

WESTERN CLARION

A Journal of
CURRENT
EVENTS

Official Organ of
THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

HISTORY
ECONOMICS
PHILOSOPHY

No. 915

TWENTIETH YEAR

Twice a Month

VANCOUVER, B. C., MAY 16, 1924

FIVE CENTS

The Importance of History

BY G. R. STIRLING TAYLOR.

WHEN the Labour Government took office a few weeks ago there was a triumphant satisfaction in the minds of its supporters that at last they had ceased to be a backwater, and were now flowing in the main river of history. The belief was only half true, for the fact was that the Labour movement had been in the main stream of history all along. Those political and economic and ethical desires of man, which all together make up the creed which the new Government represents, have been continually expressed in human affairs since anything worth calling civilisation began. The philosophy of Labour is a thing of venerable antiquity compared with, for example, the mushroom growth of Liberalism. Labour can trace a stately pedigree to the roots of history; the stories of Greece and Rome, the Middle Ages, are full of its struggling vigour. Whereas the Liberals can only go back to the nouveaux riches of the Industrial Revolution and its Reform Act of 1832; though they vainly attempt (the gods know why!) to give a more patrician strain to their blood by claiming descent from the Whig oligarchy of the earlier eighteenth century; or they even sometimes pretend (again with obscure advantage) that they trace to a militarist adventurer named Oliver Cromwell, who attempted to govern England by major-generals. He certainly seems the most unnatural of parents for the chapel-going gentlemen who now have the Liberal banners; but perhaps he is a more respectable parentage than the plutocratic sweaters and grinders whom history shows as the real founders of the Liberal faith.

Anyhow, compared with the Liberals, the Labour Party has all the stately qualities of the bluest aristocracy of human thought. It is the expression of the oldest social faith of man. By a piece of folly which the Roman Church describes by the technical term of "invincible ignorance," the Labour movement has recklessly thrown away this most valuable asset. Its speakers and writers have modestly claimed that they were only the vanguard of an entirely new and untried social experiment, and they hoped, by patient application, that they might eventually make out a good case for their beliefs. Whereas, had they but known it, they had at their disposal the unanswerable evidence of the history of the whole world to prove that, as against all other parties, the Labour case is right every time.

Of course, there are in the Labour ranks, as in all political bodies, a great number of cranks and faddists for whose wayward beliefs history will not hold itself responsible. But, in the main, in nine cases out of ten the evidence of history is on the side of Labour against Capitalists, if the struggle may be summed up in these clumsy and limited but convenient terms. At least, it can be put in this negative way; if history cannot always accept the whole official programme of Labour, at least its doubtful silence is better than the loud peals of mocking laughter with which it hears the statement of the plutocrats' case.

A systematic use of the history book strengthens the Labour case so materially that the Party might have reached office long ago. If it is necessary to reproach the Labor supporters for their neglect of history in their struggle for power, it is still more important to point out the urgent need that they

shall consult history now that the very future of British history has been placed officially in their care for a period. In no way can the Labor Party more easily prove its superiority to its opponents in the Houses of Parliament than by showing that it knows the facts of the historical past; and, further, that it respects the laws of history as carefully as a scientist respects the laws of evolution.

It is a common charge against the Labor philosophy of life that it is a reckless disregard of the laws of human growth. It would be child's play to prove that the Liberal and Tory creeds are, in the main, one long defiance of the evidence that history brings forward on every page.

Take the case for Imperialism. It is put forward as the plan of hard-headed business men and experienced administrators who profess to know the ways of the world. One has only to examine the history of the empires of the world to find that this belief in the advantages of Imperialism, and the possibilities of its success, is one of the most amazing pieces of sentimental hysteria that ever fitted through the brain of man. Go through history and find a people that did not bring themselves to ruin by empire building. Athens was a great city—until its statesmen began to blow the bubble of Imperialism and built a great fleet. Where is Alexander's empire? On the day Rome conquered the world she sealed her doom; with mad folly she created an army with which to govern—and she might as well have sharpened a sword to cut her own throat. There was once an empire of the Hapsburgs, an empire of Spain; then came the empire of Napoleon, of Russia, of Germany. How many careful brokers would buy their shares today?

They are one long tale of inevitable disaster. Yet with such a history behind them there are men who will rise in the Houses of Parliament today and (with all the cold insolence of ignorance) advise their fellow-countrymen to follow once more this reckless path to national ruin. Such people have the mental instability—or is it knavish cunning—of financial sharks who persuade widows to invest their "little all" in rotten companies.

Now there are many honourable men who believe in Imperialism, men who will frankly admit when the facts are against them. And it is the easiest thing in the world to put before them the evidence of history that ninety-nine hundredths of the Imperialism of all peoples has been little but the clever tricks of a few merchants and bankers who have been anxious to make rapid fortunes, and have been quite unconcerned if their fellow-countrymen have been put to the pain of war on behalf of a few company promoters. There is a very healthy spirit of adventure in sound men and women, that often leads them to wander in foreign lands. The imperial leagues need not worry lest this valuable human quality should deteriorate—it will still be flourishing when their leagues and empires are only dusty ruins.

Take another political creed which is having one of its epidemic periods today. A certain futile group of sentimentalists, usually covered by the term Communists, preach an incoherent doctrine which apparently means that the quickest way to give the world order and logical government is to cause as much

noise and confusion as possible. In general, we are told by these excitable children that the only method of government which has succeeded in history is Revolution; or, at least, that we do not succeed in making a better world because we will not rise and walk about under red banners and pay at soldiers behind street barricades. It is most significant that the apostles of this creed are peculiarly fascinated by the boyish sports of marching with flags and playing with arms. One uses the phrase "excitable children" with scientific precision.

Now the whole case for Revolution as a manner of social progress collapses under the cross-examination of history, as the proverbial pack of cards falls with a breath of air. There are weird mental freaks who have gathered messages of hope from the present (or would it be better to say late?) revolutionary regime in Russia. One would have thought that a primary schoolboy's knowledge of history would have made clear that this Russian revolution has almost followed the lines of the earlier French Revolution.

There are even stranger freaks who believe that the French Revolution of the eighteenth century was a step towards democracy and social reconstruction.

The present writer remembers hearing a member of the National Guilds League (who, by some unfortunate accident, had apparently mistaken that body for a Fascist company of black-shirts) explain to his audience, with warning finger—he was arguing for the beautiful weapon of democracy, the Dictatorship of the Proletariat—that "we might have lost the French Revolution if Carnot had not brought in compulsory military service." Now, one remembers vaguely to have read in the history books that it was not "we" (the Labor Party) that won the French Revolution after all—but Napoleon Bonaparte and a militarist empire.

The end of every revolution is usually the same place (or worse) where it started. It scarcely seems worth all the noise and bloodshed—merely to come back to where we began. Within a few years of all Robespierre's and Danton's rhetoric and executing, France was in the grip of a gang of adventuring army contractors and victorious generals. That was what gas and noise amounted to when they were added up in the cold columns of economic and social facts. History has repeated the same clear conclusion every time a revolution appears on its pages; and the people who still believe in revolution as a method of reform can only be ignoramuses.

But there is another valuable piece of evidence that history offers in this matter of political and social violence, namely, that a great many so-called risings of democracy have been deliberately inspired by interested persons on the other side. When the plutocrats are in a tight corner a bloody revolution is often their only chance of escape. Let the real democrats of today examine the history of revolutions very closely; they will find that a great number of them were fought for the salvation of the autocrats. Take the case of the Peasant Rising of 1381—the latest historical research by M. Petit-Dutaillis shows that in the City of London, at least, the innocent rustics were the tools of a small group of municipal plutocrats who wanted to get rid of their in-

(Continued on page 7)

Lenin's Life and Work

BY KARL RADEK

(Continued from last issue)

A subsequent result of this preparatory work was his book: "State and Revolution." As early as the year 1916 he spoke of the idea of the state Commune, which we at first understood no better than the Russian comrades understood Lenin's famous April theses after the February revolution. Every one of us had read Marx's book on the Paris Commune several times. But we had not observed precisely the new idea in it, the idea of the "State Commune," and it cost Lenin much effort to make his standpoint clear to us. It is highly characteristic of him as a tactician that the experience gained in 1905 caused him, even at this time, to draw our attention to the possible role to be played by councils as organs of the state commune. But at the moment of the February revolutions, Lenin, being in receipt of only very vague reports on the real situation in Russia, and being applied to for directions from comrades Piatakov and Kolontay, who had gone to Russia, replied as follows: "No confidence in the provisional government. The constitutional assembly—a farce. We must get the Petrograd and Moscow municipal Dumas into our hands." In struggling for the state commune, Lenin sought the aid of organs closely connected with the daily life of the masses, without concerning himself to any great extent as to the names of these organs. One result of his program work at this time is his attitude towards the question of the right of self-determination of the peoples. Up to the war, Lenin had dealt with this question from the Russian aspect, as a means towards the emancipation of the Russian proletariat from the influence of Great Russian chauvinism, and as a means towards winning the confidence of the masses of the non-Russian peoples of Russia, in whom he hoped to find allies in the struggle against Czarism.

