

WESTERN CLARION

A Journal of
CURRENT
EVENTS

Official Organ of
THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

HISTORY
ECONOMICS
PHILOSOPHY

No. 936

TWENTY-FIRST YEAR.

MONTHLY

VANCOUVER, B. C., MAY 1, 1925

FIVE CENTS

War With Japan

What Shall the U. S. Get Out of It?

NO, the substance of the U. S. controversy with Japan is not immigration. It is not a genuine conviction that Japan is planning an aggressive war on the United States. It is China—trade and profits. There are of course minor elements. There are war-scare mongers who make profits out of congressional appropriations for munitions and armor plate. There are capitalists, land speculators, and merchants on the Western coast who honestly think that they did not get their fair share of the profits of the last war or that they do not now receive their due proportion out of the annual pork barrel for harbor improvements and coast defenses. There are labor-politicians in some communities who flourish on anti-Japanese agitation. There are restless navy officers who enjoy fishing in troubled waters and are eager to see the "untoward incident" precipitated—on account of the fun, the glory, the excitement, the honors, the decorations, and the promotions. Some of them are doubtless wondering just how the matter can be started with a show of propriety. There are also some brave souls who still think that another world conflict would strengthen national and Christian virtues—the two being one and the same thing. All these, however, could be easily held in check by a President and a State Department really bent on peace with honor.

But the substance of the controversy with Japan is not immigration, nor fear of Japanese aggression, nor the promotion of Christian virtues with bayonets, bombs, and gases; it is China—trade and profits. This has been the substance of the matter for many long years. We know from Russian diplomatic papers now exposed to public gaze that Philander Knox, when Secretary of State, carried his system of dollar diplomacy into the Far East. Manchuria, Mongolia, the Chinese Eastern Railway, and other spheres of economic gain were the objects of his tender solicitude. It was the Washington specter that facilitated the secret union of Russia and Japan just before the collapse of the Czar's regime. Professor Paul Reinsch, in his reminiscences of a diplomat, frankly continued the serial story. He regarded the American legation in Peking as a bureau for the assistance of American merchants and capitalists in China, and he did his best to get the United States committed to a programme of driving Japan from the mainland by force of arms if necessary. This same trade and profit motive was at the centre of the savage assault on Japan during the dispute over Shantung. High and mighty gentlemen at Washington, who spoke softly about what England, France, and Italy got in the grand distribution of the spoils of victory at Versailles in 1919, were terribly shocked to learn that Japan got a bit of plunder also. American liberals were likewise horribly shocked and got quite red in the face lashing the

distant imperialists. What a strange collection of upstanding citizens joined in the clamor over Shantung—a clamor that almost landed us in a war with Japan over the business! Hard-boiled Tories who rejoiced in trampling on the liberties of the Filipinos, the Haitians, the Dominicans, the Nicaraguans, and the other wards of American marines, were visibly pained to see Japan holding a piece of territory belonging to the poor, dear Chinese. The cause was righteous—to those who could see the mote and not the beam.

We were headed for the crisis when Senator Borah forced the calling of the Washington Conference in which Hughes and Harding shone so brilliantly. By firm but gentle pressure England and the United States forced Japan to relax her grip on Shantung—without letting loose of anything themselves. Everything was done with great ceremony and with a fine feeling for the proprieties—and with less noise than would have followed an attempt of Germany and Japan to break the hold of American capitalists on the Philippines. About the same time the Chinese bubble burst. Even the man in the street discovered that the government of Peking was no government at all and had no power outside the walls of the city—and very little inside. It stood revealed as a band of military adventurers recognized by the foreign Powers and sustained by the levings from the salt and customs duties collected under alien auspices—saving always "the sovereignty and sacred honor of China." American bankers who lent money to the Chinese government without security lost their investments. Japanese imperialists were badly singed. American capitalists who rushed in to gather the prizes promised by the bustling, bustling Department of Commerce got their fingers burned also. In spite of all the puffing and blowing, American business with the sixty million Japanese continued to be about twice the business with the three or four hundred million Chinese. The vocation of loving China and hating Japan lost some of its charm.

For a time, American financiers, having suffered a set-back in China, turned their attention to Nippon. Some of the most astute said unto themselves: "Lend money to the Japanese and let them do it in and to China." So money was lent to the Oriental Development Company which operates in Korea, China, and other distant places—sometimes curiously and mysteriously. A big loan was advanced to the Industrial Bank of Japan, which likewise finances various economic activities in the Far East. Another loan, huge in amount, was made to the Imperial Japanese Government on a basis that netted a tidy commission as well as a good rate of interest. Another was made to the Great Electric Company, and still others to minor concerns. All these loans work for peace between Japan and the United States—at least for the present. American financiers do not want the business structure of the Far East shaken by dangerous military adventures.

But the saturation-point is about reached in Japan, and longing eyes still rove restlessly in the direction of Manchuria, Mongolia, Siberia, the China trade, and the waste places of the Far East. If American financiers are content to lend money to the Japanese, American promoters and traffic hunters are thinking of other worlds to conquer.

So "what" we shall get in the great day is fairly

clear—at least in the scheme of calculation. Assuming victory as a matter of course, the United States at the close would take Formosa and the neighboring isles, the South Manchurian Railway, and other valuable properties. It would assume "moral responsibility" for Korea, Manchuria, and Mongolia. Doubtless a "commission" of experts and bishops would show that Christian ethics did not require us to follow the example of Japan in the case of Shantung and return Manchuria to China. The outposts of American civilization would be planted along the Chinese Eastern Railway and the basis laid for the penetration of Siberia. Korea would be assimilated to the benevolent administration of the Philippines. The United States would master the trade of China if it took seven times twenty-one demands. This is the substance of the "what."

Of course there would be other things. There would be "cost plus" once more, labor boards, and committees on public information. There would be created a few thousand additional millionaires. The Hon. Charles E. Hughes has soberly said that in view of the precedents already set, constitutional government as we now know it would hardly survive a long war even if victoriously waged. So there would be sedition and espionage acts. Professors would be expelled for expressing doubts about the infallibility of Congress and the President. The jails would be filled with American citizens unable to believe what their consciences forbid. Aliens would be deported by the ship load. The Department of Justice would let loose a million spies to stir up suspicion and hatred.

And who are "we"? According to Mr. Dwight Morrow's analysis of foreign bond distribution in the United States, the number of "us" interested in spreading the benefits of civilization is very large. The advent of the baby bond has multiplied our godly company. There are some of us on every Main Street. Stock-sharing schemes augment the fraternity of the fortunate. As most of the men drafted for the army and the navy would be farmers and unskilled laborers not useful for the lathe or test tube, a great proportion of "us" would escape the heat of the day. Especially is this true since many thousand Negro boys could be called upon to help carry the white man's burden and hold back the rising tide of color. In the end there would be jobs for deserving Republicans and Democrats in the new dependencies, places for teachers and missionaries. On the whole quite a number of "us" will be delighted with "what" "we" shall get.

But things might not be so simple, eventually if not now. Would England stand idly by and see the United States become mistress of the Pacific and dominant in China? Would Russia always remain powerless under the sway of American enterprise? Would it be possible to isolate the burning house? What if the conflagration started on the Yangtze or on the Inland Sea spread to Europe? It is easier to start a war than to stop it or to divine its outcome. Would the spoils and the fun then balance the blood, treasure, frenzy, and hysteria? Who would hold the bonds, gather the profits, reap the dividends? Who would give their lives and pay the taxes? Would the loot be worth the pain? For a little while the sun shines and it is constitutionally permissible to ask these questions.—The Nation, (N. Y.)

The Economics of Labor

(Continued from last issue)

ALL wealth is produced by labour and it is its object, not its source, which determines whether wealth is or is not capital. Capital, then, is simply the result of past labour, used to assist present labour in producing wealth in order to produce profit for its owner. It is clear, then, that capital owes its existence to labour and must have been preceded by labour. One of the mischievous results of reversing the proper order of these two elements is that economists represent labour as dependent on capital. Capital, they say, is the result of thrift and abstinence on the part of the capitalist, who makes advances to the thriftless workman while he is working. Profit and interest are the reward which the capitalist receives for his thrift and abstinence—the natural, economic reward received through making these advances. Now all this is entirely fallacious. Capital does not make any advance to labour. Generally speaking, labour works a week or a fortnight before he receives any wages at all, and during that time he increases the value of his employer's capital by far more than he receives in wages. The capitalist does not subsist him during that time; he pays him the cost of his subsistence after he has done his work—not before. And even then the capitalist does not really give him anything beyond an order on other labourers to supply him with a certain quantity of food, clothing, and shelter, all of which, bear in mind, have been produced, not by the capitalist, but by these other labourers. A man's wages are only useful in so far as they enable him to get hold of these various commodities produced by other labourers. Indirectly, then, he merely exchanges the result of his labour with that of other labourers, all of which must necessarily be produced before it can be exchanged. All that the capitalist does is to act as a sort of go-between and pay himself well for performing this part somewhat badly.

