject "our comrade's" elucidation with disgust. We all know that the labor party in obtaining office, had many "socialist reform," measures to put through, after they took office, such as a Capital Levy,* and freedom of the Indians, etc. Philip Snowden was racing all over Britain telling the workers that the only thing to save Britain from utter ruin was a capital levy, and again when they took office we never heard another word from these gentlemen.

Again our friend portrays his bourgeois ideology, by telling us that "The Labor Party philosophy is on a higher plane than the Liberal philosophy." We members of the class conscious proletariat know that one could get all the implements of detection from a microscope to a telescope, and after a careful and patient scrutiny he could not discover any basic difference between these two institutions, so far as the interests of the working class are concerned.

I would err if I were to say that the leaders of the new government were alone responsible for their present bourgeois policy. These so called emanci-

pators of labor maintain their leadership generally on account of the insufficient class consciousness on the part of the working class, but nevertheless that will not prevent us from portraying the leaders of the Labor Party in their true colors, as treacherous prostitutes.

Again he says, "In no way can the Labor Party more easily prove its superiority to its opponents in the Houses of Parliament than by showing that it knows the facts of the historical past, and further, that it respects the laws of history as carefully as a scientist respects the laws of evolution." I don't really know who our "friend" is but it is evident that he has been reading Aesop's Fables, all class conscious workers are aware that the leaders of the B. L. P. possess a keen knowledge of history as well as the labour movement, and anyone who possesses the understanding of the labor movement as well as Ramsay Maedonald does and pursues such political economical policies as he does, only goes more to substantiate what I said that he is a conscious intellectual prostitute. It was only yesterday that Ramsay was telling the English proletariat what misery and degradation was the lot of the working class under capitalism, and the brutal and murderous policy of the British Foreign Office, and again what did we see as soon as the new government took office? The minister of Foreign Affairs informs the leaders of the Hindu emancipation movement, that he "won't tolerate any monkey business" and appoints Sir Sidney Oliver, (a died in the wool) imperialist, to look after the affairs and interests of 300,000,000 Hindus.

He says: "Go through history and find the people that did not bring themselves to ruin by empire building. Why the editor of the Manchester Guardian would say, give him a job in the foreign office." "Our friend" should inform the ruling class that the ultimate and logical outcome of Imperialism will result in a catastrophe, and perhaps the Bourgeoisie will take heed of his warning and turn back the wheels of history.

"Our Friend" evidently has it in his head that England is going headlong into a red revolution, and he wants to know what broker would place his shares in Britain if the workers took political power. He says, "look at Russia and Germany."

Again he says, "There are many honorable men who believe in Imperialism, men who frankly admit when the facts are against them," (can you beat it!). If our "friend" would cast his optic nerves over the pages of Julius Caesar, by Shakespeare, and read Mark Anthony's speech at the grave of Caesar, he would find that Mark Anthony says of Brutus and Cassius and the rest of the conspirators, that "they are all honorable men," and so are the British Imperialists all honorable men, pursuing a policy of murder, plunder, and exploitation of its subjected colonial peoples, but of course that is the "white mans burden."

In conclusion I will take up one more question that our friend requires enlightenment upon. He "pours the full vials of his wrath" on the communist movement. If "our friend" wants to attack the Communist he should at least acquaint himself with the movement before he spoke on the subject. We Clarion readers are well aware of mistakes in the communist movement, and they are going to continue making mistakes, and also the very condition of their existence implies mistakes, owing to the fact that the Communist movement is confronted with such enormous tasks, and also the communist movement in the west is young and has only acquired but very little experience, and those enthusiasts who only a short time ago were looking around the corner for the revolution have seen their mistake and see that their foolish acts were immature.

Again Our Sherlock, "There are a certain group of sentimentalists, usually covered by the term communist, preach incoherent doctrines, which apparently means that the quickest way to give the world order, and logical government is to cause as much noise and confusion as possible." I am confident,

after deliberating over this paragraph that "our friend" is in such a hopeless state of confusion that he is unable to see "the forest for the trees." Our hero continues, "In general we are told by these excitable children that the only method of government which has succeeded in history is revolution, or at least that we do not succeed in making a better world because we will not rise and walk about under banners and play at soldiers behind street barricades."

I wonder if our friend in glancing through the pages of history with which he is no doubt well acquainted, ever heard of a change in government of one class by another without a revolution. I am afraid that if our friend holds tenaciously to his present outlook on history he will be picked up on the other side of the barricade. I think that the founder of the first Communist International said, that "Revolutions are the locomotives of history."

"There are weird mental freaks who have gathered messages of hope from the present regime in Russia (or I might say late). One would have thought that a primary school boys knowledge of history would have made clear that the Russian revolution has almost followed the lines of the early French revolution." Again he shows his appalling ignorance of the subject he was trying to convey to us. It is a known fact that the Russian revolution has passed through all the phases of both the 1789-1871 French revolutions and has gone a step further in the evolution of society. Our friend's contention is without foundation. The Russian revolution did not stop at a Bourgeois revolution but continued until it culminated in a proletarian and peasant dictatorship.

So in summing up the criticism of our historical contortionists article we can arrive at the conclusion that our friend does not understand the Socialist movement and his article is a "conglomeration of confusion". I will in a further article try and elaborate more extensively on the B. L. P. But I am sure all Clarion readers will agree with our philosopher "that one fool can ask more question than ten wise men can answer."

MALCOLM J. INGLIS.

PRIMEVAL PACIFISM.

BY H. J. MASSINGHAM

(Concluded from last issue)

What Dr. Malinowski has entirely failed to do in his reply to me is to draw the vital distinction between savage custom and savage instinct. This invalidates his whole case, since the savage habits (which, without giving any data, he calls instinct) described by him can be shown to have been introduced by foreigners with a highly cultivated ruling class.

