

WESTERN CLARION

A Journal of
CURRENT
EVENTS

Official Organ of
THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

HISTORY
ECONOMICS
PHILOSOPHY

No. 907

TWENTIETH YEAR.

Twice a Month

VANCOUVER, B. C., JANUARY 16, 1924.

FIVE CENTS

By the Way

It is an axiom of political economy that all true political representation must be and can only be based on definite economic interests.—Marx.

Before 1914, we doctrinaire socialists and educationalists were often asked to forecast a detailed plan as to ways and means that would be adopted in the transition period for turning the means of production and distribution into communally controlled enterprises. How will the job of establishing "production for use" be worked out? asked practically-minded workers who, sensible that the present state of things was fundamentally wrong and attracted by the socialist ideal, yet were, by native bent of mind, naturally desirous of some information on the intermediate steps to the ideal. Such minds are in the majority, perhaps fortunately so, and do not easily succumb to an ideal unless some more or less practical ways and means of realizing it accompany its advocacy. Perhaps our questioners ideas on ways and means of change run somewhat to this effect: Production for use evidently means that private ownership of industrial plants is done away with and that all activity in both the distributive and productive spheres is to be carried on on the principles of co-operation and democratic control.

If the competitive market is done away with, by what means are values set and the rewards of industry established? If by the hour, if, for instance, five hours of labor in a mine will be rewarded with a sack of flour which had taken five hours to produce, what is to prevent the miners indulging in a form of profiteering by slacking, working at low intensity, or being unprogressive in introducing new methods and inventions into the industry, thus falling behind the standard of productivity set up by the millers? Do the miners control the mining industry, appointing the managers, technical staffs, bosses, etc., setting the exchange values or prices of the product and the hours and conditions of work? If so, what protection has the general community against this monopoly by a group? On the other hand, if the community controls the industry, what protection have the miners against the vague interest and lack of knowledge of mining and mining conditions which must unavoidably prevail among the mass of consumers remote in distance and with other preoccupations, interests and habits of life? Or, again, questions might run to this effect: is it possible that in a system of "production for use" that the principle of competition may be retained in some controlled form as stimulus to activity, that is, a free trading market and price fixing in some such fashion as prevailed in medieval times when the Guild system prevailed? In those times each craft was organized in a guild which regulated prices, quality of goods, hours of work, and kept a general supervision over the working activity of the individual craftsman in the interest of the whole craft. At the distributive end were merchants and traders' guilds, functioning to a like purpose. Is it possible that in the future the general body of the consumers might create co-operative consumers' organizations functioning to a similar end as the traders' Guilds? How shall varied individual tastes and preferences find themselves effective demands, and desires and appreciations be stimulated and elevated as they must if it is to be a progressive society? Will there be left room in this society for individual

enterprise and initiative to energize by its competitive stimulus the lumbering-non-competitive mass of economic activity? Can such individual enterprise be controlled in the interest of the community, retaining its advantages while checking profiteering tendencies? Is it not always individuals who break new ground in all the arts of life, and generally doing so contrary to the immediate felt interests and will of the herd? Will the future be one where it is realized that man is an individual personality as well as a unit in an economic machine?

Some such ideas as those I have formulated lay back of the innumerable questions as to ways and means of organizing economic activities and relations in the transition period. We, however, declined to satisfy the enquirers, contenting ourselves with the broad definition of the future society at the far end of the transition period as one in which social ownership of the means of productive life prevailed. Since then, much water has run under the bridge, the issue of social change has been forced to the front beyond denial. There is Russia; there is Great Britain where a Labor Party is expected to succeed to the powers of the state and there are other countries, as for instance, Italy, in which country they are entering into an experiment for a controlled capitalism along syndicalist lines. Italy is a country of small bourgeoisie, of peasantry in various states of affluence and of proletarian wage workers. Neither "big business" interests, nor the landed aristocracy are powerful. The latter class have but little influence and a diminishing one at that. The experiment may be worth attention. As the problems of transition loom up, it seems to me that large generalizations descriptive of an ideal state at the further end of a process of transition to be yet undergone, no longer meet the present need. The objective in which the process is intended to end must be kept in mind so that the intermediate steps may have guidance, but the need is for information, understanding and criticism of proposed measures and programs considered from the standpoint of the process of transition. There should be prediction of consequences arising out of their application, as they might bear on working class well-being and progress, or effect legal and institutional changes one way or another. It no longer suffices to say that this or that measure is not socialism or that it will not bring socialism, as though we subscribed to the possibility of wholesale change.

The working classes in Europe are working out a clearer understanding of their position in Society. Singling themselves out as an economic-social class and creating their own class instrumentalities, their influence on state policies increases. That class orientation is fundamental in politics—that far, in that degree, having arrived at the stage of creating its own political instruments, class consciousness, is in the stage of young life, the rest is nurture and growth, an acquiring of the wisdoms, ways, habits, dispositions and skills that are necessary to the achievements and practice of a co-operative and democratically controlled social life. The realizing of that future depends on more than merely acquiring ideas, it is also one of character, one of psychology of habit and disposition, if you will. We shall realize that society will approach the ideal as we become fitted for it. Education is a solvent of old habits, and

gives new direction to dispositions, but the practice of life and its ways is the fundamental discipline in the formation of character. As a revulsion against the competitive life of capitalism our thinking may turn to the idea that a co-operative life would be superior to the former, but character follows ideas, it changes slower. History is full of the wrecks of "New Harmonys" because human nature ran athwart fanciful ideals. There are limits to what human nature can stand; it may revolt, it may break down. To the camel its load.

The "perfectionists," seizing upon whatever truth there is in that, ask us to stay all action till we are fitted:—says one group, "you must change human nature first," and another, "the workers must first be socialists;" and another, "until the system collapses we can do nothing." Their prototype is Joshua of old, who commanded "Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon; and thou, Moon, in the valley of Ajalon."

