

WESTERN CLARION

Official Organ of

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

A Journal
CURRENT
EVENTS

No. 908

TWENTIETH YEAR.

Twice a Month

VANCOUVER, B.C., FEBRUARY 1, 1924

FIVE CENTS

Revolutions, Social and Political

By J. Harrington

Article Twenty-one.

THE defeat of Austria in 1866 was of course the defeat of France. Napoleon had calculated on a long drawn out war, which would leave him master of Europe. Napoleon and the group of financiers and industrialists who surrounded him and depended upon him for whatever advantages they possessed, were afflicted by that terrible mental malady which, to the average man, furnishes a shelter from the evils of life, into which he may withdraw, but which to the statesman is fatal: the childlike faculty for sincere acting: Deadwood Dick, or the mother of a large family, as the case may be. The average man may withdraw and dream in safety; there is no one to follow him as he dreams, for instance, of capturing at one fell stroke the powers of state, and revolutionizing forthwith the property basis of society. The fact that he has to snoop around back street halls "decked in a dim religious light"; that his ratio to the rest of the population can scarcely be represented by figures, that not one of his associates has the slightest knowledge of warfare, nor the remotest chance of obtaining even the meanest tools of that art nor of even knowing the names or uses of the chief weapons and their ingredients, has but little weight with him. In those masterly maneuvers of the fireside, the opponent's strategy is either foreseen or ignored, and can be with perfect safety. But faced with the facts of life he must somehow continue to produce the means of warfare or depart in pieces. And he must meet real men, not apparitions.

Napoleon and his associates knew that war with Prussia was inevitable. Not the least peculiarity of that peculiar animal man is that he longs for peace and prepares for war, and conducts war eternally to secure it. Prepares and fights on a scale which would furnish him with everything he requires on the most lavish basis, and vastly beyond anything experience has shown he has ever gained by war. We speak, of course, of man in general. However we observe that those who make wars do not fight them, and in case of victory sometimes profit, while those who fight them never make them, and never profit from them.

Such being the fact, statesmen have always prepared by alliances to secure to their country certain advantages in case of an outbreak. The North German Confederation, then, placed France in a more precarious position than ever, and naturally would compel her to extreme action should the Palatinate and Baden bordering on her middle east frontier, and Saxony, Bavaria and Wurtemberg farther back, be joined to Prussia. Napoleon's early days were spent in South Germany. In connection with which a story is told of him and Bismarck. As a compliment to the latter's linguistic gifts Napoleon said, "I have never heard a German speak French like your excellency." "If you will permit me a similar compliment, I have never heard a Frenchman speak French like your majesty," replied Bismarck. Presuming on his German accent that his knowledge of the German people could be measured by his knowledge of their language, he proceeded to form an alliance between South Germany, Austria and France. But upon entering into negotiations with Holland for the acquisition of Luxemburg which, nominally, belonged to the Dutch

though garrisoned by Prussia, he discovered that the wily Bismarck had already a secret treaty with the South German states, which was now published. The French were quite ready to engage in war, but the matter was finally settled by a compromise, through the good offices of the Powers, and Luxemburg became a free city whose neutrality was guaranteed by the Powers. This was resented by the French, and Napoleon was pushed a step nearer war with Prussia. The formidable character of the enemy had been sufficiently emphasized by the six weeks' war with Austria even if the Danish campaign was accounted a mere skirmish. It does not appear that this was properly appreciated by the French, who had not recovered from their war spree of the early days of the century.

Bismarck estimated the task of beating the French, in the light of their history, as a very hazardous one, and spared no pains to secure himself against any alliance which France might form; and against any breach in relations until he was completely ready, and against any possibility of himself having to declare war.

We left Napoleon the proud and happy heir of his great uncle. To round out the story and fully appreciate the last chapter of this thrilling romance it will be necessary to glance at affairs in France. The Crimean War, by which he had with British aid, humiliated Russia and exalted the unspeakable Turk in 1854 and the Italian campaign of 1859 in which he had, with the Italians, defeated the dreaded Austrian Empire, gave to a name hitherto reflecting only the glory of an uncle by law, a father by repute, a lustre of its own. He became Emperor during the infancy of French railway steel and coal enterprises, and fostered these mighty children with every aid a slight and inconsequential man could lend by allowing any charlatan or swindler free access to the game. Lotteries and joint stock companies kept the Frenchmen in hope; and a sufficient number of lucky players, added to the steady growth of industrial life, amassed such fortunes, sometimes literally at a stroke, that every Parisian gamin and every tattered peasant was sizing up the real estate values and tentatively enjoying his assured but future wealth. Monte Cristo was a piker.

While far behind the phenomenal development of Prussia, France could not miss the general prosperity which steam and its progeny rained down upon Europe. But alas for the morning after! It is but a few generations since our vermin feeding, hunger driven ancestors gazed longingly at the last morsel of their scanty meal, and a couple of centuries are all too brief to develop a gastronomy capable of consuming Gargantuan feasts of capitalism. He who would hitch his wagon to a star should have regard to the banana peel on the pavement.

In the mad race for profits, railroads and industries pushed ahead of consumption, and France suffered from her gorge. The dreams that nations dream do not come true; the gamin and the peasant returned to their hopeless squalor, and turning their disillusioned eyes to the real world envisioned Napoleon and his court,—an example we can follow with profit.

Napoleon was well aware that the glamor of his conquests had gone; bold spirits were stating in bald language unpleasant facts; so bold had these

wolves become that the fold itself was invaded, an exaggerated life of Napoleon's wife was sold, to the pleasing subtitle, "Portrait and virtues of the Empress, the whole for two sou."

At this time Napoleon conceived the romantic notion of establishing an Empire in Mexico. The United States was busy preserving the Union, later described as freeing the slaves. He sought to have Europe recognise and aid the Southern States, and then by the honorable process exercised by the democratic country to our left he seized Mexico for delinquent debts, and after much deliberation, in which the fruits of the Great Napoleon's sparse leisure moments snatched from the absorbing task of conquering the world were much discussed, Maximilian, brother of Franz Joseph, was chosen to occupy the throne of Montezuma. The brothers, half brothers, cousins or whatever their illegitimate excellencies were, declined the honor. Napoleon had promised to maintain twenty-five thousand men as his new Emperor's bodyguard. But when your Uncle Samuel had settled his little trouble in the south he suggested to the Frenchmen that Paris might look good to them after so long a sojourn in foreign lands. Napoleon, perhaps with fond recollections of his uncles' army in Santo Domingo, perhaps in respect to the endearing young charms of Grant's and Stonewall Jackson's Army of the Lord, sort of regarded the suggestion seriously, and accordingly in 1867, Maximilian, left to the tender mercy of the Indian Jaurez, was shot like a dog before the walls of Queretaro, just three months after Napoleon's guard was withdrawn. It is usual at this point to moralize upon the dastardly conduct of trying an Emperor by drumhead court martial and shooting him at sunrise next day, but we exhausted our tearducts upon the sad occasion of the Czar of all the Russias' departure, and are unequal to the present task. But while it leaves us dry eyed its effect on France was tremendous, and aside from the added resentment to the Luxemburg affair, was the unwitting cause of Napoleon's eyes being put out, figuratively speaking.

Hyrviox, an extremely efficient secret service chief, whose duty it was to report truthfully what the French people said, in making his report on the feeling aroused by the betrayal of Maximilian referred to the feeling against the Austrian woman, Marie Antoinette, during the reign of Louis XVI. and said, "Now they blame it on the Spanish woman." The Empress, who was a Spaniard, came into the room at this moment and in a terrible rage expressed the desire to show them what a Spanish woman really could do. This was limited, happily for the French nation, to the removal of Hyrviox. The next chief was careful to make the truth palatable, again we might infer happily for the French. There are a number of such stories told, some richer in humor, but hardly tellable in a respectable family journal like ours, whereby the Empire was deprived of its most needed men.

Meanwhile Bismarck was ensnaring his victim in a net of diplomacy. Roon was yearly adding to his great and efficient army, and Moltke was from his army of spies planning the strategy of the war. Napoleon, dreaming of war, was indulging in adventures more to his fancy in the forest of Campiegne. Here he indulged the French taste of fetes

(Continued on page 8)

By the Way

MORE than anything else it seems to me, J. H. B.'s reply in last issue to my article in the Jan. 2 issue serves to reveal a state of mind. His thought is violent, too violent to have a coherent background of philosophy based on a sober, contemplative study of humanity and its ways. His "science" is exploited to justify prejudice, and to support once-and-for-all-time adopted positions which hatred of troubling thought and respect for precedent do not wish disturbed. Something of fear, I might also concede inspires him, that socialist principle may be compromised in a shift to other positions. For that, I respect him, but I would respect him more if he did not use the arts of demagoguery to defend his position. Whereas his reply is such a mass of contentious half-truths, false proposition and therefore it follows, etc., etc., some of which common knowledge denies, that my space will not allow of serial rebuttal.