Dr. Malinowski accuses me of exaggeration. But what can be more reckless than his statements that anthropology gives no support to the assumption of man's primeval pacific, and that weapons of war were abundant in prehistoric times? In his whole article he never so much as mentions the Veddas of Ceylon, the Punan of Borneo, the Kubu of Sumatra, the Semang, Sakai and Jakun of the Malay Peninsula, the Samoyedes and Ostiaks of Siberia, the Apiute of Nevada and Utah, the Californian Indians, the extinct Tasmanians, the Eskimo outside Alaska and other tribes who have all been unanimously described as peaceful folk in the extreme, and who were never in contact with the "archaic civilisation." Moreover, the flint implements of prehistoric man in Europe, with the possible exception of the Solutrean blades (whose originals in predynastic Egypt were used as knives and not as war-weapons), do not afford the smallest fragment of evidence that the men of the Old Stone Age knew anything whatever about warfare. Dr. Malinowski cannot deny these facts; what he does is to ignore them. But what is left of his argument if he admits them?—

The New Leader.

(* Editor's Note: It is incorrect to say this. Whatever denunciation you may have in store for the Labor Party you should be sure of your ground. The Capital Levy, since the Labor Government was formed, has been mentioned often enough and the nature of the Labor Party's advocacy of that measure has not altered.

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

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

VANCOUVER, B. C., JUNE 16, 1924.

THE ELECTION.

WHATEVER it may be that is the determining factor in setting the date of an election the fact is upon us that immediate political strategy, employed by the party in power in the exercise of its initiative, has decided upon June 20th as the day upon which the people of British Columbia shall indicate the degree of their susceptibility to or immunity from the wiles of the political advertiser.

Prosperity, increased population to share the country's worries—and debts—lower western freight rates, bigger payrolls, harbour development, business for the business man and work for the worker, all these are in prospect dating from June 20th, no matter what orthodox political costume becomes the style.

Beer too. We almost forgot, shame be upon us. Beer by the glass. The experience of four years of what is pleasantly known as "moderation" has uncovered liquor as the richest vein of all our vast natural resources. Whether the politicians now control liquor or liquor controls the politicians is a question not very easy to dogmatise upon, but upon such questions the people take sides and forget their own worries.

During the past four years—the life-time of the retiring government—British Columbia's wage working class has encountered lean years very much similar to those of 1913-1914. The tide of unemployment at the present time appears to be as high as it has been at this time in any one of those years. In such employment as offers the conditions of hire are so disadvantageous as to clearly indicate the overstocked condition of the labor market.

It is a peculiar trait of the wage working man that he avoids as far as possible a studied attention to anything other than the vulgar display of mutual character-biting common among professional politicians at election times. Always, with him, those whom he would throw out of office are more given to malignity than those upon whom he relies to turn the wheel of fortune to the promised prosperity in his favor. It is, of course, because this is his habit that the professional politicians serve him with such electioneering distractions as are the general, common run.

On the other hand the Socialist, election times or not, in dealing with government as a human institutional form sets it forth as a consequence of certain social needs; its form has changed in response to the urge of those needs in the changing orders of society's growth; even its routine detail has been developed, enlarged, its departments divided and subdivided and specialized to the point where today its executive control is marvellously exercised and responds with the required precision to the needs of the major economic interests within its boundaries. The Socialist, in election times, is primarily concerned with the task of acquainting his fellows with the growth and present function of government rather than with the personal character-miseries of any particular group of political camp followers.

Government as we have it suits the productive system as we have it. Hence, when we have what is

called productive prosperity we have generally what the interests call "good government" or "a business administration." Otherwise, when the wheels of industry are idle, efforts are made to change the government's complexion; rival interests fight for the initiative party power may give them, all to their own gain.

The worker learns but he learns slowly. But in these days of quick changing events his ideas are subject to change accordingly. At election times he has thrown upon him heaps of literature and torrents of mutual abuse from the rivals who play for his interest. A sound and fury as intense as that of the alarm clock and steam whistle, and as full of meaning. The change will come with his own insistence. He will not then be "susceptible."

THE MAZE OF FRENCH POLITICS

BY J. T. W. NEWBOLD

THROUGHOUT the period since Waterloo there has throbbled through the brain of France the memory of the fact that, in the wars of the 18th century, she lost to Britain the promising foundations of a world-wide colonial empire. The bourgeoisie of Paris, Marseilles and Bordeaux does not forget that the North American continent was once in the grip of France, and that India might have been theirs as well.

Had it not been for the success of England in repeated wars and armed diplomatic encounters, France would also have, as the ally of Spain, had, as her special preserve, the fabulously valuable commerce of the South American countries.

Prior to the Revolution, France was much richer and had a greater overseas trade than Britain. Political circumstances, at home and abroad, coinciding with great changes in the methods of production, combined to make bourgeois France appear the victim of a conspiracy organised by Britain and carried through (according to the Monarchists) by the aid of German-Jew financiers.

The Buonapartists, whose original leader, Napoleon I, had sought with an armed nation at his call to break the economic power of England and her allies, and had fostered the old financial interests incorporated in and grouped around the Bank of France (which he created), stood for and left behind them a tradition of a military dictator, serving the cause of an adventurous and prosperous financial oligarchy.

One might say that the Monarchists, represented today by the parties of the Extreme Right, have aimed at reviving the ancient glories of France under the Grand Monarch, "le roi soleil," Louis XIV.

Their dream is always of France—victorious on the Rhine, master of Germany, arbiter of Europe. It is this ideal which, diffused throughout the parties of the Reaction, consumes with passionate devotion to "La Patrie," that pious Catholic, Marshal Foch.

The Reactionaries, the party of the Clericals, are, also, as Catholics, animated by a fanatical hatred—after the manner of "Plain English"—of the Jewish banking oligarchy and, as Frenchmen and patriot landlords, incensed against them as revolutionaries escaped from the Frankfurt ghetto.

This political entity lumps together all foreigners, whether Germans, Italians, Dutch or English, as organised conspiracies of German Israelites bent on the ruin of Christendom in general and France in particular.

For the last forty years there have been, really, no Buonapartists and Monarchists have become less conspicuous as such and more evident as Clericals and Nationalists—which latter category, under one or other party name incomprehensible to the ordinary Britisher, covers the heirs of the Napoleonic tradition of military dictatorship.

In the centre of French politics are other parties, with weird names, all bent on advancing the cause of the financial oligarchy who, from 1680 and, again, from 1851, from 1872 and from 1883, have, in successive waves of private and public banking and investment houses and companies, established themselves as the grande bourgeoisie of France.