That profit and interest are the reward of abstinence is not less fallacious than that capital subsists labour, or that capital is the result of abstinence. The natural economic reward of abstinence is the result of abstinence. If two of us have ten shillings each, and one spends his in drink, while the other saves his, the result is that on the morrow one has ten shillings and the other has a headache. The reward for the abstinent one is the possession of ten shillings and freedom from headache. But his continued abstinence from consuming the ten shillings will not make the ten shillings grow, and the reward of his abstinence becomes no bigger from long-continued contemplation. According to the orthodox theory, this ten shillings should grow and grow, so long as its owner abstained from consuming it. But if it were left alone it is quite certain that it would not increase at all, and it is necessary to seek for another source than mere abstinence for the return to capital represented by interest and profit.

Profit and interest have their source, as has all wealth, in the labour of the workers, applied to natural objects. What we are immediately concerned with is the consideration as to how, if they are the result of labour, they go to others than the workers. Nobody, except the economists, believe profits to be the reward of thrift and abstinence—and it is even doubtful if the economists themselves believe it. They appear to me to put this forward as a justification for what is morally unjustifiable—as an ethical basis for what is ethically unsound. But the majority of people are not troubled by considerations of abstract ethics in matters of business. They do not therefore consider if profit is the reward for the practice of any virtue; to them profit is the reward of astuteness in business, of the practice of the art of buying cheap and selling dear, which art is the perfection of commercialism. Yet this theory is as fallacious as the other, and only arises in consequence of the fact, to which I have before referred,

that production today—capitalist production, is not carried on for the purpose of supplying human needs, but for the production of profit. Consequently you have, not the production of articles of utility, per se, but the production of commodities to be put upon the market to sell. This is the characteristic feature of the capitalist system which distinguishes it from preceding stages of economic development. Whereas under other economic conditions production was carried on primarily for use and only superfluities were sold or exchanged, production today is carried on primarily for exchange.

In mediæval times, with all the evils of serfdom, there was this advantage, that people used to grow food to eat, make clothes to wear, and build houses to live in. Now, strange as it may seem, we do not grow food to eat, make clothes to wear, or build houses to live in. All these things are made to sell at a profit, with the result that we have adulterated food, shoddy clothing, and jerry-built houses. The sooner things are destroyed or tumble to pieces the better for everybody, except the unfortunate purchaser. With the change in economic conditions there has come a change in the political, the religious, and the social phases of the life of the community. In mediæval times the feudal chieftain was absolute master—land was the dominant economic factor. But with the growth of manufacture, of production for sale, the rise of the bourgeoisie meant the downfall of feudalism. The plutocrat supplanted the baron, capitalism became king. The "old nobility" of England today are successful brewers, bankers, and traders, and the Nonconformist Conscience dominates in the place of Holy Mother Church. These facts go to illustrate what I have already incidentally pointed out, that the economic conditions dominate all other conditions. Economic dominance is bound to secure political and religious dominance, the owner of capital being master in the material field of economics, dominates in all other departments of social life. On the other hand, attempts to secure political power without economic freedom meet with but sorry success. The political atmosphere is probably more corrupt in America than in any other country in the world, because there you have a sham political democracy on top of a real economic plutocracy. There capitalism is unrestricted by any of the old feudal traditions which still have some influence in other countries, it is absolute monarch, and the pretended freedom of the American people only serves to gild the chains which enslave them.

This then is the economic system of today, the production of commodities to be put upon the market to sell, for profit. From this arises the very general impression that it is on the market, and in the process of Exchange, that profit is made, that people make their profits by buying cheap and selling dear. This I say is the general view, and yet a very little consideration should be sufficient to demonstrate that it is impossible for everybody to be buying cheap and selling dear. If one buys cheap somebody has to sell cheap, and if one sells dear someone has to buy dear. Now it is the bourgeoisie, the capitalist class, who are engaged in this trading, in this buying cheap and selling dear, and although sometimes here and there one goes under, and some here and there make fortunes, they are all, generally speaking, daily and yearly getting richer. Now, to suggest that they are getting rich at each other's expense is as absurd as the statement that the inhabitants of the Scilly Isles make a precarious living by taking in each others' washing. "Dog doesn't eat dog," and capitalist does not exploit capitalist. He cannot. The higgling of the market is simply a gambling with the products of other men's labour, but it produces no more than gambling does as a rule. If you in this room had a hundred pounds and started gambling with it, and kept it up till tomorrow this time, some of you would

probably be richer and some poorer than when you started, but your hundred pounds would not have increased by a red cent. But, as I have said, apart from their individual losses and gains, the whole capitalist class grow richer, and apparently in this process of gambling among themselves. Yet, as you must see, this is only apparent, not real. It is not here that gains are made. All that the process does eventually is to determine the proportion of the surplus value each partner in the long firm shall take. What would you have? "Honour among thieves." And the capitalist cannot keep his gains for himself, but must share them out with his hangers-on and assistants, the landlord, the lawyer, the parson, and the prince.

Just now, however, the question we are concerned with is how he comes by his gains rather than how he apportions them. We have seen that they are not really the reward of abstinence, and that they are not in the process of exchange—seeing that neither abstinence nor exchange can of themselves create anything.

If, however, we pursue our investigation of this process of exchange we may discover the actual source of the surplus-value which is gambled with therein. If we conclude that there is no ultimate gain made simply by the exchange of commodities we arrive at this, that over the whole area of exchange there is a general average, that taking the whole mass of exchanges, all commodities exchange at equal values. The price of one commodity may rise above, that of another fall below, its normal value, but the two exchanges cancel this difference, and falls or rises in individual instances make no more difference in the rule as to exchange of equal values than the rise and fall of the waves of the sea make to the sea level. But what is this value, which must be equal in any two commodities which exchange for each other? So many pairs of boots, for instance will exchange for a watch; but what is there in common between the boots and the watch? Nothing but this, that they are both the embodiment of a certain amount of human labour. The amount of socially necessary human labour that is expended on a commodity determines its value in exchange with any other commodity. This is simply an amplification of the theory of the older economists—Adam Smith and others, that the cost of production was the basis of value. Karl Marx has taken this theory and given it a scientific value by amplification and limitation.

We say, for instance, socially necessary human labour. If it takes as much labour to produce a watch as would produce two pairs of boots, then, generally speaking, two pairs of boots are of equal value with one watch and the boots and watch will exchange for each other. If a man took twice as long as was ordinarily necessary to make a pair of boots—that would not make his one pair of boots equal a watch as a value in exchange. If, however, by some improved method of production watches could be produced with one half the usual amount of labour, while the cost in labour of producing boots remained the same, the result would be that the value of watches in exchange with boots would fall to one half, and whereas formerly one watch equalled two pairs of boots it would now only exchange for one pair. It is sometimes attempted to disprove this theory on the ground that it is the utility of a thing and not its cost of production which determines its value. But a coat as an article of utility remains the same, although its exchange value may fall considerably as the result of improved method of production. The utility of a loaf of bread, as compared with a gold watch, to a starving man may be incalculable, but makes no difference to their relative values in exchange. Objectors to this theory will point to a picture which will fetch a fabulous price, or to a man dying of

(Continued on page 8)

The Common Herd and the Commonwealth

BY F. W. MOORE

NAPOLEON BONAPARTE, when driving in his carriage through the streets of Paris, was once asked why he did not seem to be affected by the applause of the multitude, "I am not moved at all," said he, "They would applaud just as heartily if I were going to my execution, provided they had the necessary inspiration from the press and pulpit."

In a similar manner Scott referred to the crowd in the following lines:

"Who o'er the herd would wish to reign?
Fantastic, fickle, fierce and vain, etc."