During the war he approached the question from the international aspect. The pamphlet issued by Rosa Luxemburg on the bankruptcy of German Social Democracy, in which she entirely disputed the possibility of wars of national emancipation during the epoch of imperialism, induced Lenin to take up the question of the right of self-determination of the peoples again. With an unexampled tactical elasticity he showed us—though he most decisively rejected the idea of the so-called defence of native country in the limited West European states—that though the period of national wars is over in Western Europe, this is not yet the case in South Western Europe, nor in the case of the national minorities in Russia and the colonies in Asia. Lenin had not occupied himself concretely with the study of the colonial movement; many of us were much better informed than he on these questions, and with the utmost sincerity he endeavored to gather the concrete material which he required, from books and from conversation. But then he turned this material against us, and in the question of the right of self-determination of the peoples he combatted the attitude adopted by Kautsky, for whom this slogan was an instrument of pacifism, a solution of the Alsace-Lorraine problem. The severe criticism which he levelled against my theses in the question of the right of self-determination of the peoples, was followed up by the demonstration of the importance of this question, which contains the blasting force of dynamite against imperialism. The cunning centrist philosophers of the Hilferding type attempted to prove to the European proletariat that Lenin raised the colonial and national question, at the second congress of the Comintern, in the interests of the Russian state. But already at that time, when Lenin was still living in Switzerland as an exiled and persecuted emigre, he was carrying on an inexorable struggle in regard to this question against Gorter, Pannekoek, Bucharin, Piatakov, and myself. For him this question had the same significance as the winning over of the peasantry on an interna-

tional scale as an ally for the world proletariat. The international proletariat cannot be victorious without allying itself with the revolution of the young enslaved peoples of the East and of the colonies. This Lenin taught us as early as the year 1916.

From the very beginning of the February Revolution, it was Lenin's endeavour to destroy the bloc with the centrists, to liquidate the Zimmerwald Union. He was of the opinion that the Russian revolution, which raised the question of revolution in all the countries taking part in the war, would give to us communists the forces of the masses, and would drive the irresolute elements of the centre into the camp of the traitors. He did not allow us to sign the manifesto issued by the Zimmerwald commission on the Russian revolution, for he saw that this meant confusing the Russian workers by the common signature with Martov, and would interfere with the struggle against Tscheidze and the Mensheviks. The rupture did not take place in 1917, as we were attempting to use the aid of the Zimmerwald bureau for the purpose of inducing the Independent Socialists in Germany to take up the fight against German imperialism; at this time the Spartacus Union had not yet separated from the Independents. After the seizure of power in October 1917 the Zimmerwald Union practically expired. The struggle of the Russian working class actually proved to be the most effectual means of awakening the proletariats of all other countries. The whole of the year 1918 was occupied by the preliminary work for the congress at which the Communist International was founded.

This congress, which took place in March 1919—at the time when the fighting began against Denikin and Koltshak—brought nothing fundamentally new. Its basis was the ideological work accomplished by the Bolsheviks in the Zimmerwald Left during the war years just passed through. The resolution passed by this congress, the manifesto, and above all Lenin's theses on dictatorship and democracy, formed the bases for the future work of the Communist International. At the time of the October revolution, many of those who read the decrees on peace, and on the land enactments, were of the opinion that these documents would share the fate of those proclamations which are never executed. When the Russian revolution was passing through its most critical moments, when tidings were received that Koltshak had advanced to the Volga, when news came that the young Red Army had been defeated in the south—at this critical juncture the decisions of the First Congress of the Communist International were issued, and there were many comrades, not only in Western Europe, but also among us members of the Russian Communist Party, at that time working illegally in the West, who asked if these documents were not the legacy of the Russian revolution, bequeathed in an hour of deadly danger. The Executive of the Communist International, cut off at that time from the West European labour movement by the wall of the blockade, was able to exercise but little practical influence upon our actions, could help the West European workers but little. The latter made their way forward by themselves, learned to solve their problems independently, and it was not until the year 1920, after the victory of the Red Army over Denikin and Koltshak, that the daily mass work of the Communist International began. And here Lenin at once undertook the leadership of the international labour movement as its practical leader, as the good spirit hastening to the aid of the young communist movement, helping it to consider its first steps, and to find its path onwards.

Lenin drew up three important documents for the Second Congress of the Communist International. Delegates arriving from every part of the world found a translation of Lenin's pamphlet: "Radicalism, the Infantile Disease of Communism" awaiting

them. Lenin's work on "State and Revolution" was already known to them, as a torch lighting them to their goal, the dictatorship of the proletariat. The pamphlet on radicalism shed light on the path of those young communist parties which believed that they could spring at the enemy's throat without delay, that the revolutionary wave would bear them directly to their goal. The young communist parties, rejecting every compromise in their revolutionary zeal, were taught by Lenin to consider the lessons won by the experiences of the Russian revolution. He showed them that the first premise towards the dictatorship of the proletariat is the winning over of the majority of the working class. He showed them that the winning over of the majority of the working class requires the utilization of all those means granted to the advanced workers by the same bourgeois democracy which they are about to overthrow. He showed them that the road to the barricade leads even through Parliament, we must preach the idea of communism to the working masses, even from this rubbish heap. He pointed out to them the mass organizations of the workers, the trade unions, which have to be rescued from the hands of the yellow leaders by unwearying efforts. He showed them that a revolutionary minority cannot renounce all compromise, if such compromise can facilitate the winning over of the majority. It is difficult to concentrate into a few words the contents of this incomparable work of our great leader. But it may be safely asserted that even now nine tenths of the leaders of the Communist International have not entirely made the contents of this pamphlet their own.

This little brochure contains in a concentrated form the quintessence of the whole philosophy of Bolshevism, its strategy and tactics, and many years will pass, years of victory and defeat, until we can maintain that these ideas of Lenin have really passed into the flesh and blood of the leaders of the Communist International. The more we read this pamphlet, the greater the wealth of ideas we find in it, the finer the shades of thought. It suffices when I say that after I had been applying the united front tactics for two years, I discovered last year for the first time that these tactics are already contained in the pamphlet, though this never entered my mind when I made my first diffident utilization of these tactics in January 1921, in my well-known "open letter" to the Social Democratic parties and trade unions. The inexhaustible source of instruction afforded by this treatise on the war of the proletariat, or contained between its lines, will be of no less importance for our strategy than Clausewitz's book on military strategy is for the tactics of war. The difficulty in the application of Lenin's teaching lies in the fact that it is impossible to learn the strategy of the proletariat by means of propaganda, by means of comparison with the struggle of the Russian proletariat. The daily experiences of the Communist Parties in the different countries shows us that the main questions invariably arise in quite different forms, and that every Communist Party must be capable of independent thought if it is to rise to the level of the revolutionary strategy of our greatest revolutionary leader.

The second document submitted by Lenin to the Second Congress consisted of his first draft of the conditions of admission to the Comintern. These theses have been much derided. Many protests have been raised against them. But when we read them through and when we ask ourselves what parties belonging to the Communist International have hitherto learnt to fulfil only one tenth of these conditions, then we began to realize their political significance. Lenin's book on "State and Revolution" shows us the goal on the road to this goal; his pamphlet on radicalism shows the whole of the thorny path leading to the dictatorship of the proletariat; and theses of Lenin's deal with the question of what

(Continued on page 7)

Quantitative Determination of the Magnitude of Value

By "GEORDIE"

IN a recent issue of the Clarion our old friend C. K. sets forth with his usual felicity and facility a somewhat attractive theory, no less than a short cut through what he, no doubt, regards as the Marxian jungle.

Taking as his text the following quotation:

"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. I, p. 46).