These are the people who constitute, for the most part, the owners and administrators of the Bank of France and those six great banks, i.e.: the Comptoir National d'Escompte de Paris, the Credit Mobilier Francais, the Credit Foncier, the Credit Lyonnais, the Banque de Paris et des Pays Bas, the Banque de l'Union Parisienne.

These are the people who dominate the French Colonies; who hold 70 per cent of the Ottoman Debt; who are big creditors of Central Europe and Italy; who had gigantic interests in Russia.

They are an economic amalgam, made up of groups which, in the past, have fiercely fought each other; and, quite naturally, they are the core of the "Bloc National" and the most ardent supporters of Poincare, Barthou and Tardieu.

They are the French equivalents of the British Coalition and, like the latter, their bias is increasingly Conservative.

Prior to the war there were other interests such as the Societe General de Paris which, at that time, was roundly accused of being a German institution. It was, certainly, cosmopolitan and it had been, in its origin, financed largely by English Catholic bankers, Manchester textile manufacturers and Jewish cotton brokers.

This "Societe" was the main economic prop of the pre-war leader of the French Radicals, M. Caillaux. He, like his contemporary, Lloyd George, mixed up with some queer people—"queer" in the financial sense. He was the political champion of the lower middle class. He wanted to cheapen credit and to emancipate trade and industry from the clutches of the monopolist banks. Needless to say, Poincare and he were pitiless enemies.

Between Caillaux and Poincare politically, there stood Clemenceau, of the Republique Left and Millerand and Briand, the renegade "Socialists." Today, of course, there is not much space dividing any of these beauties. They all belong to the class of lawyer politicians who, having seen in the votes and briefs of the proletariat and the lower middle class stepping stones to higher things, eventually "arrived." Like Lloyd George and in a lesser degree, the kept Labour M.P.'s who joined the Coalition, they are now the subservient tools of the industrial magnates and high financiers.

Millerand, as President, and Poincare, as Premier, danced to the pipes of M. Sargent and M. Schneider, the respective heads of the Banque de l'Union Parisienne and Seneider-Creusot.

Between the big monopolist banks I have named and the Societe Generale there stood, before the war, but having affiliations with them, the Banque Francaise pour le Commerce et l'Industrie, another concern with cosmopolitan connections and strong links with British and Belgian Judaism. Today, this bank is lined up with, whilst the Societe Generale has been absorbed by, the big monopolist banks.

There is, at present, only one big bank which whilst in French finance, is not really of it, viz., Sir Basil Zaharoff's concern, the Banque de la Seine. This institution works in conjunction with the Anglo-Persian Oil Company and sundry enterprises operating in Egypt and generally throughout the Near East. What politicians respond to its inspiration it is not easy to say.

Such then is, historically reviewed, the background of economics and of politics on which have been chiselled the frescoes of the Entente.

ECONOMIC CAUSES OF WAR

By PETER T. LECKIE

NOW READY

Promoted by the author.

122 PAGES

Per Copy, 25 Cents

Ten copies up, 20 cents each.

Post Paid

The Existing System

BY T. A. JACKSON.

THE existing system of Society—the sort of social arrangements with which we are familiar—we call the Capitalist system because it is all built or pivoted upon the part played by the “Capitalist.”

What is a Capitalist? In the loose way we use words in our ordinary speech the idea is often given that “any man with money in his possession is a “capitalist.” This notion you must get rid of at the start. If you had all the coin in the world locked up in a vault you would not by that fact be a “capitalist.” You might be a “miser” or an Oriental Emperor or a successful pirate, but a “capitalist” you would not be. True, given certain social circumstances, you would, in that case, have the power to become a capitalist, and the chief of capitalists, but the mere possession of money, much or little, does not of itself make a man a capitalist. A Capitalist is a man with money—but every man with money is not a Capitalist. (Pay might not turn a worker into a boss—even if he is the sort of fool that puts on the swagger of a boss when he brings his wages home).

“Capital” is a word which originally meant “head” or “well-spring” or “beginning.” Modern industry is worked in this fashion. Somebody with a stock of money goes to market and buys land, buildings, machinery, raw materials, and Labour-Power. The building is on the land; the machinery in the building; and the worker with the machine produces such a change in the raw material that the finished product, taken to market, can be sold for more money than these materials (including labour-power, mark you!) cost. At the beginning the Capitalist had a stock of money. He exchanged it for a stock of materials (including the use of sundry working men). These materials were brought together in his factory and the result was a stock of finished products. These were taken to the market and exchanged for money again.

Thus we get the series—Money; means of production; production process; finished goods; More Money (the original or “Capital” sum plus addition created in the factory or workshop by the coming together of raw material, machinery, and labour-power).

At the beginning the money form; then raw materials; then materials and men in the process of “productive consumption”; finished goods; finally the Capital back again in the money form.

Now that mode of production—the leaving of its initiation and control to the initiative of owners of stocks of money (or what comes to the same thing power to borrow money on a large scale) who engage in production solely to make their “Capital” grow—solely to get this “more money” over and over again: this is the existing system.

We are so used to it that it comes as a surprise to many when they hear us argue that another system is possible. It comes as a still greater surprise when they learn that it was not always the system even in this country—and that in some parts they have not adopted it even yet.

Originally—in the time of the Very Beginnings—men produced directly to satisfy their needs. They hunted, fished, and gathered nuts—either by themselves or (more usually) in groups and what they gained they consumed straight away. Only later when they had acquired skill in tillage and pasturage and the more fundamental crafts did man begin to think of producing one thing in order, by exchange, to obtain another.

Only slowly did men become aware of the existence of other races possessed (by reason of differing climatic and geological situations) of a surplus of the things they lacked and suffering a shortage of the things of which they had plenty. Only slowly and by a roundabout road did men acquire the habit of producing a surplus beyond their own needs for exchange for products beyond their capacity.