The shock of experience of the course of affairs since 1914, the fact that much was happening that was running contrary to socialist desire and prognostications spurred me into vague doubts and discontents with some of our Party attitudes. My doubts and discontent were strengthened by such study as I could give to the findings of those engaged in the field of the social sciences and by keeping in touch with the modern trend of thought and speculation on the problem of social change. As a result, I have arrived at a fairly coherent philosophy on the problem with definite conclusions regarding the Party, its functions and as to what its attitude and relations should be towards other organizations, political and economic, of the producing masses, agrarian and industrial. My conclusions, as I see them, turn upon methods and do not trench upon the fundamental principles of revolutionary socialism. For instance, I have advocated that all working class organizations should be regarded as institutions expressing the needs or carrying out the purposes of the working class in their several departmental activities, socialist educational and political, political reform and economic activities. Without prejudice to the debated question as to whether reform political parties can permanently improve the condition of the working class, I have advocated that the Party recognize them just as it at present recognizes the economic organizations of the workers, on that of a minimum basis of resisting the encroachments of capitalism upon the well-being of the workers. These recognitions should be based upon this—that degradation has no survival value, is inimical to the revolution, and that thus, the organized labor movement and the political reform movement function indirectly in behalf of the revolution. Again, in regard to methods, I have attacked the doctrine of violent overturn as an inexpedient method of bringing about revolutionary change, impractical in highly developed capitalist countries, and that other methods must be resorted to. In his reply J. H. B. seems to deny the efficacy of any method, other than violence, and therefore is committed to defending it and its propagation as a fundamental principle of socialism. But I hold we are not so bankrupt of ways and means as to be bound to any method and one that would, as I see it, result in disaster. However, in my articles giving my point of view I have attempted in a small way a restatement of the socialist philosophy in terms of this day and generation and if I have not got anyone to my way of thinking, perhaps a little grubbing around the roots of our philosophy will do no harm, even lead to lustier growth.

Looking over J. H. B.'s reply, I can see that even if he was more careful of the truth and better informed on history he would still have fallen down in his argumentation—his ideas about the nature of man are at fault, and by that much he would still miss his mark. All discussion of the problem of social change and interpretation of history pivots

upon the nature of man. And my critic's human beings are such as were never on earth, for they are mono-maniac, hag-ridden creatures of a single devouring interest. Economic motives serve for him to explain all human conduct, the rest is "hypocrisy and sloppy humanitarianism." Accordingly, this is his idea of a modern community:—"An aggregation of human beings divided into classes and subclasses, manifesting economic antagonisms, soaked in prejudices mutually hostile and exclusive, leavened with sloppy humanitarianism, insulting charity and religious hypocrisy." And this is how he idealizes an individual man! Referring to the factory regulations acts in the 19th century in England which put restrictions on the employment of children, took them out of the mines, reduced the hours of work in factories and introduced hygienic regulations, he introduces the man who was chief leader in these reforms, in this fashion, "... Such as Lord Shaftesbury, who perceiving that the unbridled exploitation of the workers in mill, mine and factory was fast killing the goose that laid the golden eggs of profit, and if the profit system was to continue the limits of human endurance must be recognized." "Foresighted," he calls him, this man who was a religious fanatic, a one-idea man who was difficult to get on with, who did slum missionary work before he started out on his long agitational work for the children of the poor. Economic motives do influence men's conduct and on occasion will dominate. But J. H. B. runs his theory to seed in the use he makes of it. He puts himself out of touch with ordinary humanity. Men in real life are men of many interests, many motives.

Of the innate, instinctive disposition of man, which he shares with other animals to herd in groups and defend the group, J. H. B.'s theory knows nothing. The thousand years of group life, the warp and woof of which are, likeness of temperament and physical feature, a common language, a common lore of legend and fact handed down in song and story from generation to generation by word of mouth or literature, a common group experience recorded not alone in the history books but also in ancient burial mound in cairn, in brass, or stone or marble, visualising to succeeding generations the continuity of the group down from the legendary past to the present. The great names the group elects to revere, its warriors, its chief rulers, its wise men, its artists, poets, priests and prophets reflect the group, its virtues, its vanities, its struggles as well as its failings. For, those whom it regards as its great men form a composite ideal of what the group would like to be. The common standards, conventions, usages, tacit understandings, customs, institutions, laws, history, religion, philosophy, art, science, politics, industry, peace and war, all alike bear the stamp of the genius of the particular group. Community! You could not escape the community. The renegade Englishmen who become more Irish than the Irish themselves or more German than the Germans, as Houston Chamberlain, are but paying a left-handed compliment to their English complex. Watch an internationalist and ten to one you will find him "placed" on Burns' Nicht. Soviet Russia repelled the foreign invaders because of love of Russia more than for love of internationalism. Russia first, is the dominant note of Soviet policies today; of necessity so since Russia is a community by racial inheritance of temperament and culture and by political organization and intimate economic relationships. Communities may be divided by class interest, partial herds within the larger herds, and classes may come into power and classes may go out of power, but so far as the masses of those engaged on either side of the struggle are concerned it is a community interest as well as a class interest and a possible international interest that inspires them. Men are creatures of many interests, not of one. Read the current literature, proclamations and propaganda ap-

peals of any great revolutionary period. "The world is my country, to do good is my religion," said Tom Paine. But he also helped to draw up the American Declaration of Independence. Economic impulses pursuing their will unchecked, unrestrained, unmodified by other interests and by social habits and standards are destructive. No group life could ever come into existence on that basis. Group life is at all possible because, in individuals, instinctive, cultural and rational interests live side by side, restraining or re-enforcing each other, with economic interests. When a man acts, the whole man acts. It can never be said of group man that he is driven by one interest alone, free, anarchic, untrammelled.

My critic, objecting to my use of the terms, "Community" applied to the national groups in society, says there are no communities. Yet he has himself witnessed the working classes sink the class-struggle in the broad sands of patriotism. When the herd leaders bellowed and the war drums throbbed he saw them streaming in from the ends of the earth in defence of their respective La Patrias and saw life-long internationalists and pacifists cast their principles to the winds. The national interest thrust itself uppermost, if only for the time being. What is the use of experience? He cites a long list of organizations, from Rotarians and the Red Cross to the Salvation Army as dispensers of "sloppy humanitarianism, insulting charity and religious hypocrisy" and this he sees as the only leaven in the life of a modern community. A scientific socialist of over fifteen years standing by his study of history, say under Professor Jenks and De Gibbins and other historians, and by his study of the origin and development of the institutional and cultural life of groups, say under Lewis H. Morgan and the later anthropologists—he should know that "insulting charity, sloppy humanitarianism and religious hypocrisy" and such organizations, if any there be, as are devoted to dispensing those delectables, are but the aberrations of a community and could by no means serve as bonds that would hold a community together: mere by-products and not the solid principles of associated life.

J. H. B. rages sentimentally about working class wrongs and capitalist class iniquities, packing his reply with recriminations. But the working class are not shedding any tears about their wrongs. He needn't worry. That aside, however, I want to put his interpretation of human conduct by economic motives to the test again. Take the case of the poverty stricken slum population of England. Poverty and riches in that country have existed side by side for nigh on two thousand years. All a theory of economic motives would see in that, would be two thousand years of predation, just as it sees in a "community" an aggregation of beasts of prey—one of those distorting half-truths which, if relied upon exclusively, are fatal to an understanding of the social problem. But here is another facet to life. By use, people become inured to poverty, either themselves, or to the sight of others existing in that condition, "and their withers are unwrung." There is as much indifference at the condition of the slum proletariat among the masses just above it as there is among the wealthier classes. Perhaps the slum populations themselves are the most indifferent about it of all. The cause is old "use and wont" and habit. J. H. B.'s theory, however, knows nothing about those paralyzing forces of social inertia. But there is the fact that they have a stranglehold on the whole community in a multitude of respects. It is therefore useless to berate the capitalist class if we do not at the same time throw a due share of responsibility on the workers themselves. For if the workers never acquire a sense of responsibility by realizing that there are inert forces in themselves, they will never seek power to remove social evils. Character is the lever of change in the social environment: as forces, character and environment react

upon each other. Do not let us flatter those softening vanities of the workers such as self-pity, by throwing the whole blame for social conditions on the capitalist class as though capitalism was a scheme and an imposition of theirs. The workers need pride, self-respect and a feeling of self-dependence and self-sufficiency if they are to play a dynamic part in social affairs. And the present form of social organization is not an imposition but one of historical growth for whose existence at this day of universal literacy and enfranchisement we must assume there is a social responsibility. By the way, J. H. B. says, that enfranchisement is "carefully adjusted to ensure that the workers do not secure undue representation." I do not know about Italy since the new electoral arrangement and other negligible exceptions, but I do deny there is any substantial truth in what he says. In some countries compulsory voting has even been introduced and in others, as B. C., there is talk of it, so hard is it to get the electorate to the polls. By far the biggest sabotage on popular representation is practiced by the indifferent populace itself.

