

# WESTERN CLARION

A Journal of  
CURRENT  
EVENTS

Official Organ of  
THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

HISTORY  
ECONOMICS  
PHILOSOPHY

No. 937 TWENTY-FIRST YEAR

MONTHLY

VANCOUVER, B. C., JUNE 1, 1925.

FIVE CENTS

## Where Shall Coal Be Sold?

(I. F. T. U.)

ALL coal-producing countries are faced with difficulty in selling their coal, and this difficulty grows visibly from day to day. Stocks are accumulating to an alarming extent—in Britain, for instance, there was not long ago provision for no less than 4 months ahead, and these stocks are not likely to have diminished since. Statistics have made it abundantly clear that at a time when any reasonably organised system of world production would have taken precautions against the oncoming of the depression, the output was everywhere growing. Not only was this the case where the production had not yet attained the pre-war output, and where there would therefore seem to be plausible excuses for an increase in activity; it was also seen in countries, such as Germany, the Saar Basin, France, Belgium, Holland, Czechoslovakia, U. S. A., S. Africa and British India, which had already exceeded their pre-war production, Great Britain alone has to record a diminution of output. For all the other countries named above, with the exception of Czechoslovakia, there has been a steady increase even in the two months of December, 1924 and January, 1925.

The increase of output is in many cases startlingly great. The National Coal Mines' Committee of France recently stated that the production in 1919 was 22½ million tons but that, estimated on the basis of the output per day, that of 1925 would probably be 48 million tons. The Alsace-Lorraine Coal Basin gives the following increases in output per day: 126,147 tons in 1913, 75,000 tons in 1919, and 160,445 tons in January, 1925. In the brown coal fields of Central Germany, the output per head for 300 shifts in 1913 was 3.06 tons, while that of 1924 was 3.1 tons. In Britain alone the output per man per shift has fallen, it being now 17.74 cwt. against 20.32 cwt. in 1913; in the opinion of an expert not belonging to the Labour Movement, this is due to "technical and organisational backwardness and the fact that many mines are very old." The same expert adds: "If we compare the output per man per shift, we shall see that the output of the United States is about 5 times that of Great Britain, and that other factors are at work here besides negligent management."

As to the causes of the slump in the coal trade, it is increasingly clear that, except in cases where the consumption of coal has been decreased, these are to be sought in the artificial distribution of coal since the war: this, which is an outcome of the political arrangements made by the victors, has destroyed the equilibrium of the various markets. To give some instances: it has happened twice within a short space of time that the Port of Antwerp authority has placed an order for bunker coal with a German firm, to the exclusion of Belgian firms. Germany, which before the war had both an export and an import trade in coal, although the former was much greater than the latter, became an importing country after the war as a result of post-war developments, especially the obligation to deliver reparations coal. Hence every year since the end of the war up to 1924 she has had to pay 34 million gold marks for British coal in freight alone. In 1923 she imported from Britain 67% more coal than in 1913. But now the tables are turned. Germany has so large a surplus of coal that it is only the high

cost of freightage which prevents her from supplying her northern towns with her own coal, although they were Britain's permanent customers before the war. Her import of coal from Britain fell in 1924 to 24% below that of 1913. Her obligations under the Dawes Scheme make it necessary for her to become as far as possible self-sufficing, and even, if possible, to make large exports. The efforts of both Germany and Austria to attain independence of imports have brought Czechoslovakia into difficulties. Before the war Germany took 70 million and Austria 5 million cwt. of Bohemian brown coal; now Germany takes 10, and Austria 1.1. And Czechoslovakia has no other customer to put in their place! Then again, Austria and Hungary now both buy Saar coal, which was unknown in either of these countries before the war. Poland, to whom the Geneva Convention allotted an export of 500,000 tons, now demands a yearly export quota of 7 million tons; otherwise she says, her industries in the districts recently ceded by Germany cannot be maintained. Germany which has now become a coal-exporting country, is expected to buy coal from Poland, although it (German) has 8 million tons of coal at its pitheads. The Polish districts already announce stocks of 1 million tons. France, formerly a good customer for British coal, now imposes an import duty on coal, with which she is absolutely overstocked. The French state railways have had a coal-purchasing office in Cardiff ever since last century, but this office is now closed; their needs are supplied mainly from Germany. Britain is in consternation, for even the Italian state railways are now sending orders to the Ruhr. Certain kinds of British coal, which were formerly purchased whatever the price might be, are now being replaced by other coal, because the gulf between the prices has become altogether too great. The British coal magnates have lived to see the Stinnes mines book orders even from Greece! Except for Italy, American coal has been practically shut out of Europe since the Ruhr crisis was settled. Most of the American export goes to Canada, from which British coal is completely ousted. In South America, on the other hand, British coal is so far holding its own better than in North.

Absolute chaos! There is not the slightest regard to necessities and possibilities, there is no sign of any comprehensive measure to remedy the evil! Every expert must know how deeply rooted is the cause of the present chaos, and how imperative it is that there shall be well-considered and carefully concerted action. And yet all we hear are the well-worn catch words "wage reduction" and "lengthening of working hours." The most the employers do is to make up their minds to institute a national "enquiry."

In Belgium, where the stocks of coal have mounted to 1,600,000, the employers have profited by the occasion to cut wages again and to notify the termination of agreements. The proposal to create a Compensation Fund, or Pool, to which all profits would be paid in, in order to aid the poorer mines, has been rejected; also a proposal for public enquiry, which would have been only too likely to disclose defective organisation and waste. The unaccommodating spirit of the employers has had its natural reflex in the decision of the recent Miner's Congress to institute a referendum (on the 27th and 28th April)

to decide whether or not there shall be a general strike. Almost certainly there will be a fierce conflict if the Government does not intervene. In Czechoslovakia nationalisation plans are again coming to the fore: these would place the industry on an organized basis, but they would require an expenditure of from 12 to 15 million Czech kronen. In Poland there are idle shifts despite the dismissal of 71,378 miners. In Great Britain, where the Minimum Wage Bill has been thrown out by parliament, the miners' agreement expires next June, and the employers are already seeking to worsen conditions. Cook, the secretary of the Miners' Federation, has rejected the proposal to lengthen working hours on the ground that already the miners are producing more coal than can be sold, and the introduction of the eight hours' day would not help matters.

(This means extending the underground day from 7 to 8 hours.—Ed.)

One of the employers even hit upon the brilliant idea of inviting the workers to take over a pit for their own account. The miners' union warned their members not to fall into the trap, reminding them that those who had pocketed the profits ought to pocket the losses too. The British miners are now exploring two distinct avenues. One of these is to engineer an alliance with the workers of other important trades; discussions have already taken place with the engineers, transport-workers and railwaymen's unions, and it is expected that a joint conference will be called of all the union executives who have been thus consulted. Besides this, a series of joint conferences are being held with the mine-owners in London; Cook, the secretary of the Miners' Federation, is not, however, very hopeful of concrete results from these meetings. In Germany, miners are being dismissed by thousands. Yet, in spite of the gigantic accumulations of coal, the Stinnes and other mines are working steadily on probably in eager anticipation of the rich possibilities of a long stoppage of work in Belgium or Great Britain.

One thing alone is certain. Since the coal slump is international, it is not in the power of the individual nations to take any very effective step towards remedying it. The employers' efforts to hammer a way out somehow do not hide the truth. If the International Labour Office, for instance, instead of merely being able to institute enquiries into past events and questions of principle, were empowered to use its large and highly qualified staff to intervene in acute situations and to provide all information and expert advice it would have seen the significance of such factors as the increased use of oil and water-power and have drawn the inevitable conclusion that less coal would be needed, and permanent adjustments and conversions must be made. The deep lying relations between coal output and the production of manufactured goods in general would be laid bare: it would be realised that a period of decreasing production must infallibly be a period of falling demand for coal, and vice-versa. Even the German Coal Syndicate, although for a long time it was content to deal with coal only, discovered later on the close inter-relation between coal and iron, and learnt to take it into account—in the interests, of course, of capitalism.

Knowing as they do that all such enquiries and tentative attempts cannot fail eventually to show up the unreason and anarchy of the capitalist system, the employers are unanimous in opposing any really thorough enquiry. It is better, they think, to do nothing, and to use the slump to exploit the workers. The comment of a Czech newspaper on the Czech coal-owners is more or less true for all employers: "The employers are glad that nothing is being done. They think the opportunity is an excellent one to abolish the collective agreements which have been wrung from them by the strength of the miners' unions."