Only slowly did the practice of exchange create the need for “money”—as a measure of value and medium of exchange. Still later were the precious metals selected for reasons of practical convenience as the money commodity. Later again came the adoption of conventional units (by weight) of these metals; latest of all the making of these units into coins bearing the mark of some recognised authority (in our day the State) as a guarantee of weight and quality. And not until the habit of producing for the market had grown and extended for many, many centuries did we enter upon the beginning of this modern period in which all production is for the market and all subsistence derived from it.

At first men produced to satisfy their essential needs in food and clothing. Only when this was done did they take what was left over and exchange it. The modern period begins with the creation, first, of a number of crafts so specialised that the craftsmen give their whole time to the production of one special article and get their food, etc., with the money received in exchange; second, of a number of boards or accumulations of money capable of being used to buy stocks of raw materials for fabrication into such articles; thirdly, with the creation of a class of people who had become so placed that no land was at their disposal for tillage and who therefore could not produce their own food however much they wanted to.

The owners of these stocks of money were able to begin at this point. They bought the workshops, the workmen, and the means of work. They introduced into their workshops newer forms of specialisation—so that a man no longer made a whole article but specialised on a detail part of it. They thus were able because of this better division and subdivision of the work-process to get more produced in a given time than had been previously possible. This made it possible for them to undersell the craftsmen who remained independent and to continue the underselling until a point was reached at which he was forced to give up his independence and work as a wage-worker for the capitalist whose competition had ruined him.

Such, roughly, is the way in which we arrived at our existing state of Society in which the market dominates the earth and the lords of the market are lords over vast masses of propertyless wage workers—now the overwhelming majority of the population.

In this process of competitive development the capitalist workshop has grown from puny beginnings into the mighty masses of shops, sheds, bays and plants familiar to all industrial workers. As the tool of production has massed so has the ownership concentrated into a few dominant corporations whose nominal capital is expressed in millions.

The workers have likewise been massed into industrial centres and side by side with the competition between the capitalist and the small producer—and between capitalist concerns ever growing bigger as each giant swallowed more and more of its rival—so has gone on a struggle between the workers competing for jobs.

The net result of the process is that the worker dependent wholly upon the price he can command in the labour market, a price which competition and custom have combined to keep down to a minimum, is now faced with a small but enormously powerful combination of capitalist bosses who control all the resources of the earth and are united in their determination to compel the worker to live at an even lower scale than ever before.

The competition between a host of small capitalists has ended in the virtual monopoly of a few powerful groups whose quarrels threaten to disrupt human society and whose one point of agreement is their common determination to allow the working mass just as little as they can and to get from them the utmost in work that can possibly be squeezed. Capitalism gained at the expense of small, handi-

craft production because it could produce more cheaply. This was the gain to the wealthy, the luxurious, the professional, and the capitalist classes. It was a negative gain to the propertyless worker in so far as cheap food and clothing, and little of it, is better than none at all, and a humdrum life of toil better than the risks and humiliations of a life by begging or stealing. It was, in the long run, a means for the total destruction of the class that once formed the “backbone” of every nation—the class of small peasants and craftsmen, once the vast majority, now, in Britain, totally extinct.

Capitalism was in the ascendant when it was able to draw raw materials from the surplus products of self-subsisting small producers, giving them manufactured articles in exchange. That was the operation that in fact lay behind the Trade which Made the Empire. America, Africa, the Near East, India, and the Far East—all have been theatres for the activity of the Great Powers with this as the prime motive.

Now that capitalist methods are applied to the production of raw materials, and that each territory has its own “national” capitalist clique keenly determined to monopolise the plunder of its own area, this phase of Capitalism has passed.

At first Capitalism had no difficulty in disposing of its surplus goods and so realising in cash the value extracted from the workers. Now owing to the very magnitude of Capitalist production and the universal establishment of its system, this is no longer the case. Capitalism now cannot expand outwardly. Its future growth can only be along the line of limiting output to the capacity of the world market and depressing the workers’ share to the ever lower limits.

To this process there exist two great obstacles. First, the limiting of production means putting an end to the ambitions of the smaller capitalist bosses who will resist to the uttermost; secondly, it involves an adjustment of the conflicting claims of rival groups—an adjustment that is bound to end in general disappointment; thirdly, it involves beating the worker down to a level at which he will be too feeble to produce.

And yet impossible though it be the Capitalist Class of the world are forced to attempt this adjustment. Here you may see the reason for all the Conferences, all the “produce more,” “take less” propaganda, all the wage-cuts, and all the hostility to the Communists who urge the workers to resist. Capitalism has exhausted its possibilities. It can only live by making life possible to the vast working mass. If the workers want to live they must end Capitalism.

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

The Materialist Conception of History

BY N. LENIN.

THE realization of the inadequacy and one-sidedness of the old materialism convinced Marx of the necessity of bringing social science into accord with the materialist foundation of society. If materialism lays down the general rule that consciousness is to be explained by being, then the application of materialism to the examination of society demands that social consciousness be explained by social being. "Technology," says Marx, "reveals the active attitude of Man towards Nature, the immediate productive process of his life and mental conceptions arising therefrom." Marx gives a consistent formulation of the fundamentals of materialism in its application to human society and its history,—in the preface to his book, Critique of Political Economy, in the following words:

"In the life of social production, human beings enter into definite and necessary relations which are independent of their will and which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces. The sum total of these productive relations constitutes the economic structure of society, the real basis, upon which a legal and political super-structure arises, and which corresponds to definite forms of social consciousness. The methods of production of man's material existence, determine the whole process of social, political, and mental life. It is not the consciousness of human beings which determines their existence; the reverse is the case; their social existence determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of their development, the material productive forces of society come into conflict with the existing relations of production, or, in juridical language, with the relations of property within which they have hitherto functioned. These relations are transformed from the forms of development of the productive forces into fetters of production.

"Then comes the period of social revolution. With the change of the economic foundation, the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed. In considering such transformations the distinction should always be made between the material transformation of the economic conditions of production which can be determined with the precision of natural science, and the legal, political, religious, aesthetic or philosophic—in short, ideological forms in which men become conscious of this conflict and fight it out.