C. K. argues as follows:

"Socially necessary labor" is, I suggest, labor necessary to satisfy a social need. The amount of socially necessary labor, then, required for the production of a commodity is that amount necessary to continuously produce it in quantities sufficient to fill the effective demand. The demand for any certain commodity may at a given moment be considered as a fixed quantity. The amount of labor necessary to produce that quantity of the given commodity is the amount which counts in determining the magnitude of the Value of the total quantity of that commodity on the market at that moment. Thus, if the demand for commodity A at a given moment be 10,000 units, no matter how much more or less the total quantity of commodity A on the market at that moment may be its total value, in terms of labor-time, will be that amount of labor necessary to produce 10,000 units, for that is the amount of labor socially necessary, and since it has been exerted in response to a social want it can be no more materialized than the amount socially necessary.

This means that while Value is created in the act of production and exists prior to and independent of the act of exchange, its magnitude is not determined until it meets the market and equates itself to the social need. It means that just as prices determined by the conditions of the market tend in the long run to coincide with Cost of Production, so will Exchange Values tend to coincide with Values, and over a period total Values will theoretically equal total Exchange Values. It discloses the relation Exchange Values bear to Values, they being the phenomena that mark the process of trial and error by which supply equates itself to demand and the magnitude of 'Value' is determined."

Now it happens that Marx gave considerable thought to this question and, for that matter, others before him. For instance, the French economist Sismondi, in a work published in 1837, gave it as his opinion "that it is characteristic of our economic progress to reduce the magnitude of value to the necessary labor-time, to the relation between the demand of society as a whole and the quantity of labor which is sufficient to satisfy this demand."

This quotation is given by Marx himself in his "Critique" where it may be found on page 70.

Concerning the position of Marx in this matter the present writer made the following statement a year or two ago in the Clarion:

"This phrase (socially necessary labor) is somewhat ambiguous and may be used in a sense much more comprehensive than that in which it is used in connection with the theory of Value:

(1) It may mean the average labor time socially necessary for producing a certain commodity—at any given time.

(2) It may mean the social labor time necessary to produce the commodity if it were produced according to the general average of social efficiency in production.

(3) It may mean 'that quantity of labor-time which is necessary for the production of the socially required total quantity of commodities of any kind on the market under the existing average conditions of social production.'

In the first case the "socially necessary labor-time" corresponds to the value of the commodity; in the second case to the price of production and in the third case to the price.

It is, however, clear that the amount of labor socially necessary to produce a certain article under given conditions is a very different matter from the amount of labor socially necessary to produce the total amount of any given commodity—represented by the entire solvent demand for it in the market."

The above, in my apprehension at that time, was the gist of what Marx had to say on this matter. Looking over it again, however, I notice a few inaccuracies and it will be just as well to see what Marx actually does say.

In the first place, it should be noted that when Marx speaks of labor in connection with value he means "social" labor as distinguished from "useful" labor which creates utility. Social labor is simply, undifferentiated human labor which forms part and parcel of the social division of labor; the exercise of which is a social act looking to the satisfaction of a social want.

There is not, therefore, such a great difference between the phrases "necessary social labor" and "socially necessary labor." As a matter of fact Marx appears to use them indifferently.

In any case the quotation C. K. makes from p. 46 of "Capital" will not bear the interpretation he puts on it, for the simple reason that Marx himself on the same page specifies the application of the terms in these words:

"The labor-time socially necessary is that required to produce an article under the normal condition of production, and with the average degree of skill and intensity prevalent at the time."

Nevertheless on page 750 of Vol. III I find the "socially necessary labor-time" defined as "that quantity of labor-time which is necessary for the production of the socially required quantity of commodities of any kind on the market under the existing average conditions of social production."

Now, it is possible that these two definitions may be read as being identical but they are not really so as they refer to two distinct things. Marx draws a distinction here, as always, between the thing itself and its magnitude, in this case between the demand for a commodity and the quantity demanded. There is a social need for a certain use-value and there is a social need for a certain quantity of that use-value.

It appears to be essential to the Marxian viewpoint that the magnitude of value is conceived as being determined in production and Marx everywhere insists on this. For example:

"Lastly, suppose that every piece of linen on the market contains no more labor-time than is socially necessary. In spite of this, all those prices taken as a whole, may have had superfluous labor-time spent on them. If the market cannot stomach the whole quantity at the normal price of two shillings a yard, this proves that too great a portion of the total labor of the community has been expended in the form of weaving. The effect is the same as if each individual weaver had expended more labor-time upon his particular product than is socially necessary."—Capital, Vol. I, p. 129.

It seems to me that Marx sums up his opinion on this point in the following:

"The same takes place in the division of labor within society as a whole, as distinguished from division of labor in the individual workshop. It is the labor necessary for the production of particular articles, for the satisfaction of some particular need of society. If this division is proportional, then the products of the various groups are sold at their values (at a later stage of development at their prices of production), or at prices which are modifications of their values or prices of production due to general laws. It is indeed the law of value enforcing itself, not with reference to individual commodities or articles, but to the total products of the particular social spheres of production made independent by division of labor. Every commodity must contain the necessary quantity of labor, and at the same time only the proportional quantity of total social labor-time must have been spent on the various groups. For the use-value of things remains a prerequisite. The use-value of the individual commodities depends on the particular need which each satisfies. But the use-value of the social mass of products depends on the extent to which it satisfies in quantity a definite social need for every particular kind of product in an adequate manner, so that the labor is proportionately distributed among the different spheres in keeping with these social needs, which are definite in quantity. The social need, that is the use-value on a social scale, appears here as a determining factor for the amount of social labor which is to be supplied by the various particular spheres. But it is only the same law, which showed itself in the individual com-

modity, namely that its use-value is the basis of its exchange-value and thus of its surplus-value. . . . This quantitative limit of the quota of social labor available for the various particular spheres is but a wider expression of the law of value, although the necessary labor time assumes a different meaning here. Only just so much of it is required for the satisfaction of the social needs. The limitation is here due to the use-value. Society can use only so much of its total labor for this particular kind of products under the prevailing conditions of production.—Capital, Vol. III, p. 745.

Such is the stated opinion of Herr Doctor Karl Marx. More anon.

Evolution of Coal

Excerpts from a Miner's Diary.

IN reviewing history for data relating to the origin of coal and how it entered into the affairs of man, it is to find coal was not exempt from the criticism and abuse "which accompanies all new things and ideas when making their first appearance in the drama of life."

In the field of science its wonders were laughed at and ridiculed, while on the commercial field penalties were imposed prohibiting its production. The Prelates and nobles of England denounced it as a black smoky nuisance. When coal finally became recognized as being a fit substitute to take the place of wood and charcoal "derived from diminishing forest areas" penalties which were formerly imposed upon its production were now enforced upon its use. In 1662, £200,000 was raised by the "Hearth Tax" imposed by Charles II. on the people of England.

The Greeks, Romans and Chinese were all acquainted with this fossil fuel and it was not until the arrival of steam that its wonderful possibilities became more fully realized. With the invention of the steam engine in 1784, and the numerous applications of steam that followed, coal started out on a new and wider career as a generator of "Motive Power." It gave an impetus to the railway, steamboat, mills and blast furnaces all of which in turn accelerated its own production. From fuel, to power, we now come to the various discoveries which take the form of "By-products" arising out of its use in "Industrial Processes." By a distillation of coal the scientist, armed with his knowledge of formulae and equations, can evolve and furnish us with a series of beautiful dyes, scents, explosives, powerful drugs and effective antiseptics, etc. The story of coal when told by the botanist, geologist physicist and chemist is both fascinating and instructive and while every page bears their trade mark it in no way means the evolution of coal ends here, and there is no room for a chapter bearing the "Value Mark of the Economist." This phase of the question seems to have been entirely overlooked by all writers. The great majority who receive their education in the public school are not instructed on what determines the "Exchange Value" of coal, or any commodity, and the part played by the law of supply and demand in the levelling of prices. When a dispute arises over a question of wages, why is it The Militia, Police, Press, Politicians and Preachers are always to be found on the side of the coal barons instead of the miners whose death roll amounts into thousands in the last decade. Why does this antagonism of interests exist? Surely an intelligent explanation of these questions together with the many more arising out of our financial system could fill an interesting volume in the history of "Man and Coal."