And not only Scott and Napoleon, but thousands of soi-distant intellectuals imagine that these attributes are inherent in the constitution of humanity. They never for a moment suppose that they are imminent merely, and not inherent; in other words, the attributes are not inseparable from the constitution of humanity but are temporarily remaining there as the effect of suggestions embodied in a crude environment.

As a matter of fact the herd is the heir apparent to the industrial throne. The continually increasing ability of man to produce by means of machinery more commodities than he can sell in any expansion of the world market, assures this, and at the same time heralds the early decease of the capitalistic system. The really momentous question incidental to the opportunity is as follows: Will the fantastic ones rise to the occasion?

Will they be able, when capital breaks down of its own weight, to operate the industries of the world on a basis of production for use? If they don't, we may rest assured that the whole civilized world will be adversely affected by the most regrettable calamities.

But in the meantime we are merely considering their capacity to rule. Men in the mass are fantastic, fickle, fierce and vain only in direct ratio to their lack of opportunity for self-culture. When they have no set of general principles, the truth of which they know how to prove, and the value of which as a standard they can use in estimating the worth of the opinions and judgment of others, it is impossible for them to be anything but slaves to their own credulity. Hence being fantastic, fickle, vain and unconscious of their class position in society, they send representatives of the plutocracy to parliament under the impression that their interests are identical.

That is why the promoters of industrial interests, whose money is instrumental in sending these men to power, can afford to despise the opinions of the majority of their constituents; that is why their hired men as members of parliament can so flagrantly treat the people as a herd in positively refusing to account for millions of dollars placed in their trust, as we shall show later. They hold them in contempt because the opinions of the majority, so-called, are in reality the opinions of their masters imbibed unconsciously in various subtle manners through the feeding-bottle of suggestion, insinuated too subtly for notice amongst the dining utensils with which they introduce their mental pabulum to the system; they despise them all the more because in case of dissatisfaction with the government in power, they know that the wrath of those whom their poets have dubbed "the herd," will be expended at the polls in throwing out one set of their servitors, and putting another, equally useless, in its place; yet, to be perfectly candid, the lack of judgment is not the only reason for these conditions, since the class that controls the wealth, has various methods of controlling the votes also. Nevertheless, the lack of judgment, and the environment that is partly responsible for it, are of tremendous importance. This is all the more so since environment, which is in a great measure factitious, possesses all the potency of its creators as a medium of suggestion. Its influence begins in our boyhood's days. What emulatory emotions, for instance, may be aroused by the statue of

a far-famed warrior in the subconscious mentality of a boy scout whose environment involves inspirations from the swash-buckling characters of a dime novel no less than from the apotheosized heroes of his text-book literature!

In an analogous manner the political orators of every country, hypnotizing the crowds by flattery, induce them to believe they are the most fortunate people on earth flourishing, as they are, under an ideal system of government.

Nowhere are the citizens more easily cajoled in this way than in the great republic to the south, sometimes grandiloquently described by the term "God's country," where, as in the case of the Morgan interests, 60 per cent. of the wealth is owned by 2 per cent. of the people (The Nation, N.Y., quoted from Clarion 935).

We may behold the same joyous crowd, obsessed by the flattery of their rhetorical sophists, in every country of the civilized world. They are particularly in season when the Machiavellian "spielers" of capitalism, after announcing that their countrymen are the most superior people on earth in times of peace, go on to dilate on their invincible courage and prowess in time of war, and that, when they are drawing part of their incomes from foreign munition factories whose weapons are used later against their own armies.

About the time that immediately preceded the outbreak of the world war it was commonly reported that certain prominent Englishmen had shares in the Essen cannon foundries established

Krupp in 1848; and even if that were so, we know that the paradoxical state of affairs did not end there, for sometimes we find titled Englishmen's names inscribed on the guns captured from their enemies. On one side of a cannon that now adorns the town of Bedford, England—a cannon taken by the Bedfordshire Regiment from the Turks at Gaza, in Palestine—is the following inscription: "Made by Sir George Armstrong, Whitworth & Co." (See pamphlet "Women and War," by Rose Henderson.

Such extraordinary situations are no discredit to their human factors. They go to show that while our chauvinistic sophists are trying to keep the human race divided, the inexorable tendency of the development of trade, commerce, and finance is to create an international federation of the world.

A greater bar to progress in that direction even than the sophistries of the chauvinists, is the insidious propaganda of the press veiled by a mantle of patriotic enthusiasm; indeed so potent are the suggestions from this source that their effect descends unto the children of the third and fourth generations. Sometimes a grandson of the original recipient of capitalist psychology may quite innocently disseminate distorted portrayals of the stern realities of life.

We shall finish this article with a quotation from the "B.C. Teacher" for March. It is a statement in which 99 per cent. of the teachers of Canada would place implicit confidence, coming as it does from an obviously honorable man who believes in his own words himself. Here they are: "If our teachers acquire a personal knowledge of the various

provinces and gain a vision of Canada's splendid possibilities, they will make such an impression on the minds of our future statesmen, who are yet at school, that the narrow provincial viewpoint will disappear in wise legislation for a united Canada."

The sentiment embodied in the above is all right as an ideal, but the idea of materializing it under modern circumstances, where opposing interests are at stake, is to say the least, grossly absurd.

It is an open secret that members of parliament on this continent are returned by means of funds supplied by the plutocracy (See charges sworn to by prominent citizens and preferred against the agents of both the Liberal and Conservative parties involving the acceptance respectively of \$300,000 and 350,000, as campaign funds. Other larger funds of a similar nature are referred to in the same section of the "Searchlight" No. 9, page 29—pamphlet got up by the Provincial Party.)

In connection with the helplessness of members of an organization controlled by campaign funds we shall quote Mr. Woodsworth, M.P., for Centre Winnipeg in referring to a parliamentary enquiry into the expenditure of \$50,000,000 voted for war purposes:—

"The total amount of money involved in the purchase investigated was not more than \$3,000,000. This included the price of the submarines, in other words, the Public Accounts committee's investigation touched less than one sixteenth of the \$50,000,000 voted by parliament for war purposes."

We wonder, if the habit of sending plutocratic nominees to parliament persists, how any knowledge whatever of our provinces could influence our future members in bringing about legislation in any way opposed to the interests of the masters at whose hands they are fed. Teachers' ideas as to the future are usually grand, but when entertained without taking into consideration the doctrine of Economic Determinism they are likely to remind one of some accredited faculties of the subjective mind, which, they say, are specially adapted for use in a future life; yet, in connection with the ideas, heaven is not meant here, but the world as it will be when its inhabitants, no longer the unthinking herd, have at last awaked to the necessity of initiating a real civilization by combining together politically and industrially in an international federation of the world long expected by socialists and known to them as an ideal under the name of the "Co-operative Commonwealth."

Then for the first time in history shall all these have been metamorphosed into real men and women of whom it may be justly said in the adapted words of Tennyson that they: "moved upwards having cast out the beast, and let the ape and tiger die."

In other words civilization, which is now embryonic, will have seen the light. The higher development of man will have begun.

BUSINESS HELPS ITSELF.

In the United States the business man "views with alarm" all things that disturb his political peace. Following upon the recent presidential election there the National Republican League has actively bestirred itself on behalf of "sound principles of government" by circularising all and sundry who may have more of the world's wealth than the other fellow, sounding the warning note against overconfidence concerning the defeat of radicalism. "Radicalism," says the circular letter sent out by the League, "is not dead. Two years after the great Harding landslide the radicals 'came back'." Apparently this was somewhat astonishing to big business which now, through the Republican League, urges the policy of organising a nation-wide campaign ahead of next year's Congressional election, and, specifically, to send literature broadcast "to

(Continued on page 4)

ECONOMIC CAUSES OF WAR

By PETER T. LEOKIE

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 740, Vancouver, B. C.
Entered at G. P. O. as a newspaper.

Editor: Ewen MacLeod

SUBSCRIPTION:

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

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

937

VANCOUVER, B. C., MAY 1, 1925

MAY DAY.

ALL the bodies of the International,—Labor, Socialist and Communist—have in the time honoured way given forth in abundance the manifold reasons why the workers of the world should, on May Day, awaken to the significance of their condition and function in life, take resolution and, "by opposing end it." The rallying cry ranges all the way from the time worn demand for the universal application of the eight hours' day to the establishment of the co-operative commonwealth.