"Just as little as one can judge an individual by what he thinks himself to be, just as little can such a revolutionary epoch be judged by its consciousness, but must rather be explained from the contradictions of material life, from the existing conflicts between social productive forces and relations of production. No social order ever disappears before all the productive forces, for which there is room in it, have been developed; and new higher relations of production never appear before the material conditions of their existence have matured in the womb of the old society. Therefore mankind always takes up only such problems as it can solve; since, looking at the matter more closely, we will always find that the problem arises only when the material conditions necessary for its solution already exist or are at least in the process of formation. Broadly conceived, Asiatic, antique, feudal, and modern bourgeois methods of production may be designated as progressive epochs of the economic social development. The bourgeois relations of production are the last antagonistic form of the social process of production."

The materialist conception of history, or, strictly speaking, the application of materialism to the sphere of social phenomena, has removed two of the main defects of the theory of history as hitherto understood. History has, at best up to now, considered the ideal motives of the historical activity of human beings without examining into the cause of these motives, without discovering the objective law behind the development of the system of social relations, without seeking for the root of these re-

lations in the degree of development of material production. Secondly, the theories applied up to now, have overlooked precisely the activity of the great masses of the population, while historical materialism has given us for the first time the possibility of examining, with the precision of natural science, into the social conditions influencing the life of the masses, and into the changes taking place in these conditions. Pre-Marxian "sociology" and history writing achieved, at best, an accumulation of bare facts, and have provided us with nothing more than a representation of some separate phases of the historical process. Marx showed the way to a comprehensive and thorough examination into the process of evolution, and decay of social-economic formations, in that he regarded all contradictory tendencies in their totality, and traced them back to accurately definable conditions of life and production in the various classes of society; he thus eliminated subjectivism, as well as arbitrariness in the choice and interpretation of some "leading ideas," and laid bare the roots of all ideas, without exception, and of all the different tendencies in the state of social productive forces. Human beings make their own history, but Marx was the first to show what determines the motives of human beings, and particularly of the masses of human beings; he was the first to show what the totality of all these conflicts is to human society, what are the objective conditions of the production of material life, forming the basis for every historical activity among human beings, what is the evolutionary law of these conditions. In this way Marx pointed out the way to the scientific study of history as a consistent process, following definite laws through all its multifarious immensity and in all its contradictions.

That in every society the strivings of some members of this society are opposed to the strivings of others, that social life is full of contradictions, that history shows us a struggle between and within peoples and societies, that history is composed of alternating periods of peace and war, revolution and reaction, standstill and rapid advance or decay,—all these facts are well known. Marx gave us the clue which enables us to discover the law underlying this apparent labyrinth and chaos. This clue is the theory of class war. It is only the study of the sum total of the strivings of all the members of a society, or of a group of societies, that can lead to a scientific determination of the results of these strivings. The source of conflicting interests lies, however, in the difference of position and living conditions of the classes into which every society is divided. "The history of all societies up to now has been the history of class war," wrote Marx in 1848 in the Communist Manifesto (and Engels added later: "except the history of primeval society"). Free men and slaves, patricians and plebians, barons and serfs, guild citizens and journeymen, in short, oppressors and oppressed have always stood in opposition to one another, have carried on an uninterrupted struggle, at times open, at times concealed; a fight which invariably ended with a revolutionary reformation of the whole society, or with the common decay of both fighting classes. In earlier epochs of history we find almost everywhere a complete stratification of society into various classes, a multitudinous gradation of social positions. In ancient Rome we see patricians, plebians, knights, slaves; in the middle ages,—feudal lords, vassals, guild citizens, journeymen, serfs; and within almost all of these classes a still further special gradation. The modern bourgeois society which has arisen out of the decay of feudal society has not annulled class antagonisms. It has only replaced the old classes by new ones, created new conditions of oppression, new forms of struggle. Our epoch, the epoch of the bourgeoisie, however, is distinguished by having simplified class antagonisms. The whole of society splits up more and more into two large hostile camps, into two large classes directly antagonistic to one another: bourgeoisie and proletariat.

Since the great French revolution, European history has revealed in a number of countries, with special clearness, the real fundamental of events, the Class War. Even during the epoch of restoration there were a number of French historians (Thierry, Guizot, Mignet, Theiers), who could not but designate—when forming a generalization on events—Class War as the key to French history as a whole. And the latest epoch, the epoch of complete victory of the bourgeoisie, of the parliaments, of extended if not general suffrage, of cheap daily newspapers read by the masses, the epoch of mighty and ever growing labor organizations and employers' unions, etc., has shown even more graphically, though often in a very peaceful constitutional form, class war as the motive force underlying events. In a number of historical works, Marx has given us many brilliant and profound examples of materialist historical writing, analyzing the position of each separate class and even of the various groups and strata within the class, and thus demonstrating why and how every struggle of class against class is a political struggle.

HERE AND NOW.

The custodians of youthful ambition at school used to try to work up the idea that there was a germ of poetry in arithmetic, if only you got into that atmosphere breathing deeply. It's no startling confession to make that in our case we had poetry enough if we had the proper answer to any sum. Given a sum in addition, for instance, a nice handsome total set down correctly meant that the atmosphere was right to a degree.

Look, however, at these totals, and find the poetry. The totals are what you might call all right, but not sufficiently so—

Following \$1 each: J. Mitchell, L. B. La Marche, R. Kirkman, S. Rose, S. Weber, Mrs. Griffith, J. Ord, J. Meldrum, J. Jenkins, W. Black, Ed. Meek, F. Harman, J. Marshall, J. B. Ray, J. C. Kennedy, Mrs. G. Korlann, R. Mihalich, D. J. Burton, A. Cassin, A. E. Cotton, R. Thomas, H. Arnold, A. McDonald, J. W. Grayson.

Following \$2 each: Roy Addy, Bert Smith, A. Firby, I. I. Olson, L. G. Atkins, J. M. McDiarmid, C. Crooks.

H. Myers 50 cents; J. Burton \$25c; D. R. Lloyd \$4.30; Walter Meuzies \$2.15.

Above, Clarion subs. received from May 17 to June 12th, inclusive, total \$45.20.

CLARION MAINTENANCE FUND.

Following \$1 each: J. Meldrum, J. Chrystal, Mrs. Annie Ross, "P.L.D." A. McDonald.