The Party has always avoided sentimentalising "wrongs." And so far so good. But our Party attitude to reform movements has put us on the side of the inhumane—as party men we were dangerously out of touch with ordinary human kindness. By adverse criticism, we obstructed efforts to alleviate working class conditions of life and launched destructive opposition to all labor organizations on the political field. Why? We conceived that all alleviations and "mere" improvements, as such, would never break through the system and emancipate the working class. And we were right in that. But there was another thought present, to the effect that such alleviations and improvements were a "prolongation of the system," ergo, that the "progressive degradation of the working class was a necessary preliminary phase to the overthrow of capitalism." In that thought, we were against history, threw down Darwinian biology, and our psychology was puerile. Give a man an inch—The desire for power grows by what it feeds on. Experience shows that the workers are always most aggressive in "good times" when they feel they have some leeway. Darwinian philosophy of nature says, degradation has no survival value—the battle is to the fittest, to the strongest and the swiftest. History says, that "mere" numbers count for nothing, the underlying populations have always been more numerous than the ruling classes: And abject degradation spells deterioration and abject submission. On the other hand, both history and psychology point to the rise of the manufacturing and trading class, never on a physical minimum, rising in economic and political power yet never satisfied. "Milk for babies" has been our scornful gag for efforts of amelioration. But if working class children were suffering from under nourishment through poverty or parental neglect or ignorance I myself think it well that some one had the humanity and spirit to see that the babies got the needed milk. Our work was in another department and should have been carried on without prejudice to those activities. How that inhuman twist came in our social philosophy I may try to explain in another article. Suffice it to say that it belongs to the "Marxists" and not to Marx himself, to the lesser men who followed after him.

There is enough evidence in Marx's works to warrant the belief that besides being a destructive critic of capitalism he was also a constructive statesman. Read his "Eastern Question," read "Revolution and Counter Revolution," read the biography of Marx by his close friend and comrade William Leihknecht and the latter's "No compromise, No Political Trading," in pamphlet form. Read also, chapters 10 and 15 in the first volume of Marx's "Capital" on the effect of the machine industry on the working population in England. In those chapters Marx betrays thankfulness for the mercies of the factory regulation acts for, while he expresses a proper scorn for the inadequacies of those regulations he time and time again praises the efforts of the English factory inspectors to enforce the regul-

lations, especially those efforts of Leonard Horner, Redgrave and others who went beyond the mere duties of their positions and incurred the hostility of the factory owners by an exposure of the evils of factory life, an exposure that helped to arouse public opinion on the matter. J. H. B., the Marxist, would say that Marx was up to the neck "in the futile bogs and swamps of middle class reform." Poor old Karl! A correspondent's letter in the Clarion of last issue reminded me that Marx had also actually organised a political association, the members of which were not "Marxists"—Ha! Unclean! J. H. B. chortles joyously because it is largely due to our activity "that Canada up to the present has been largely free from the curse of reformist labor parties."

Procreation, birth, nurture and growth is the order of life in nature and society. All social or class instrumentalities, all institutions whatever go through that process. A new social class might be expected to begin the creation of its own instrumentalities for expressing its felt needs and furthering its purposes with the dawning of its consciousness, but also it might have been expected that those instrumentalities would reflect all the marks of immaturity of the class itself. To expect otherwise is to reverse the order of the nature of things, that is, to expect the miraculous, an expectation no one would suspect of those who were supposed to be steeped in Darwinism and who had the secret processes of social evolution laid open to them with a Materialistic Interpretation of History. That these instrumentalities, economic or political, should have appeared at all might have been welcomed as a sign and a symbol of growing consciousness of class, of class needs and dawning recognition that its own class effort was necessary if its need were to be in some measure satisfied. But no, if it was a political labor party, the young life had to be strangled at birth, or if it was too virile and persisted in living its growth was obstructed. Where was the sense of evolution and that foreseeing insight got by studying the institutional life of men in groups?

Says J. H. B. "Whatever its shortcomings may be (and reformism is the most outstanding) the present political position of the Labor Party of Great Britain does not seem to reflect the activities of a working class anaemic, stunted physically and mentally and morally degraded." O, that mine enemy would write a book! Here in one sentence he couples two admissions whose premises I have been advocating to these many issues. A convert! a convert! He recognizes the British Labor Party, "whatever its shortcomings may be"—somebody write to Ramsay MacDonald! And—I put him on record—he acknowledges it is a good thing that the working class of Great Britain is not "anaemic, stunted physically and mentally and morally degraded" because "the Labor Party of Great Britain" owes "its present political position to the activities of a working class who are not anaemic, stunted" etc. etc. Let me try my hand again—He says, that the political position of the Labor Party of Great Britain (he admits that the Party has its shortcomings) is such that it does not reflect the activities of a working class anaemic, stunted, physically and mentally and morally degraded. The inference is, that the Labor Party of Great Britain would not be in its present position if the working class had been anaemic, stunted, physically and mentally and morally degraded. He's sound on that! Let's see—The British Labor Party is committed to constitutional methods? Yes! To keep a working class from getting anaemic, stunted, etc. etc. you must have reforms? Yes! And reformism is only a shortcoming, if an outstanding one? Yes! Moved and seconded applicant, be admitted—carried unanimously—into the Labor Party of Great Britain. The reader will now think naturally, that J. H. B. was only fooling when he wrote all that foolery round the little kernel of sense we have just examined. He is wrong and has another think coming. J. H. B. has one law for the Labor Party of Great Britain and another for a Labor Party in Canada—one law for the rich, another for the poor: a touch of the cap to a big fellow, a trimming for the

little one—a servile reverence for mere bigness. But the bigness of the Labor Party of Great Britain and thus the greater possibility of influencing state policies that lies in bigness, or the bigness of the support behind it in the constituencies, is a bigness that has been built up from very small beginnings, "generally under very questionable auspices," as J. H. B. might say, and under the destructive attacks of those of like faith to J. H. B. who, if they had had insight born of a sense of history, might have by constructive criticism helped on instead of retarding its growth. At this moment there is a distressed little old lady of a Socialist Party in Great Britain busy as a cat on a tin roof trying to sweep back the tide, trying to destroy J. H. B's Labor Party in Great Britain.

Listen to him expound his faith for Canada though, and hear him expose his lack of evolutionary sense and his lack of consistency and illustrate the grave nature of my charge that our destructive tactics in regard to working class political institutions has retarded the advance of that class to political maturity in this country: Says he—

"The 'issues' raised by 'C' are old ones. There is nothing new about them. The writer remembers the 'good old times' of fifteen years ago, when we were actively and joyously engaged in the dissection and analysis of this same reform bug wherever it showed its head, whether outside or inside the party ranks, and it is mainly due to that activity and keen combativeness that Canada up to the present has been largely free from the curse of reformist 'labor' parties. The short life and restricted and waning influence of such as have sprouted up (generally under very questionable auspices) is evidence that our task was well and thoroughly accomplished. Perhaps it would be all to the good, from a party standpoint, if we were to go through the same experience once more, but I think that there is small chance of that. The bug is too dead to make the task of resurrection a pleasant one for any so minded."

There you have it, a Labor Party is allright in Great Britain, but not in Canada. Why? Because it is a big Labor Party in Great Britain and strong as to its political position in the country, while the Labor Party in Canada is only small, weak, striving to be big. I claim to have torn aside the screen of J. H. B's verbalism and revealed the secret and even to himself no doubt unconscious, workings of his mind. In one sentence he betrayed his real self—the rest was mere rationalizing.

He says: "The issues raised by 'C' are old ones!" I reply, no older than the problem of Social change and the ever open, ever debatable questions of what had best be done, and how to do it! "C"

MANIFESTO

of the
SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA
(Fifth Edition)

Per copy.....10 cents

Per 25 copies.....\$2

Post Paid.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

EVERY SUNDAY

THEATRE ROYAL

SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 3rd.

Speaker: DEAN COLEMAN (U.B.C.)

Subject: "Is There a New Psychology?"

All meetings at 8 p.m.

Questions. Discussion.