The First International in its time declared the limitation of hours in the working day to be the first step in the direction of the emancipation of the working class, which sentiment has been reaffirmed times without number these sixty years since. Irrespective of the emancipation of the working class but significant of the tendency toward international organization and control of industry under capitalist finance, the Peace treaty following upon the world war made provision for the establishment of an international labor office through which a uniform work day of universal application was to be worked out and agreed upon—which has been done. Some fifty countries have agreed upon the principle of the eight hours' day—each resolving, meanwhile, to carry the principle into practice when the other does it. And when the other does it the eight hours' day that evolves is somewhat warped and twisted by amendments and conditions having effect in favor of certain prescribed industries, generally those concerned in export trade, which is in accord with the considerations of the case as being of the world market variety.

Actually, today, the tendency is for the establishment of the universal eight hours' day—or any other uniform work day—to become something for international capital to promote in its own interest. This is very well illustrated by a recent report made by the International Federation of Trade Unions (Amsterdam) from which we take this: "The placing of a recent British order for five motorships in Germany has been a shrewd blow for British employers, affecting as it does employers' profits. At a joint conference of shipbuilders and shipyard workers, a shipbuilder urged that the British Government should be approached and urged 'to take international action for the enforcement of the 48 hours' week in Germany and Holland.' So long as their own pockets were not touched the British employers' representatives at the International Labor Conference shewed some coolness towards the ratification of the Eight Hours' Day Convention. Now they are suddenly beginning to think internationally, having been converted by the needs, not of International Labor, but of British trade."

There is sound sense in the observation that the employer's first concern is trade rather than the aims and aspirations of labor. The point here to be observed, however, is that while the annual May Day output of ink and paper continues its plaint for the eight hours' universal work day after the pattern of the old fashion wherein this is set forth as one of the ideals of labor and thus deserves first attention—while that is being done the needs of the employers

have prompted these latter to get together and to attempt the arrangement of their differences—through the eight hours' work day if need be.

Still the old fashion prevails of issuing slogans on May Day. Here is one not a month old, issued in all seriousness by Amsterdam:

"Let the workers force their governments to establish the eight hours day and to make disarmament a reality, not an empty phrase.

Let the workers open their eyes and see things as they are. Let them recognise their economic and political rights and demand them of their governments.

Let them awaken from their apathy, let them rise and bid the war-makers of the world cease from their deadly work.

We will not wait!

No longer will we be driven like a flock of sheep by a little band of capitalists who have no ideas beyond their own selfish interests.

No longer will we be the unresisting prey of a handful of men who spill our blood and blast the lives of our wives and of our children merely that they may heap up higher their ill-gotten gains.

Let us free ourselves once and for all from the yoke of Capitalism. But we shall never be able to rid the world of this pest while our working hours are long, and our barracks full of soldiers.

Come then, Comrades, come in your millions to join us on May Day: come and march with us in our world demonstration for the Eight Hours' Day, Disarmament and Peace."

Capitalism is a "pest" sure enough, as the document has it, and we miss our guess if the workers don't know it. Yet the matter of looking at the international labor multitude, in its present temper, from the traditional May Day standards, has the appearance of an autopsy.

G. M. F.

Abe Karne \$1.00; J. Mitchell \$2.00.

Above, C. M. F. receipts from March 31 to April 30, inclusive, total 13.

BUSINESS HELPS ITSELF

(Continued from page 3)

4,800 country newspaper editors, to a selected list of several thousand ministers, to college libraries, to college fraternity houses, to railroad and Y.M.C.A. reading rooms and to workers in certain states who are influential in forming sentiment in their respective voting precincts." etc. To this end funds are needed and asked for—ten dollars and up. Together with the circular goes a reprint in leaflet form from "The National Republican" which we here reproduce as indicative of how bankers, manufacturers and mine owners propose to prevent themselves from being "misrepresented" before the people:—

(Reprinted from The National Republican)

IF BUSINESS MEN DON'T DEFEND SELVES,
THEY WON'T BE DEFENDED.

By George W. Hinman,
In the Chicago American.

"Radicalism received its death blow in 1924!" "This death blow is one of the two real achievements of the year—one of the two chief assurances of business progress in 1925!"

These stiff statements were laid before business men by a business man's newspaper. Many statements of the same sort have been made in the business reviews and forecasts of the last six days. The battle is over, the victory won! That is the idea.

Nothing could be further from the truth. If the present tumult in Italy, the communist alarm in France, the commotions in south-eastern Europe did not prove just the contrary, the figures of the elections nearer home would do so.

In the United States the so-called radicals have polled some 5,000,000 votes. That is, one out of every six voters in the United States has gone on record for sweeping changes in the present way of doing business.

In Great Britain, the so-called radicals have polled 5,500,000 votes. That is one out of every three British voters has gone on record against the present way of doing business.

In Germany the so-called radicals have polled 10,700,000 votes. That is, one out of every three, and then some have registered their protest against the present business order.

When in the three most conservative countries on earth more than 21,000,000 grown men and women deliberately demand a general upheaval of business and business methods, their cause is neither dead nor sleeping. And, in stating this plain fact, a man does not have to give Russia even a first thought.

Of course radicalism is not dead. Neither is Socialism. Neither is communism. No one of them will be dead so long as some men prosper and some do not; so long as some men have plenty and some not enough; so long as some men are successful in business and some men barely manage to live.

The men who imagine anything else, who think they can maintain themselves in their business success without defending it, are sure to learn these truths soon enough if they do not grasp them now. But what is the practical use of all these vague words just now? Let us see.

Samuel Rea, president of the Pennsylvania railroad, suggests in the morning newspapers that what the railroads need to keep them going is more understanding and more confidence from the public. He means more understanding of their way of doing business and more assurance that this way is the right way.

Railroad officials all over the country are saying the same thing. They are on the battle line of business, have been there for years, are there still. Therefore they know that radicalism of all sorts, whether good or bad, is neither dead nor moribund.

The lawmakers of thirty-nine states are to assemble and pass laws this year. The estimate is that some 60,000 new laws will be proposed and about 15,000 of them will be added to the 2,000,000 laws and local ordinances already in force in the United States. The majority of these laws will cross the lines of the nation's business.

What will be the main power in making these laws? Largely the desires of the people who elect the lawmakers. Largely also the activity of the people in demanding this, that or the other sort of business legislation.

Who will be the most active in making known their demands? The so-called radicals—not only the 5,000,000, but many others who did not go radical in the last election because they did not like just the kind of radicalism offered them.

Who will be least active? The business men, probably, who think the battle over and the victory won on November 4, always, of course, excepting Mr. Rea and his railroad associates who woke up a few years ago and have not gone to sleep again. That is the situation. What then? What do all these general statements lead up to? They lead up to this:

If the bankers and manufacturers and mine owners of the country refuse to be warned by the example of the railroad men, if they sit back in silence while sociologists, psychologists and sentimental upholders misrepresent them to the people, if they are too idle and self-confident to bestir themselves as long as the money flows to them across the table, they will wake up to find the radicalism, socialism and communism that they thought dead more alive and aggressive than ever.

If these men have real confidence in themselves, there is no excuse for their failure to stand up and declare it—at public meetings, in the assemblies of schools and colleges, before Sunday evening clubs and along the Chautauquus circuits.

Nobody helps those who do not help themselves. That is a business fact that all the elections in the world cannot alter.

This, then, is the manner outlined whereby the American business man proposes to continue to—as he puts it—"help himself."

I
rad
"p
sical
physical,
property
sideratio
that Man
value he
fts only
arose."
boycotte
theory, l
"shown
sical and
saying th
With
aphysica
if I know
ity or no
I am goi
labor is l
it is "pu
a mental
theory s
on the
However
the stunt

If Ma
crystalliz
value wa
performe
"purely
don't thi
How in
that is ne
sary labor
such a ce
contentio
and comp
pointed o
merely a
formed.
that.

Let us
cause so
performe
labor is
specialize
labor, ski
of labor o
commodit
lized in a
the first p
cralinatio
ed for th
second pl
much of t
article, o
we mean
far from
reality" i
weeks, m
These ar
labor cry
There ma
trate the
complicat
tion and
there is n
would be
in the So
things su
plain eve
"Capital
It labo
it is value
as there b
value to
value. It

Does Value Exist?