Bert Smith \$3; "C. K." \$5; J. McDiarmid \$2; R. Thomas \$4; Walter Meuzies \$2.15.

Above, C.M.F. receipts from May 17 to June 12, inclusive, total \$21.15.

Edouard Herriott in New York Nation:—

"When I was called to confer with Millerand a short time ago, it was not for political purposes, but with regard to the financial situation. I willingly gave the President the assurance that we, the Radical Socialists, considered it would be our first duty to safeguard the equilibrium of the budget. But I went no further.

I was informed by Millerand and de Marsal (Minister of Finance under Poincare) that before the American financiers agreed to what is known as the Morgan loan of \$100,000,000 for the recovery of the franc, they asked for a guaranty in gold and other rather general political guaranties.

The Bank of France was obliged to place funds to the credit of the money lenders amounting to 528,000,000 in gold francs as a guaranty for the loan. This amount fully covered the loan. Aside from this, the French Government agreed to engagements of a general character. This method of treating France like Turkey is extraordinary.

Patroitism Perhaps Matriotism

BY F. W. MOORE

ALTHOUGH Patriotism means love of one's fatherland, and is derived from the Latin root, pater a father, yet there is much more to the meaning of the term than that. The word must have been coined after man had been developed to the stage in which property in severally had taken the place of tribal ownership in land: hence the love of the country one inhabited was synonymous with the love of institutions built up by one's own compatriots according to the ideals that seemed to the majority of the race to have been best. It further indicated a pride in traditions, literature, music, science, and art incidental to the development of that section of humanity, that in a sense we regarded as our kith, and under whose protection we hoped that we ourselves and our kin, would acquire the necessary means to make life not only tolerable but also pleasant.

This conception of the meaning of patriotism, is incidental to one only of the mental view-points that are available for analysis. It would be out of the question to do justice to the subject without taking into consideration some of the others, since the sentiments pertaining to the institutions mentioned above were quite as strong as they are today, long before a fatherland, in its legal sense, had ever been heard of: indeed in as far as patriotism means love and loyalty to one's traditions and institutions we have ample proof that the sentiment pervades the membership of a tribe with ten-fold intensity. Ardent patriotism must have been the Indian whose death is described by Pauline Johnson in her well known poem:—

"Up the long trail of fire he boasting goes
Dancing a war dance to defy his foes

One savage yell—
Then loyal to his race
He bends to death—but never to disgrace."

We may definitely state then that patriotism is a sentiment of loyalty towards one's fellow-participants in any particular form of government—a loyalty that expands as civilization develops. We may furthermore conclude that patriotism, in its incipient form, began in the family group, developed in the gens or clan, expanded further in the tribe, took on much larger proportions in the nation, and is bound to include in its embrace the whole world, just as soon as the laws governing human development are able to bring about the federation of its component parts.

It will be only then that patriotism will have reached its ideal form embodying the sentiment that every human being must be reckoned as a unit in the kith of every other, and that all men and women owe loyalty to all others whether taken individually or collectively:—

"Where'er a single slave doth pine
Where'er one man may help another
Thank God for such a birth-right brother!
That spot on earth is thine and mine
There is the true man's birth-place grand
His is a world-wide fatherland."

This conception of a father-land is ideally beautiful, but we have not reached the higher stage of development that makes it generally acceptable. We must therefore be content with considering, in a critical manner, some of the different species of patriots that are playing their parts on the stage of the world today. Of these there are many varieties, from the Machiavellian type imbued with the idea of an ever-expanding imperialism to that of the idealistic cosmopolitan referred to in the poem above. Between these extremes there is a great diversity of typical characters, more or less harmless, but to one in particular, we must pay special attention as embodying in his mental constitution the seeds of discord and disaster. He is the victim of chauvinism, which according to the dictionary means—"an absurdly extravagant pride in one's country, with a

corresponding contempt for foreign nations." We may take it for granted therefore that his association with intelligent individuals of such races, has been as limited as his familiarity with books dealing with their habits and customs.

Such a specimen of humanity with his warped ideals, must necessarily be unconscious of the fact that in no country, not excluding his own, in which machinery is highly developed, have men reached that state of freedom which would entitle them to a claim of superiority worth noticing. The vast majority of them earn their living on suffrage, and are as a consequence, mentally at least, as far as their contributions to public opinion goes, under the control of the monopolist: and until this defect is remedied there can be no room—we won't say, for shame; but most assuredly there is none for boasting. It would be much more seemly if the peoples of the world joined in mutual endeavour to improve their status in society, which at present is—let us not be ashamed to confess the truth—a condition of mental—incidental to a condition of economic servitude, that pervades the whole civilized world.

A statement of this description will at first sight appear unpatriotic, but it is really not so. Does duty to ourselves and to humanity not demand that we find the truth and govern our lives accordingly? Or must we, like the heathen in his blindness, apotheosise certain types of falsehood just because somebody says that these types ought to be regarded with great reverence? Let us never forget that the quest for truth is the most important of all human activities: it is only the result of that quest that the foundations of a sane patriotism ought to be laid.

Real patriotism would inspire the inhabitants of any particular country with a desire to search diligently for the cause of these conditions, to the end that they might eventually destroy them. This they could do by organisation on the industrial and political fields, so that when the institutions of capital break down (as they surely will some day because of the contradictions in them that makes continued existence impossible) a trained force may be on hand to administer the great trust that evolutionary development has placed at its disposal. In this way they not only render patriotic services to the fatherlands in which they are situated, but should success crown their efforts in the attempt to permanently establish a worker's government, the practical demonstration of what might be done by the rest of the world, would possess a value in reference to the development of the human race that is entirely beyond our powers of calculation.