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

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

VANCOUVER, B.C., FEBRUARY 1, 1924

LENIN

LENIN is dead. Alive, in the first few years of the revolution he was pictured by the agents of privilege as the embodiment of wickedness and social disorder; in the later years as a modifying element in a turbulent state. Dead, he is accorded a moderately generous measure of appreciation.

He has been acclaimed by one or other class according to the condition, hopes and desires of either. Each has already chiselled his epitaph according to its lights. Which is always the human way. Adding our note to the general voice we would say that above all other qualities his was the ability to see circumstances in the way of the realist and to condition his advices accordingly.

To the Russian people in the mass, no doubt, he appeared as the antithesis of the cruelties of Czarism, the embodiment of the hope of liberty. As such they mourn him. He has added a great share to the working out of the problems confronting the Socialist movement and has spent his life in that work. The world wide attention now centred upon his passing is a tribute to his capacity, his energy and tireless devotion in that field.

WHY?

CONTINUING our consideration of Comrade Reid's letter in our last issue we come to the implication of the "perfect" concept, as held supposedly by ourselves, of an international organization to which we might belong if it could pass muster by that standard. To which we would say that we, like other people, are not very much worried when confronted with any practical proposition by the perfect idea, but are actuated by our consideration as to whether or not the proposal is possible of fulfilment and in accord with our general principles. Broadly speaking, we do not suppose it to be likely that our membership is actively hostile to an international as such, either to the Third or to the memory of the First or, for that matter, to the Second. There have been also the (so-called) Two-and-a-half and the Fourth. It can hardly be gainsaid that ideally they all have a similarity if not an identity, but their present practical concepts are widely apart, hence their present ways are divergent where they tend to function at all.

It is perhaps true that we have been more interested in the text book than in the active program, otherwise, of course, than active promulgation of educational material (as we see it) may be considered to be an active program. It is usual, in the hum-drum of up-to-date psychology, to run to earth the source of self-justification for action taken or opinions expressed and if we were to set forth a hard and fast statement as to why we find ourselves isolated from any international organization in membership we too, quite likely, would deservedly come under the lens of the psychoanalyst. Yet it might hit the mark to say that membership in the Third, as membership was and apparently is conditioned, would quite likely have destroyed such habits as we had not yet grown out of and which, consequently, we still had good use for. Not, mind you (this may be rationalizing—who knows? Rationalizing,

humanly enough and in obedience to its content, is never—or hardly ever—described in the first person)—not that we were simply mulish and stubborn, but that the people of contrary mind to ourselves were unable to satisfy us that our work could be better done by adopting what we thought were arbitrary and unreal standards, administered from the outside, even where sentiment ran on fairly even lines. Besides, if an international is to function at all it must function through its several parts, and all it may overrule the judgment of the several parts on their native ground in their judgment of method and material it is more than likely that the international will be at fault, if it does so. It is not necessary to cite instances, though that might be done.

Again, it is surely a strange concept—if it exists—that international affiliation in form is absolutism from local socialist sin. There certainly was a time when it was considered to be so. This last consideration, if we are not mistaken, is part and parcel of the ideas arising out of class spirit and courage. But a revolutionary complex is not enough, more particularly so when statistical analysis reduces its voice to a whisper. Much in the same fashion as ourselves (now that we are put to it) in enquiring into why we have not welded any formal international linkings, other bodies have bothered over why they have. Which is all of a piece, and it is generally easier to understand one's own actions or to uncover what we are pleased to call the prompting motives at a date later than the eventful time.

As to Marx: He was, of course, an important element in the First International, which was the formal embodiment of workers' internationalism. Hard and strenuous days knocked it out of Europe in '72, a year after the Commune. (J. H. has recorded the immediate events attending its birth—see Clarion, December 17th, 1923). It is recorded by Morris and Bax that it produced an impression on the governments of Europe beyond what its real strength warranted. It had its "revolutionary romanticists" too. By the way, Comrade Reid asks what was Marx's connection with the Second, besides the First International. The Second took shape in 1889 and Marx died in 1883. To offer any conjecture as to what might have been his attitude to the Second had he lived is somewhat bordering on the guide-to-conduct-manual of The Faithful: What Would Jesus Do? The pathway to the New Jerusalem must be dug by ourselves.

Now to as to Dietzgen. The process of getting used to Dietzgen seems about as difficult of realization as has been the "dehegelizing" of the descendants of the Holy Family. But all well and good, provided you don't stop there. The modern man is not so dull as over hesitancy and delay in the literature of past days would cause you to think. The old survives in so far as it is useful to the present generation, which turns to and abolishes it by bringing it up to date in tune with the other mental and material equipment in use. Otherwise (philosophers please note) language itself, for instance, falls behind the fashion of present use, and the thought it holds as likely as not is out of fashion also. Which is to say that we may be yelling truisms to people who have recognized them long ago though they may not be familiar with the standard copyright.

These running comments may not be to the satisfaction of Comrade Reid, and may or may not meet his state of mind as evidenced by his query. But there is time yet. Be critical anyway,—of yourself and of us. This way we'll get to a better understanding. Appreciation,—we both have that now, and that's good to go on with.

HERE AND NOW.

NOW that he has become Chancellor of the Exchequer in Great Britain, Philip Snowden has a chance to properly weight fact with fancy. In balancing his Budget his talk will be almost as onerous as is ours Here and Now. We are watching him with a keen eye, with a view to the possibility of becoming acquainted with a new wrinkle or two. Of course he gets expert opinion from the managers of the banks, and they probably top

the burden by charging for that. Now we're beyond that already. We've been trying to dodge just such advice this long time. In our case it simply means that what we get doesn't balance what we owe, with the additional "comfort" that the elasticity has gone out of credit. Subs., therefore! We need subs! And we won't be happy till we get 'em! These are the variant factors in a dull world:

Following, \$1 each: C. Bright, F. P. Dawes, J. A. Beckman, G. E. Philbrook, J. Eslinger, J. Mogielka, W. E. Brunskill, A. Gillespie, A. Paterson, M. Cassin, J. Woods, C. M. Smith, O. Erickson, H. Holt, A. W. Osterberg, Wm. Dooney, Geo. Paton, E. P. Solomon, C. F. Gale, S. T. Mitchell, C. F. Orchard, C. Clarkson, D. Oliva, Sid Earp.

Following \$2 each: J. C. Blair, S. Lowery, G. Beagrie, E. S. Fiala, Walter Bell (per M.B.), John Marshall, Alex. Leckie, R. Gardner, A. E. Hollinghead, C. W. Allsop.

A. Jorgenson, \$6; T. Odermatt, \$1.50; F. Cox, \$1.20; A. Larson, \$3; Mrs. M. A. Lewis, \$3.

Above, Clarion subscriptions received from 11th to 29th January, inclusive—total, \$58.70.

CLARION MAINTENANCE FUND

Following \$1 each—B. D. Huntly, J. Eslinger, S. Clements, A. Paterson, J. Woods, H. Holt, J. A. Beckman.

C. Bright, \$4; G. E. Philbrook, \$4; St. John Comrades (per M. Goudie), \$10; W. Dorney, 50 cents; Ukrainian Labor Temple, Transeona, \$1.50.

Above, C. M. F. receipts from 11th to 29th January, inclusive—total, \$27.

ALBERTA NOTES

S. P. of C. Local Calgary, No. 86

Economics Class held every Tuesday, 8 p.m.

History Class held every Friday, 8 p.m.

Both at headquarters, 134a 9th Ave. West.

Propaganda Meetings every Sunday at 8 p.m. at Empress Theatre, Calgary.

CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS

CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS is a dual and antagonistic mind product, arising out of the antagonistic relationship of the two classes in society, such relationship being that of master and slave, or parasite and producer. It is based upon and cannot be separated from the concrete methods of producing the wherewithal upon which the existence of human life depends.

As the machinery, land, and factories necessary for carrying on production are in the hands of a class called capitalists, production on a capitalistic basis can only be carried on with their permission and in accordance with the demands of capital, i.e., the production of a surplus over and above the needs of the producers. It is due to the excess rate of growth of this surplus value over the rate of growth of the markets for absorption thereof, and, consequently, its limitation to be used again as capital, that we have such titanic crises and their necessary tremendous social convulsions.

Whereas in times of prosperity the conflict between the classes takes on the form of a bartering over the price to be paid for labor-power, or the wild disputes that arise naturally between buyer and seller, the conflict is now carried on under the heading of unemployed and hunger, versus parasites and plenty. But though a switch in slogans takes place, there is essentially no difference in the propelling cause, which is the private ownership of the machinery of wealth production and distribution.