BY F. J. McNEBY.

IN his letter in the Clarion of March 2nd Comrade Thompson wants to know if value is a "property of a commodity? If so, is it a physical property? And if it is a property, but not physical, must it not therefore be a 'metaphysical property' and as such be ruled out of scientific consideration?" Then, after explaining at some length that Marx had a purely metaphysical conception of value he tells us that: "The labor theory of value fits only that pre-capitalist epoch from which it arose." He further informs us that he has "rigidly boycotted the notion of value—not merely the labor theory, but any theory of value," and that he has "shown that the concept of value is both metaphysical and unnecessary." All of which is equal to saying that in his opinion value no longer exists.

With regard to the questions, they are too metaphysical for me to answer just at present. Damned if I know whether value is a property of a commodity or not. But some time when I get around to it I am going to attempt to prove that the concept of labor is both "metaphysical and unnecessary." That it is "purely psychological," a "mere shadow" and a mental hallucination. If I can demonstrate this theory successfully, without encroaching too much on the "Christian Science" philosophy, then it ought to be easy to prove that value does not exist. However, I am a little doubtful of my ability to pull the stunt off.

If Marx meant that the socially necessary labor crystallized in a commodity which determines its value was "an abstract sort of labor that is never performed in reality," he sure as hell did have a "purely metaphysical" conception of value. But I don't think that was his conception of value at all. How in hades could Marx get the idea that "labor that is never performed in reality" is socially necessary labor? The fact that any person can arrive at such a conclusion from reading Marx proves my contention that his method of presentation is vague and complicated, and difficult to understand. I have pointed out before, that socially necessary labor is merely a generalization of all labor actually performed. Surely there is nothing metaphysical about that.

Let us examine this abstract labor that seems to cause so much confusion. Any person who has ever performed any labor surely knows what concrete labor is. Now all concrete labor is more or less specialized, each worker performs a certain kind of labor, skilled or unskilled. But these various kinds of labor do not manifest themselves separately in commodities. When we speak of the labor crystallized in a commodity as abstract labor we mean, in the first place, that it is social labor, that is, a generalization of all the different kinds of labor required for the production of the commodity. In the second place, we mean that we don't know how much of this social labor is crystallized in any given article, or unit of a commodity. In the third place, we mean that it is crystallized labor. In other words, far from being "labor that is never performed in reality" it is labor that has already been performed, weeks, months, and some of it perhaps years ago. These are some of the reasons why we refer to the labor crystallized in a commodity as abstract labor. There may be others, but these are enough to illustrate the point. No doubt, the proposition may seem complicated, but so is the whole process of production and distribution in modern society. However, there is nothing metaphysical about it at all. It would be good practice for our budding economists in the Socialist movement, to learn to reason these things out for themselves, instead of trying to explain everything by what Marx said somewhere in "Capital."

If labor was value in the "pre-capitalist epoch" it is value today, and it always will be value as long as there is any such thing as value. And if it is not value today it never was value, and it never will be value. It is obvious that labor produces all wealth

at the present time, just as it did in the pre-capitalist epoch and, therefore, value cannot change its nature, nor evolve itself out of existence, just because the social order has changed. The very fact that a person can be cheated in a trade is conclusive proof that value exists. If there was nothing to value except the price that a person pays for an article, that is, if "the value of a thing is as much as it will bring," as some economists claim, then it would be impossible for a person to be cheated at all, because no matter what price was paid for a thing that would be its value, and all any man can expect is value for his money. The same argument applies when we consider the stunts pulled off by horse thieves and pickpockets. The only charge that is ever made against any of these boys is that he helps himself to something of value and forgets to leave anything of value in exchange for it. Now if there is no such thing as value, in other words if "the concept of value is both metaphysical and unnecessary," surely it is unjust to accuse a man of crime just because he happens to pick up something that has no value, even if he has forgotten to leave some other valueless thing in its place.

It seems to me that Comrade Thompson has rather a metaphysical and exaggerated conception of monopoly prices. While it may be necessary to keep the price of a commodity produced under monopoly conditions above its value in order to pay the average rate of profit on the total capital invested, it does not follow that the monopoly price will be much above the value of the same commodity produced outside the monopoly by less efficient methods. Even if no such competition existed it would very soon make its appearance, and on a large scale, if the price of the commodity was very much above its value as represented by the amount of labor necessary to produce it by less efficient methods and machinery. The very life of a monopoly depends on keeping the price of its commodity low enough to crowd out most of the competition. This can be done even when the price of the commodity is considered above its value as produced under monopoly conditions, due to the high degree of efficiency in monopoly production. It is a good idea for Socialists to read the fallacies of Marx as they are explained by some of our foremost professors of economics, but their conclusions should always be taken with a little grain of salt.

The Pathway of Science

BY KATHERINE SMITH

THE inhibitions placed upon youth in the past which precluded the expression of their opinions, like many other ideas have given way to the advance of science. "Children should be seen and not heard" is no longer an accepted adage. Youth refuses to be silenced and to accept passively whatever emanates from the public rostrums. Instead they actively criticize the theories of religion and philosophy and measure them up in the cold white light of scientific facts. Especially are they interested in the efforts to harmonize religion and science. If in harmony why all the talk?

That there is a certain relationship is true enough as there exists a relativity among all things, but to understand that relationship requires some little knowledge of evolution, both social and organic.

Science has been developed in the necessities of capitalism for raw material and markets. In so doing it has come in conflict with prevailing concepts of religion. As both are essential to the capitalistic scheme of things there arises the need of harmonizing them in some way.

Religion is a matter of unquestioned faith in what we do not understand of natural forces. It has

always been surrounded with mystery, so that the greater the mystery the greater the faith necessary in the devotee. Different concepts of religion and morality have prevailed at different periods of the world's history. From the voodooism of the primitive savage to the most modern aspects of religion is but a difference in degree of superstition. According to the knowledge obtained of natural forces and the uses to which that knowledge is put in subjugating one class in society to the economic domination of another can be ascribed the ideals of religion and morality prevailing in society at any given time. For instance—when the early merchant capitalists were hampered by the restrictions on trade placed upon them by the landed interests they did not hesitate to attack the then generally prevailing concepts of religion common in Europe and Asia Minor as exemplified in both the Greek and Roman churches, the greatest of the landed interests, and what is known as Mohammedism in the one instance and at a little later date Lutherism or Protestantism in the other were the result, religions which did not interfere with the newer economic interests. Now that the exigencies of industrial capital make science indispensable religion must again be made to conform, and old doctrines previously proclaimed as inspired must give way to newer ideas more in harmony with present day demands of capitalism.

When sufficient knowledge has been acquired by any group faith in what had been considered unknowable gives place to speculation and then religion merges into philosophy. When speculation advances to the stage of investigation, what had previously been philosophical theories when substantiated become scientific facts. When science develops it negates philosophy in the same manner in which philosophy had negated religion. To that extent only are religion and science related, the metaphysicians to the contrary notwithstanding. Indeed, Emmanuel Kant, the greatest of metaphysicians, proclaimed that "there can be no science of metaphysics."

Those who would "Back to Kaut" would be going back indeed. For there is no future progress except through science only.

"WORLD WORKERS' EDUCATION"

This is a booklet embodying the report of the second International Conference on Workers' Education held at Oxford, from August 15th to 17th, 1924. Published by the International Federation of Trade Unions. Price, 50 cents. Obtainable from the Publication Department of the Trades and Labor Congress of Canada, 172 McLaren Street, Ottawa, Ont., Canada and from all booksellers.

This booklet contains a full report of the sessions of the Conference, together with the special addresses on various aspects of Workers' Education delivered at the Conference, photo of delegates. It also contains a summarized report on the activities of the bodies engaged in workers' education in Austria, Belgium, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Great Britain, Holland, Italy, Luxemburg, Palestine, Poland, Russia, Sweden, Switzerland, and the United States, together with a list of names and addresses of workers' educational bodies in these countries and others which did not send in reports. The book is therefore not only interesting reading, but also forms a hand-book to the Workers' Education Movement, such as has never hitherto appeared, and it is a convincing proof of the ever-increasing importance in all countries of the educational side of the Trade Union Movement.

HERE AND NOW

Following \$1 each: Abe Karme, E. H. Cove, T. Smith, R. F. McKenzie, J. Chrystal.