The selling of coal is principally carried on by companies who buy direct from the mines and by agents selling on commission. As a business it consists in crystallizing the energy of the various workers engaged in the production of coal into cash. Price is the approximate monetary expression of Exchange Value. The profits do not originate out of the blackness or carbon contained in fuel but are derived out of the labor involved in its production. This is the motive that brings all sellers into the arena of sale. Personal Interest takes them into the business and when the average rate of profit is not

(Continued on page 4)

Western Clarion

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

Published twice a month by the Socialist Party of
Canada, P. O. Box 716, 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

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

VANCOUVER, B. C., MAY 16, 1924

POLITICAL UNITY.

THERE has recently occurred here a B. C. Federated Labor Party and Trade Union affiliation with the Canadian Labor Party, with which is affiliated also the Communist (Workers') Party. The idea is toward unity of all labor forces, more particularly during election periods. Without exhaustive examination of the clauses of the tentative Platform and By-laws adopted at the recent convention of delegates it may be generally assumed that the policy likely to be pursued in connection with the adoption of candidates is that these may be nominated by the several individual affiliated organizations and, in turn, endorsed by the major body. This is likely to mean the elimination of some aspirants, but it is to be supposed that has already been taken for granted by all bodies concerned.

These notes are set forth without prejudice to the formation of any organization promoting real unity among workers on the political field or any other. The political success of Labor in Great Britain has lent something of a flip to Labor elsewhere. It has undoubtedly had its influence upon the recent fall of Poincare in France, although in this connection the chronic unevenness of the French Budget, the state necessity of increased revenue from taxation, the failure of the Ruhr policy, the instability of the franc and the unwelcome necessity of general acceptance of the Dawes Report are by no means to be neglected as important factors. There are others too.

However, labor and socialist activity in the political arena is the prevalent atmosphere of the day: Ebert and Scheidman in Germany, Branting in Sweden, Vandervelde in Belgium, MacDonald in Great Britain, not forgetting the Soviet power in Russia. It is thus not an unfair assumption that these present tendencies in Canada towards unity are of the nature, somewhat, of following suit. It is to be noted, however, that in those countries where working class parties have attained political success, of whatever particular complexion in the technique of inclusive proletarian politics they may be made up, there the system, so called, of the production and sale of commodities has been choked up and unworkable. Russia first, then Germany, then Great Britain and now, in a measure, France; with the lesser countries a similar progress can be seen in events.

Looking to this continent, the U. S. A. has had to go no further than to promote a Third Party, while in Canada, since the most important productive department in the country is agriculture, and since the farmers have suffered severely from depression in prices since the war period, the tendency has been to reduce parliamentary representation through old orthodox channels and to seek to build their own political bodies. They have done this with some considerable political success. Labor in Canada has a tendency to follow that lead, to unite its scattered forces and also to co-ordinate its efforts with those of the farmers.

Now it appears that our own attitude is in question, more particularly since the B. C. Provincial election is scheduled for 20th June. It is agreed that our influence in the body of thought among the

workers of this country has been of a positive character and has been singularly effective over the past years and is so recognized now, in spite of sundry hopes expressed to the contrary.

The idea of unity is good insofar as it tends to break down the thin ideological partitions which have prevented unity of action in certain quarters. In point of fact the present unity is in some respects a re-union. In respect of ourselves, however, while we have no desire to obstruct the path of working class unity in political action our members are not likely to take their Party Constitution so lightly as to alter it without very serious consideration. That constitution precludes affiliation, for instance, with the C. L. P. and no local area can alter it alone.

It is characteristic of all ideas that are worth while that they give rise to a great deal of dispute and argumentation. The position of the S. P. of C. has been held to tenaciously over many years and has been found to be useful. If it has been somewhat isolated from the general working class activity its point of view has found a great deal of attention centred upon it from that fact alone. If unity where organizational identity were in no danger of suffocation were possible the case might be different. That, of course, is a matter still to be demonstrated. Meantime, towards unity we express a goodwill, which is not so empty a sentiment as these few words might seem to make it.

HERE AND NOW.

IN the regular setting forth of these totals in small sums we are continually reminded of that biblical verse which says: "Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, today and forever." This has come to an appreciable common use, although, as is well known, we have no reputation for blasphemy.

But it would appear that our condition of penury is to remain static until the shadows flee away or the poets bob their hair. It is hard to be cheerful under the circumstances. Hence the gloom indicated herein. Here follows the monetary expression of that gloom:

Following \$1 each: H. Wilmer, Martin Ophus, J. C. Blair, T. B. Roberts, P. M. Friesen, E. Johnson, W. Smith, H. W. Speed, Wm. Sheepmaker, Wm. Mitchell, A. N. Roberts, C. Luff, R. V. Hastie, C. Saunders, C. M. O'Brien, J. Hunter, T. Hughes.

Following \$2 each: Mike Macdonald, E. Anderson, Wm. Breeze, C. A. Harding.

Jim Lott, \$5.00.

Above, Clarion subs. received from 29 April to 16 May, inclusive, total \$30.

CLARION MAINTENANCE FUND.

Martin Ophus \$1; T. B. Roberts \$3; St. John Comrades, (per S. E. White) \$8.25; "B. L. J." \$2; Wm. Mitchell \$2.

Above, C. M. F. receipts from 29 April to 16 May, inclusive, total \$16.25.

LOCAL No. 1, VANCOUVER.

The business meeting held on the 13th inst. decided to hold its nomination of candidates meeting in connection with the B. C. Provincial election on Tuesday 20th May. It is hoped that a full attendance of members will be present.

The French newspapers, and even the French minister of finance, accuse enemy foreign countries, above all Germany, of having brought about the fall of the franc by their manoeuvres. The French minister of finance spoke in parliament of a conference alleged to have been held in France by bankers from the occupied territory, in which united action for the fall of the franc was resolved upon. The kernel of this assertion appears to be as follows: Until the stabilization of the German mark the French franc was used more and more in the occupied territory as currency. After the stabilization of the mark, and the simultaneous depreciation of the franc, this latter was supplanted as a general medium of circulation in this territory. No one

wanted to take French francs in payment any longer, and the francs thus liberated in the occupied territory streamed back to France, or sought investment in pounds and dollars. It is an actual fact that on some days French francs could be purchased in the occupied territory for German money, at half the price paid in Berlin.

The depreciation of the franc once begun, that process has been repeated which we already know too well from the history of the currencies of Germany, Austria and Poland: the alarmed foreign owners of French money speedily converted this into pounds or dollars, the French capitalists sought to provide themselves with an adequate supply of foreign currency, so that the demand for foreign bills far exceeded the normal requirements of the economic process. It is of course impossible to say whether—as maintained in some French circles—the English from political motives have exercised pressure for the fall of the franc. The French press asserts that English capitalists have converted their francs into dollars to a wide extent.

The depreciation of the franc has naturally been accompanied by a parallel depreciation in the value of interest-bearing French bonds. This means that the French investors who put their savings at the disposal of the state until the year 1923 for the purpose of the restoration of the devastated districts and covering of the state deficit, by their purchase of state bonds, became equally distrustful. Short term state loans have become harder to place of late, along with increasingly high rates of interest. It goes without saying that a movement for the sale of French state bonds set in. According to calculation, published by the "Ere Nouvelle," French investors have suffered a loss of 19 milliards in state bonds since November 1919, as the result of the rate of exchange.

If we regard the fact of the failure of French loan operations in the inland market not only from the financial stand point, but from the economic point of view, we see that it means that the saving powers of the French people are exhausted; that is, France is no longer able to obtain, from the annual production of values of her own economics, the sum required for the restoration of the devastated territories.

E. VARGA.

EVOLUTION OF COAL.

(Continued from page 3)

forthcoming the material interest which takes them into the arena today will take, drive, them out again tomorrow and this regardless of whom their successors will be. In exchanging coal into gold it is not necessary for a seller to be gifted with the power to see, to understand its fossil nature or useful purposes. For proof of this statement let anyone ask his dealer how much coal is required to concentrate or reduce a given quantity of metallic mineral, or, if he is selling coal under specifications, that is, it has been proved to give a certain "Calorific Value" so many B.Th.U. heat units per given weight. These questions have a very important bearing on the "Use Value" of coal, yet we find that 99 9/10 per cent of those who sell coal are not concerned about its composition or utility. What is of vital interest to the seller is the array of prices and many have no hesitation in saying they do not give a damn what becomes of coal after it passes through their hands. That Profit is the Primary motive behind the production and sale of coal is so palpably self evident and needs no further elaboration, to any one with his eyes open.