The conflicts over hours and wages, length of working day and working conditions, etc., grow in magnitude with the expanding growth of capital. So also do the conflicts which arise out of the periodic crises, which are not only inherent in capitalism but their growth, and consequently the hunger of the masses are also dependent on the demands of capital. Hence the greater the productivity of the wage-slave and its necessary accompaniment surplus value—the more numerous and the longer do these crises become.

(Continued on page 8)

Lessons For Young Proletarians

GEORGE STEPHENSON.

(Continued from last issue)

The Locomotive.

THE locomotive engine which Stephenson constructed for Killingworth Colliery in 1815 continued working usefully for many years. Its author continued his experiments, and next applied himself to the improvement of the road. He considered the rail of great importance, and spoke of the rail and the wheel as man and wife. In 1816 he took out a patent for rails in conjunction with Mr. Tosh, a wealthy iron-founder. Stephenson early declared the advisability of tunnelling through hills and raising low ground in order to make the railways level, and thus economise power. In 1817 he built a locomotive for the Duke of Portland for use in Ayrshire. In 1819 he built a railway for the Holton Colliery in Sunderland.

In 1819 his son Robert left school and became an apprentice viewer in Killingworth Colliery. In 1822 Robert Stephenson went for six months to Edinburgh University, where he won a prize for mathematics. Having learnt shorthand before going to Edinburgh, Robert took down the notes of the lectures verbatim and copied them out word for word for his father's benefit.

The railways we have hitherto referred to were for private use of certain coal-owners and iron masters.

The first public Railway Act was passed in 1801, authorising the construction of a public railway from Wandsworth to Croydon called "The Surrey Iron Railway."

Twenty-six miles of railway were constructed, and any person was at liberty to put wagons on the line and to carry goods within the prescribed rates. The wagons were worked by horses, mules and donkeys. The railway did not prove a paying proposition, but continued to be worked till 1837, when the London and Brighton line was constructed.

It should be observed that when railways first came into use they were not regarded as the roadways for locomotives but for horse drawn vehicles. In those early days of railways the battle of argument and interest was between them, the canals, and the turnpike roads. Sir Richard Phillips, in a book written in 1813, advocated double lines of railway from London to Edinburgh, Glasgow, Holyhead, Milford, Falmouth, Yarmouth, Dover, and Portsmouth, declaring that horse-drawn mail coaches would travel by them at ten miles an hour and Blenkinsop's steam engine at 15.

From 1766 there had been discussion of a canal project between Stockton and Darlington. The canal was not made, but later a railway began to be suggested and a Stockton Committee was appointed to consider it in 1810. Nothing happened. Then a Darlington Committee was appointed with Edward Pease, a Quaker, as one of its members. Nothing but talk eventuated till 1818, when a company was formed to build the railway. It applied to Parliament for permission, but was defeated by the Duke of Cleveland, whose fox covers would have been interfered with. The railway Bill was re-drafted so as to avoid the fox covers and re-introduced, but was opposed by those who had vested interests in the tolls charged on turnpike roads.

Capitalism was barring the way to progress; but whilst the engineers and inventors stood helpless, money replied to money. Edward Pease issued a circular that the railway company would purchase the toll mortgages at the price originally given for them. This somewhat placated the interests, and though still strongly opposed the Bill went through.

The railroad was to be free to all persons for the haulage of coal and merchandise, but the company was empowered to charge 4d. per ton per mile for coal intended for land sale. Only a halfpenny per ton was allowed for coal intended for shipment

at Stockton, this provision being secured by the man who later became Earl of Durham, because he desired to prevent competition with his coal loaded at Sunderland and did not believe that any one could afford to carry coal at a halfpenny per ton per mile. The low rate led, however, to the great success of the railway.

Doubts as to the advisability of the railway delayed commencing it for some time. George Stephenson had learnt of the project and in 1821 he went with Nicholas Wood, the viewer at Killingworth, to interview Edward Pease in Darlington.

He told Pease that he was "only the engine-wright at Killingworth," but begged him to come there "to see what my engine can do." Pease did not accept the invitation then, but the result of Stephenson's visit was his appointment to survey the land for the Stockton and Darlington railway, and in May, 1822, the first rail was laid.

The intention of the directors was to use horse power on the railway, but Stephenson pressed for locomotives, and continued urging Pease to examine his engines at Killingworth. At last he prevailed, and from that day Pease supported the locomotive, and inserted in the amended Stockton and Darlington railway Bill a clause empowering the use of locomotives. The Act was secured in 1823. Stephenson had hitherto worked with ordinary mechanics working at the collieries of the North of England. To perfect the structure of the locomotive he considered it necessary to concentrate a number of good workmen on locomotive work and to enable them to increase their skill. He conceived the idea of establishing an engine factory in Newcastle, and did so with the £1,000 he had received for inventing the safety lamp and £1,000 contributed by Edward Pease and Thomas Richardson. This later became a gigantic enterprise, but it passed through many trials first.

Stephenson had a financial interest in supplying to the company the cast-iron rails that he and Tosh had patented in 1816, but he advised the company to have malleable rails, which he had since discovered to be much better. Malleable rails cost £12 per ton, cast iron rails £5 10s.; the company only agreed to half the rails being malleable on that account.

The question of the tractive power to be used on the railway was even yet not decided by the directors. The press denounced the proposal to use steam engines. Finally, however, it was agreed that Stephenson should construct three locomotives, the first of which was named "Locomotion."

The railway was opened on September 27th, 1825, having taken three years to construct. On the opening day Stephenson took a meal at an inn with his son Robert and John Dixon. He opened a bottle of wine, which was unusual with him, to drink success to the railway, and said:

"Now, lads, I venture to tell you that you will live to see the day when railways will supersede almost all other methods of conveyance in this country—when mail coaches will become the great highways for the king and his subjects. The time is coming when it will be cheaper for a working man to travel on a railway than to walk on foot. I know there are great, almost insuperable, difficulties to be encountered; but what I have said will come to pass as sure as you now hear me.

"I only wish I may live to see the day, though that I can scarcely hope for, as I know how slow all human progress is, and with what difficulty I have been able to get the locomotive introduced thus, notwithstanding my more than ten years' successful experiment at Killingworth."

A great concourse of people were present to see the opening of the railway. A procession was formed on the line, headed by "Locomotion," driven by George Stephenson and drawing twelve wagons

laden with coal, twenty-one wagons filled with passengers, and a covered coach for the directors. A man on horseback, carrying a flag, headed the procession. The train was only expected to go from four to six miles an hour. Men, women, and children ran and gentlemen on horseback rode alongside the train. At a favourable point in the road Stephenson called to the man on horseback to move aside, and the engine rushed off at fifteen miles an hour, leaving behind all that were trying to keep pace with it.

The "Whitehaven Gazette" had dismissed as "too chimerical to be entertained" the idea that steam carriages could travel "at a rate almost equal to the fleetest horse!"

The coach in which the directors travelled was named by Stephenson the "Experiment." It resembled a caravan, had a row of seats on each side, and a deal table in the centre.

A fortnight after the opening of the line the "Experiment" began to run regularly to carry passengers. It was given out to a contractor and like other coaches which also began to run it was drawn not by locomotive power but by a horse. Several private companies were organised by the inn keepers of Stockton and Darlington for taking passengers on the railway. The railway company bought up old stage coach bodies and mounted them on an underframe with flange wheels.

Old Dixon, who drove the "Experiment," used to place a lighted candle on the table of the "Experiment" at night, and so was the first to start railway carriage lighting.

The railway was so much used, the trains grew so long, and the traffic was so profitable that the company, which had first allowed all comers to use the line on payment of the fees, stepped in to monopolise the working of the traffic. The dividends obtained by the railway shareholders were so satisfactory as to give great encouragement to proceed further with railway undertakings.

In order to provide further accommodation for the rapidly increasing coal traffic Mr. Edward Pease bought about 500 or 600 acres of land on the Tees and there founded the seaport of Middlesbrough, where had been only a solitary farm house.

(To be concluded)

ECONOMIC CAUSES OF WAR

By PETER T. LECKIE.

NOW READY

Preface by the author.

132 PAGES.

Per Copy, 25 Cents.

*Ten copies up, 20 cents each.

Post Paid.

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Obeys 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

A Reply to F. J. McNey

BY L. T. MORGAN, Arts '24, University of British Columbia.

A recent edition of the "Western Clarion" contained an article supposedly on "Marginal Utility," contributed by one F. J. McNey.* Having carefully perused the contribution, I have come to the conclusion that the author knows practically nothing of the Marginal Utility theory of Value, and even less, if possible, concerning that which Marx has written on the same subject. It is possible that a University student—and one who takes a keen delight in baseball at that—can somewhat enlighten F. J. McNey on the subject, and so clear the "atmosphere" for him—an obvious need. One who so clearly does not understand the difference between Value and Value-in-Exchange, so definitely expounded by Marx, surely is in need of such enlightenment.