Following \$2 each: Rod Dewar, Geo. Paton, R. C. McCutchan, J. Sutherland, J. Allen, C. Foster.

Above, Clarion subs. received from March 31 to April 30, inclusive, total \$17.

Symbols and Substance

BY J. HARRINGTON

WELL, as I was trying to show when interrupted (first by the exigencies of space and later by static in the loud speaker, and other matters necessary to and contingent upon life), the troublous times in which we live are not to be charged to any deeds of ours, or misdeeds either. Nothing can be more illogical than the logicians, except the facts they juggle with. Whether they think so or not most of them act on the assumption that the world is a piece of well-contrived mechanism which ought to function in a specific manner, and if it does not then some one has removed a pin, loosened a screw, opened a valve or put emery dust into the cylinder. Our ancestors of pre-machine days peopled the world with genii and gnomes, upon whom they could heap convenient blame, with more reason than we can furnish for loading our scapegoats with our sins. The starving Leningrad workers, weaponless and abject, march to plead with the Little Father for bread; the wise men gaze in despair at such folly, and almost instantaneously we have the first working class Republic in all history. The German navy, fully armed and powerfully efficient, revolts; all the wise men hail the event as the harbinger of the Social Revolution; almost instantaneously we have the most thorough dictatorship ever established over working class humanity. Lenin and Trotsky gave us our victory; Schiedeman and Eberts engineered our defeat; Ramsay MacDonald, by a freak move in Imperial politics finds himself head of the British Empire, and because he does not forthwith institute all his preceding preachments he is a traitor, though he is unceremoniously kicked down stairs because he squashed an indictment for treason against an obscure editor of a communist paper. For my part I have no desire to defend him; he is possessed of the God of barbarous Jewry, a sufficient handicap, and never was a Marxian, a sufficient indictment. So beneath J. A. McD's retributory cudgel my head is bowed but unbloody.

Nor can I see why any one who could write down

such a sentence as—"The change from Lords Clarendon, Bute and North to a Lloyd George is as great a departure as from the latter to a Ramsay MacDonald" should worry his head about debating the worthiness of MacDonald and his associates North and Bute both preceded the machine age and were the last advocates of absolute monarchy to head the British Empire. Bute was the first of that aggregation of weaklings which George III chose to lead his government in order that he could assume that absolute control which had slipped from the monarchy during the reigns of his German speaking, German thinking grand-father and great grand-father, and significantly enough was called to power just twenty years after George II. dismissed Walpole, who had been called in derision the Prime Minister. Clarendon, if it is he of the 19th century, has no place in the picture; Palmerston was the man who did as he pleased and when Victoria the Good severely reprimanded him expressed surprise that he had done wrong, promised never to err again, and did as he pleased. He, with Peel, Disraeli, Gladstone, etc., down to Lloyd George were Prime Ministers in fact. But if the change from Bute and North (antedating the American and French Revolution and the steam engine, mark you) to Lloyd George is as great a departure as from Lloyd George to Ramsay MacDonald, then it is great enough to forget Ramsay MacDonald and rejoice in the Revolution. However, I would not myself go as far as J. A. McD. in this matter. The departure is not by any means as great, but it is great enough to ignore the symbols and examine the substance.

Away back in August I tried to set our position down. I said, "In the matter of reforms there is no change. There are still a few, as there have always been, who think that reforms are not only useless but harmful, but the Party as a whole so far as I can judge, still holds to the position that reforms can only be granted and enforced by a permanent majority." And it is some satisfaction to hear

Labor men after a year or two in office explain to their supporters their reasons for being unable to do anything for them. However, I don't suppose anyone read what I said then, nor do I have much hope that they will read it now. However, in case they do, I have this to say. The straight issue is maintained just as much as it ever was. And, concerning reforms, we now have the word of the reformers themselves who have freely admitted since coming home from Parliament that it is impossible to get reforms enacted. Education is still our standard, but "one glimpse within the tavern caught, Better than in the temple lost outright." We are just as crazy for debate as ever but we have no debaters. In days of change and decay such as we live in thirty or forty dollars a week makes a mighty sure anchor, and men have no money. But take it all in all, the bumptiousness, the holier than thou, the crude attempts at sarcasm, the wilful misrepresentation, the words, and words again, and yet again more words.—Ain't we got fun?

As for Winnipeg. Peace, perturbed spirits. I had no intention of using that famous town as an irate schoolmaster does the unfortunate scholar in a refractory class who first catches his eye, visiting upon him the wrath he is unable to distribute where it rightly belongs. As might well be seen by reading what I said, Winnipeg was introduced to show that logic or weighing the facts has nothing to do with the turmoil in labor circles. Frisco would have served the same purpose. The handful of revolutionist who keep alive the spirit of revolt on this continent could very well devote what energy they have to the purpose they profess. But there you are, this is a perverse world, and however cunningly we may be able to contrive an engine or calculate a balance, when it comes to a Social Revolution the powers which served us so well in the mechanical task seem smitten with palsy. And each tenth thinks the other nine-tenths are hopeless idiots. And, looking upon the advanced Labor Group today it is quite possible that they are right.

That Senseless Animal

A World Beyond Our Ken

BY G. G. DESMOND

AT Cambridge long ago, we remember a don who was said to be prodigiously learned. He was blind to almost everything except books, which he read about an inch away from his face, deaf to the sounds of Nature, the laughter of other dons as a connoisseur of wine, but perhaps not more blind of nose or finger-tip than the average civilised man. We young bigots summed him up by saying that he had taken five firsts and had forfeited a sense for each of them.

But after all what did even we young, healthy, white savages know of any of the senses in comparison with the best practitioner in each of them among wild things? The brain behind our blunt senses does wonders with them, as a man might do wonders against a baby's rifle with bow and arrow. In a way, we manage to get along without senses at all, as we get along without legs by the invention of wheels, and without hands by the use of machinery. What perceptions we have left are just enough to stand by us in time of great need, by dint of tense brain and will power. They are not so automatic as senses were once, and if we disuse them a little more, we may never be able to call upon them when nothing else may save us.

The wonderful sense-extension instruments invented by man enable him to imagine how senses could conceivably be trained or developed. Is it

sible that the eagle can see with the naked eye as far and as well as man with a medium telescope? Can some creatures see as minutely as we do with a low power microscope? It is thought that bees can appreciate the tiny spot on a bee's egg (not quite within the power of a pocket lens), where the sperm of fertilisation enters, so as to judge whether the egg is destined to become worker or drone. The hunter wasp can find by means of the touch-organs near its sting the microscopic spot where it can wound a caterpillar so as to paralyse and not kill it. The sense organs in an insect's antenna or horn number scores of thousands and are of four or five different kinds, each with its own function about which we are almost completely in the dark. Is it by hearing or smelling or tasting or by the tapping of ether waves that they find flowers or lovers miles away and know how to fly straight to them?

It is not as though the thing we wanted to find was crying, scenting, blazing alone in a silent in-odorous, uncoloured world. We have to single it out from a clamour of other sights and sounds and scents. To a great many of them we are at all times blind and deaf. Sounds above and below certain pitches no man can hear. They are addressed to other ears that can hear them. To get rid of the others, we have to gain the faculty of shutting them out for the time being. Some people by practice can stand in the street and pick out the voice of one person standing far away and talking quietly, in spite of many distracting noises, including voices, far

nearer and louder. For most of us the nearer noise overlays all the others, very much as a near object blots out the middle distance. Our great instrument, the wireless, shuts out, more or less effectively, all noises between here and America, so that a person on that continent whispers into the ear of us in Europe. It is done, as we all know now, by keying the receiving instrument to the wave-length of the sending-out instrument. It may be that the moth's antenna is in key by wave-length to one tremor only, that given off by its spouse's body, and that is how he finds her miles away, through a thousand rival odours or vibrations that are the messages of other people with which the moth has nothing to do.

The inverse relation between sense and brain, between instrument and the power to get along with poor instruments is brought home to us as the senses deaden with age. First, the baby hearkens with difficulty; then the youth hears everything easily, though often with comparatively perfect apparatus he makes ludicrous mistakes; then the old man, hearing only half as much must, by means of logic, make that half tell him as much as the whole used to tell him. He hears by circumstantial evidence. The totally deaf man, by extra use of his eyes can sometimes "hear" as much as a very careless man does with all his faculties.