A. G. McC.

Social and Dance

Don't fail to attend Local Vancouver's Social and Dance to be held in Oddfellow's Hall, 6th Ave. and Main, on Friday 23rd May. Tickets are 50c and 25c (men and women). Refreshments free. Come along and bring your friends with you.

The Significance of Marx

It is well known how the Marxian theory has been the object of many attacks on the part of so-called critics of Marx. And it is unfortunate that these attacks have had considerable influence upon the militant proletariat of all civilized countries. There are not a few individuals today who are convinced that Marxism as a theory has outlived its usefulness and should give way to new theories whose many colored mixture goes under the name of critical Socialism; and it was only at a recent meeting that I heard an old time veteran of the class struggle make the statement that he thought perhaps the time had come to revise the teachings of Marx.

I am going to try to prove in this article that the teachings of Marx are as sound today as they ever were. The history of mankind can be biologically divided into many different epochs, each respective epoch performing a peculiar function of its own, and to know the function of these different stages in historical evolution we must above all things understand their physiology, or their structures, and we must also comprehend upon what particular economic premises their organisms were reared. In other words, in order to permit a comprehensive and an intelligent appreciation of history a thorough and fundamental knowledge of the previous social systems in society and of their functions is essential.

And it is impossible to formulate an intelligent understanding of history unless we are acquainted with the laws and principles governing our own society. And so the object before us is to analyse the structure of our own society, and to acquire a knowledge of the economic premises upon which its foundation is based. What then is the form of our society? It is a capitalist society. What is it that distinguishes the capitalist epoch from the preceding epochs? What force was it that lifted up society to the unparalleled height that it occupies today. And what are the forces inherent in Capitalism that are working toward its disintegration and preparing the basic elements for a different foundation?

The Marxist, equipped with an understanding of the class struggle, and the materialistic conception of history, sees clearly how capitalism appeared in response to certain material conditions prevailing during the latter period of the middle ages. "The mode of production in material life determines the general character of the social, political and spiritual processes of life." (Marx). When one looks at history through capitalist glasses it takes on the appearance of a collection of dates and events concerning kings, princes, wars, battles, royal marriages and intrigues, but we learn precious little concerning the basic causes that underlie human activity, and it is only by applying the materialistic interpretation of history as it was taught us by Marx that we come to a correct understanding of history and events.

Capitalism is to be distinguished from all other earlier forms of society by its system of producing commodities and also their exchange. A commodity is a product of human labor produced for the purpose of exchange in the markets of the world, and Marx starts out in "Capital" by telling us that "the wealth of capitalist society presents itself to us as an immense accumulation of commodities." A commodity may contain a two-fold character, that of a finished article, and that of raw material, which is determined entirely by its function in the labor process. The capitalist buys the commodity labor-power (L); for money (M), and sells its product for more money (M plus), and the process of exploitation it follows is therefore M—L—M—plus. In

the socialist society the plus will have disappeared, the entire product will belong to the producer; if he then exchanges it for other products by means of money the formula will be C—M—C. Money will then become merely a medium of exchanging articles of equal value.

The key to Marx's economic doctrines is his theory of value, and the reason why he stresses the importance of labor-power in capitalist production is to point out and emphasize that the worker is the important factor in our present social system. Value is that element which is embodied in the products of human energy or labor; although the phenomena of nature may be use-values they cannot be values in this sense, for the simple reason that no human labor has been expended in their production, while material objects are products and results of human energy. It is true, natural forces are co-operative agents in the creation of material objects, yet they play only a secondary importance, while Labor, which organizes the shapeless substances of nature into tangible forms is the productive factor.

Marx took hold of the social question and placed it upon a scientific basis; he came upon the scene when that question was drifting about aimlessly, when the effects of capitalist production were being analyzed by utopian thinkers in whose hands the practical application of politics was directed toward appealing to the humanitarian instincts. He studied the nature of society, and came to the conclusion that the social structure was based upon the economic arrangement of society. In other words he found that the social structure depended upon the method of wealth production, and the relationship existing between the producers and the appropriators of the goods, and proceeding still further along this line of reasoning he was able to point out the existence of class formations and divisions in society.

In "Capital" Marx develops the subject of relatively increasing misery. To this the reformer objects that there can not be any doubt about the fallacy of such an idea, and he claims that the working class in our day can secure for itself considerable improvements. This is substantially incorrect. The capitalist and the worker are both subject to the inexorable laws that underlie and govern our present day society. As capitalism develops the markets become glutted, and the orders failing to come in any longer, it makes necessary the closing down of industry until such a time when the conditions of the market will warrant the reopening of these establishments. And in the meantime the laborer and his fellow workmen find themselves face to face with a condition of affairs that bodes no good to them and their families.

The great task before the socialist movement today, a task which will also rejuvenate and impart fresh vitality to it, is to individualize the workers as a class or, in other words, to make independent thinkers out of followers; and this necessitates the education of the proletariat in the sciences from a Marxian perspective. Knowledge is power, and the dynamic of that creative proletarian vitality in the socialist movement rests in the class consciousness of its membership. As this class consciousness develops among the workers their actual revolutionary power increases. The power of the labor "fakirs" rests in the intellectual immaturity or undeveloped mental condition of the millions of workers. Being incapable of perceiving and determining their position as exploited wage slaves they are, therefore, also unable to appreciate the great and glorious task of emancipating their class and society from the fetters of private property.

So that, on its fundamental doctrines Marxism appears to be in no need of revision. Quite often the critics who would revise Marxian doctrine are not overly well acquainted with their subject on hand. Elaboration, extension, interpretation interlinking Marxian concepts with the apparent trend of thought today towards materialism has its uses. But we are too far off our objective yet to ditch the pilot.

THE CLAIMS OF "NORDIC" RACE SUPERIORITY.

(Continued from last issue)

These advocates of the "Nordic" theory mislead the public; this is certain. What are the facts? Ever since Mendel, scientists have been testing the fluidity of human traits, and independent scientific experiments the world over have disproved Weismann's theory and have established beyond doubt the great fact that the human body is molded and modified by its environment, that it passes on to following generations the physical changes and mental habits which it acquires, and that these characteristics, whether acquired in pre-historic times or in the last generation, remain the same only as long as the environment is unchanged. In other words, science dismisses the idea that a tall, blond race settled in the north while a short, dark race occupied the south, and justifies the belief that through countless ages the northern people were bleached in complexion and were increased in stature, whereas the southerners were tanned and diminished in size by the climate and the living conditions peculiar to each division of the earth. We have had it demonstrated in the United States that minute modifications of both extremes toward a new type, or rather toward new types, best fitted to survive in the various sections of our vast country, take place within one or two generations.

As for the nebulous "Nordic," the latest anthropological analysis by Professor Roland B. Dixon of Harvard University finds the origin of this type in the mixture of Caspian and Mediterranean types. It is safe to assume a "mixture" for the "Nordic" as for all other races, inasmuch as recent research has shown that the closest sort of contacts existed between north and south even in the earliest days of our civilization. The tens of thousands of Arabic coins which have been found on Swedish soil and which date back to the first dynasties, form one instance of the constant intercourse between the south, which wanted amber, and the north, especially Scandinavia, which needed bronze. War, however, was more effective as a means of merging the types than peace. Long before the great migration of Goths to the equatorial regions, as a result of which northern blood infiltrated every people of the Mediterranean, there occurred Viking raids in which the warriors, if they got away at all, carried off as many women as the ship would hold to bear more Vikings in the northern fastnesses. In later days conquests, invasions, alliances and crusades brought alien armies into every spot of Europe and intermingled every type and people. The conclusion of anthropologists that "every modern race and nationality is of strongly mixed descent" is founded on many kinds of evidence.

These facts in themselves are sufficient to destroy the illusion of a perpetually superior race responsible for a superior culture; but the preposterous impudence of this theory becomes fully apparent when we consider the history of civilization. We find, to begin with, that different nations or races are at various times in the vanguard of cultural development. Thus in the fifteenth century the standard of civilization in China is much higher than that of Europe. Western Europe surpassed the Orient during the Renaissance, but Western civilization was taken over and improved upon in many respects by the Japanese during the lifetime of the average middle-aged man. It is clear that a cultural advance is an inexplicable phenomenon; it is an accidental and fortunate combination of the right mind, the propitious time and the proper place. Cultural expansion, the shattering of old walls and the enlargement of life is always the result of a flash of genius in the powder magazine of economic and political conditions. If the leader is lacking or the time is unpropitious, the masses stagnate, whether they be white, black, red or yellow. But though nothing can explain the rise and continuation of culture in primitive peoples, we see that after a certain stage the civilization of a race is the cumulative increment of all other cultures.