Let me say to them that we shall never get socialism if we wait till we are fitted for it, but yet, on the other hand, we can not wait until we are fitted for it. The urgencies of life throw humanity, the perfectionists included, in between the horns of that dilemma. Men act anyway, must act with such wisdom as they may. You may question the wisdom. But take comfort from my significant quotation at the head of this article in regard to the working class. Entering into political life as a definite economic-social group, they will grow in stature in the school of experience. " . . . thro' the ages one increasing purpose runs, And the thoughts of men are widened with the passing of the suns."

To illustrate my point further: We might say to the one-idea "perfectionists"—are we fitted for political democracy? Look at the corruption and charlatany in politics! What percentage of the population are interested to exercise their franchise? What percentage of the millions who cast their vote for this or that party, this or that measure, have an intelligent understanding of what they are giving a mandate for? Is it not well enough known that a mere sporting interest is the chief interest with many in the results? Certainly we all realize that we are far from "perfectionism" in this phase of life. Yet the remedy is not to go back to the absolute monarch again to be children in leading strings, not even to a benevolent despotism, for they are the most vicious of all in undermining the spirit of liberty and self-dependence. The struggle of this age is away from both political and economic absolutism to the self-government of peoples. And it is only by practice in the arts of self-government that they can learn to use them, by experiencing the evils of licence learn to appreciate liberty, by learning to use past experience so that the consequences of future acts may be better and not worse. So it is by experiencing the evils that arise from our mishandling of the instrumentalities of political democracy that we shall acquire wisdom, growth of stature to cope with the problems of industrial democracy.

It is the fashion among many who, it seems to me, do not sense that social development has in it the characteristics of organic growth, to sneer at political democracy because it has not proved a universal panacea for social ills. True enough it has its inherent limitations. But these should

(Continued on page 8)

Revolutions, Social and Political

By J. Harrington

ARTICLE TWENTY.

THE POSITION of Prussia, we have seen, was precarious and the ambitions of her rulers kind if unproportionate. The world still looked upon Bismarck as somewhat of a fool (The fathers of the Socialist movement, more charitable, remarked that he was a reckless gambler). Prussia's ambition was a joke, where it was not regarded as fortunate folly, from which material advantages might in the future accrue. The third Napoleon fondly hoped and rather feebly maneuvered to that end. Bismarck realized that the neutrality of France and the active co-operation of Italy were of vital importance. The negotiations with Italy were carried out on both sides with the utmost suspicions. But by March, 1866, everything was fixed up.

Bismarck was much exercised to have all the elements of his diplomacy synchronize. Italy realized she must be assured of action once the treaty was signed. Bismarck was not sure he could drag Prussia into a war with the rest of German-speaking Europe. Having to concede to Italy that action within three months must ensue, failing which the treaty was void, his task was to goad Austria into war.

The terms upon which they jointly occupied the new Duchies of Schleswig-Holstein, provided ample opportunity for this, and were briefly: Prussia controlled Schleswig, Austria Holstein. The question of final settlement was pushed forward. Austria was quite as anxious as Prussia for a pretext upon which she could manifest her power, especially in view of Prussia's evident reluctance to approach extreme action. Not to make too long a story of matters, which are merely the trappings and suits of national conflicts, the garb in which they were arrayed, the moral image of the material fact, Austria very gracefully allowed the widest latitude of popular expression, and even decided to permit the Assembly of the Duchies to decide the issue. The people were permitted to assemble and express open and strong condemnation of Prussia, and also cheer for the Pretender.

Besides assembling her forces Austria offered to Austria with trafficking with revolution. Franz Joseph refused to answer, and referred the matter to the federal diet, where she was all powerful. Bismarck used this as undoubted evidence that the monster successfully smothered in 1848 was to be again conjured forth, and Prussia from monarch to pauper commenced to take interest. Bismarck now only awaited the time. A delay arose after a disarmament agitation, in the midst of which Austria mobilized troops in Venetia, having been informed by Napoleon of the treaty between Italy and Prussia.

Beside assembling her forces Austria offered to Italy, in return for her help against Prussia, the contentious territory of Venetia. Napoleon, being the medium through which this precious piece of moral uprightness was conducted, was also compelled to return Italy's negative. It seems though Italy had some objection to going back on her word. Napoleon now offered Bismarck an army of three hundred thousand for a Rhinish province. Bismarck suggested Switzerland or Belgium as being more likely to agree with French digestion, similarity of lingo, tradition, etc.

An appreciation of your neighbor's difficulties being one of a statesman's virtues, Russia, England and France now the war loomed, proffered their good offices. Austria agreed to attend, but to Bismarck's unalloyed delight imposed conditions which no country could accept with honor, and called the Holstein Assembly to convene and decide its own fate.

Any sane Prussian could now estimate the character of Austria. Bismarck could now proceed, with the assurance that at least he had the support of the ruling class. He ordered the Prussian army in Schleswig to invade Holstein. Austria obtained power from the Federal Diet to mobilize the German states. And after a few more such moves,

which we must pass over, war finally broke out. Hanover, Saxony and Hesse Cassel were immediately overwhelmed and within six weeks Austria was completely defeated.

Bismarck, Roon and Moltke sat in Berlin directing operations, for the first time by telegraph. The Prussian army was provided with every means required; the Allies were badly equipped, and lead. The net result of this little holiday adventure was the North German Federation: Hanover, Schleswig-Holstein and Hesse Cassel being joined to Prussia. A small beginning to a great end.

While not within the scope of its author's vision, this Federation placed the navigable portions of all the rivers in Germany that flowed north in control of Prussia; it also brought within scope of the Prussian law all the medieval restrictions peculiar to the guilds, which flourished in full force in many parts of Germany. Although the Communist Manifesto was almost twenty years old, the demands of the German wage slave expressed no wish to shed its chains, but loudly demanded release from guild tyranny. Factories were offering higher wages than guild masters, but the law forbade them to hire guild trained craftsmen. Guild masters, too, were alone legally competent to train journeymen. While Prussia had less of these encumbrances on her statute-books, the states incorporated by her victories brought them to her door. By 1869 when Liebknecht and Bebel formed the Social-Democratic Labor Party, the old restrictions had just departed. It will now be our task to review this part of the Social Revolution.