In the first place, F. J. McNey, let us consider the Marginal Utility theory of Value (which is a theory of Value in Exchange). According to Professor Ely, whom you condescended to reprove, Marginal Utility, is "Utility under a condition of scarcity. To possess value a thing must be able to satisfy wants, and it must exist in less than sufficient quantity to satisfy wants." I have read that definition over again, and pondered over it and meditated over it (your advice), and I admit quite readily that is the keystone of the whole theory of Marginal Utility; but, my dear fellow, I fail to see "the snag that punctures the balloon"—that you spoke of. It is a certainty that if commodities were produced to such an extent that we had more than enough to satisfy all wants, those commodities would have no Exchange Value, and we should get them for nothing. If such were the case in actual life, F. J. McNey, there is no doubt that such a situation would be a splendid state of affairs for you and me (and the rest of the "great unwashed.") But—and here's the thing—and unless you clearly recognize and admit goods to such an extent that you and I could get them for nothing you have a much better imagination than I, and you should try your hand at fiction—for the science of economics is too dry, too dull, and too full of fact to do you justice. Now look here, F. J., the Exchange Value of a commodity cannot be greater than its Marginal Utility, because no one—not even you—would pay more for a commodity than it is worth; nor can the Exchange Value of a commodity remain below the Marginal Utility, because this would assume that people desiring additional needs would neglect to offer for them what they would be worth, and by purchasing the additional units (assuming a lower Exchange Value than the Marginal Utility warranted) the buyer would therefore necessarily raise the Exchange Value.

Cost is important because if at any time the Exchange Value—which as you see by this time tends to coincide with Marginal Utility, is greater than cost, more units will be produced, and the Marginal Utility of the commodity would therefore fall until it no longer exceeds the cost. Likewise, if the Marginal Utility is less than cost—as will be the case if too much were produced, F. J. McNey—then production will cease to be profitable and will therefore be curtailed. Thus over a long period of production, cost is indeed all important.

It is therefore quite consistent to say that Value in Exchange, on the side of demand, tends to coincide with Marginal Utility; and that the Exchange Value, on the side of production, depends—in the case of most commodities—upon the cost of producing those commodities, because in the long run, the Marginal Utility must conform (in most cases) to the cost of producing them.

* See our issue of 2nd January. Comrade McNey has not seen the present criticism of his article, but we look for a further article from him on these matters, to appear probably in the next issue but one. (Ed.)

What is there difficult to understand about that, my friend? Indeed, I fear your head must have been sadly addled when you effervesced so exuberantly, and committed that little indiscretion that you so naively charged Professor Fairchild with—that of indiscriminately peddling undeniably large quantities of very, very hot air!

Secondly—now pay attention—let us seriously consider together just what Karl Marx has to say on that very subject, and just let us see where you and the Old Master come into conflict. I warn you beforehand, that where you and Marx disagree, I will be forced to side with the latter.

In the first place, Marx differentiates clearly between Value and Value in Exchange, F. J. McNey, and you know you don't. In the second place, Marx made a clear distinction between concrete or useful labor on one hand, and abstract or social labor on the other. Again you differ, but why? Surely Marx cannot be wrong in both instances. The producer, according to Marx, expends useful labor on appropriate material, and, effecting a qualitative change produces a useful object. At the very same time, and by the very same act, the producer, by incorporating a certain quantity of abstract labor, creates Value—not Value in Exchange. This Value though thought of as an entity—as a substance having actual existence in the commodity—is only conceptually existent,—in the mind only. (Are you still with me?) Thus Value is created in the act of production, and—note carefully—exists prior to and independent of, the act of Exchange—where Exchange Value and the Marginal Utility theory come into being. This is the principal difference between Value and Exchange Value. Thus Value, being materialized and undifferentiated labor, can have no other quality than magnitude, and since it has been created in response to a social want, it can be no more materialized—than the amount "socially necessary" for the production of a commodity. Marx clearly states the Law of Value in the following manner:—

"We see then, that that which determines the magnitude of the Value of any article is the amount of labor socially necessary, or the labor time socially necessary for its production." (Capital, Vol. 1, pp. 46)

"The value of a commodity, therefore, varies directly as the quantity and inversely as the productiveness of the labor incorporated in it." (Capital, Vol. 1, pp. 47).

As a matter of fact, F. J. McNey, the Law of Value is only another way of saying that labor produces all values. Do you get it?

Marx further distinguishes between Labor Power and Labor. The worker, given appropriate instruments can produce more in any given period than is necessary for his maintenance during that period. Stated in terms of the Law of Value, this appears as follows: the value of the product of Labor, allowing for the value of the constant capital consumed in the process, is greater than the value of the Labor Power expended. This difference is known as Surplus Value.

Exchange Value—take note, F. J. McNey—may be regarded as the phenomenal form of the substance Value. It does not follow that there is any causal connection between the two—nor is there any mechanism by which Value can make itself effective in the field of circulation. It is precisely in the field of circulation (the market) that Exchange Value necessarily emerges. Exchange Value, then, is the quantitative ratio in which commodities exchange. When one of the quantities to be exchanged happens to be the money-commodity, Exchange Value appears as Price. It is the Law of Prices, not the Law of Value which is now in question.

Now this Price is clearly arrived at without reference to the Value or the Cost of Production of the goods. These goods, when once exposed for sale are

at the mercy of the market. Taking the market for any given commodity, at any given moment, we find that the supply of that commodity is—for the time being—a fixed quantity. Now the average seller must sell. That is his business, and the goods will be therefore sold at such a price as will make the demand equal to the supply (this is very important). That is to say, the Selling Price is a Price which will find purchasers for all of the goods. If the Price is so low as to cause a withdrawal of goods from the market, this would show the influence of Price upon supply. In any case, the supply would equal the demand. However, F. J., the production and the sale of commodities is a continuous process, and when goods are removed from the market by the purchaser, others must take their places. The Price realized, therefore, must be such as to allow a continuous flow to the market; that is to say, the Price must, on the average, cover the cost of producing the goods (which same conclusion—*Mirabile Dictu*—is reached by the Marginal Utility theorists!)

Yet it must be remembered that the Cost of Production is itself merely an addition of prices plus the average rate of profit, and therefore we cannot say Prices are determined by the Cost of Production. However, prices determined by the conditions of the market will, in the long run, tend to coincide with the respective Costs of Production (Price of Production in Marx). Of course, this is the case with only those goods produced under competition. Further, the Cost of Production cannot, by reason of the fact that it includes the average rate of profit, coincide with Value, because (a) of the varying organic composition of capital (b) even in the case of capitals of average composition, the constant capital employed may, and probably does, include the products of capital of another composition (c) of varying rates of turnover and (d) Merchant's Capital must share in the average rate of profit.

Nevertheless (now follow me closely Mac) Value can be connected with Exchange Value in one way. In any given period of time there is produced a given quantity of commodities; these have already absorbed a given quantity of labor, and consequently have a certain total Value. The Values of these commodities are expressed in gold prices. The total Gold Price must of necessity equal the total Value. A certain proportion of the total Value will consist of Surplus Value—depending upon the productivity of labor and the intensity of exploitation. The proportion which the total Surplus Value bears to the total capital involved gives the Rate of Profit. The total profit (including rent and interest) equals the total Surplus Value; and this is again a part of a total value produced by labor. Are you still with me Mac, for this is the point at which the concept Value touches the percept Exchange Value? All of which can be condensed into the statement that Exchange Value and Prices are NOT to be explained by reference to the Law of Value, Value and Exchange Value therefore, are very distinct and separate things and unless you clearly recognize and emphasize this, F. J. McNey, the Marxian theory of Value is indefensible—not even intelligible.

The conclusion is inevitable—as I am sure you will now agree. There is a complete unanimity of opinion between the Marginal Utility theorists and Marx on Value in Exchange. You started out with a definite object in view—to ridicule one theory by using another in opposition to it—when as a matter of fact you understood neither. Professors may, or may not, have made mistakes which will make them the "laughing-stock of future generations," but you certainly have not wasted any time in giving the present generation an opportunity to at least smile. Now look here, Mac, I will tell you what to do. Don't be discouraged, spend a little more time in study; read Marx.

Science and Scientists

BY F. J. McNEY.

IN the "good old days" when skeptics and heretics were not so plentiful as they are at the present time, it was the custom of the great majority of men to accept the word of the priest as final on all subjects. The priest was supposed to be the interpreter of all God's wishes with regard to man whom he had created, and consequently, what the priest said was the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, and from it there was no appeal. This superstition of the infallibility of the priest still persists to a considerable extent in modern times, but it has been supplemented by a still more dangerous superstition, the theory of the infallibility of the scientist.