Culture Origins Due to Non-"Nordics"

Nowhere is this better illustrated than in the

(Continued on page 8)

The One Idea of the Empty-Headed Socialist

BY F. W. MOORE.

OF all the extraordinary delusions we ever heard of, none is more remarkable than that of the honest individual whose imaginary multiplicity of ideas gives rise to the hallucination that socialists are men of one idea only. He accuses them of continually reverting in argument to the following facts: that our industrial institutions do not correspond with the needs of society and ought therefore to be completely reorganized; that this reorganization ought to be developed on an international scale and along lines indicated by democratic management; and that if this course were followed, it would prove a panacea for all political and industrial ills as well as for the still worse maladies that follow in their wake. He makes no allowance for a connection between this fundamental thesis and the numerous tributary problems that it predicates—problems of which the disconnected ideas of the exuberant one, are mere reflections—problems which interest him all the more because in many cases they are relative to the high cost of living; yet they are problems that do not interest him sufficiently to induce him to go further afield in his quest for a solution than the columns of a press whose very existence is to a large extent, depending on the income derived from the printing of advertisements of those who make it high.

Needless to say, the connection between outgrown industrial institutions and the ills of society is never mentioned consequently, the deluded one, imagining that each of the problems springing from the separate roots of the parent stem is an isolated entity, succeeds by this mental process in automatically lowering the veil of prejudice and in effectually obscuring the truth that would glow effulgently if traced to its original source in accordance with the law of economic determinism. The light of truth would then fall on the problems arising out of the multiplicity of disconnected ideas of the exuberant one—ideas incidental to many topics of which we shall choose a few for discussion. In these we shall include, trusts, unemployment, war, education, defence, trade, and commerce: all of which are of a homogeneous nature, in as far as the problems to which they give rise are directly dependent for their solution on a knowledge of the thesis laid down above.

Take the case of the trusts for instance; only a booby imagines that in these days of meal-ticket electioneering any government could, satisfactorily to the wishes of the public, regulate one of these octopuses whose money is the great agent in returning it to power; as well might the hired man be asked to regulate the affairs of his master. And since the owners of a trust were the only men ever known to regulate it, we are justified in concluding that this can only be accomplished when the time arrives for public ownership and democratic management, and right here we flounder into the one idea of the presumably empty-headed socialist; nevertheless, we must not let that fact excite us in the least, since we are bound to run into it at every turn, as we shall presently see.

In the meantime, let us consider the next subject on the list above: Unemployment, apart from the abnormal conditions incidental to the World War, is caused in many ways, one of which recurs sufficiently often to deserve special attention: We refer to the so-called "glut" in the market. It is not hard to see that an overproduction of commodities for this dwindling institution is bound to clog the wheels of industry, and temporarily shut the door on further employment; but this is not all. These gluts must occur oftener as time passes in consequence of the industrial development of backward countries, and the invention of new and improved machinery, until eventually conditions become intolerable and necessity compels the reorganization of the whole fabric

of society, and here, for the second time, we have stumbled into the mental atmosphere of the notorious socialist who, no doubt, is still in contented possession of his precious idea.

Now let us consider the World War. There is hardly need to repeat at this late date that it was not fought to put down militarism, which, metaphorically speaking, is a vigorous baby still. Nor was it fought to make this world a fit place for democracy; most people bide by the opinion that with increased taxation, higher cost of living, unemployment, and poorer material in the world's commodities, it is not quite as fit as it used to be; but to stop war we must obliterate its cause by instituting a federation of the nations of the world, and here again we stagger into the solitary idea of the contented one. Verily, it appears that all ideas relating to industrial problems when traced logically to their origin, converge acutely towards the radical concept of the queer fellow, just as in ancient days all roads led towards Rome.

Education comes next in order, and in connection with this subject we shall be surprised if the exuberant one is not astounded by the array of facts that we are about to produce. Here is a statement concerning the appropriations for the national revenue in the United States for the year 1920. They are taken from a report by Dr. Edward B. Rosa, of the United States Bureau of Standards, and were published in the "Social Service Bulletin," the organ of the Methodist Federation of Social Service, for April, 1921.

United States Appropriations for the Year 1920

1.—Past Wars	\$3,855,482,586	68%
2.—Future Wars	1,424,138,677	25%
3.—Civil Departments	181,087,225	3%
4.—Public Works	168,203,557	3%
5.—Education and Science	57,093,661	1%
Total	\$5,686,005,706	100%

This is an example of the cost of apotheosising the spirit of Nationalism, a practice for which there might have been some excuse when conditions were not ripe for closer union amongst men, but which today, as we have just proved, is expensive to the taxpayer and potentially bestial in its nature, inasmuch as in it, is embodied the spirit of war, which with the improvement in infernal inventions becomes, year after year, more infernally horrible to contemplate.

Think of it, ye gentlemen of the exuberant stock of ideas! This is what we calculated would astound you. Think of ninety-three percent of the national revenue; indeed, we might say "international revenue," since the United States is only a type of the other industrially developed nations. Think of this ninety-three per cent. amounting to billions, spent to pay debts contracted on account of past wars and to provide for defence for the duration of the ones expected, while one per cent. goes towards education.

Don't you think that it is high time commingled shame and disgust with the necessity that exists for international prodigality under our present system of international competition, would suggest the advisability of a complete revolution in our modes of thought—a revolution that would lead us to train ourselves in accordance with the dictates of economic determinism for the time when circumstances will force us to make unnecessary this process by establishing a United States of the World?

And again we have expressed it—that ubiquitous solitary idea of the gentle revolutionist. We shall, however, make amends by trying to get away from it as we pass on to the last topic of those mentioned above, and concerning trade and commerce we shall cite more quote from the Social Service Bulletin

In the number for April 1923, is a quotation from Mrs. Forbes-Robertson Hale's pamphlet written for the Foreign Policies Association, in which she makes the following statements in discussing the international issue at that time: "In England we have a devastated region, but it isn't a geographical one. We have between a million and a half and two million people out of work. . . . The one question in England is food for her people. She must see Europe economically restored so that she can do business with Europe."

Alas! How can we keep our promise when Mrs. Hale so forcibly reminds us of the solitary idea of the idealistic iconoclast? "England's one vital question, is the restoration of Europe," says she. In other words the countries of the world are so intimately associated that they are compelled to depend on each other. Some day they must, owing to this fact, bend to the inevitable, and form the only sort of union that would bring peace, happiness, and prosperity to the human race—the union of the world in a United States; similar and yet very dissimilar but much more freedom-fraught than the United States of America. Can it be then that the origin of the explanation of all maladies of political and industrial society, is involved in the solitary idea of our radiant radical? It is not for us to answer. We can only mention the fact to our readers in all humility that we ourselves found a wonderful enlightening influence in the study and application of the law of economic determinism, from which we found it impossible to escape the conclusion that if we wish to develop along progressive lines we must alter our institutions to suit new conditions, or endure stagnation, misery and final degradation.

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.

LENIN'S LIFE AND WORK.

(Continued from page 2)

a Communist Party should be. It is not worth while to pass any new resolutions, whatever until examination has been made into the question of the extent to which these theses have been fulfilled. These theses form the test, the measure of the progressive development of the parties of the Communist International, of their conversion from left social democratic parties into really communist parties!

Lenin's third document was his draft of the theses on the colonial question. These theses have also not yet become part and parcel of the very being of the communist parties of the West, whose bourgeoisie holds hundreds of millions of human beings in its rapacious claws in the colonies. Neither has it fully penetrated the consciousness of our young communist parties in the East. The work being done in the colonies by our English, French and Dutch comrades not only encounters great difficulties on the side of the police of the imperialist powers, but finds another obstacle in the imperfect preparation of our comrades for work among masses of colonial peoples of an unheard of low degree of culture. Our comrades in the colonies often err along the paths of left communism. Themselves educated by a literature which proclaims the fight for the dictatorship of the proletariat, it is only with the utmost difficulty that they can adapt themselves to combining the work of gathering together the young proletariat and the craftsmen of China, Corea, Persia, India and Egypt, against the foreign and native bourgeoisie, with the attempt to support the national emancipation movement of the young native bourgeoisie against the capitalist centre by which it is being suppressed. Decades will again have to pass before actual practice will be successful in combining the struggles for national emancipation among the colonial peoples with the proletarian revolution in Europe and America. But one thing is clear: Lenin's genius has pointed out the path to be pursued by the international proletariat.