Bismarck, finding his path to the "legal" furthering of his policy encumbered by the Progressists, seeking a means to curb their power, conceived the idea of enlisting that group of intellectual giants who had thrown in their lot with labor. As early as 1860 he had offered both Liebknecht and Marx substantial bribes, in the form of editorships of government papers, with full freedom to advocate Socialism to its last dire consequence on him and his tribe. He, of course, calculating to crush this movement when it had crushed his immediate foe. After the manner of the horticulturists who introduce a parasite to prey on the parasites which prey on their product. And, as often occurs in the field of nature, this stratagem of the great statesman almost proved his undoing. While unable to enlist either Marx or Liebknecht, he did secure the support of Lasalle and Schweitzer, who actively supported Bismarck.

They further supported the North German Federation, which was opposed by Bebel and Liebknecht.

Lasalle was killed in a duel in 1864 and at that time the movement he had fathered, the German Working Men's Union, numbered some 4,000 odd. Not a very formidable body and, in the main, without political vantage. But there were giants on earth in those days and the work of Marx, Engels, Liebknecht, Bebel, Lasalle, to mention but a few, proceeded with a vigor and integrity not seen until the late Russian revolution. In order to fully realize the effect of these labors and turn them against the roaring and obstreperous capitalist class, and incidentally calm the resentment against his outrageous policy, Bismarck brought in his universal franchise scheme. To quote his own words: "Looking to the necessity, in a fight against an overwhelming foreign power, of being able, in extreme need, to use even revolutionary means, I had had no hesitation whatever in throwing into the frying pan by means of a circular dispatch of June 10th, 1866, the most powerful ingredient known at that time to liberty-mongers, namely universal suffrage, so as to frighten foreign monarchies from trying to stick a finger into our national omelette. I never doubted," he naively confessed, "that the German people would be strong and clever enough to free themselves from the existing suffrage as soon as they realized that it was a harmful institution." The Socialists were not to

be counted among those who worshipped this "most powerful ingredient," and scored "this worship of universal and direct franchise," as Liebknecht put it vigorously. In another comment on universal suffrage, Bismarck is rather humorous: "I still hold that the principle is a just one, not only in theory but also in practice, provided always that voting be not secret, for secrecy is a quality that is incompatible with the best characteristics of German blood." (Emphasis ours.)

This will be our excuse for not following him further into the philosophy of voting and its effect on the nation. But some of his remarks were to be substantiated in, to him, an alarming manner. At the next election the Social-Democrats polled over one hundred thousand votes. The Lasalleans and the Eisenachers, after years of bitter strife, came together and, wonderful to relate, in spite of the dictum of some of the homo-revolutionists, that the social revolution is best furthered by strife among the workers, the result appeared in 1874 with over three hundred thousand, and in 1877 almost half a million. Then Bismarck saw the error of his ways and the Socialist laws were enacted. This was unable to stem the tide, however, and after a slight set back, 1884 saw the political barometer at over half a million, and so on until some three million votes were recorded. And while the forces of capitalism rendered, in 1914, this hopeful gathering of the clans useless to the revolution, it will serve to illustrate the change which had come over the German workingclass. That peculiar human trait which causes men to feverishly struggle for a worthy object, and yet on the eve of victory, surrender to an already defeated enemy, can be understood if we remember the paralysis-producing power of habit.

A Bismarck, held in contempt by the majority of the nation, could nevertheless drag them with him in all his mad adventures, while head of the nation. When finally removed from that post none were so poor as "to do him reverence." The entire country was opposed to him, and an attempt on his life, frustrated by his quick wit and vigor, was heralded everywhere with gladness. After the victory he was careful to remove this animosity as far as possible.

The tendency of all conquerors to bleed the conquered he checked at once. He had only commenced his task of unifying Germany, and realized fully the need of reconciling, not only the annexed provinces, but Austria and the Prussian people as well. So in the midst of the enthusiasm which greeted his victorious return, he frankly confessed the illegal methods by which he had proceeded and asked for an Act of Indemnity. Many of the men who were his instruments were quietly retired, and men more in line with his new policy appointed in their place. The Progressive Party died, the National Liberal Party took its place, and the immediate prosperity which followed rendered the return to these "illegal" practices unnecessary. Austria was treated with the utmost consideration. And as these measures were carried through by Bismarck against the entire land-owning class, his own class, the Junkers and the king himself, our capitalists simply walked into power almost before they realized what they were doing. Few writers on Germany have failed to note the greatly superior institutions of learning which have for centuries been her boast. Wells, in his first edition of the "Outline," is quite caustic, but had reason to remove the sting in his second, when referring to British and German educational methods and results. Two industries above all others, and directly influencing all others, require exact knowledge in all the higher spheres of learning—foreign languages, general science and mathematics—these are chemistry and electricity.

In 1852 the immense deposits of potash were discovered and methods were being found to release the sulphur potassium and chlorides from coal and

(Continued on page 8)

Correspondence

"BY THE WAY."

Editor, Clarion,—Replying to "C's" rejoinder to my criticism in the issue of December 17th.

Careful perusal of his article in the issue of January 2nd has not cleared up anything. On the contrary, excluding what he describes as "weird stuff" from consideration, the rest of the article contains contradictions, mis-statements and understatements that should not be allowed to pass without protest.

The recognition of the existence of a class-struggle based on the irreconcilable interests of master and slave is a fundamental principle of Marxian Socialism—the only kind that the S. P. of C. endorses, on the ground that it furnishes the key to the solution of all the problems raised by capitalism. To quote our platform, it is "an irrepressible conflict of interest between capitalist and worker" which "necessarily expresses itself as a struggle for political supremacy." This struggle is imposed on the working class by virtue of the fact that "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 goal of the struggle, via the capture of political power from the capitalist class, is the socialization of all productive powers functioning as capital. But—"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." That presentation has always appeared to me as concise, clear and uncompromising a statement of the actual, fundamental condition of modern society that it was possible to render in print. There is no camouflage about it, but a statement of the bare facts and essential outlines. What kind of a "class struggle" does "C" present to us?