The culminating effect of patriotism, and a very high type of its fruition in the concrete, would be a federation of all the fatherlands; but as we have not the bases on which to reason beyond the next stage of human development, it would be advisable to stop here and observe some of the attributes of patriotism as considered from that viewpoint. Nobody for instance could imagine the existence of serious racial antagonism that might end in war, since the economic cause of war could not be embodied in an international federation of the world established for the administration of human affairs in the interest of the race. There would be so many things to invent and discover that the achievements of each country would be joyously accepted as assets of the whole. Castes and classes as we now know them would soon disappear, and those that remained, founded on culture alone, would be related to each other under conditions of perfect harmony. Love would rule the world. The lion, metaphorically speaking, would lie down with the lamb, and all humanity united in one family, and having at its disposal the united forces of a higher civilisation, would have pleasure and opportunities that are impossible in the present congeries of strife-imbued fatherlands. There would be no misunderstanding or need of everlasting intrigue in the higher circles

of political life, nor of mountebank trickery in the lower, in order to maintain the appearance of a semi-pseudo contentment. Patriotism would then be as instinctive as filial duty or mother-love: yet we could hardly expect a great display of sorrow if the recollection of past ideals associated with the name and connected so closely with a stage of venerated barbarism, induced a more sensitive generation, mindful of the oceans of blood that flowed between the boundary-lines of Mother Earth's fatherlands, to consider the advisability of discarding the word patriotism and substituting in its stead the term "matriotism"—the love of one's mother-land. Would not the earth be every man's native-land, and do we not even now call her mother?

Does not this imply the common red blood of a world-wide brotherhood, and the loyalty to each other of every member of the human race?

It is only by the materialisation of such a condition that the famous prophecy of Tennyson can be fulfilled—a prophecy founded on abstract reason:—

"Then the common sense of most shall hold a fretful
realm in awe
And the kindly earth shall slumber, lapt in universal law."

MANIFESTO

of the
SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA
(Fifth Edition)

Per copy..... 10 cents

Per 25 copies..... \$2

Post Paid.

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.

SHOULD WORKERS THINK?

(Continued from page 1)

which he eloquently emphasised the proposition that, despite all argument to the contrary, "a man is a MAN." Now that doesn't sound very terrible. But then as Spinosa wrote, to determine or limit means to negate or deny. There were other "men" (?) in Burns' day, some one of whom might conceivably be "ca'd (called) a Lord." But by defining such a person as a Lord, Burns rather too cleverly suggested the legitimate conclusion that he could also be probably a fool, at whom the man of independent mind would look and laugh. Result, a sentence of "no promotion for you in the excise" was rigidly imposed upon the poet. See what that syllogistic stuff can do! And by the same token, it will be noted that in ordinary speech or writing, we scarcely ever frame our arguments in the rigid form of the complete three-propositioned Aristotelian syllogism. Like Burns, we more or less merely suggest them.

So much, in brief, for the Aristotelian syllogism, which Mill despised as merely a "Subjective Inference" because a subject (or person) who knew its first proposition, didn't need to exert himself in order to infer (or draw) his conclusion, since the first proposition already carried it ready-made for him. For instance, if I hold that all capitalists are pests, I know at once without any further brain-racking that if Jones is a capitalist, he is likewise a pest. But it was "Inductive Inference" that Mill set himself to boost and that too with nearly as much claim to originality as Aristotle was entitled to for the invention of the deductive syllogism. Mill called the former "Objective Inference" and claimed it to be the only true scientific form of inference; although, as Killick remarks, there is no real inconsistency in the two views, as both forms of inference make up a complementary whole.

Mill avers that in "objective inference" the fact stated in the conclusion is a genuine new truth, and not merely part of the same fact or facts already contained in the premises. Thus, the magnetic oxide of iron (lodestone) can attract iron like a magnet. After trying out, say six pieces of it, one came to the conclusion that a seventh, or eighth or every piece of it would also attract iron. This follows by virtue of a law of external nature and not by a mere law or cudgelling of the mind. Hence the name "objective" inference to describe this kind of inductive reasoning. And, by the way, the true founder of nature questioning and scientific reasoning was not the 16th century Lord Bacon, but Roger Bacon, a 13th century monk and professor of Oxford, who denounced the barrenness of the schoolmen's word-jangling. His logical reforms were submitted to the court of Rome, and they not only fell flat, but actually earned for Roger twelve years of imprisonment. The seed sown by this Medieval clear-sighted thinker did not spring up till centuries later.

Let us now take up two other forms of inductive reasoning. The first, as follows, is more useful for ordinary, every day purposes than for strictly scientific research. It is made up of four different steps: 1, preliminary observation; 2, the making of hypotheses (guesses); 3, deductive reasoning; 4, verification. As regards the guesses, these are based on the fact that Nature is a tremendous aggregation of causes and effects; and being "logical" means acting as Nature commands us to act; for, as the philosophers say, Nature is existing reason and Mind is thinking reason; and we, ourselves are part of Nature, as Omar the poet indicates in these lines:—

For let Philosopher and Doctor preach
Of what they will and what they will not—each
Is but one link in an eternal chain (of causes and effects)
That none can slip, nor break, nor over-reach.

Therefore the guesses must not be "wild" ones. A somewhat freespoken "humorist" the writer used to work beside, on being asked some such ordinary workshop question as "wha done that?" would dryly and solemnly draw out "God!" No doubt, but He was never the effective cause! Here is an illustration in practice of the four steps:

A few miles out from the writer's location, is a wooden bridge which got badly damaged from the heavy Spring floods of 1923. Early in the Spring of

this year he noticed that the bridge had just been renovated and where the overhead timber is mortised into the traffic side-rails, a coating of healthfully smelling tar had been smoothly and skillfully applied. Later visits in the season gave a sort of "too much of a good thing" shock because the top of the side rails were now covered at intervals with an irregular confusion of unsightly separate drops of tar. Thus much, on the second visit, did preliminary observation reveal. Next "Wha done that?" gave a chance to employ hypotheses as to the cause thereof. The likeliest guess was that the hotter sun of the advancing spring had melted deposits of tar somewhere above the side rail, thus making these fall down on the rail in drops. Next, deductive reasoning (always supplied by previous experience of cause and effect) enabled one to assert that IF other tar deposits had been spread over the higher overhead timbers, such deposits, when sufficiently melted to the flowing point by the sun's heat, would inevitably drop down below. Last step of all that ends this "strange, eventful" reasoning, is verification or confirming the soundness of one's deduction. In this case it was done by gazing aloft, and it was at once seen that just above where lay the ugly collections of tar drops, were several separate thin streams of tar clinging down the sides of the overhead timbers, the surplus from which had fallen "as the gentle rain from heaven upon the place beneath." The hypothesis or guess was, therefore correct—quod erat demonstrandum (which was to be shown).