In the figure of Lenin, and in his works, we have for the first time in the history of class warfare a comprehensive centre, in the literal sense of the words, for the workers of the whole world. For the first time we begin to emerge from the blind alley into which the European proletariat has run, to tread the path of a real world movement. The book written by our Indian comrade Roy, gave us the first theoretical example of Lenin's teachings tested in a concrete instance. The struggle carried on by the newspaper published by Roy himself gives us the first example of the periodical application of Lenin's teachings, and we may confidently maintain that this test has shown how far and how deeply our leader could see. At the time of the Hamburg Congress of the Second International, the Hamburg social democratic newspaper printed a poem of welcome to the congress. The poet called upon the Chinese coolie in the rice fields, to the negroes on the cotton plantations of South America, to the black men working in the gold mines, inviting them to gather beneath the emancipating standard of the International. But these are mere empty words. This same Second International is now celebrating a great victory. Its leader, Ramsay MacDonald, has formed the first labour government. And whom has he appointed as minister for the 300,000,000 oppressed Hindus? Sir Sidney Oliver, an official belonging to the old staff of colonial authorities, the governor of Jamaica. This colonial official is the tried and tested protector of the sugar plantation owners of Jamaica. Will he call the Indian slaves of his Majesty the King beneath the flag of the Second International, or will this perhaps be done by Lord Chelmsford, the one-time viceroy of India, now appointed First Lord of the Admiralty by the grace of MacDonald, leader of the Second International? It is only the Communist International which can organize the colonial peoples, and Lenin's work in showing us this path will never be forgotten in history, nor by the international working class and the whole of humanity.

At the Third Congress of the Communist International Lenin was still at his fighting post. The

revolutionary wave of 1918-19 had ebbed. The German CP., grown into a mass party of the proletariat, had not taken the altered conditions into account, did observe that the offensive of capital had already set in, allowed itself to be provoked, and plunged into an armed struggle, without possessing even the sympathies of the majority of the working class. We all admit the error committed by the Party. We all rejected the theses submitted by the German central, which drafted a theory of offence at the moment of political retreat. But we, the immediate functionaries of the Communist International, knew that the Party Central, consisting as it did of the old leaders of the Spartacus union and of the best leaders of the Independent party, was the sole possible Central for the German communist movement, and we wished to teach our German brother party as kindly as possible the lessons to be learnt from this defeat. Lenin forced us to alter our theses five times. He forced us to say brutally to the German Communists, and to the Communists of the whole world: "First win over the majority of the proletariat, and then you may turn to the task of seizing power!" Lenin saved the Communist Party, and with some decision he supported the united front tactics, which encountered violent resistance in the ranks of the Communists—and not only in the ranks of the West European communists. With extraordinary fine feeling he pointed out the main differences existing between Russian conditions in the year 1917, and the conditions under which the West European communists have to fight. He understood exactly that here we have proletarian mass organizations possessing a past extending over half a century, and in the hands of yellow leaders, so that the work before us is extremely complicated, and demands much perseverance. Such a situation calls for a number of compromises, disagreeable to communists, but unfortunately unavoidable if the majority of the proletariat is to be won over. Overburdened with state work, Lenin had no time to follow the detailed questions of the development in the West, and yet he possessed a certain sense enabling him to grasp the essential differences in the positions of the different countries, and the tasks of the different Communist Parties.

At the Fourth Congress of the Communist International Lenin gave a report on the situation in Russia, though he had just recovered from the first attack of that disease which has now robbed us of him. The congress received him with enthusiastic joy, and it was with the greatest sorrow that we observed the painful slowness with which our beloved leader had to seek for the words enabling him to express his clearly defined ideas in a foreign language. Before giving his report, Lenin put the question, accompanied by a wink of one eye: "And what shall we say when we are asked about the immediate prospects of the world revolution?" and then added immediately: "I shall say that when the communists behave more sensibly, the prospects will improve." Lenin gave instructions on the methods of war against war to the Russian trade union delegation going to the Hague. This last piece of advice given by Lenin to the international proletariat represents a perfect example of his extraordinary sense of reality. He declared that those who promise the carrying out of a general strike in the case of a fresh outbreak of war, in face of the lessons taught by the imperialist war, are either fools or humbugs. If we cannot prevent the imperialist war, then the masses will be drawn into the war and then we shall be compelled to enter the war ourselves, in order to work for the revolution in the ranks of the imperialist armies. Our task is to exert every endeavour to prevent any fresh outbreak of war. And again Lenin unfolded, point by point, the plan of daily revolutionary work against the danger of war.

One year of work in the Communist International without Lenin now lies behind us. This year brought us two great defeats: in Bulgaria and in Germany. We must learn the lessons of these defeats alone, without Lenin. The revolutionary wave is not rising as we had expected it to rise during the past summer, and if it does not rise next year, then we shall have a number of complicated questions to clear up. We shall have to decide the question of

how we can best gather the masses around us during the period of reaction, of capitalist offensive, and how we can combine the daily struggle with the preparation for the fight for the dictatorship. We have 42 parties. Each of these parties exists under its own special conditions. It is a task of extraordinary difficulty to accord due consideration to all these special conditions, and still to carry on united communist work. But we shall accomplish this task. Are we not in possession of the legacy which Lenin has bequeathed us, the inexhaustible store of his ideas, his methods, tried and tested in many attacks and retreats? We shall learn from Lenin's works. As with Marx's tenets, it is not the results and concrete solutions which have here the greatest value, but the method of solution, the way in which this greatest of proletarian revolutionists approached the problems.

The Communist International and the Russian proletariat have suffered a severe loss. But if ever it could be said that death has only taken the body of a leader, in no case could these words be truer than here. And therefore the Communist International will shed no tears by Lenin's graveside, but will turn with tenfold energy to the task of making its own all that is immortal in the teachings of Lenin. And with Lenin's sword in its hand the communist International will stride forward to victory!

Our beloved leader is no longer among us. We shall accomplish our task by means of the collective thought of the whole of the communist parties of our International.

Lenin's banner and Lenin's teachings arm the Communist International for the whole epoch still dividing us from the victory of the proletarian world revolution.

(The End)

THE IMPORTANCE OF HISTORY.

(Continued from page one)

convenient creditors. This great French historian's summary of the rising is worth quoting: "The records prove that the events of 1381 caused no change in the condition of the peasants. . . . The insurrection had only one appreciable result; it let loose popular passions which retained their violence for many years." Passion does not happen to be a successful manner of going about social reconstruction. One might as well ask a surgeon to take out one's appendix in a passionate manner. Legislation and administration need the coolest of heads.

But this article did not start with any intention of discussing matters of history in detail, but rather to give a dry list of books in which the leaders and followers of Labor may learn a vast number of facts which will prove of value in strengthening their case against their opponents. History is the statement of what happened yesterday and the day before; and it is an indication of what will probably happen, and what ought to happen, tomorrow and the day after that. There is surely every advantage in foreseeing your enemy's moves; and many of the moves in the great game of world chess called life, have been worked out already in the history of the past, worked out, indeed, with almost the scientific precision which we find in the manuals that deal with the smaller game of chess which we play on chequered boards.

For example, what is the use of slippery-tongued gentlemen rising on political platforms to tell us that multi-millionaires are no danger to the State, but even an indispensable factor in an energetic social organization. For we can turn up the history of any race in the world and we will not find one that has not been ruined by excessive wealth. It was plutocracy that brought the great Roman Republic to its ruin; it was the great financiers who sucked the blood of Italy. Incidentally there is another useful point to be learned from the history of that moment. The great Republic had grown so corrupted by wealth and political adventurers that it could only save itself by accepting an Emperor. Now there are certain persons who can find no other way of delaying real social reconstruction except

by endeavouring to sidetrack us into a demand for a republic instead of a monarchy. The history of Rome is somewhat disheartening on this point. Again, does the history of the United States of America suggest any special advantages in a republican constitution? Are the Trades Unions strong there? Is there a political Labour Party within sight of office? History can show many cases of genuine democratic movements which have been craftily turned into the backwater which ends in a plutocratic republic.