His opening paragraph is weak and inconclusive. Here is a brief summary: "The working class comes into existence as the result of the victory of machine production over handicraft production, under the pressure of class needs has developed its own class consciousness, a class viewpoint and a class philosophy of its own." There he leaves it. Not a word or a hint of the object of its class aspirations (except for a reference to vague "improvements") or a reference to the fact that, like Ishmael, in the class struggle its hand is against every man and every man's hand against it. Is there any neutral ground?

In the next column we have the following:—"There is a bitter, competitive life between individuals, between classes, between the national entities; concurrently there exists a condition of world-wide mutual dependence due to an interlocking system of economic relations such as calls for a pooling of the world's resources in the common interest. The latter condition is the result of a change in the industrial arts; the former is a condition of life which suited a state of the industrial arts now passed away . . . (Emphasis mine—J.H.B.)

So the "bitter competitive life" of today has no foundation in existing economic conditions, but is a hang-over, a psychological aberration, which had its genesis and justification in the "small, self-sustaining economy of the pre-machine age and handicraft." How it was possible for a "self-sustaining" method of production to produce a "bitter competitive life" that would continue with increasing virulence long after its alleged "cause" had disappeared from the scene is a problem of weighty import indeed!

"Whether control is seized by violence or by legal means, both must alike have the massed opinion of the community in support of the social programme." (Third col.) "Labor has not had the community point of view; it has not ranged itself with the community and become initiating and authoritative against the system of capitalism." (Fifth col: emphasis mine—J.H.B.) What does all this "community" clap-trap amount to? What is our modern "community"? An aggregation of human beings, divided into classes and sub-classes, manifesting economic antagonisms, soaked in prejudices mutually hostile and exclusive, leavened with sloppy humanitarianism, insulting charity and religious hypocrisy. Tuxis, Rotary, Kiwanians, Gyro and such-like aggregations of the business fraternity mouthing "communityism," dispensing charity and preaching patriotism as a mental foil to their normal occupation of getting the best of their neighbors; Red Cross organizations collecting funds ostensibly for the relief of the war-torn and loaning them for the purchase of munitions and military equipment for the suppression of the first Workers' Republic; medical associations proclaiming their self-sacrifice for the public health and combating every new method or school of thought in the art of healing or prevention of sickness that threatens their privileges and income; associations of scientific men, equally vociferous in their zeal for the welfare and progress of the "com-

munity," bending all their energies to the discovery of new and more potent means of destroying similar "communities"; the Salvation Army, most vociferous of all, advertising its "social service" with the brass band and raking in the dollars and increasing the existent misery by its emigration-immigration schemes and its sweatshops—each and all of them will accept the others as worthy co-workers in "community service" and "community ideals, and each and every one staunchly upholds the system that produces the evils they bewail. And at the bottom of all this, vastly outnumbering the superincumbent horde of parasites, the object of their loud vicifications and scanty ministrations—the working class, the creator of all values, of a social system reared on the product of its labor, with no hope or prospect under that system but "an ever-increasing measure of misery and degradation." What community of interest have they with "C's" "community"? As a slave class they need freedom. Who will aid them—the "Community"? The "community" is based on their slavery. "All previous historical movements were movements of minorities, or in the interest of minorities. The proletarian movement is the self-conscious, independent movement of the immense majority, in the interest of the immense majority. The proletariat, the lowest stratum of our present society, cannot stir, cannot raise itself up, without the whole super-incumbent strata of official society being sprung into the air." (Communist Manifesto.) The co-operation of other classes in the struggle of the working class for emancipation is impossible. They exist and owe their dominant position solely to the fact that labor is exploited and enslaved. A real community, common in economic interests, will never exist until the basis of the present kaleidoscope of conflicting interests mis-called a community has been "sprung into the air" and swept away by the "immense majority in the interest of the immense majority." That basis is the modern slave market, the buying and selling of labor power, the exploitation of labor. To say that there is an alternative way, that co-operation with the other elements of the existing "community" is possible, is to obscure and deny the class struggle, and an attempt to divert labor from its revolutionary objective to the futile bogs and swamps of middle-class reform.

"C" takes exception to my characterization of his proposals as "slow changes in social viewpoints and patchwork reforms." He says he used the term "gradualism." Well, let it go at that. "A rose by any other name—" Then a long paragraph is devoted to a recital of this process in action. The list could be indefinitely extended, and protagonists of each reform have, as does "C," proclaimed their pet projects as steps in advance to that much-to-be desired future of ease and plenty for all. What do they all amount to? Reduction of the hours of exploitation has, under the stress of competition, but resulted in the introduction of labor-saving machines with whose tireless pace the worker must keep step or drop out. Those past their physical prime are not wanted. The energy and "pep" of youth are needed to maintain the pace, and as they drop out with exhausted vitality their places are quickly filled. The ever-increasing number of unemployed acts as an effective brake on the demands of the employed for better treatment, and, from a class viewpoint, the employing class is all to the good. All legislation affecting the conditions under which the workers labor has its origin in the foresight of a few of the ruling class (such as Lord Shaftsbury, who perceived that the unbridled exploitation of the workers in mill, mine and factory was fast killing the goose that laid the golden eggs of profit, and if the profit system was to continue the limits of human endurance must be recognized). Hospitals and public clinics are as much a safeguard to the health of the ruling class by prevention of contagion as to the health of the workers. The harnessing of science to industry demanded a supply of educated workers, and the demand was recognized and met by legislation, and is constantly being reinforced to keep step with new applications of science. Other reforms, such as the extension of the franchise (carefully adjusted, however, to ensure that the workers do not secure "undue" representation), repeal of the anti-combine laws, the corn laws, etc., have all been initiated by the ruling class, either in response to the needs of their growing industries or, being first-class-vote catchers, as weapons against their opponents in party warfare.