Speech, of course, is the hardest thing to hear, the modifications of sound are so many and so slight

(Continued on page 8)

Religion

AFTER finishing a job on the premises of a Jewish patron, the writer got his permission to carry away a weekly paper, the "Canadian Jewish Review" which, as it is printed in English could be used for general purposes in dealing with the religious question.

In discussing religion, we incline to view it only from the best known standpoint—that of Christianity. But this paper shed light on other aspects, for it contained an article on its contributing editor, Rabbi B. R. Briekner of Toronto, who had accepted a "call" from one of the very largest Jewish congregations in America, meeting in Cleveland at the Temple Centre. This structure, regarded as one of Cleveland's show places, was recently completed at a cost of \$350,000. The Rabbi is an M.A., B.Sc., Ph.D., and has served on many important Boards. The Cleveland congregation, which he will lead has a membership of 1,260 families, a Sunday School of over 1,200 children, the largest Jewish Sisterhood in America with a 1,600 membership and an unusually large brotherhood.

From the above and from what we know of other congregations we realize how powerful is the hold that religion exerts upon its followers. And yet, despite its apparent strength, religion is weakening; for Joseph McCabe, himself an ex-priest, says that "religion is slowly dying everywhere. Social idealism is growing everywhere." Even Judaism is now split into two bodies, a sort of Old and New Light sects; or, as they are called, the Orthodox and Reform sects; and of the two, it seems far better salaries and conditions are enjoyed by Reform Rabbis, than by Orthodox ones.

Bishop Brown tells us that every modern church with its ministry, bible, creed, heaven and hell, is founded on capitalism and that the churches, as so constituted, are but so many expedients for protecting an economic system from change. For example, in the above mentioned Jewish paper, there is a weekly saying by "Rivka" (Rebecca), the current one being, "It doesn't take so very much prosperity to convince a man who was once a radical, that radicalism really belongs to the kosher (Jewishly clean) restaurant intelligentsia; and should remain there."

As socialists know, religion has its materialistic basis, or as Marx, we believe, says "religion does not make man; man makes religion." Epictetus, born 60 A.D., an ex-slave and Stoic philosopher, tells us in his Handbook, "Where (personal) interest is, there too is piety placed." The modern workers are drawing so little material advantage from the Church, that their "piety" is gradually finding its true sphere in Socialism. Hence, in the U. S. A. recently, a movement arose to promote religious attendance; in which Catholic priests, Protestant ministers and Jewish rabbis sunk their differences and combined against the common foe of growing distaste for their respective religions.

Several Jewish religious festivals are founded upon the materialistic basis of some "historical" preservation of their race from foreign destruction. Perhaps the most historical of these is the Pass-over, to commemorate their deliverance in Egypt, when the destroying angel passed over the houses of the Israelites, but not over those of their Egyptian oppressors. Of course, in this case, the Egyptians were "wicked" and "deserved" all they suffered from the good Lord. But what about the Jewish invasion into the Promised Land, when the original inhabitants were ruthlessly exterminated? So far as they were concerned, the latter had no reason to praise the Lord, especially those Midianites (Numbers, xxxi, 17-18) who were all killed with the exception of the virgins; whom the pious and wrathful Moses commanded to be kept alive for the males of the Chosen People of God.

Hence, we see, that although "religion" may be useful for making otherwise careless people dress and clean themselves up for worship, and develop

the memory, industry, courage and determination in regard to following out highly complicated rituals, etc., it by no means always fosters the spirit of peace. Therefore, commenting on a politico-religious murder that occurred in 1922, in London, Eng., H. E. M. Stutfield accused Ancient Egypt, Greece, India, the Far East, Mexico and modern Rome of all having the same tale to tell of religious or quasi-religious butchery and mutilation.

But why did not Stutfield mention Palestine and the Jews as well? The falling away of a section of the Israelites into idolatry (Exodus xxxii, 27) caused the orthodox remainder, at God's command, to slay every man his brother, his companion and his neighbor. And then there is the holy murder story of Elijah (I Kings xviii, 40) which is considered such a lovely subject for religious admiration, that it has been set to music in the shape of a famous oratorio, by a Christianised Jew—Mendelssohn.

Of course, Marx is notorious for the nasty knock he gave religion when he said it is "the opium of the people." But it seems clear that all Marx was kicking at was the habit people get into either through laziness, ignorance or stupidity, of taking doses of religion like opium addicts, to kill the pains arising from unbearable surroundings; instead of logically revolutionising out of existence the bad material environment that causes the trouble. And if it be objected that that is merely the debased opinion of a "renegade German Jew," still it may be backed up by a previous and almost identical one from a genuine Scots Presbyterian peasant, Robert Burns, who in his "Tree of Liberty" poem (which, by the way, like several others, he dared not publish while he was alive), says that without liberty "this life is but a vale o' woe, man; a scene o' sorrow mixed wi' strife; nae real joys we know, man. We labor soon, we labor late, to feed the titled knave, man; an' a' the comfort we're to get, is that ayont (beyond) the grave, man."

Even if religion doesn't land a person, as it often does, into a hospital for the insane, it may cause him to act in the way that called forth this item in the Manitoba Free Press: "A man in New York burned himself fatally while undergoing the rites of some weird religious cult. That's one of the odd things about religion; numerous persons are always willing to do something foolish in the name of it."

Rabbi Briekner, in his current approving editorial upon many prominent Jews having contributed money to complete the Episcopal Cathedral of St. John the Divine in New York City, tells us that "religion is a road leading up the mountain of life toward the peak—God. Every man is entitled to pursue the road Godward that suits him best. . . And let us also remember, that as we get toward the peak, the roads show a tendency to converge."

Suppose we grant the tendency towards religious convergence; what features are or will be dropped, to make the final approach possible? Assuredly Jewish or any other religious national preservation festivals are meaningless to outsiders. And to those who know the evidence about Christianity reported in Bishop Brown's "Heresy" trial magazine; and the "Chrestus" facts of Prof. Murray's, as recently published in our "Clarion," Christianity is no better. A chain is not stronger than its weakest link; and when Christ (Luke vi, 27-30) is reported as sustaining his general character by such mild advice as, Love your enemies, do good to them which hate you, etc., etc., how weak is the Biblical chain, with all the attempts at "symbolical" explanation, when a link in Luke xix, 27, makes the same Christ say "But those mine enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither and slay them before me." So weak, (and repulsive) is the latter link, that a certain clergyman refused to believe, until he was "shown" that it was in the Bible at all; nor was that the first time we have found that the clergy are ignorant of their own text book!

Hence, the "converged" future religion, will be

very much as laid down in Bishop Brown's "Communism and Christianity" (to be had from 'Clarion' office); but without the author's "symbolical" hankering after staying in a Church from which his more than 40 years connection, makes him reluctant to completely break. Judging religion by its fruits and by its disruptive, mind-obscuring and burdening puerilities in an age when, as never before, the brain must be kept clear, clean and efficient to deal with modern problems, Socialists generally avoid contact with what Voltaire called "the infamous thing." Or, as Goethe put it "I am too religious, to be 'religious.'"

Though her person has been gorgeously arrayed and decorated by the genius of musical composer, musician, poet, author, orator, singer, architect, sculptor and artist, 'neath it all, she is only—Religion: so, let us beware! Those who truly know her wisely exert a far greater, purer and nobler strength of will in refraining from touching or countenancing her; than do those who imagine they are doing well, whilst they are her miserable and abject slaves!

—PROGRESS.

LIBERTY

THERE is no more useful and courageous work in this country than that done by representatives of the American Civil Liberties Union in going to places where free speech is denied, submitting to arrest, and then carrying the issue into the courts. An especially interesting case arose in Patterson, New Jersey, during the silk-workers' strike last autumn when the chief of police forbade the meetings which the strikers had been holding in the Turn Hall. Thereupon Roger N. Baldwin, director of the American Civil Liberties Union, rented the building for a free speech meeting, and when the doors were locked against the speakers by the police the former proceeded to assemble on the steps of the Paterson City Hall. They chose this place purposely in order to avoid a complaint of trespass or interference with traffic. The meeting was just beginning with the reading of the constitutional guarantees of free speech and assemblage when it was violently broken up by the police, who charged that it was riotous in character and made numerous arrests.