List

Per Copy  
\$1.15  
1.05

1.00  
30c  
30c  
30c  
30c  
30c  
30c  
30c  
30c  
30c  
30c

1.50  
30c

Per Copy  
30c  
10c  
10c  
10c  
10c  
35c  
15c  
15c  
15c

10c  
10c  
10c  
10c  
10c

# The Economics of Labor

(Continued from last issue)

We have arrived at this then, that commodities are produced simply for exchange, exchange carried on purely for profit, and yet, as commodities exchange for equal values there is really no actual profit made in exchange. Whence then does it arise, this mysterious increase which is the be-all and end-all of capitalist production and private enterprise? It arises from the exploitation of labour; it is made, not in the market, but in the workshop and the factory.

Labour-power is a commodity, and, like other commodities, it exchanges in the market at its cost of production in human labour. That is, the labour-force of the labourer is sold in the free and open labour market, at what it costs to produce that labour-force. We have no slavery here. "Britons never will be slaves!" The free British workman is not sold, neither does he sell himself. He brings into the market his commodity—the only thing of any value which he possesses—his power to labour, the labour-force which is embodied in his person. There is nothing in the world to compel him to sell this labour-force—but sheer necessity. He can keep it if he likes—and starve. But "il faut vivre," and although others as well as Talleyrand may not see the necessity, it is this very necessity to live which makes it imperative on the otherwise propertyless labourer to sell his only valuable possession, his one ewe lamb, his labour-power. But he has no monopoly. There are other laborers in the market, equally ready, equally anxious, to sell the same commodity, with the result that this, like all other commodities offered under similar conditions, generally exchanges at its cost of production in human labour. So much food, clothing, and shelter, all produced by labour, is necessary for the production and maintenance of the labourer, and this forms the basis of the exchange value of his labour-force. Stated in other terms the basis of wages is the cost of subsistence of the labourer. This is called the "iron law of wages," with reference to which I shall have something to say later. At present we are considering the source of surplus-value. The labourer sells his labour then, on the average, as all commodities are sold, at its normal exchange value—its cost of production. But the amount of wealth which the labourer produces in the time for which he has sold his labour-force, is out of all proportion to what it costs to produce and maintain his labour-force for that time. This, the difference between what he produces and his own cost of production, is surplus-value, and is taken and divided up by the capitalist into rent, interest, profit. This surplus-value then, this profit, is so much robbery effected by taking advantage of the necessity of the proletariat—the naked, propertyless labourer. But, you say, the labourer is perfectly free, he made his own bargain, it was a free and open contract, how can it be described as robbery? I do not want to use unnecessarily harsh terms, and remember, I am not attacking individuals, but attempting to describe the working of the actual economic system. Your political economists talk of freedom of contract; but there can be no freedom of contract between the man who must sell or die—who is forced by sheer necessity to, like Esau, sell his birthright for a mess of pottage, so to speak, and the man to whom it is a matter of indifference whether he buys or not. The labourer is forced by necessity to sell, and as a consequence gets, on the average, but a subsistence in return. All over and above the cost of subsistence belongs to his exploiters—he has what he has bargained for, his wages. What right has he to more? In the result there is, generally speaking,

no relation between the value of a man's work, between the value of what he produces and what he receives. What he receives is governed, not by what he produces, but by what he must have to live to go on working. It is sometimes urged as an objection to this that wages vary in different countries. Precisely, and this, which at first sight appears to disprove, really goes to prove the truth of the theory I am propounding. Although it is sometimes sought to show that the labour of some men is vastly more productive than that of others, it is fair to assume, and facts and experience go to prove, that there is nowhere such a difference in the productivity of labour as would account for the extraordinary difference in wages. The British workman is doubtless the finest fellow on the face of the earth, as his pastors and masters tell him when they want to keep him contented; but he cannot do twelve times as much work as the Chinaman. Yet the latter will work for fourpence a day, while the former wants four shillings. The Chinaman gets fourpence a day because he has learned to live on fourpence a day. When you have taught the British workman to live on fourpence a day—if capitalism continues—he will get but fourpence a day, although he may do just as much work as he does today. There is, of course, a constant effort on the part of workmen to force wages above this subsistence level, and frequently they do rise above it; but at the same time, as with all other commodities, competition is constantly operating to force down the price of labour-power—wages—to its normal level.

Once you have clearly understood the working of this economic law, this "iron law of wages," this fact that the return to labour is governed, not by the productivity of labour, but by its cost of production (which in my humble judgment is the central fact in the economics of labour) you see how useless are many of the proposals of your social reformers, and how fallacious are many of the teachings of your political economists.

Remember that the operation of this law is imperative and inexorable as long as present conditions obtain. It is no use appealing to the sense of justice of the capitalist. He, as capitalist, is in duty bound to buy labour, as well as other commodities, as cheaply as possible. If he is so noble minded, so quixotic, as to pay an artificial price for labour, the economic conditions, which, like the Almighty, are no respectors of persons, have no mercy on him, but relentlessly thrust him on one side to make room for another less scrupulous than himself.

To preach temperance and thrift to the workers may be very well. From the point of view of abstract morality the practice of temperance and thrift and industry may be a good thing, but economically considered the practice of thrift and abstinence and industry not only does not advantage the worker, but is frequently pernicious. The practice of thrift and abstinence simply means for the workers reducing their consumption and ultimately reducing their standard of comfort—their cost of living and consequently their wages. To be industrious does not mean for the worker increased wealth and increased comfort, but increased production of surplus-value for the capitalist class, which surplus-value is being piled up around him in masses of overproduction which do not belong to him, which he may not consume, but which frequently condemn him to involuntary idleness, and, by intensifying the competition in the labour market, help to force down wages.

Recognising the inexorable working of these economic laws you will see how fallacious are the theories of political economists as to individual liberty, freedom of contract and free trade. How can there be freedom of contract between the propertyless proletariat—the labourer with nothing but his labour-power to sell and therefore compelled to sell

his labour-power—and the capitalist, with whom it is a matter of indifference whether he buys the labour of this particular individual or of some other?

What is the value of the individual liberty of the labourer who, being thus compelled to sell his labour-power must of necessity sell it for a bare subsistence without any regard to its productivity? Of what value is free trade when it only tends to cheapen commodities, and labour-power as well as all other commodities when by reducing the cost of production of labour it reduces its value in exchange? when by reducing the price of food it also reduces the wages of labour? Yet your propertyless proletarian is a sine qua non of capitalism. Capital, as you have seen, ceases to be capital if it ceases to produce profit. This profit is surplus-value—unpaid labour—the result of the exploitation of the proletarian. This exploitation is only possible with your free, naked labourer. If he were not "free" he could not sell his labour force, and if he were not naked of possessions he would not sell it for a bare subsistence. Thus the proletarian is necessary to capitalism and thus capitalism produces the proletarian which is necessary for its existence. Thus capital grows by what it feeds on, and thus labour becomes poorer the more it abstains and the more it saves.

You will thus see that not only is the poverty of the workers essential to capitalism but that capitalism maintains and intensifies this poverty so that all the well intentioned efforts of social reformers to mitigate its evils merely furnish capitalism with additional weapons. Temperance, thrift, industry, only serve to make labour an easier or more valuable prey to capital. If they reduce the cost of living in any particular they but reduce the cost of labour to the capitalist. Take education again. There is a growing cry for technical education, in order, it is said, to enable us to compete with foreign countries. What does this mean save that in those countries with which we are called upon to compete education itself is being exploited, that the monopoly hitherto enjoyed by skilled labour has been broken down by the spread of education, and that skilled labour is now on the same level as unskilled?

A recognition of these facts not only demonstrates the fallacy of many so-called reforms, but points the direction in which we should proceed in order to eliminate the evils arising from present conditions. We see that the mere cheapening of the cost of living only tends to reduce wages and thus cannot advantage the worker. We must, therefore, aim at raising the standard of life rather than cheapening the cost of subsistence. We must see that public money is well spent rather than that taxes are reduced, and that the workers are provided with better and healthier rather than cheaper dwellings, with more wholesome, better, and more plentiful, rather cheaper dwellings, with more wholesome, better, and more plentiful, rather than cheaper—and nastier, food.

Seeing that the operation of the laws we have been considering is inexorable under, and inseparable from, existing economic conditions, our efforts should be directed to changing these conditions rather than tinkering with their effects, to revolutionising conditions which divert the means of production from their proper object—that of producing wealth—and which convert them into capital—means of exploitation. We cannot change these conditions, we cannot destroy the class ownership of the means of production which lies at the bottom of these conditions by going back to the individual ownership of the middle-ages, but we must press on toward their collective ownership. Every step in social reform should be a stepping stone to that end, for the whole trend of the economic development is in that direction.