It is a common thing in this day and generation to hear some imbecile preaching in favor of some freak theory or superstition, and clinching his argument with the assertion that he has the statements of one or more great scientists to back him up, and prove that his particular nostrum or superstition is the truth, and as a rule he is correct as far as his authorities are concerned. The fact that there are other great scientists who consider the said nostrum or superstition a joke cuts no ice whatever, and if anybody makes so bold as to question the truth of this, that, or the other divine revelation, he is scornfully invited to show by what right or authority he presumes to doubt the opinion of a great scientist who has made a thorough investigation of the subject, and so on and so forth.

Science, according to this type of hombre, is merely a few of the opinions and statements of one or more scientists who happen to be obsessed by some freak theory or superstition similar to his own. He knows nothing about science, in many cases he does not even know what the word science means. All he knows is that science is supposed to deal with truth and facts, and that a scientist is supposed to be able to explain things scientifically. Consequently, what a scientist says must be the truth, provided, of course, that it agrees with his own pet theories and superstitions, otherwise, it has no force or effect whatever.

Now this theory, that every statement made by a scientist on any subject must therefore be scientific just because it is a scientist that makes it, is bunk, and we can prove that it is bunk by the statements of the scientists themselves, without using our own reasoning ability at all. For instance, if everything Sir Oliver Lodge has to say with regard to spiritualism is scientific, then it is a cinch that what the materialists have to say with regard to the same subject is not, and vice versa. In fact, as far as belief in a supernatural is concerned, we find the same variation among scientists as we do among ordinary "scissor-bills." At one end of the scale we find the materialists, who explain everything from a materialistic point of view. Next come the various brands of agnostics; these shade gradually into the various brands of unorthodox Christians, the fifty-fifty type; these again, shade gradually into the orthodox Christians, and finally we come to the group typified by Sir Oliver Lodge and his herd of trained and performing ghosts.

But religion is not the only subject upon which we find a difference of opinion amongst scientists. And furthermore, a scientist, no matter how logical he may be in his reasoning is not a reliable authority on every subject under the sun, and many scientists do not even reason logically within their own fields of investigation. Take the majority of modern economists for instance; they reason on the subject of economics like a man up a tree, and there is good reason for such reasoning, there is logic in their lack of logic; it pays to be illogical on that particular subject. In short if we wish to under-

stand any subject scientifically, we must learn to distinguish between science and the mere opinions and statements of scientists which may or may not be scientific. Briefly stated, science is classified knowledge, the result of logical reasoning based on known facts, but much of what is handed out as science by certain scientists is neither based on reason nor facts.

Of course, in the case of Sir Oliver Lodge and his opinions and statements with regard to spiritualism, we are informed that he has studied the subject for many years and has made a thorough investigation of it, thus reducing it to a science, and consequently he must be a more reliable authority on the subject than other scientists who have not given it the same amount of study and investigation, particularly the scientists of the materialistic school.

Now this argument seems quite logical at first glance, so we will examine it a little closer. It is true, we may if we stretch a point or two, classify spiritualism as a branch of the so-called science of theology. But here we encounter another difficulty. Sir Oliver is not the only authority on theology, and it is hardly logical to suppose that he is the best. There are many men who have spent their whole lives in the study of theology, and who claim to know all about ghosts, gods, and devils, heavens and other places, men "whose souls are lighted with wisdom from on high," and yet very few of those men have arrived at the same conclusions as Sir Oliver Lodge. In fact most of them do not hesitate to denounce him as a hoax as far as his dealings with the ghosts are concerned. They tell us that Sir Oliver may be all right as an authority on physics, but as an authority on ghosts he is rotten, or words to that effect.

Nor is it much wonder that those wise and holy men object to Sir Oliver's scientific ghost paradise if we are to believe everything he tells us about it. For instance, he informs us that there are all kinds of liquid refreshments, jackass brandy and other such beverages, "over on the other side." And Sir Oliver is not alone in this contention, he is ably supported by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle—another authority on the subject, therefore it must be true. Now if there is booze "over on the other side" it is logical to suppose that it has a "kick" to it like booze everywhere else, otherwise it would not be booze. And if it has a "kick" to it we may assume that it has the same effect on the ghosts who imbibe it, as it would have on—well say a prohibitionist. Any prohibitionist will tell you that the wine is "red and rich—but grief and woe are hid those rosy depths below." In other words, we may let it be granted that the ghosts get drunk and disorderly at times and have to be pinched for disturbing the peace. All of which brings us to the conclusion that when the prohibitionists have dried this world up to their taste their task will only be half done, because they will have to start all over again "on the other side."

But that is not all. It is a poor pleasure resort that has to depend on booze alone. There should be other things besides the cup that cheers, and there always are. It is true, Sir Oliver tells us, that there are also cigars. That will help some, of course: "a good cigar is a smoke," but even that is not enough. There is no reason at all why a man should not be able to get a shot in the arm or soothe his nerves with a pipe of opium "over on the other side" if he feels that way inclined, and I am sure that if Sir Oliver will just look around a little he will find joints where such luxuries may be procured. And what about women and cards? Surely no well conducted pleasure resort could get along without those "Wine, women and cards" always go together, and it is a well known fact that it is these three

great evils that drag us poor innocent male animals down into the dust in this "vale of tears and woe." It is quite possible, indeed it is almost certain, that if it were not for the triple evils which beset us we would sprout wings before ever we leave "this terrestrial ball." But if the same temptations are waiting for us "over on the other side"—well we are out of luck right, and that is all there is to it, so what is the use? Anyhow, I offer these few suggestions and deductions to Sir Oliver and his disciples, free gratis and for nothing, to be used in whatever way they thing best.

However, leaving all jokes aside, Sir Oliver is not the only scientist whose opinions and statements on certain subjects are open to criticism from a scientific point of view. Science is science, and a scientist is a scientist, and the twain meet occasionally, but at times they are far apart, for much of what is presented as science by certain scientists, especially in the science of sociology and its various branches, is not science at all but merely drivel.

But don't think for a minute that I am condemning all scientists on general principles. No person could have more respect for a scientist so long as he is scientific than I have, but when a man makes use of the prestige that his name as a scientist gives him to propagate in the name of science ideas and theories that are anything but scientific, and in many cases utter nonsense, then I feel called upon to protest. Nor does it make any difference to me or to any member of the working class what his motive may be for so doing. In some cases it may be that there is merely something the matter with his head. In other cases it is no doubt his stomach that is the cause of the trouble. Now don't misunderstand me; I am not alluding to dyspepsia, or such like diseases, although these are factors to be considered. What I mean is that many scientists, in order to make sure of their meal tickets must temper their science in accordance with the needs and desires of those who pay them their salaries and if a knowledge of the material facts upon which all science must be based is not in accordance with the wishes and interests of the paymasters, then the scientists must peddle something else or starve. When we look at the proposition from this point of view, scientists of this type are not so much to blame, self-preservation, they say, is the first law of nature, and it affects scientists as well as everybody else. But the fact proves conclusively that science, in many of its branches, has come to a standstill. It can advance no further so long as the present system of society exists, except to the extent it may be carried forward by the workers themselves. And don't think because you have not got a university education you can't help to advance science, that is another superstition that must be kicked into the garbage can pronto. The only equipment a man needs for a study of the sciences we are most interested in is a few books and a mind capable of reasoning logically on what he reads, and comparing it with the facts and conditions he sees around him in everyday existence. This equipment is almost as free to the average worker as it is to the university professor, because, while the professor has the advantage as far as books and time are concerned, the worker has the advantage of experience gained by his contact with the stern realities of life. Also, the mind of the average worker is equal to that of the average professor and if the worker is hampered to some extent by his lack of education the professor is hampered still more by the kind of an education that has been crammed into him. Again while many professors are hampered in their teaching of science by their economic situation as mentioned above, there are no such restrictions on the workers at all; we don't make our living by teaching science, and consequently we have no incentive

(Continued on page 8)

CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS

(Continued from page 4)

Whether the dispute be one of wages and hours, or one of bread, the amount of workers affected at any given time correctly reflects the concentration of social wealth in private hands. And with this concentration and its motion we get a corresponding growth of action of an antagonistic nature between the owners and non-owners thereof.