"Has all this been the work of masters and slaves"? says "C." Bah! let us not make a perverted use of words in seriousness." Can "C" imagine a similar state of affairs in a class-less society—or anything different in a modern class society based on machine production? Perhaps he can. One afflicted to such an extent as he with the "community" bug sees strange things.

"Push the class struggle in a civilized way," says he. Since the dawn of civilization what has been "the civilized way"? What is it but a long, monotonous record of force, the oppression of the weak by the strong, the brutal victory of might over the concepts of right, between nations as between classes, and man and man? Was the recent war not a "civilized" war, and are not the nations preparing with all due haste for another still more "civilized"?

The modern arms of precision in the hands of "anaemic" workers were as effective in the great war as if their manipulators had the physique of professional strong men. Mental lethargy can be awakened and dispelled under the stress of impelling social conditions now as previously. Whatever its shortcomings may be (and reformism is the most outstanding) the present political position of the

Labor Party in Great Britain does not seem to reflect the activities of a working class "anaemic, stunted physically and mentally, and morally degraded."

If the activities reflected in the enactment of endless reforms are properly to be regarded as "preparations, if unconsciously designed ones, for the social revolution," where are we today? Has the condition of the working class been materially or appreciably improved in relation to that of the capitalist class, or in relation to the possibilities of well-being latent in the development of industry that has proceeded at breakneck speed during the production of these "preparations"? Has the worker a more secure livelihood, less cause for worry and anxiety in the present and for the future? The war is over, and "the outbreak of peace" has brought a new "normalcy." Let conditions speak for themselves and provide the answer. Unemployment, scanty doles, lengthening of the working day, assaults on the safeguards laboriously erected around the worker's life, limb and health in his occupation are the order of the day.

In col. 4, "C" pays tribute to the influence of "luck" and "fate" in life. As Com. Harrington put it recently from the platform, society moves in obedience to definite laws and regulations that are inherent in the material processes and conditions under which and by means of which it maintains itself. Nothing happens by "luck;" "fate" can only properly be used to describe the inevitable outcome of the operation of inexorable social-economic laws. "C's" "fundamental insight into life" is apparently only an impressive euphemism for a dreary exhalation induced by mental excursions into the nebulous realms of metaphysics.

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

J. H. B.

P.S. The printer made a ludicrous mistake in rendering my letter in the issue of Dec. 16. Paragraph 2, line 4, "making" should read "murdering."

J. H. B.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

PROPAGANDA
MEETINGS

EVERY SUNDAY

THEATRE ROYAL

SUNDAY JANUARY 13th.

Speaker: PROF. H. F. ANGUS, (U.B.C.)

Subject: Some Aspects of the Capital Levy in
Great Britain.

All meetings at 8 p.m.

Questions. Discussion.

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

Western Clarion

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

Published twice a month by the Socialist Party of
Canada, P. O. Box 710, Vancouver, B. C.
Entered at G. P. O. as a newspaper.

Editor Ewen MacLeod

SUBSCRIPTION:

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

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

908

VANCOUVER, B. C., JANUARY 16, 1924.

WHY?

WE reproduce here a letter by an Alberta comrade who marks the letter "for publication:"

To the Editor:

This letter is written by a rather young student, a plain workingman, confessedly lacking in knowledge but with a desire to know the WHY of things, and, in spite of some internationalism enough Irish still left to have no objection to "dacent b'atin'." At least, so I kid myself.

In the S. P. of C. Platform we find the words "We call upon all workers to organize under the banner of the S. P. of C." Now, if this Party is an international party why the word Canada? If it is national, why no provision for world-wide affiliation? Granting that in the controversy carried on in the Western Clarion some time ago the question of affiliation with the Third International, taking the 21 points proposed by them as a basis, those opposed to union had the best of the argument, then where are we? Does the responsibility not rest with the S. P. of C. to make a real effort to belong to a real international workingman's association?

What was Marx's position in regard to the first and second Internationals? He must have known that in the nature of things they were imperfect. Why did he say "Workers of the World, Unite"? Why? Why? Why? I don't suppose he meant the brightest students of the movement to stay by themselves.

We understand, thanks to Dietzgen, that all things are relative except the universal; only all things taken together as a whole can be truthfully spoken of as absolute. Hope the reader will bear in mind the modifying influence "the nature of things" as explained by Dietzgen must necessarily have.

Yours for Socialism,

ROY REID.

Luscar, Alta., December 14th, 1923.

Now Comrade Reid may or may not be deserving of "a dacent b'atin'," but his poise is commendable and his mind is open, as witness his use of the philosophical banter of our good friend "C," which is itself an indication that prejudice may be expected to give place, given time, to reasoned opinion and the facts.

There is a little misapprehension suggested at the beginning of the letter, surely. And a touch of pride! Commendable enough in its way, perhaps, but what are we, any of us, but "plain workingmen" who take it for granted that our lack of knowledge is apparent. It surely is not innocence that asks, concerning the S. P. of C. "Why the word Canada?" Why, immediately arises the question,—why the S. P. of any particular country, or the C. P., or the W. P.? Or, carrying the matter further, why (in Canada for instance) designate Local Winnipeg, Locals Calgary, Edmonton, etc., of the S. P. of C., W. P. of C., or any other body which finds itself in Canada? Obviously, any Socialist Party in any country, while its general outlook is world wide, its immediate field is set out within the country of its identity, in its political arena, geographical boundaries, statutes, language and so forth. Its internationalism is general, and in all cases, be it noted, within socialist parties working class internationalism is accepted on principle without question. The question and argument comes always when the terms and conditions of association or membership are set forth. There is no "provision" for international affiliation that can be made otherwise than international unity of interests, of ideas in the perception of those interests and of method in furthering them. There goes with that, too, the capacity of an international organization to

function, as such, to the satisfaction of all concerned.