(The End.)

# The Race Myth Crumbles

By Harry Elmer Barnes

More and more we are coming to recognize the fundamental importance of race in human affairs. . . It is about the liveliest, most practical subject that can engage the attention of thinking men and women today. . .

Especially do we need to regard the racial factor when considering Europe. . . Whoever begins looking at Europe from the racial angle is astonished at the new light thrown upon its problems, at the apparent mysteries that are explained, at the former riddles that are solved. Europe's seemingly tangled history grows much simpler, while present-day conditions become more understandable.—Lothrop Stoddard, 1925.

**T**HE racial phobia of the last three-quarters of a century, which has reappeared with a new virulence since 1916, has based much of its dogmatism upon an appeal to pseudo-history. Hence, it is curious that the critics of this monstrosity have rarely made a systematic appeal to the facts of substantial history to refute the contentions of writers from Gobineau to Chamberlain and Grant. The origins of the race myth must unquestionably be sought in vestiges from the primitive aversion-complex exhibited toward strangers, symbolized by the old phrases of Jew and Gentile, and Greek and Barbarian. In its modern form it first took shape with the theory of the eighteenth-century Romanticists with respect to the reality and the dominating importance of national character as the basis and matrix of the culture and institutions of any country. It was given a particularly forceful statement by Fichte in his famous "Addresses to the German nation" in 1807-1808, where he stated that perhaps the most precious element in the German heritage and culture lay in the German language or *Ursprache*. The emphasis of Fichte and others upon the importance of language in national character helped to produce the enthusiasm which created the origins of modern scientific philology in the notable works of the brothers Grimm, Max Muller, and others.

These philological researches stimulated interest in the study of the languages and institutions of Europe and Asia. The establishment of a relationship between the Eur-Asiatic languages was due primarily to the work of Bopp, who published his "Comparative Grammar" in 1835. During the next generation much important work was done in the way of investigating the origins, migration, and affinities of these so-called "Aryan" languages. It soon came to be rather commonly maintained that a primordial Aryan race lay back of these linguistic similarities and identities. In fact, Max Muller himself, though he later repudiated this position, confirmed this popular impression by holding that the Aryan languages were spoken by an Aryan race, hence supporting the current popular view of the identity of language and race.

This false assumption of linguistic and racial unity would not by itself, however, have furnished the basis for the racial psychosis. What was needed was a vigorous statement of the cultural supremacy and historic mission of particular races. This indispensable impetus was supplied in the famous "Essay on the Inequality of the Human Races" by Count Joseph Arthur de Gobineau, published in 1854. He contended that practically all of the worth-while cultures of the human past had been the product of the white race, and that most of these significant civilizations had been specifically the work of the Aryan branch of this superior white group. He also maintained that race mixture was a highly degenerating process. After Gobineau's time, therefore, it came to be regarded as a matter of great pride and significance to prove that one's nation was made up of the worthy Aryans.

At first this gave rise to relatively little nationalistic chauvinism in Europe because it was assumed that the broad similarities among the European languages, with the exception of Basque and certain of the Turanian dialects, meant that the overwhelm-

ing majority of all Europeans, within whatever national boundary, were thoroughbred Aryans. This benign illusion was, however, soon demolished by a number of Germanic writers, particularly J. G. Cuno (1871), Theodor Posche (1878), and Carl Penka (1883). These writers proved convincingly that the assumption of the identity between race and language was highly fallacious. A fairly well-unified race like the American Indians has more than a hundred distinct stock languages, while obviously different races may, due to cultural pressure and historic association, speak the same language. Hence it was apparent that not all Europeans were necessarily Aryans, and from the eighties onward there was a feverish effort on the part of writers in every state to prove themselves to be the only hundred per cent Aryans and their neighbors of inferior non-Aryan clay.

It has frequently been held that Teutonic writers were the only ones who succumbed to this fanaticism, but such a view is purely a product of modern propaganda. As an actual matter of fact, every state had its group of writers who interpreted national culture on the basis of racial superiority due to the Aryan heritage, England and France quite matching the Teutons in this respect. Such interpretations not only found expression in the obsessed writings of Houston Stewart Chamberlain, Maurice Barres, Rudyard Kipling, and other essayists, but also in the nationalistic historical literature which held a supreme place in historical writing until near the close of the nineteenth century, being represented by such works as those of Droysen, Treitschke, von Sybel, Michelet, Martin, Kemble, Stubbs, Freeman, and other writers who are only slightly less distinguished and widely read.

The Nordic myth is but a later variant of the Aryan myth. There is a direct line of descent from Gobineau to Madison Grant. Many "Gobineau societies" were founded in Germany and elsewhere in the last half of the nineteenth century. One of Gobineau's most enthusiastic disciples was a renegade Scotchman, Houston Stewart Chamberlain, whose "Foundations of the Nineteenth Century" marks the transition from Aryanism to Nordicism in Germany. His work was carried forward enthusiastically by Ludwig Woltmann. This eulogy of the Teutonic or Nordic type was introduced into America on the same level by Alfred P. Schultz, an open admirer of Gobineau, Chamberlain, and Woltmann, who published his "Race or Mongrel" in 1908. Madison Grant's "The Passing of the Great Race," which first appeared in 1916, was based upon the assumptions of the above works, but adopted a far more specific physical conception of the Nordic race, abandoning the rather loose and mystical attitude of Chamberlain. Grant's views have been adopted, debased, and disseminated in such works as Gould's "America: A Family Problem" and Burr's "America's Race Heritage," until now Mr. H. J. Eckenrode has offered a "serious" interpretation of the American Civil War which is based primarily upon the assumption of Nordicism.

While this racial obsession was taking its most

vigorous form, scientists were patiently assembling the data which were to reveal with pitiless thoroughness the fundamental inaccuracy of all the assumptions which underlay the racial interpretation. An American student, W. Z. Ripley, built upon the researches of European scholars a comprehensive work on the races of Europe, which demolished the theory that there ever was any thing as an Aryan race. The term Aryan was shown to be applicable, if at all, only to some linguistic traits common to certain peoples of Europe and Asia. Above all, Ripley, Sergi and others demonstrated beyond any possible doubt that the Teutonic peoples certainly could not have been of Asiatic derivation and could not have been the original bearers of the Aryan languages and culture. If there is any such thing as a definite Aryan language and typical Aryan institutions, it is the consensus of the best anthropological opinion that they must have been brought into Europe by the round-headed Alpine or Eur-Asiatic race. In other words, the Nordics could not have been Aryans. The term "Indo-Germanic," used as descriptive of a unified race or culture, is thus a scientific absurdity in spite of the fact that it crops out in so recent an historical work as the third volume of "The Cambridge Medieval History." Indeed, it is still in common usage among many conventional historians, particularly Teutonic and English historians. It may be regarded as roughly accurate to use the term Indo-European as broadly descriptive of the Alpine race. It certainly cannot be used in any historical or scientific sense as referring to either the Mediterranean or the Nordic groups, and, hence, not as descriptive of all the leading races or cultures of ancient India and modern Europe.

When one turns to examine, in the light of the most rudimentary and self-evident facts of human history, the thesis that all the striking cultures and civilizations of the past have been a product of the Nordics, the whole structure of racialism immediately falls to the ground. The fallacies in a Nordic interpretation of the great culture of antiquity were demonstrated at length in the convincing article of Professor J. J. Smertenko in the *Current History Magazine* for April, 1924 (\*). We here shall content ourselves with passing in review the chief historic civilizations and indicating the essentially non-Nordic basis which underlies almost every one of them.

All the leading civilizations of Oriental antiquity were, for practical purposes, one hundred per cent non-Nordic. The European heritage that came from Egypt and Western Asia, which has recently been so forcibly and clearly described by Professor Breasted, was absolutely devoid of any Nordic foundations. Further, we must revise the ordinary notion that the arena of human civilization has been limited to the area between the Tigris and the Thames. In most respects, aside from science and material culture, the civilizations of China and India may well be held to be more advanced and mature than those of the Occident. That they are of non-Nordic derivation would scarcely need to be pointed out even to Dr. Stoddard and Mr. Grant. The high civilization of the ancient Aegean was likewise a Mediterranean culture without any Nordic admixture whatever. To pass on to classical times, there was only the merest sprinkling of Nordics in the racial composition of ancient Greece and Italy, as Peake, Sergi, and Guiffrida-Ruggeri have amply demonstrated. Certainly, the Nordic element in classical culture, if present at all, was sufficiently slight to be almost entirely negligible.