But for deeper scientific purposes, another, kind of inductive process is used, which has really six steps. This kind, as Marx's son-in-law pointed out in his biographical pamphlet, was used by both Darwin and Marx, the latter of whom, Aveling repeats, had read all of the former's works, whilst Darwin, as he admitted in a personal letter written to Marx in 1873, on receiving a copy of the second edition of "Capital" Vol. 1, was little versed in political economy. Yet the British "Labor" Premier, Ramsay Macdonald, in his recent "Socialist" pamphlet which repudiates the Russian Revolution and belittles Marx, stated that the latter was out-of-date and "pre (before) Darwinian"—whatever Macdonald means by that! These six steps are: observation, experiment, recordal, reflection, generalisation and verification. Darwin observed and experimented upon plants and animals for twenty-eight years. He recorded in countless notebooks the results of these observations and experiments and then reflected upon his records until he arrived at the well known Darwinian evolutionary generalisations which, though now pretty universally accepted are still considered all the better for every fresh bit of verification that crops up.

(To be continued in next issue)

CORRESPONDENCE.

HISTORY OR WORSE.

Editor Clarion:

On the front page of Clarion No. 915, appeared an article entitled "The Importance of History" which, so far as a brazen perversion of the facts of history is concerned, beats anything I have read for some time.

The writer of the article—G. R. Stirling Taylor—true to his Labor Party connection, abhors the very thought of revolution. He sees that the social upheaval is a long way off, and the farther the better.

All revolutions, we are told, end in the same place as they started, so what is the use in noise and bloodshed that merely brings us back to where we began? He concludes that all who believe in revolutions must be a bunch of ignoramuses. This, of course includes the Marxian school, as no proletarian teacher has ever emphasized the necessity for revolution to a greater degree than Karl Marx.

This conception of revolution clearly portrays the blatant ignorance of your contributor. The term revolution means change—a complete change.

By an industrial revolution we imply that a great change has taken place in the manner of producing wealth, e.g. the tool has been replaced by the machine. A social revolution means that the oppressed class has become the dominant one, e.g. the bourgeoisie has seized the power once held by the feudal lord. A political revolution takes place when one group, or clique, ousts its rival and takes control itself, e.g. the American Colonists assert their independence from British jurisdiction. This should be sufficient data to show that revolutions do not stop where they started.

Taylor again states that "One would have thought that

a primary schoolboy's knowledge of history would have made clear that this Russian revolution has almost followed the lines of the earliest French Revolution." Now, I am going to grant that a primary schoolboy might possibly arrive at such a conclusion, but any mentally mature person who has paid even the slightest attention to a comparison of the two revolutions can see the vast difference between that of Russia and that of France.

History from Taylor's point of view, is nothing more than a sleight-of-hand performance where merchants, bankers and feudal lords have played the role of conjurers and harlequins to trick an unsuspecting public. That history is the life story of the human race, made up of many material factors, but where the driving force is economic necessity, the writer does not seem to be able to grasp.

A decided contempt for Imperialism is again noticeable. Nationalism is alone lovely, but Imperialism is a monstrous policy. All the great nations of the ancient world had their careers blighted in the field of Imperialism. Ergo—don't try to extend, your doom awaits you. He might as well advise a young boy not to grow old else he would surely die. Imperialism is the natural outcome of Nationalism, and history declares that the process must be completed.

Much of the article is devoted to eulogising the Labor philosophy and denouncing that of the Liberals. From the standpoint of the exploited workers they both mean the same thing. Each Party appears to be quite capable of administering Capitalist property and keeping the producing masses in their old position. As a Capitalist instrument of administration and coercion the Labor policy of today is the logical sequence of yesterday's Liberalism. Even on the question of Imperialism his Gitche Manitou—Ramsay Macdonald—appears to be a worthy successor to Curzon and Chamberlain.

The workers of England, and elsewhere, are sufficiently confounded as it is without adding to their confusion by the publication of such drivel in the name of science.

Yours for history not bunk,

J. A. McDONALD.

San Francisco, Calif.

Editor's Note: G. R. Stirling Taylor is a writer to whom considerable attention is paid in the book world and among publications. We had thought he was better known to Clarion readers. "The Importance of History" (quite evidently an incomplete article) was reprinted from The Socialist Review in order to present the "Tory-Democratic" point of view on the British Labor Government to Clarion readers, much in the same way as Wells has been reproduced and Shaw quoted.

Literature Price List

Cloth Bound.	Per Copy
Critique of Political Economy	1.65
Revolution and Counter Revolution (Marx)	1.15
Ancient Society	1.25
Capitalist Production (First Nine and 23 Chapters "Capital," vol. 1, (Marx)	1.00
Vital Problems in Social Evolution	80c
Science and Revolution	80c
The Militant Proletariat	80c
Evolution Social and Organic	80c
Puritanism	80c
Ethics and History	80c
Germans of Mind in Plants	80c
The Triumph of Life	80c
Feuerbavk	80c
Social Revolution (Kautsky)	80c
Origin of Species (Darwin)	1.15
Essays on Materialist	
Conception of History (Labriola)	1.50
Social Studies (Lafargue)	80c

Paper Covers.	Per Copy
Evolution of Man (Prof. Boische)	30c
Wage-Labor and Capital	10c
Independent Working Class Education	10c
Communist Manifesto	10c
The Present Economic System (Prof. W. A. Bouger)	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 (Lockie)	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	25 copies 75c
Communist Manifesto	25 copies \$3.00
Wage-Labor and Capital	25 copies \$3.00
Present Economic System	25 copies \$1.50
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific	25 copies \$3.25
Slave of the Farm	25 copies \$3.50
Manifesto of S. P. of C.	25 copies \$3.00
Evolution of Man	25 copies \$3.00
Causes of Belief in God	25 copies \$3.00
Value, Price and Profit	25 copies \$3.25
Economic Causes of War	25 copies \$3.00
Christianism and Communism	25 copies \$3.00

All prices include postage.

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