Concerning the argument referred to by Com. Reid, in the columns of this journal over affiliation with the Third International, it would do no harm to anyone to take up the "Clarion" for that year and read the discussion over. The impression gained will probably be that in this sphere of activity, Canada, the S. P. of C. presumed to consider itself better able to judge of the temper of the people, their loyalties to this or that political party or principle, their familiarity and degree of sympathy with what passed for revolutionary ideas and programs, in short, their ideas and understanding of conditions in Canada. If we are to believe the several volumes one and numbers one of ink and bletcher that took shape and vanished at that time, the romantic Robespierres and Dantons of Toronto had the blessing of the misguided Third Int. It is of little use to labor that point further; but we will insert here the reminder that the 21 points were held to be unworkable, and conditions and time have proved it to be so. Let us grant that the W. P. of C. grew out of it. And what then? This, that they are gradually coming to recognize their field and function, and even to consider the conditions of the country in which they find themselves, plus the state of mind of the people in it. It was quite a good beginning, for instance, to set aside and disregard the unworkable 21 points. But let us not be unkind.

This issue, the Family Journal finds itself complimented with somewhat more mss. than usual and to the exclusion until the next of some of it. Until the next, then, we will leave other considerations arising out of Comrade Reid's letter, considerations which are deserving of more space than we can give them now.

TOOLS, THOUGHTS AND LANGUAGE

(Contd. from Last Issue)

The difference between the human mind and the animal mind was very aptly shown by Schopenhauer. This citation is quoted by Kautsky in his "Ethics and the Materialist Conception of History" (pages 139-40, English Translation). The animal's actions are dependent upon visual motives, it is only by these that it sees, hears or observes in any other way. We can always tell what induced the animal to do this or the other act, for we, too, can see it if we look. With man, however, it is entirely different. We can not foretell what he will do, for we do not know the motives that induce him to act; they are thoughts in his head. Man considers, and in so doing, all his knowledge, the result of former experience, comes into play, and it is then that he decides how to act. The acts of an animal depend upon immediate impression, while those of man depend upon abstract conceptions, upon his thinking and perceiving. Man is at the same time influenced by finer invisible motives. Thus all his movements bear the impress of being guided by principles and intentions which give them the appearance of independence and obviously distinguishes them from those of animals.

Owing to their having bodily wants, men and animals are forced to seek to satisfy them in the natural objects surrounding them. The impression on the mind is the immediate impulse and beginning; the satisfaction of the wants is the aim and end of the act. With the animal, action follows immediately after impression. It sees its prey or food and immediately it jumps, grasps, eats, or does that which is necessary for grasping, and this is inherited as an instinct. The animal hears some hostile sound, and immediately it runs away if its legs are so developed to run quickly, or lies down as if dead so as not to be seen if its color serves as a protector. Between man's impressions and acts, however, there comes into his head a long chain of thoughts and considerations. His actions will depend upon the result of these considerations.

Whence comes this difference? It is not hard to see that it is closely associated with the use of tools. In the same manner that thought arises between man's impressions and acts, the tool comes in between man and that which he seeks to attain. Furthermore, since the tool stands between man and outside objects, thought must arise between the

impression and the performance. Man does not start empty-handed against his enemy or tear down fruit, but he goes about it in a roundabout manner, he takes a tool, a weapon (weapons are also tools) which he uses against the hostile animal; therefore his mind must also make the same circuit, not follow the first impressions, but it must think of the tools and then follow to the object. The material circuit causes the mental circuit; the thoughts leading to a certain act are the result of the tools necessary for the performance of the act.

Here we took a very simple case of primitive tools and the first stages of mental development. The more complicated technique becomes, the greater is the material circuit, and as a result the mind has to make greater circuits. When each made his own tools, the thought of hunger and struggle must have directed the human mind to the making of tools. Here we have a longer chain of thoughts between the impressions and the ultimate satisfaction of men's needs. When we come down to our own times, we find that this chain is very long and complicated. The worker who is discharged forsee the hunger that is bound to come; he buys a newspaper in order to see whether there is any demand for laborers; he goes to the railroad, offers himself for a wage which he will get only long afterwards, so that he may be in a position to buy food and thus protect himself from starvation. What a long circuitous chain the mind must make before it reaches its destiny. But it agrees with our highly developed technique, by means of which man can satisfy his wants.

Man, however, does not rule over one tool only, but over many, which he applies for different purposes, and from which he can choose. Man, because of these tools, is not like the animal. The animal never advances beyond the tools and weapons with which it was born, while man makes his tools and changes them at will. Man, being an animal using different tools, must possess the mental ability to choose them. In his head various thoughts come and go, his mind considers all the tools and the consequences of their application, and his actions depend upon these considerations. He also combines one thought with another, and holds fast to the idea that fits in with his purpose.

Animals have not this capacity; it would be useless for them for they would not know what to do with it. On account of their bodily form, their actions are circumscribed within narrow bounds. The lion can only jump upon his prey, but can not think of catching it by running after it. The hare is so formed that it can run; it has no other means of defense although it may like to have. These animals have nothing to consider except the moment of jumping or running. Every animal is so formed as to fit into some definite place. Their actions must become strong habits. These habits are not unchangeable. Animals are not machines, when brought into different circumstances they may acquire different habits. It is not in the quality of their brains, but in the formation of their bodies that animal restrictions lie. The animal's action is limited by its bodily form and surroundings, and consequently it has little need for reflection. To reason would therefore be useless for it and would only lead to harm rather than to good.

Man, on the other hand, must possess this ability because he exercises discretion in the use of tools and weapons, which he chooses according to particular requirements. If he wants to kill the fleet hare, he takes the bow and arrow; if he meets the bear he uses the axe, and if he wants to break open a certain fruit he takes a hammer. When threatened by danger, man must consider whether he shall run away or defend himself by fighting with weapons. This ability to think and to consider is indispensable to man in his use of artificial tools.

This strong connection between thoughts, language, and tools, each of which is impossible without the other, shows that they must have developed at the same time. How this development took place, we can only conjecture. Undoubtedly it was a change in the circumstances of life that changed men from our ape-like ancestors. Having migrated from the woods, the original habitat of apes, to the

(Continued on page 5.)