The highest culture of the Middle Ages was not to be found in Western Europe but in the Eastern or Greek Empire and among the Moslems of North-

\* See *Clarion* April 15 and May 1, 1924 for reproduction from "Current History" of Prof. Smertenko's article. (Continued on page 7)

## ECONOMIC CAUSES

### OF WAR

By PETER T. LEUKER

NOW READY

Preface by the author.

122 PAGES

Per Copy, 25 Cents.

Ten copies up, 20 cents each.

Post Paid.

## 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, 18 issues \$1.00

938

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

VANCOUVER, B. C., JUNE 1, 1925.

### A GENERAL ELECTION

**A**FTER sixteen years of effort in what is known as labor journalism in Vancouver, and about one year of service as the official organ of the Federated Labor Party of British Columbia, the "B. C. Federationist" is about to become the mouthpiece, not of any specific section of the labor movement, but of the farmer and labor movement of B. C., as a whole—without factional bias.

The last year of existence of the "Federationist" has been, it is to be supposed, somewhat of a trial, since the Federated Labor Party's financial ability to maintain such a paper as the "Federationist" as its official organ seemed improbable, and suitable mutual terms between "The Labor Statesman," official organ of the local trades union element, and the "Federationist" for amalgamation have apparently been impossible to arrange.

Lacking expected or hoped for trade union support the "Federationist" now turns to the elusive farmers' movement of B. C. for support—so we are to suppose. However, even in the heyday of its full prosperity and circulation as the official trade union organ in British Columbia, the "Federationist" has presented a variety of points of view, and that sometimes when the presentation—through advertisements or general features—has worried its readers as to which side of the fence it might really be on—particularly at election times.

Here and now throughout Canada there is a flutter in the political dovecotes as to the likelihood of a general election. The economic salvation of the West is forecast by government instructions given to the Railway Board to effect as far as possible equalization of freight rates—a sore point of grievance among western traders and manufacturers for many years—and all hands look upon that as a sure indication that the Ottawa government of the day is fishing for western support in an immediate election. That support is expected to come through the interest of western trade and, as we know, parliamentary representation may be forecast, in a general way, through economic channels.

If a projected government measure offers sustenance and prosperity which appears feasible in any section of the country to those who are the shining economic lights of that section then former political allegiance is near the breaking point. In the present case, however, there is a bugaboo, and that is the infantile labor party of the west.

When we saw the announcement of the projected equalization of freight rates we had an idea that there was a general (Federal) election at once to come. When we saw the announcement of the "Federationist" of their "enlarged" policy we became sure of it. And in saying that, strange as it may seem, we are casting no reflections upon the Federated Labor Party of British Columbia.

We are, of course, always "wrong."

### "ALAS! MY POOR BROTHER!"

Here below we introduce Mr. Jacobs, M.P., House of Commons, Ottawa. His remarks concerning immigration to Canada given in the House we set forth word for word from Hansard. Whether those people from London, Liverpool and Glasgow are of the Nordie race (now famous as the race mon-

opolizing all the virtues) or not we do not know. The Aryan, Alpine, Mediterranean, Nordie and others have, since the war, outdone the Anglo-Saxon in fame. The lost ten tribes of Israel had better remain in obscurity if the following is descriptive of their present supposed representatives on earth:—

"Mr. Jacobs: I will tell my hon. friend why. I do not know who those 60,000 people are, but I will venture to tell my hon. friend that most of those people are from the British Isles, gentlemen who largely do not want work. I do not say that is true of all of them, but it is true of a very large number. The hon. gentleman probably remembers the story of two Englishmen on the streets of Toronto. They were walking down Yonge street and one said to the other: "Look how happy everybody looks in this city." The other said: "Why should they not be happy? Do we not own them?" That is the view the Englishman has of Canada. He will not work himself; he wants the other fellow to do the work. The men who work in this country are the men who come from the continent of Europe and not those who come from the streets of Glasgow, Liverpool and London. They are victims of the dole. They have never done any work or wanted to do it. They are wastrels, useless, and they never should be permitted to come into this country. I am speaking, of course, of a certain type. The House will not, for a moment, think I am making an attack on the British people. I say this is true of a certain type. If you will analyze each and every one of these cases, you will find that many had an opportunity to go to work, but would not go. We see them in our country and in other places. Every man who comes to this country and who is ready and willing to work, can find work to do. That is why those people who come from continental Europe, ignorant of our language and of our customs, are able to find work. They are willing to put their hands to do anything. That is why they are a better element in the community than those whose only qualification is that they can talk English and think they own this country."

### THE ISLAND STRIKE.

After a delay of eight or nine months the coal owners of Vancouver Island have succeeded in arriving at the point where they have been able to press their hope for a bonus reduction of sixty cents per day to the point where they consider themselves well enough stocked with coal supplies to squeeze the miners into the usual groove of starvation and defeat. Nearly a year ago the miners declined a similar cut but the owners were not yet ready. Now they suppose themselves to be ready. Mainly, the situation covers the local field in the domestic coal trade, although the world's coal production has its long distance bearing.

We are interested in the fact that after twelve or thirteen years operations without any effective union in the Vancouver coal area the miners have shown that they are not to be crushed without effort in the maintenance of the wage standard. It is too soon yet to forecast the result. If the situation were to be gauged in the likelihood of success for the miners from the angle of present world coal production and sale of coal then the outlook for the miners would be dark. However, Vancouver Island mining conditions are more fortuitously set through geographical isolation and other factors strong enough to warrant hope for a win.

### THE SOCIALIST INDICTMENT.

The Socialist indictment of the Capitalist system of industry, and the society based upon it, has four main counts.

History proves that, whilst national poverty may have other causes, whenever and whatever the greater part of the population is divorced from the ownership of production, even where the aggregate population is relatively enormous, the bulk of the people live in penury, and large numbers of them are perpetually threatened by starvation.

In the second place, this penury and its accompanying insecurity are rendered more hideous and

humiliating by the relative comfort and luxury of the proprietary class and by the shameless filthiness of some of its members.

The worst circumstance of Capitalism is, however, neither the poverty of the wage-earner nor the luxury of the property-owners, but, thirdly, the glaring inequality in personal freedom between the propertyless man and the member of the class that lives by owning. Hour by hour, day by day, year in and year out, the two-thirds of the nation who depend for their daily or weekly housekeeping for gaining access to the instruments of production find themselves working under the orders of the relatively restricted class of those who own those instruments. The sanction for the orders is not legal punishment, but, ultimately, a starvation which is supposed to be optional. That is meant by the wage-earners when they complain of "wage slavery."

Fourthly, the Socialist believes that the very basis of the capitalist system is scientifically unsound, as a means of organizing the production and distribution of commodities and services, and fundamentally inconsistent with the spiritual advancement of the race.—Sidney and Beatrice Webb.

### TO OUR FRIENDLY CRITICS

**E**VERY now and then we observe the labor press of the City of Vancouver to be worrying itself over the activities or inactivity of the Canadian Labor Party. What work has already been done, we gather from those comments, might have been more effectively done, and what has been left undone might have been done if the Socialist Party of Canada would jump in and lend a hand. That being given in a just and complimentary fashion our quarrelsome disposition is held somewhat under restraint, at any rate for the time.

Now in these comments in the labor press to which we refer we find some very truthful records of the events of recent years in working class political circles in British Columbia, besides some records otherwise that would come to no harm if amended or rounded out to fuller explanation but, on the whole, their records are not in very serious error in so far as bare events are concerned.

However, the mere record of events lacks substance if there is no effort made towards analysis of those events. The several authors of the articles in question are fairly well known in spite of the anonymity attempted in some cases and, generally, we find them to have been members of our own party in past days whereby they are able to speak of our party history intimately. In the case of one contributor's detail concerning the decline of our party influence and importance we find no explanation given as to why he himself left our ranks long years ago nor why, now that he returns to working class political activity, he does not return to the same camp. By this we do not mean that he has no such reason good and sufficient in his own eyes, but simply that he does not set it forth. Up to date our friendly critics have told us that we have been split asunder, or that the workers who in past times paid attention to us have now largely deserted us, and we are left to assume that they themselves are but following that example. There is left to us the imputation that so long as we persist in existing as a working class political party, without identification with the Canadian Labor Party, we are therefore frustrating complete working class political unity—in short, a sort of red herring which may be the means of leading the mass up a trail allegedly too narrow to follow.