What is the main gist of the plot of history? It is the story of how one governing class after another—now feudal lords, now manufacturers, Whig aristocrats or bankers—have managed to trick the people into becoming their passive subjects. It is—as it were—the story of how a great and well-organized gang of rulers of all sorts and sizes have robbed the people of their rights for century after century. Surely there must be a great advantage in studying in detail the methods by which this social robbery has been committed? And that study is history. Surely it will put us on our guard.

But there is another equally important side of history. It is also the story of the gradual growth of those delicate social bonds which are the chief strength of civilized society. In despite of the robbers of mankind, all the time there have been slowly developing those organs of government which alone make civilisation possible. Government is not in itself a pleasant or a desirable thing; but it is inevitable if we desire to be anything but savages. History is the story of a vast number of experiments in this great business of governing. There have been many wise rulers in history as well as still more stupid and dishonest ones. We can learn what we should do today by noting the results of the attempts of the past.

The story of social development in the past is almost the only indication we can see of what must be the next step in the future. For the lesson of history is that there is no break in its healthy development. Even this newest of political experiments, a Labour Government at Westminster, cannot do more than take the next steps in the history of the world. It may take these steps more quickly than its predecessors—and, still more, they may be steps in the right direction, instead of a stupid or malicious method of going backwards, or walking in a circle.

If Labour intends to govern, if it desires to govern well, one of its first duties will be to read as much of history as possible. Every Labour Club should make an attempt to get together a little library of historical literature. There are plenty of good books in the market. The difficulty is to get them read: For a few pounds it would be possible to possess a shelf of volumes that might turn the tables on the enemy in political debates. For the opponents of Labour do very little historical reading, it would seem. Perhaps they are wise. It would be too like reading the story of their own crimes. Imagine a manufacturer reading the story of the Industrial Revolution. He would henceforth go about in terror of being arrested by the police as an accomplice of thieves and murderers.

Perhaps one day the editor may find space for an article which will suggest the most useful historical library for a Labour Club.

(Socialist Review)

THE CLAIMS OF "NORDIC" RACE SUPERIORITY.

(Continued from page 5)

evolution of Western civilization. The very first step of the "Nordic" from the primitive condition of the Stone Age to the higher era of bronze was impossible without southern help, because tin, a prerequisite for the bronze alloy, was lacking in the Scandinavian peninsula. Whether this or other causes delayed their development, the fact remains that the northern peoples continued in the savage state for thousands of years and it is precisely the races which our hysterical anthropologist regards as debased and inferior, which he would exclude from formative America, which have laid the foundations for whatever civilization the world now possesses and which, in numerous instances, have reached such

cultural heights as we are still unable to attain, for all the aid of precedent and example.

The truth is that the origins of culture are wholly Mongolian, Semitic and Mediterranean. As Dr. Robert H. Lowie points out in his excellent book, "Culture and Ethnology":

Our economic life, based as it is on the agricultural employment of certain cereals with the aid of certain domesticated animals, is derived from Asia; so is the technologically invaluable wheel. The domestication of the horse certainly originated in Inner Asia; modern astronomy rests on that of the Babylonians, Hindus and Egyptians; the invention of glass is an Egyptian contribution; spectacles come from India; paper, to mention only one other significant element of our civilization, was borrowed from China. * * * It is worth noting that momentous ideas may be conceived by what we are used to regard as inferior races. Thus the Maya of Central America conceived the notion of the zero figure, which remained unknown to Europeans until they borrowed it from India; and eminent ethnologists suggest that the discovery of iron technique is due to the negroes.

It is a matter of common knowledge that literature and art, religion and ethics, as well as other esthetic spiritual and material expressions of humanity reached their apogee among the Greeks, Jews and Romans, inheritors of this earlier culture, at a time when the northern barbarian was slowly evolving from a state of savagery. There is an intriguing coincidence in the fact that the "Nordic" apologist is thus attacking the nations to whose racial progenitors he owes an irredeemable debt and that the parvenu among civilized peoples is seeking to establish his superiority to the Spaniard and Greek, Jew and Italian, Mongolian and Arab. Without the inventions of India, China and Egypt, inventions which the Jews, Greeks and Romans passed on in an improved state, industry and agriculture, astronomy and mathematics, music and art might still be in a primitive condition.

A Problem of Eugenics.

A discussion by the partisans of the "Nordic" theory, of the comparative merits of the various cultural contributions made by this or that race, or of the greatness of its heroes, or of its physical fitness, invariably ends with the "Nordic" on the debit side of the ledger, but this proves nothing because it is trivial and irrelevant. It simply indicates the existing confusion as to what constitutes the individuality of a race. It is a demonstrated fact that the masses of every race are mentally on a par with the masses of every other race. After testing primitive intelligence and comparing it with that of all types of white men, Professor Woodworth found no appreciable difference in the average of any of them except that the Igorote and the Negrito of the Philippines and the pigmies of the Congo were somewhat deficient. "This crumb," he writes, "is about all the testing psychologist has yet to offer on the question of racial differences in intelligence." Furthermore, each race contains every grade of intellectual capacity, ranging from the imbecile to the genius. The proportion of idiots and geniuses is regulated almost entirely by the social, economic and political conditions in which each generation of the race happens to be living. Thus the perpetuation of any race as a whole means the perpetuation of many types—the undesirables, the inferior and the dead level, as well as the gifted and the genius types. Hence, not only every homogeneous nation, but every nation which, like the United States, has become a vast racial melting pot, faces a problem in eugenics, viz., the problem of improving its stock.

In teeming Europe and Asia there is only one solution, the elimination of the inferior types of all races. But our own vast and sparsely settled country need not take up the surgeon's scalpel until it has tried therapeutics. It can wait to see the wondrous effects of its climate and soil, its principles of liberty and its democratic institutions. Unless all we know of the development of civilization is false, these basic gifts that America offers her immigrant will bring about the fullest expression and the finest flowering

of his racial and individual qualities. If these qualities are not the vices and virtues of a single strain, but rather the characteristics of a cross-section of mankind in which the gifts of each will supplement and enrich the rest, our country, like a great orchestra, will play such harmonies as no single instrument can produce. And that will mean not the passing but the making of a great race; that will be the concrete manifestation of the ideals and the mission of America.

ECONOMIC CAUSES OF WAR

By PETER T. LEOKIE

NOW READY

Preface by the author.

132 PAGES.

Per Copy, 25 Cents.

Ten copies up, 20 cents each.

Post Paid.

Literature Price List

Cloth Bound.	Per Copy
Critique of Political Economy	1.65
Revolution and Counter Revolution (Marx)	1.15
Ancient Society	1.85
Capitalist Production (First Nine and 32 Chapters "Capital," vol. 1, (Marx)	1.00
Vital Problems in Social Evolution	80c
Science and Revolution	80c
The Militant Proletariat	80c
Evolution Social and Organic	80c
Puritanism	80c
Ethics and History	80c
Germes of Mind in Plants	80c
The Triumph of Life	80c
Feuerbach	80c
Social Revolution (Kautsky)	80c
Origin of Species (Darwin)	1.15
Essays on Materialist	
Conception of History (Lafargue)	1.50
Social Studies (Lafargue)	80c
Paper Covers.	Per Copy
Evolution of Man (Prof. Huxley)	20c
Wage-Labor and Capital	10c
Independent Working Class Education	10c
Communist Manifesto	10c
The Present Economic System (Prof. W. A. Songer)	10c
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific	15c
Slave of the Farm	10c
Manifesto, S. P. of C.	10c
Causes of Belief in God (Lafargue)	10c
The State and Revolution (Lenin)	15c
Value, Price and Profit (Marx)	15c
Two Essays on History (C. Stephenson and G. Deville)	5c
Economic Causes of War (Leckie)	25c
Civil War in France (Marx)	25c
Christianism and Communism (Bishop W. M. Brown)	25c
Quantity Rates on Paper Covered Pamphlets.	
Two Essays on History	25 copies 75c
Communist Manifesto	25 copies \$2.00
Wage-Labor and Capital	25 copies \$2.00
Present Economic System	25 copies \$1.50
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific	25 copies \$2.25
Slave of the Farm	25 copies \$1.50
Manifesto of S. P. of C.	25 copies \$2.00
Evolution of Man	25 copies \$2.75
Causes of Belief in God	25 copies \$2.00
Value, Price and Profit	25 copies \$2.25
Economic Causes of War	10 copies \$2.00
Christianism and Communism	6 copies \$1.00

All prices include postage.

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

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 _____