Lessons For Young Proletarians

GEORGE STEPHENSON.

MINE explosions were frequent in George Stephenson's day and several serious ones occurred at West Moor whilst he was employed there.

Soon after he was appointed brakesman ten men were killed by such an accident. Stephenson was near the pit mouth at the time. He had, in fact, just lowered one of the men. When the explosion took place stones, rubbish and trusses of hay were thrown up from the mine and, as he said, "went up into the air like balloons." He believed that the trusses of hay which had been lowered during the day "had in some measure injured the ventilation of the mine." He was already studying the question of ventilation and the properties of gases.

Explosions continued for several days and all the ditches of the neighborhood were stopped to get enough water to put out the fire in the mine. The colliery owners lost £20,000. A huge sum in those days and doubtless recovered by forcing increased privations and longer toil upon the miners.

While Stephenson became engine-wright at Killingworth Colliery, where the workings covered nearly 160 miles underground, he personally superintended the working of inclined planes along which the coal was sent to the surface. As far as his position gave him power he tried many measures to minimise the danger of explosion from carburetted hydrogen gas, which was constantly flowing from the fissures in the roof, attempting to secure better ventilation to prevent the gas collecting and having the more dangerous places built up.

Danger could be minimised but not prevented, for the miners of those days pursued their work in the darkness with the aid of ordinary lamps and candles, the flame of which might cause an explosion by igniting the gas at any time. The phosphorescence of decayed fish skins was tried for lighting, but this, though safe, was inefficient. A steel mill, the notched wheel of which revolved against a flint, was also tried. It struck a succession of sparks which scarcely sufficed to make the darkness visible.

One day in 1814 news came to the surface that the deepest main of the colliery was on fire. Stephenson at once had himself lowered into the pit and cried to the workers assembled about the shaft:

"Are there six men among you with the courage to follow me? If so, come and we will put the fire out."

The volunteers were ready. Brick, mortar and tools being to hand, as in every mine, and in a short time a wall was built, which by excluding the atmospheric air from the point of danger, put out the fire and stopped further damage to the mine. By such acts of heroism were fortunes built for others. Stephenson was demonstrating the practical utility of his nightly study.

"Can nothing be done to prevent such awful occurrences?" exclaimed Kit Heppel, who had helped Stephenson to cut off the fire at Killingworth. Stephenson said he thought so. "Then," answered Heppel, "the sooner you begin the better; for the price of coal-mining now is pitmen's lives."

In 1813, Dr. Clanny, of Sunderland, had contrived a lighting apparatus to which air was given through water by means of bellows. This lamp went out of itself in inflammable gas, but it was unwieldy and little used.

A committee of rich men and experts interested in mining was formed to investigate the cause of explosion and to devise means to prevent them. That committee invited the famous Sir Humphrey Davy to investigate the subject, and having visited the collieries in August he read a paper to the Royal Society on fire-damp and methods of lighting mines to prevent explosions on November 9th, 1815.

Stephenson knowing nothing of Dr. Clanny or Sir Humphrey Davy, had already practically solved the problem of the Safety-Lamp. For years he had been making experiments both at home and in the

place of danger: the mine. Sometimes he would be seen holding a lighted candle to the fissure from which gas was issuing and the other man would get quickly out of the way. His theory was that if he could construct a lamp with a chimney so arranged as to create a strong current, the burnt air would ascend with such velocity as to prevent the inflammable gas descending towards the flame and becoming ignited. The lamp was to have a tube at the bottom to admit the atmospheric air and feed the combustion of the lamp.

Having got his friend Nicholas Wood, the head viewer, to make the drawing to his instructions, Stephenson had the lamp made in Newcastle. When the lamp was made Stephenson went one night with Wood, and another man, Moodie, to try it in the mine. At a place where the explosive gas was issuing from the roof a deal boarding was erected to keep the gas from escaping and thus make an unusually dangerous atmosphere. Stephenson then fetched his lighted lamp and advanced to try it at the point of danger. Wood and Moodie hung back. Stephenson went on alone. He held out his lamp in the current of the explosive gas. The flame at first increased, then flickered and went out. There was no explosion. The experiment was repeated several times, Wood and Moodie both assisting.

Stephenson introduced some improvements to make his lamp burn better. Then a fortnight later submitted the lamp to another trial before a larger number of persons.

Then Stephenson thought of another important improvement. When burning inflammable gas the lamp was apt to go out if not held very steadily. The azotic gas which lodged round the exterior of the flame was liable to come in contact with it and extinguish it.

"It occurred to me," he said, "that if I put more tubes in I should discharge the poisonous matter that hung round the flame by admitting the air to its exterior part."

Stephenson contrived an apparatus for testing the explosive properties of the gas and the velocity of the current required to permit the explosion to pass through tubes of different diameters. Stephenson's son Robert and his friend Wood were his assistants in these experiments. Wood turned the stop-cocks of the gasometer and the water as Stephenson directed. Once when Stephenson called for more water Wood turned the tap the wrong way. The result was an explosion in which all the implements were destroyed, which, as Stephenson afterwards said, "at the time we were not very well able to replace."

By filing off the barrels of several small keys and holding them together perpendicularly over a strong flame, Stephenson learnt that the flame did not pass them. This knowledge he used to improve his safety lamp, introducing the air into the bottom of it by three small tubes. Stephenson then had a second lamp made, and afterwards a third, embodying still further improvements. On November 20th he arranged for the making of his third lamp with a Newcastle plumber, and Stephenson drew a sketch of the lamp in pencil on a half sheet of foolscap in the "Newcastle Arms." The lamp was tested in the Killingworth pits on November 30th, 1815.

On November 9th Sir Humphrey Davy had read his paper to the Royal Society: his theories were more correct, but Stephenson had been before him in finding out how to make a safety lamp. Stephenson's lamp was better than the one eventually produced by Davy.

On December 5th, 1815, Stephenson demonstrated the properties of his lamp before the Newcastle Philosophical and Literary Society.