We have had within our ranks in past years plenty of differing opinion and we have it now, but while reasons aplenty have arisen within our own ranks as to why we should change our policies and why we should not, we should like to see our friendly critics continue their articles setting forth the reasons they have for being where they are and what they consider the important factors that have caused them to now assume a position they once derided. In what respect were they wrong heretofore or were they right heretofore and right now? Like the Japanese schoolboy "we ask to know"—and that in full confidence.

# The Concept of Value

By F. W. THOMPSON

McNey and I have disagreed on certain points in Marxian economics; and McNey concludes our disagreement is proof that Marx's mode of presenting his theories is not a clear one. Since Marx labored diligently, going down into details, to make these points clear, and since McNey and I and a multitude of others have striven to understand them and yet disagree, his conclusion is very well founded. But he might well have gone one step further and asked himself: "What fundamentally is that mode of presentation?" That's what I'm going to take up here.

First, what ideas was Marx trying to present? These: (1) Modern capitalism developed from mercantilism through certain material causes, mainly improvements in the industrial arts that necessitated social production. (2) The essential condition of capitalism is the polarization of two-classes—a working class owning no means of production and a class that does own those means. (3) Definite forces regulate the quantity of wealth produced by the working class and the quantity that accrues to them as wages, and thereby the quantity that remains as surplus for the owning class. (4) All rent, interest and profit, all "unearned increment" is, in its total, equal to, and entirely derived from, this surplus; and is not a mysterious accretion acquired in the exchange of goods or in the "rendering of service." (5) This surplus is divided among the owning class by a definite, but intricate, interplay of forces, through the mechanism of ordinary business transactions. (6) The consequent accumulation of wealth, along with the constant improvement of the industrial arts, necessitates the spread of the capitalist mode of production to all phases of production and to all corners of the earth. This process, frequently violent, subjugates and finally eliminates the less powerful among the owning classes; centralizes ownership into fewer hands and perfects the organization of ownership; and renders more perfect the polarization of capitalist society into its two essential classes. (7) This exploitation of the wage-earner provides a conflict of interest between worker and capitalist, manifested by a continuous struggle that grows more keen as the development of the system makes the workers conscious that it is to their class interest to produce for their own use and benefit instead of for the capitalist's benefit.

This conflict becomes especially keen as the accumulation and expansion of capital approaches its saturation point—a condition accompanied by almost continuous crises throughout capitalist society. (8) This struggle will finally become a struggle of the workers to make their own class dominant to deprive the capitalist class of their coercive or governmental power, replacing it by coercive powers over society vested in their own class through its suitable organization, thereby establishing a new social order whose nature is determined by the material conditions furnished by capitalism, foremost of which is efficient social production.

This, with the facts relating to production and exchange voluminously elaborated, is what fills Marx's ponderous tomes. It is an historic process that could surely have been written up with very few abstractions. But such is not Marx's mode of presentation. He starts off with a highly abstract, a priori, philosophic analysis of the exchange of goods, and, pronto, issues the hypothesis, current in his day, that there is a shadowy something underlying price namely value. The rest of the work, apart from those oases, the historical portions, is an ingenious elaboration of every conclusion that mental gymnastics can draw from the assumption that there is such a thing as Value, and that it is determined by socially necessary labor. In that, Marx's mode of presentation, with which McNey finds fault, is, at bottom, the very point at issue, namely

the concept of value. I started this discussion by contending and, I think, proving that the concept of value is "an unnecessary, metaphysical concept." The matter in Marx's works could have been presented without using the concept of value at all. This concept of value has been mistaken almost constantly for the substance of Marxism when, in fact, it is but the clothes that body of ideas wears on the more academic occasions. McNey brushes my contention that the concept of value is metaphysical aside; and says never a word on the more important contention that it is unnecessary—but concedes it, without realizing it, by finding fault with Marx's mode of presentation.

What is there about this concept of value that makes it a poor mode of presentation, a hindrance to economic science? Value is a criterion or standard by which we compare things, to be listed along with such criteria as mass, beauty, volume, truth, duration, etc. These criteria are very important for all reasoning is at bottom a comparison of things, and to be compared things must be measurable and commensurable. The progress of science is marked by the introduction of exact measures for every aspect of the physical world we live in; and these measures are an indispensable condition to modern science. On the other hand, such criteria as "the good, the true, the beautiful" cannot be listed as scientific despite their importance. Why? Because they are not capable of exact measurement. And why? Because they are subjective, dependent on viewpoint, while all scientific standards are strictly objective.

The concept of value cannot be a scientific criterion unless it is strictly objective, and it certainly isn't. As conceived by the utilitarians it is admitted to be a subjective consideration. The labor theory that makes the value of goods due to the difficulty of producing or acquiring them, is clearly subjective. Marx polished this concept a bit by the restriction "socially necessary human labor"—a vague term that covers a multitude of things (cf. Capital vol. I, p. 120). But how can a bit of polishing change a subjective criterion into an objective one? If a bee were a Marxist it would value honey according to the socially necessary bee labor required for its production; but the human Marxist values honey according to the human labor required to steal it from the bee—for obvious subjective reasons. But it must be admitted that the necessary bee labor affects price through, and only through, its effect on the quantity of honey produced and on the cost of producing it. The labor of a mule is no more a value determining factor than is the work of a gasoline tractor; but the labor of its wage-slave skinner is held to be a peculiar "value-determining substance" for all he is as much an enslaved animal as the mule and as thoroughly exploited as the bee; and the capitalist appropriates his labor along with the mules just as the farmer appropriates the bee's honey. And what becomes of the objectivity of the labor concept of value in a predatory society? Did pirate peoples value different goods according to how hard it was to produce them, or according to how hard it was to get them? And does human labor have any further effect on prices in the present predatory system than the labor of other exploited animals—i.e. any further effect than that caused by its effect on the quantity of different goods produced and on the cost of producing them? The answer is—and Marx gives it—"No."

The conclusion is that the criterion of values is subjective and hence a hindrance to economic science—a hindrance that has frittered away many a proletarian's thought on useless mental gymnastics—a hindrance that has stopped the working class from developing an economic science serviceable as a guide to its activities.

# What is Capital?

By MARK STARR

"If you give a Scotsman a drink, that is Capital; to get him to give you one, that is Labor." Thus the comedian on a difference.

But according to the late Lord Leverhulme, "Adam's spade was his capital."

Sis Hugh Bell, the coal and iron master, has a similar notion, for he insists that the man who practised abstinence from immediate satisfaction and shaped the first flint was the first capitalist.

The little "Pay-Day Talks" distributed by the employers urge that "Capital is money usefully employed." Lady Astor has bubbled nonsense about the capitalist saving us from the "dark wild road."

Lord Birkenhead has repeated the assertion that capital is savings.

"One-room," "Dole-for-Bad-employers" Alf told the House of Commons in the debate on Socialism that "the shovel of an agricultural laborer, the tools of a fitter or a carpenter are capital."

Obviously these definitions are defences of the right of the capitalist to continue his rule, and they try to rally the short-sighted frugal Workers, blind to any larger good, because of their endangered capital, "their little all."

Capital is however essentially different from savings and means of production. Both can become capital, as a sewing needle can become a death dealing instrument.

But it is not a matter of argument—it is a matter of arithmetic to prove that a man cannot become rich by his own efforts. Adam if he had saved £3 a week for 50 weeks a year during 6,000 years would still have £100,000 to collect before he owned one solitary million.

One orthodox professor, Hadley, is frank enough about the start of capital, for he says that "capital originated in robbery," which is unkind to those thrifty and bairny ones of the Leverhulme-Bell fancy.

Even if we granted an initial honest acquirement, there is a vital difference between money put away in a stocking and money used to buy shares which yield the interest year by year, and still remains undiminished to the end of capitalist time. An idiot or an infant can be a capitalist if left sufficient shares.

Capital implies demand over Labor and its exploitation. The would-be capitalist who shipped his means of production and workpeople to a virgin country found that out when they deserted him to start on their own.

Just as a stick cannot exist without two ends, so capital is impossible without a working class forced to sell its labor-power in order to live.

In the sense that the dead hand of past accumulated wealth will be lifted from the shoulders of living labor, we hope to destroy capital and its integral exploitation.

As for "destroying" it in the ordinary sense—well, in Germany they destroyed the relation of monarch and subject without hurting a Hohenzollern hair. The present relation of capital and labor can also be abolished without hurting one spindle or one locomotive.