Among the ranks of the workers such action spreads itself out over an ever-growing mass, but among the capitalists it expresses itself more as intensity. Thus the masses must in the very nature of things be much slower to move with the same intensity of purpose as do the few who own and control. But, nevertheless, class consciousness grows in proportion amongst the capitalists. It does not become so packed and hence not so concentrated amongst such huge numbers as it does amongst those who at present rule the roost. Nevertheless, while the elements that comprise the working class cannot all be set boiling or be heated up to the point of revolutionary heat, at the present moment, yet, by the dynamic force of modern machine production, coupled with the force of convective currents and conductive channels of the most active members of this class, the heating process can be muchly accelerated and in places welded together into larger and larger groups. But the simple process of grouping these discontented elements is insufficient for our purpose.

It is not the purpose of a group, attempting to revolutionize the ideas of the working class, to simply bring the disgruntled groups together and then hatch a hotch-potch political platform to try and fit the particular case of each and every group. Such an attempt is doomed from the start to failure.

The bringing together of those who suffer most under the system is a very worthy action. But the objective should be for some other purpose than merely creating a mass discord, or, more correctly speaking, for uniting the several special expressions of discordance into one mass discord. All of these discordant factors are a product of bourgeois society. That being the case it necessarily follows that an enlightened lecture on the evils of the system as applied to both the industrial worker and the exploited small farmer would do much greater good than leaving them in the same ignorant frame of mind made worse by its massing. The work of emancipation is the work of the proletariat. Capitalism creates them, but it also takes good care to see that they are not given an enlightened understanding of the system that crushes them. Rather do the institutions of present day learning make every attempt to confuse the issue. Therefore, if ignorance of the laws of capitalism are to the capitalists' benefit, will the simple massing of such ignorance be of any pronounced danger? I honestly can't see it as such.

Capitalism must by virtue of itself create discontent, but so long as that discontent is merely centred on some special phase of its working, so long must the discontented masses move in a circle. The more capitalism tends to international consolidation, the deeper must we delve into our studies in order to explain the more complicated workings of capital. And this for the simple reason that phases of the international question must ever tend to overshadow those arising from a purely national working, if such is possible, with a given international status. For with the ever-growing importance of the international linking of capital, there must go a corresponding change in consciousness. To quote Marx: "The totality of these industrial relations constitutes the economic structure of society, the real basis upon which the legal and political superstructure of society is built, and to which definite forms of social consciousness correspond."

"The method of producing the material livelihood determines the social, political and intellectual life process in general.

"It is not men's consciousness which determines their life; on the contrary, it is their social life which determines their consciousness."

With a more complete interlocking of exploitation, therefore, we must necessarily have a growing demand on the part of the proletariat for an answer

to the international questions. These can be answered in a dual manner. One side of the question suiting the ruling interests and the other that explains the position of the exploited.

The consciousness of the worker, therefore, must be brought up to the well-tempered point of understanding that the solution of his woes lies in the solving of the problem of the abolition of Capital and the establishment of Socialism. With this thought firmly embedded in his brain and a determination to bring about the happy consummation thereof, shall we collect the ripe fruit from the tree of "class consciousness."

J. C.

REVOLUTIONS, POLITICAL AND SOCIAL.

(Continued from page 1)

and displays to the tune of a hundred thousand france a day. It was the playground of Europe and as an English diplomat said, "They did better than banish Mrs. Grundy, they invited her, and drugged her the moment she arrived." It is said that a Maggie Jiggs comedy was frequently enacted. The Emperor demanded rounded limbs and ample bosoms to the front; the Empress strove mightily to have the front benches reserved for the more angular types of beauty which she preferred. The functionaries responsible were sore distressed to accommodate such conflicting artistic values, and sometimes the poor Empress, by no means squeamish, had to hide her mortification in Scotland.

We spare the readers further detail, but while the scenes were staged a hundred miles from Paris, these were the days of telegraphic eyes, and they were seen by proxy in the dimly lit streets of Montemarte and St. Germain, whose populace had more than once reached anxiety for the flying coattails of a prince of blood. But even more ominous signs and wonders were forced upon the emperor. He had withdrawn his army from Rome, where the atheist French stood guard over God's Vicar on earth, and the French clergy, by no means a negligible factor, were not pleased. This displeasure was turned to rage when, in 1867, Garibaldi marched his Red shirts on Rome. The Pope's soldiers were routed; but the French army soon proved that they were not alone in facing the enemy back to front and while Napoleon placated the clergy, he lost a valuable ally in Italy and made impossible any alliance with Britain. He attempted to throw the responsibility of the Pope's safety on the Powers, but Bismarck was not minded to such an easy way out for his good friend, especially as he possessed knowledge of a tentative treaty between France, Italy and Austria, and recollections of the half hearted support of Italy during his war with Austria. The French army stayed in Rome.

Several other little items might be noted. Darwin's "Origin of Species" had taken the world by storm, and the old safeguards of property were shaken to their foundation. The first International had been lately and successfully launched and had taken to the new gospel like a temperance communicant to his wine. A new power, electricity, was engaging the attention of the Capitalists. Napoleon decided to grant a constitution and a responsible ministry.

But fate, so long indulgent to this fortunate adventurer who rested securely in the dictum "in the Empire is peace"—Peace, of course, between the classes—was marked for the slaughter. Bismarck was ready, and fate kindly lent her assistance through the vacant throne of Spain, which is all so exciting and illuminating as to deserve a chapter all to itself.

SCIENCE AND SCIENTISTS.

(Continued from page 7)

to teach anything but the facts, whether our masters like it or not.

Therefore I maintain that any advance worthy of mention that is made in the science of sociology in the future must be made by the workers themselves, because it is not in the interests of the capitalist class that any advance should be made in that particular science. Of course, we must take into consid-

eration an occasional scientist of the capitalist class who is both economically and intellectually independent, as well as intellectually honest, but such are few and far between.

BOOK REVIEW*

"Freedom of speech, of press and of assemblage . . . and all the above named freedoms are so regulated that, in their enjoyment the bourgeoisie encounter no opposition from the like rights of the other classes. Wherever the bourgeoisie wholly interdict these rights to others or have allowed them their enjoyment under conditions that were but so many police snares, it was always done in the interest of 'public safety', i.e., of the bourgeoisie as required by the Constitution."—(Marx).

MR. POST'S book is a belated addition to the mass of "Now It May Be Told" literature of the post-war period. It is a form of literary apologia offered by liberal politicians in defense of the aberrations of Democracy and Justice in times of class strife.

Mr. Post, viewing American Capitalism through the 18th century spectacles of Jeffersonian democracy is loath to admit that the Republic "of Liberty triumphant in government" (as he phrases it) is a class State.

If any contradictions have developed between the high falutin' principles set forth in the Declaration of Independence and the practical application of these principles in the realities of injunctions, deportations, Espionage and Criminal Syndicalism laws, directed exclusively against the workers, the fault lies not in the abstract principles of bourgeois freedom to which the Republic is dedicated, but in the venability of the official interpreters of the basic laws incorporated in the Constitution. So reasons Mr. Post. Some of the laws applying to aliens are subversive to American ideals, says Mr. Post. Yet, being a firm supporter of "a Government of Law," as opposed to a "Government of Men," Mr. Post administered the law as he found it. The gentle art of "passing the buck" is an ancient one.

"I did not make the law, I merely administer it," has been re-echoed from the lips of ruling-class officials down through the ages.

From Pontius Pilate to Metcalf in Winnipeg, and the "administrators" of Criminal Syndicalism in California, that cry has resounded. "He only did his duty," re-echoe the gullible slaves.

Aside from the defense of Mr. Post and American Ideals, the facts set forth in the book are in general accord with the personal experiences of the victims of the Red Hysteria. The power of the minor bureaucrats to ignore the orders of their superior officer, when it suited their purpose is exemplified by the fact that though the assistant secretary of labor ordered the release from jail of the membership of one organization on "their own recognizance," this order was not complied with until the final disposition of their cases, some months after the order was issued! Mr. Post is evidently unaware of this fact, though it can be amply substantiated.

As a sample of the mentality of the morons who saved the Republic from the Red tyrants, I quote from the book. During one of the raids in New York city a portrait of Karl Marx was "captured." "Painting Karl Marx's pictured nose red, one of the detectives used the mutilated portrait as a mask, and, thrusting a cigarette through the pictured lips into his own, made the caricature of the founder of Socialism seem to smoke gaily as its wearer paraded about the place—all to the delight of the office force."

To the worker who has given some time to an investigation of class society, and the functions of capitalist governments, the book presents nothing new. It only proves the assertions of Lafargue that in times of class strife, the "Right to Life, to Liberty, to Justice, to Revolt and the rest of their Constitutional rights," are about as useful to the proletariat as "a plaster on a wooden leg."

F. CUSACK.

*The Deportations Delirium of 1920.—By Louis F. Post, assistant secretary of Labor, U. S. A., 1913-21. Chicago, C. H. Kerr & Co.