Ten persons were subsequently indicted under an old English law, re-enacted in New Jersey in 1798, on the charge that they "did then and there unlawfully, routously, riotously, and tumultuously make and utter great and loud noises and threatenings," manifesting their purpose "to beat and assault and frighten and intimidate certain and quiet and orderly persons then and there gathered and standing"; that they did "unlawfully, routously, riotously, and tumultuously" assemble "to commit assault and battery upon the police officers, patrolmen, and officers of the police department of the said city of Paterson, and to break, injure, damage, and destroy and wreck the City Hall." Mr. Baldwin and six others were tried on these ridiculous charges. When argument was heard last December it was brought out that the only previous trial in New Jersey under the statute was in 1913, when "Big Bill" Haywood and others were released on a writ of habeas corpus on the ground that a meeting for redress of grievances was not unlawful assemblage. Judge Delaney held the case of Mr. Baldwin and the six others under advisement for more than three months and then, without delivering a written opinion, found them guilty. This silly decision will be appealed, and should be reversed in the higher courts.

—The Nation (N. Y.)

MANIFESTO

of the
SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA
(Fifth Edition)

Per copy.....10 cents

Per 25 copies.....25

Post Paid.

THAT SENSE-LESS ANIMAL.

(Continued from page 6)

and mean so much. Most often, we do not hear the consonants at all (not even all of them when a Scot or a German is speaking). It would be absurd to say that one could hear the tongue touch the palate for "l" or the teeth for "t" and the breath of an "h" at the distance of four or five hundred yards; yet we can hear what a man shouts a good deal farther than that. So can we make one another understand a sentence spoken with the mouth open, that is, without consonants at all. That shows how enormously numerous are the vowels. The "o," for example, has a different sound for every consonant it precedes or follows, whether in thought or in fact. We hear the sound without the consonant, and we know what the missing consonant is. The deaf man by using his eyes very well can see both the vowels and the consonants. His eyes, with a good brain behind them, perform the function of ears.

The paramount sense in man is sight. It will probably remain after the others are nearly gone. Far more people take pains to preserve and increase the power of sight than to supplement faulty ears, and until now the megasmell has not even been invented. The immense importance of the nose to the other animals is but dimly perceived by us. What the dog sees is practically deemed by him not evidence. He must test the impression of his eyes with his nose before he believes it. The fox follows his mate by scent and more easily at night than by day. He evades his enemies or the timidity of his prey, not so much by getting behind something that cannot be seen through as by going somewhere the scent will not lie or by going in a direction contrary to the wind. I think that once in an African forest I smelt a lion quite close to me. According to the smell that came to me I ought to have been quite certain about it. I have fired at a dimmer-secular appearance, believing it to be game. A dog that passes where a lion has been two days before will bristle and tremble, so that the man knows quite well what he is smelling. The dog may never have seen a lion, may know nothing of what sort of an animal it is, may be fresh from Europe and bred of a line equally ignorant of lions, yet the smell will have the same effect on him. We are not surprised that the roar of a lion would have that effect on a man with the same lack of experience; that one should suddenly climb a tree on the evidence of his nose is so unthinkable that we should be inclined to call it mad.

We are so jealous of the sharp sense that the animals have that we say they must have faculties extra to the five we know. By constant pure practice, their feeling for the outside world perhaps becomes instinctive. It may be that there is an unconscious awareness when the brain knows a thing without knowing whether it was eyes, ears, nose, mouth or touch that brought it in. We have a feeling that someone or something is near us that leads us to look well and see that it is so. Fanciful people believe that by looking hard at someone we can compel him to turn round and look at us, and that in a wood it is the frightened or suspicious eyes of wild things looking at us from their hiding places that gives us a feeling that we are not alone. It is probably some ordinary sense or other trying to speak to us, and only succeeding in getting into touch with our unconsciousness. Sometimes two people seem to have the same thought together, and it turns out that one has uttered it and the other, though in complete ignorance that he heard it, was at any rate in a position to have got a whisper of it through the ear.

The alleged extra sense that is most persisted in relates to the faculty of homing or the sense of direction. It has been over and over, in single instances, disproved. Borel showed that the bee only finds its way home from the area of its honey-gathering. If it lives on the edge of a thick town where there are no flowers it can be taken only a short distance

in that direction, and it fails to get home. The carrier pigeon does not fly straight home, but by a series of landmarks that are not necessarily in a straight line. In time it cuts off bends, finding the line from A to C straighter without taking in B.

But what of birds on migration, that fly upwards of a thousand miles across the sea without any landmark? Did they and their ancestors fly that route long ago when it was sprinkled with islands, or have following flocks constantly headed off those bending round the coast, till at last the straightest line was reached quite out of touch of all coast? In either case, what now looks like a pure sense of direction is mixed up with memory and logic. We, too, make straighter and straighter roads across any wilderness where travel is equally possible everywhere. Our civilised roads go round to take river crossings and to avoid difficult places, and, oh! how they wind to suit the jealousy of landed proprietors. So if we know, the short cut we cannot take it because we cannot fly, and our faculty for direction falls out of use. We no longer smell or feel the south, because we have the compass to tell us which is the north. We admire the untutored savage for knowing so much more than we without having to learn it. But we feel on the whole that we can get along without senses if we have wisdom. Other primitive virtues no longer of much use, such as running and leaping, we keep up by gymkhanas and olympiads. Why not have smelling contests at Wimbledon, hearing rodeos, seeing contests?—ah! there is Bisley.—The New Leader, (Lond).

THE ECONOMICS OF LABOR.

(Continued from page 2)

thirst in a desert, who would give all his possessions for a cup of water, as facts which tell against it. Let me point out that we are dealing with the production of commodities, commodities the production of which is practically unlimited and which are produced to sell on the market, to exchange for profit. The picture and the cup of water are both monopolies which are outside the sphere of our present enquiry.

It appears to me so obvious that the exchange of commodities must be the exchange of articles of equal value, and that value based upon their cost of production, that I would not weary you by labouring this point, but that such constant attempts are made to disprove this by dragging in monopolies of one kind or another, which have absolutely no bearing on the point at issue. Now it must be clear that if by any means the price of any commodity could be forced up beyond its normal value the result would be that labour and capital would be directed in increased measure to the production of that commodity until the increased supply reduced the price to the normal level. If, on the other hand, the price fell below the value of a commodity, production would shrink until the scarcity of supply forced up the price. Indeed we are constantly witnessing such fluctuations, which after all only tend to maintain the level, and, so far from disproving, actually prove, beyond the shadow of question, the absolute truth of the theory of the basis of value.

(Continued in next issue.)

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		1.00
Capitalist Production (First Nine and 22 Chapters "Capital," vol. 1, (Marx)		1.00
Vital Problems in Social Evolution		30c
Science and Revolution		30c
The Militant Proletariat		30c
Evolution Social and Organic		30c
Puritanism		30c
Ethics and History		30c
Germs of Mind in Plants		30c
The Triumph of Life		30c
Social Revolution (Kautsky)		30c
Essays on Materialist Conception of History (Labriola)		1.50
Social Studies (Lafargue)		30c
	Paper Covers.	Per Copy
Evolution of Man (Prof. Bolache)		30c
Wage-Labor and Capital		10c
Independent Working Class Education		10c
Communist Manifesto		30c
The Present Economic System (Prof. W. A. Bouguer)		10c
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific		15c
Slaves of the Farm		10c
Manifesto, S. F. 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 (Leche)		15c
Civil War in France (Marx)		25c
All prices include postage.		
Christianism and Communism (Bishop W. M. Brown)		15c
Quantity Rates on Paper Covered Pamphlets.		
Two Essays on History	25 copies	2.00
Communist Manifesto	25 copies	\$1.00
Wage-Labor and Capital	25 copies	\$1.00
Present Economic System	25 copies	\$1.00
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific	25 copies	\$1.00
Slaves of the Farm	25 copies	\$1.00
Manifesto of S. F. of C.	25 copies	\$1.00
Evolution of Man	25 copies	\$1.00
Causes of Belief in God	25 copies	\$1.00
Value, Price and Profit	25 copies	\$1.00
Economic Causes of War	25 copies	\$1.00
Christianism and Communism	25 copies	\$1.00
Make all money payable to E. MacLeod, P. O. Box 710, Vancouver, B. C. Add amount on cheques.		