Money will not be able to become capital any longer. Out of the product will be set aside the funds needed to rebuild and extend the means of production used for exploitation no more. Social needs will rule instead of profit considerations.

## A DANIEL COME TO JUDGMENT

"It is quite true that the land monopoly is not the only monopoly which exists, but it is by far the greatest of monopolies—it is a perpetual monopoly. It is quite true that unearned increments in land are not the only form of unearned or undeserved profit which individuals are able to secure; but it is the principal form of unearned increment which is derived from processes which are not beneficial, but which are positively detrimental to the general public.  
Rt. Hon. Winston Churchill, Edinburgh, 17th July, 1909.

# The Birth of Modern Capitalism

By F. W. MOORE

A tragedy in three acts, being the 1851-16 annual report on progress by Satan at the congress of princes of the infernal regions subsidiary to the planets Venus, Earth, and Mars.

## Dramatis Personae

Satan, King of the infernal regions.  
 Beelzebub, Prince of devils.  
 Madame Capital, daughter of Pluto.  
 Mr. Reactionary, an alias of Beelzebub.  
 Mr. and Mrs. Trust, relations of Madame Capital.  
 Miss Credit, daughter of Mephisto.  
 Midas, whose touch turns everything into gold.  
 Mr. Ed. U. Kashion, the intermundane wizard of educational jugglery.  
 Miss Kashion, his sister, who is powerful in the educational circles of the nether world.  
 Archbishop Churchianity, primate of the universe and diabolical moulder of ecclesiastical thought.  
 Miss Churchianity, his daughter, cousin of Beelzebub.  
 Madame Eve O'Lution, who hurls her anathemas at the whole crowd.

## Act I. Scene 1.

Satan, addressing the princes of Hell.

Your Royal Highnesses, ladies and gentlemen, on rising to present you with the report on progress concerning the temptations of men for the years 1815-16 I have great pleasure in announcing the fact that in it is recorded the most phenomenal success of our numerous infernal organizations situated respectively on the planets Venus and Mars (we shall refer to Earth later) so that with machine guns, poison gas, liquid flames and disease germs, men did periodically slaughter their fellows by the million to our great and endless amusement; also, that various foul and loathsome diseases, which were universally prevalent hitherto, have within the last five years increased 40%, and that, evidently, owing to your unexampled ability in leading men astray; furthermore, that apart from these misfortunes, the circumstances attending their daily round of toil, have forced a state of misery and wretchedness that is well calculated to retard the normal evolution of the race. We all know that there are myriads of unrecorded instances of penury and starvation directly attributable to anarchy in production, of which you are the patron deities; yet I warn you that our day is fast drawing to a close, and that if these crazy humans get to understand the potential benefits involved in international brotherhood, our game will straightway be ended. Therefore, you will make most of your time and delay that dreadful possibility by every means in your power. When you have done this, it will be diabolically impossible to do more.

There is, however, one section of the solar system whose tempter has not furnished those thrills that up to the present have been characteristic of his past operations: his deviltries have become monotonous, stale, flat, and unprofitable. There is no doubt that innocent young fiends just imported by St. Peter, might be tempted to laugh at the screams of burning victims of Central African witch-doctors, or smile at the crude attempts of wholesale homicide in the Napoleonic wars. They might even enjoy the pathetic sight of a few thousand women champions of nationalism weeping their weary hours away because their sons and husbands were killed in vindicating the principles that their wives and mothers advocated. There is a certain amount of attraction for them in assassinations, intrigues, subornations, unnatural vices, or political charlatany but you all know that such trifling offences pall on experienced devils and are only fit amusement for our tender-hearted female friends—Beelzebub! hast thou not charge of that circuit in which is situated the planet Terra, and hast thou not monotonously continued thine unimproved temptations for a thousand years at least? Dost thou not think it is high

time to look to thy reputation lest, peradventure, it be our disagreeable duty to appoint a more worthy specimen of a damned soul to thy place?

Beelzebub: Sire, the homogeneity of my deviltry on Terra over so long a period, has not been altogether satisfactory even to myself: indeed, I had already begun to be tired of watching the wretched antics of burning witches and dying warriors; to such an extent was this the case that I have already planned the introduction of a system of race torture that for remorseless and relentless persecution is bound to please the most fastidious imp that ever breathes the flames of hell. But, blast it all, Your Highness, I cannot resist the logical conclusion that if I put it in force, we shall, as our Shakespeare used to say, "get hoist with our own petard;" nevertheless, I am inclined to trust to chance to kill its good, and foster its bad effect since, in the evil involved, we shall have a couple of centuries, more or less, of diversion that will make our oldest torturers, whom long use has rendered nonchalant, once more experience that old-time joy in life; once more make the welkin ring with roars of Mephistophelean laughter.

Satan: Art thou sure Beelzebub that too much heat hath not unduly expanded thy brain—Of what nature is this race torture?

Beelzebub: It will, Your Highness, be inflicted by a woman with whom I am madly infatuated, Madame Capital by name, although, to tell the truth my affections are not reciprocated. She loves, in a very materialistic way, one Mammon, who is to me a very dear friend; therefore, I am not jealous. It is a case of the eternal triangle, with this difference, that each one can indulge his or her passion without in the least being conscious of any offence to the other.

Satan: Has this lady passed over the Styx, or is she still on Terra?

Beelzebub: That's just it, Your Highness, She's a Terrestrial, and therefore only a child, although a very apt child in what on Terra they call "committing sin." That is to me her chief attraction. I shall be enraptured with her acts merely with what I can tempt her to do to her fellow humans.

The object of her love, on the other hand is a real personage—a world-famed regal procurer by the name of Mammon to whom millions of the human race will sell their souls and prostitute their individualities until all are debased sufficiently to tolerate the presidency of my sweetheart as a grand Madame in the tenderloin environment of a mechanical world.

Satan: Ha, ha, ha, h-a-a-a-a-a—I get you. The word "mechanical" is intensely expressive, you fiery old fossil. It was just such a system that was incidental to the marvelous success of the diabolical operations on Mars and Venus referred to in my opening address. There is danger to it, as you say, but keep the people economically ignorant; keep them interested in Latin or Greek; in history especially—history that is a defecation of kings and generals. Get books on political economy written, but make them as inexplicable as a Chinese puzzle and you have a basis for cycles of the most interesting fiend-craft imaginable. (Exit Satan and princes)

Beelzebub (alone) Well, well, well, I certainly made a hit that time—"a very palatable hit" as my old friend Shakespeare used to say. I must now bid me hence and indulge my fiendish longing for an interview with Madame Capital.

## Act I. Scene 2

Exit Beelzebub, who next appears at the office of Madame Capital who knows him under the name of "Reactionary."

"Delighted to see you," was her greeting in response to the butler's announcement.

Mr. Reactionary (taking a chair), I just dropped in to talk to you about our old friend, Madame Eve O'Lution.

Madame Capital: Oh I detest that talkative woman!

Reactionary: How delightful so do I. She's a dangerous person, well known and feared by our comrades on Mars and Venus. She not only inspires capitalists to introduce machinery on a large scale but fills the workers on these machines with the idea that to avoid anarchy in production they must eventually own them. She demonstrates to their satisfaction that competition, which is inevitable and incessant, must eventually thrust the ownership of the earth into the hands of a few monopolists.

This, she continues, ought to be the grand condition looked forward to by capitalists and socialists alike: "for," says she, "on the day that the wealth of the world is concentrated in sufficiently few hands to induce universal hardships through unemployment, or to constitute a constant menace of disastrous war, the hour has struck for the birth of the new social order."

Thus did Madame Eve O'Lution analyse the future of capitalism, and I cannot, without stultifying my powers of reasoning, deny the scientific value of her statements.

Do you know that industry gets developed, and ever larger trusts emerge from the process, that labour must necessarily become socialized? Do you know that the skilled mechanic must be reduced to the level of the common labourer?

Do you know that the term "common labourer" must necessarily embrace women and children who can attend to certain kinds of machinery just as efficiently as the strongest men?

And, lastly, do you know that the whole class of laborers will be reduced by the necessity of mechanical development, to one common level of social importance? They are, even now, awakening to a consciousness of their class position in society. It is up to us to use every means in our power to keep them in the dreamland of fancy which has been their heritage for generations.

Miss Capital: But how can we work such a miracle?

Reactionary: Oh, that's easy. Get more complete control of the schools, the pulpit, and the press, and the world will be ours for a long time to come. No institution can exist now-a-days without money, and our class, Miss Capital, knows no scarcity of that.

Miss Capital: Mr. Reactionary, you are a genius. The logic of the situation will appeal to the whole commercial world.

## Act II.

Afternoon tea at the bishop's palace, seated in the drawingroom are: Mr. and Mrs. Trust, Miss Capital, Mr. Reactionary, Mr. Ed. U. Kashion, Bishop Churchianity and Miss Credit.

Miss Capital addressing Mr. Trust, talking about the feeling of separateness that is beginning to evince itself amongst factory hands; this "class consciousness" as the Reds are in the habit of putting it, is a mental disease due to suggestions from the radical element that is present in small numbers in all factories. We must save the people from insidious doctrines of that kind, and there is only one way we can save them: We must influence them mentally, just as the Reds do.

Mr. Trust: But surely we owe it to the position of our patrons in society to avoid making it necessary for them to expose themselves on soap-boxes.

Miss Capital: Oh dear, yes; there is no need to oblige them to forfeit their dignity in that ungainly manner. We must control the press, the schools, and the pulpit. We must train the mass-mind and create in it our own special psychology. We must adjust our ethical standards to the exigencies of modern industrial development.

This will not be so difficult as it at first appears since the common people prefer our bourgeois papers to their own and that being so the natural thing

(Continued on page 5)

## Trotsky's Point of View

By LEON TROTSKY

The Russian working class will have to do constructive work for its own benefit and for its own plan.

This historic plan, though still extremely imperfect and muddled, will connect all parts and particles of the work, all its ins and outs, by the unity of a vast creative conception.

All our separate and mighty problems—Soviet retail trade included—are part of the general plan which will enable the ruling working class to overcome its economic weakness and lack of culture.

In dealing with the vast problems rising every day our economically inexperienced working-class will have to hold a plastic point of view, here standing on the principles of Socialism, there fighting its battles, occasionally retreating in order to recoup, on certain occasions even temporarily yielding one or two; always keeping in mind that the ultimate goal can only be reached through a series of forward marches, being prepared to fall back for strategic reasons.

### Lenin's Program

This is the meaning of the now famous new economic policy introduced by Lenin during the latter part of his administration.

Amid all the ups and downs, amid all the errors and retreats, amid all the intricacies of the new economic policy, the Soviet republic will carry its plan educating the young generation of Russia in the spirit of it, teaching everyone to co-ordinate their private aims with the one problem of all, which may one day call on them to sew on a Soviet button and the next—meet death fearlessly under the banner of Communism.

I have been called a heretic because I demanded serious and thorough training for our young people to save them from the great defect of the present generalities, constantly repeating the old songs which we had to sing before the resolution instead of searching after knowledge and skill, in order to serve a common purpose that would be grasped by everyone—work and create.

Now, what were these views which brought about my withdrawal from active participation in the affairs of Russia?

It was not on the Soviet aims that we disagreed. It was on question of methods. What were these methods?

In the pre-revolutionary days, and even during the early days of the government, it was necessary to harp on politics and political propaganda. Politics then was a means to an end. Party literature and party propaganda were all conducted through politics, for politics ruled everything.

But there came a time in the life of the successful Soviet republic when it was necessary to fulfill some of the aspirations so widely talked about before the revolution. We had power, we had the mighty machinery of organization, and we had the government.

Government is only a machinery for an end. The politics advocated for the seizing of that machinery must be plastic after the victory.

An army attacking a beleaguered city uses a certain method of attack, but once the city is captured, if the same method is still employed it becomes plunder.

My colleagues were too dogmatic. I believed that our political policy should be flexible, for changed times bring changed tunes.

So I intimated that, now that the revolution had won the victory, we must change our party tactics, for we could not live by politics alone.

I maintained that, in its practical realization, the revolution had drifted to all sorts of problems.

There was the problem of finances; the problem of repairing bridges; the problem of teaching people how to read and write; of lowering the cost of boots in Soviet factories; fighting against filth; catching thieves; installing electric power in country districts; how to sew on Soviet buttons, and instructing people on the necessity of taking weekly baths.

In other words, I advocated that we talk a little less and do a little more work, because now that the revolution was a reality its security lay in hard work and acquisition of culture.

### THE RACE MYTH CRUMBLES

(Continued from page 3)

ern Africa and Spain. The contrary view has become popular solely because of the grotesquely misleading nature of our conventional textbooks on medieval history, which concentrate their attention, almost without exception, upon the Christian culture of Northwestern Europe during the medieval period. The Moslem culture was, of course, entirely non-Nordic, and there was but a small Nordic minority among the peoples that maintained the Byzantine culture to the final conquest by the Turks in the middle of the fifteenth century. Even the civilization and institutions of medieval Europe in the West, as Jullian, Fustel, and others have proved during the last generation, took their departure, not from the crude and primitive Teutonic institutions of the Goths or Franks, but rather from the Nordic appropriation and assimilation of the Gallo-Romanic culture of Italy and Roman Gaul. Even in a political and military sense no strong case can be made for Nordic supremacy during the medieval period. The strongest national monarchies of the Middle Ages were those of France and England, while the Holy Roman Empire remained throughout the medieval era a loose and weak organization. We now know that medieval France was predominantly non-Nordic, and that the non-Nordic element was certainly as large as the Nordic in medieval England, which was not "swept clean" of the Celts during the Germanic invasions.

The facts of history constitute more of an indictment of the political ability of the Nordics than a demonstration of their unusual capacity in this field. The most striking political organizations of early modern Europe were the despotisms of Spain and Bourbon France, while the Central European and Scandinavian countries remained politically backward and loosely organized. The Germanic states continued as the "weak sister" in the political family of Europe down to the period of Bismarck's statesmanship following 1860. If one were to accept for a minute the thesis of the racial determination in politics, European history since the fall of the Roman Empire would constitute about as effective a case as one could hope to erect for the relative political incapacity of these very Nordics, whose unique political force and subtlety has been argued by the whole school of writers from Droysen and the Maurers to Stubbs, Freeman, Fiske, Herbert Baxter Adams, and Burgess. Of course, the sane historian will disregard the racial interpretation of political history as a whole, and understand that, in all probability, the political backwardness of Germany was caused by certain specific historical situations and accidents of an ecclesiastical, geographic, and economic type.

In the case of England and our own country the race myth has been that variant of the Nordic obsession known as the "Anglo-Saxon Myth." It was based essentially upon the contention that most of the unique political virtue of the Nordics migrated from Germany with the Angles, Saxons, Jutes, and Danes, and took up its abode among the Nordic immigrants to the British Isles, who were supposed to have cleared this area of the fickle and decadent Celts. The American version of the Anglo-Saxon

myth contended that the best in the Anglo-Saxon political genius likewise left the British Isles during the period of the colonization of America. It came to fruition in the township government of New England and, on a larger scale, in the Federal Republic established in 1787. The researches of physical anthropologists and cultural historians have demonstrated both the racial and institutional fallacies in this theory. England, after the Germanic conquests, remained certainly as much non-Nordic as Nordic. The United States has been from the colonial period a most mixed population. Finally, most of the institutions which are looked upon as primarily "Anglo-Saxon" were in few cases derived from Germany at all, but have been the result of the interaction of various historic forces and situations more or less uniquely English or American.

It is scarcely necessary to call attention to the manner in which the demonstrable racial mixture in the historic nations of Europe rules out as utterly impossible the thesis of the racial determination of European history. Even if we were to grant, for example, that the culture of Germany or the culture of France is unique and the product of a definite racial basis, shall we assign this culture, in the case of France to the Nordics of the Northeast, the Alpines of the Central portion, or the Mediterraneans of the South; or, in the case of Germany, is her culture primarily the product of the Nordics in the North or the Alpines in the South? That there is no basis whatever for the assumption of Jewish racial unity or purity to give aid and comfort to either Zionists or anti-Semites was admirably shown by Professor Roland B. Dixon in the article which he contributed a couple of years back to The Nation's series on the Jewish problem. Even if we could feel sure which we certainly cannot, that there is any important relationship between race and culture, the hopeless mixture of European races since the Neolithic period would, then, most assuredly brand as nonsense any attempt at a racial interpretation of the history of the various European states. This fact can probably best be driven home by a concrete illustration. There is no better one than the following summary by Karl Pearson of the racial heredity of Charles Darwin, long pointed to as physically and mentally a typical Englishman:

He is descended in four different lines from Irish kinglets; he is descended in as many lines from Scottish and Pictish kings. He has Manx blood. He claims descent in at least three lines from Alfred the Great, and so links up with Anglo-Saxon blood, but he links up also in several lines with Charlemagne and the Carolingians. He sprang also from the Saxon emperors of Germany, as well as from Barbarossa and the Hohenstaufens. He had Norwegian blood and much Norman blood. He had descent from the dukes of Bavaria, of Saxony, of Flanders, the princes of Savoy, and the kings of Italy. He had the blood in his veins of Franks, Alamans, Merovingians, Burgundians, and Longobards. He sprang in direct descent from the Hun rulers of Hungary and the Greek emperors of Constantinople. If I recollect rightly, Ivan the Terrible provides a Russian link. There is probably not one of the races of Europe concerned in folk-wanderings which has not had a share in the ancestry of Charles Darwin. If it has been possible in the case of one Englishman of this kind to show in a considerable number of lines how impure is his race, can we venture to assert that if the like knowledge were possible of attainment, we could expect greater purity of blood in any of his countrymen?

—The Nation, (N. Y.)

## MANIFESTO

of the  
SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA  
(Fifth Edition)

Per copy..... 10 cents

Per 25 copies..... 25

Post Paid.

THE BIRTH OF MODERN CAPITALISM

(Continued from page 6)

to do is to try and control the editor.

Mr. Trust: But I understand that those editors are sensitive and proud and dislike being dictated to by mere businessmen.

Miss Capital: Quite so, Mr. Trust, but it is not really a matter of dictation, but rather of commercial life or death. No editor could expect a man to continue advertising in a paper that carried adverse criticism of his product; moreover, the profits of a paper come almost wholly from the advertisements, and even an editor as such, cannot exist without profits. An editor, therefore, must eat out of our hands. I don't consider him in the least bit formidable.

Mr. Trust: The truth of your remarks are self-evident. I can see we need not worry about the editors, but we still need the support of our schools and colleges. Perhaps, Mr. Kashion would give us his opinion on the subject.

Mr. Ed. U. Kashion: Well, to tell you the truth, in speaking for the educators in general: that is for the immense throng of Terrestrians whose mental outlook under Beelzebub I am supposed to supervise, I might say that nearly all of them from the University professor to the nursery governess imagine quite falsely, like the great majority of their fellow-citizens, that they are living in an atmosphere of freedom notwithstanding the fact that they have absolutely nothing to say in determining the attitude that institutions of learning should adopt towards the state schools are necessarily capitalistic institutions just as they used to be feudalistic and will, in the future, be socialistic.

The selections of our educators for positions of responsibility is directly or indirectly in the hands of the wealthy. It is, for instance, no uncommon occurrence, at least in that part of the earth called the new world, to see the executive heads of the school system come and go with the changing fortunes of the bourgeoisie political parties which are themselves returned to power by means of a generous supply of campaign funds. How often do we see men like the well-known Professor Gearing forced to relinquish his duties at a series of universities on account of his logical, if somewhat radical views on international relations: indeed there is no need to accept or retain the services of a teacher who does not appreciate the blessings of our glorious civilization. Is that not so Your Lordship?

Bishop Churchianity: The word "blessings" Mr. Kashion, is well chosen and highly suggestive.

I am delighted to be associated with so loyal a champion of our civilization. Loyalty is a peril of great price now-a-days. I remember the time when a youth did actually submit himself "lowly and reverently to all his betters": as a matter of fact he does so today, but not in so lowly and reverent a manner. The same betters somewhat modified, of course, exist, but we find it convenient in the face of the growing development of class consciousness amongst the poor, to conceal the fact: moreover, Providence, in his unbounded mercy has provided for the submission of the lowly by the creation of a law called "Economic Necessity" whose beneficent effect may be noted everywhere in mercifully restraining the minds of the masses when they try to wander wantonly across the metaphorical rubicon that it has pleased the Almighty, in his infinite wisdom to allow the pillars of society representing the powers behind the schools, the pulpit, and the press, to erect around them. The influence of these men is paramount at present, and with that fact uppermost in our minds there is every reason why we should all be happy and optimistic. Nevertheless, the benefits accruing from the control exercised over the minds of the poor, are in part negated by practical inefficiency due to imperfect coalescence of the factors used in their exploitation.

Mr. Kashion: Am I to gather from your remarks that you consider the schemes for the subjugation of the mass-mind are inadequate?

(To be continued.)

CORRESPONDENCE

MICA, MICA, PARVA STELLA

Editor Clarion:

I considered our discussion re tactics to be finished three months ago, but notice in the last issue of the Clarion that J. H., indulges in some futile sharp shooting in order to resuscitate the argument. His attempt is hopeless. There is too much demand for real work in the revolutionary movement for me to dissipate my energy exchanging compliments with one who has neither the temerity to debate nor the common sense to keep quiet when he has nothing to say.

J. H.'s last contribution is surely a convincing example of intellectual deterioration. Scarcely a statement worthy of attention in the whole article. He rents about my reference to the Prime Ministers of Britain, and thinks he has scored a point when he discovers that Lords Bute and North preceded the machine age. What if they did? My explanation could utilize the names of Russell, Derby, Peel, etc., just as well as the ones mentioned. It was an illustration to make plain the fact that all of them represented certain definite ruling class interests in much the same way as Lloyd George and Ramsay MacDonald.

J. H.'s superficial injection anent what Palmerston said to Victoria, or what Victoria said to Palmerston, or what both of these worthies said to Mrs. Grundy is of no interest to me. It might find a responsive chord in "Felix Penne," or a fifth grade school boy, but has little importance to a student of history.

His reiteration of the revolutionary character of S. P. of C. propaganda can be taken for what it is worth. I have it on good authority that the S. P. of C. conducts nothing in the nature of either lectures or classes in Vancouver, at present, or for a long time past. The publication of the Clarion once a month appears to be the chief item of propaganda left. As to the clarity of the Clarion I will leave that to the judgment and conclusion of our readers.

This discussion is now closed so far as I am concerned. There is much more profitable material to be attended to. Our case for a continuation of the old S. P. of C. policy has been presented in all essential phases. Comrades "R." Lester, "F. C." Inglis and others have greatly assisted in making clear the issue to Clarion readers. This is all we can do at present.

Yours for Socialism,

J. A. McDonald.

San Francisco, Calif.

HERE AND NOW

Following \$1 each: D. MacLeod, E. Simpson, A. Manson, Alex. Shepherd, K. MacLeod, P. J. Hunt, H. A. Gilchrist.

Following \$2 each: J. Pedley, E. Antijuntti, R. Heilingher.

Jack Shepherd \$4.

Above, Clarion subs. received from May 1 to 31, inclusive, total \$17.

CLARION MAINTENANCE FUND

Following \$2 each: J. Pedley, M. Gulton, H. J. B. Harper.

St. John Comrades, for March and April (per S. E. White) \$11.25; R. Heilingher \$3; Jack Shepherd \$31.

Above, C. M. F. receipts from May 1 to 31, inclusive, total \$51.25.

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 .....

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.

Literature Price List

	Cloth Bound.	Per Copy
Revolution and Counter Revolution (Marx)	.....	\$1.15
Ancient Society	.....	1.85
Capitalist Production (First Nine and 32 Chapters "Capital," vol. 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
Germs of Mind in Plants	.....	80c
The Triumph of Life	.....	80c
Social Revolution (Kautsky)	.....	80c
Essays on Materialist Conception of History (Labriola)	.....	1.50
Social Studies (Lafargue)	.....	80c
<b>Paper Covers.</b>		
Evolution of Man (Prof. Bâche)	.....	20c
Wage-Labor and Capital	.....	10c
Independent Working Class Education	.....	10c
Communist Manifesto	.....	10c
The Present Economic System (Prof. W. A. Beager)	.....	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 (Lœckle)	.....	25c
Civil War in France (Marx)	.....	25c

All prices include postage.  
Christianism and Communism (Bishop W. M. Brown) 25c  
Quantity Rates on Paper Covered Pamphlets.  
Two Essays on History 25 copies 75c  
Communist Manifesto 25 copies \$2.00  
Wage-Labor and Capital 25 copies \$1.50  
Present Economic System 25 copies \$1.50  
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific 25 copies \$2.25  
Slave of the Farm 25 copies \$1.50  
Manifesto of S. P. of C. 25 copies \$1.50  
Evolution of Man 25 copies \$1.75  
Causes of Belief in God 25 copies \$1.50  
Value, Price and Profit 25 copies \$1.50  
Economic Causes of War 25 copies \$1.50  
Christianism and Communism 25 copies \$1.50  
Make all orders payable to E. MacLeod, P. O. Box 710, Vancouver, B. C. Add amount in cheques.