Shortly after Sir Humphrey Davy's lamp was brought to Newcastle and the miners said: "Why, it is the same as Stephenson's." Davy's lamp was not, however, the same as Stephenson's for Stephenson's was a better lamp. Under circumstances in

which the wire gauze of the Davy lamp became red hot, the "Geordie," as Stephenson's lamp was called, was extinguished. This was proved by experiment and by actual working. In the Oaks Colliery Pit, Barnsley, in 1857, a sudden outburst of gas took place. The hewers had "Geordie" lamps, the hurriers had Davy lamps. The Geordies went out, the Davies were filled with fire and became red hot, and several men had their hands burnt. Had a strong current of air been blowing an explosion would have taken place. Neither lamp was absolutely safe. Experiments at Barnsley gas works in 1867 showed that the Davy lamp exploded the gas in six seconds, with a shield outside in nine seconds; the Belgian lamp in ten seconds, the Mozard in ten seconds, the small Clanny in seven seconds, the large in ten seconds, the Stephenson in 75 seconds. Undoubtedly the Stephenson was the best.

Nevertheless Sir Humphrey Davy, not George Stephenson, was acclaimed as the inventor of the safety-lamp, and he was presented with a public reward of £2,000, organized by the coal owners. Stephenson's friends pressed his claim to recognition and £100 was voted to him out of the same fund. Stephenson and his friends were not satisfied, and an agitation developed to recognize him as the inventor of the safety-lamp. Another public subscription was organized, from which Stephenson received £1,000 and a silver tankard, whilst the colliers of the neighborhood gave him a silver watch.

(To be Continued)

TOOLS, THOUGHTS AND LANGUAGE.

(Continued from page 4)

plain, man had to undergo an entire change of life. The difference between hands and feet must have developed then. Sociability and the ape-like hand, well adapted for grasping, had a due share in the new development. The first rough objects, such as stones or sticks, came to hand unsought, and were thrown away. This must have been repeated so often that it must have left an impression on the minds of those primitive men.

To the animal, surrounding nature is a single unit, of the details of which it is unconscious. It can not distinguish between various objects. Our primitive man, at his lowest stage, must have been at the same level of consciousness. From the great mass surrounding him, some objects (tools) come into his hands which he used in procuring his existence. These tools, being very important objects, soon were given some designation, were designated by a sound which at the same time named the particular activity. Owing to this sound, or designation, the tool and the particular kind of activity stands out from the rest of the surroundings. Man begins to analyze the world by concepts and names, self-consciousness makes it appearance, artificial objects are purposely sought and knowingly made use of while working.

This process—for it is a very slow process—marks the beginning of our becoming men. As soon as men deliberately seek and apply certain tools, we can say that these are being developed; from this stage to the manufacturing of tools, there is only one step. The first crude tools differ according to use; from the sharp stone we get the knife, the bolt, the drill, and the spear; from the stick we get the hatchet. With the further differentiation of tools, serving later for the division of labor, language and thought develop into richer and newer forms, while thought leads man to use the tools in a better way, to improve old and invent new ones.

So we see that one thing brings on the other. The practice of sociability and the application to labor are the springs in which technique, thought, tools and science have their origin and continually develop. By his labor, the primitive ape-like man has risen to real manhood. The use of tools marks the great departure that is ever more widening between men and animals. A. PANNEKOEK.

The Egotist

THE EGOTIST is a "born leader of men." He aspires to do—mostly us. He loves to show our errors. He longs to set us right. He would stay our faltering feet in the paths of rectitude. And fundamentally, he never knows what he is talking about. He does not know because, blinded by his egotism, he imagines he knows it already. Self-complacent, he is above change. Self-righteous, he requires no condition. He does not need to study a matter. He knows it by intuition. He is above the "common herd." He pities them; he abuses them; he castigates them; he marvels at their ignorance. The while himself is ignorant as they, and in some respects more pitiable.

Usually he has a soft heart for abstract man; a long head for the "main chance," a tender regard for himself. The failure of the "crowd" to recognize his "truth" he ascribes to obtuseness. Brought up against a problem himself he hides behind the plea of a "busy life with no opportunity." Forced to admit the workers have no opportunity, he hedges under his parables of the lazy; the drunkard; the gambler and the slacker. Commonly he regards the toiling masses as an indolent bunch, dullard and unenterprising; without ability and invention. All told, he looks upon himself admiringly. Like Goldsmith's schoolmaster—"Still the wonder grew, that one small head could carry all he knew." And he never sees the comedy—or the tragedy—of it all.

Were he as original as he imagines himself to be, he might afford a momentary entertainment. As it is, he bores one like a sermon. And like a sermon, there are but two ways to bear the infliction—to fall asleep, or by proxy. But if the infliction steals upon us unawares, we can but fall back on wine, or Emerson, or Longfellow, and "know how great a thing it is, to suffer and be strong." For certainly it imposes suffering.

It would be superfluous, perhaps, to point out that the evils of society are the natural progeny of the organization of society. That its economic absurdities and antagonisms are the certainties of Capitalist development. That the inability of man to share in social progress is due to Capitalist property in the means of life. That social prosperity cannot exist concomitantly with class-rule. That the failure of man is not the magnitude of sloth, but the negation of law. And that no matter how diligent and earnest man may be, the private ownership of industry usurps his reward and prevents the common harvesting of social success. But superfluous or not, we state the case in the hope that it may pierce the fatuity of egoism, and prove a rankling barb in its vanity. For egotism is but the vanity of self. And in its present historic setting, self is but—Capitalist phantasia. The romantic psychology of "success," bourgeois apotheosis of activity. To be up and doing, to rustle up a job, to promote opportunity, to "get ahead," to take advantage of circumstances, to be optimistic, to have faith in the future, to hush the "whisper of death." That is the egotist viewpoint. It is also the ethic of Capital. And it is—slavery. To do "justly" and escape the judgment. Punk!

Egotism and bigotry have this in common—they cannot see a contradiction in terms. To them there is nothing incongruous in a square circle; a divine world; an infinite mind; or in ordinary mundane affairs; a human government; an intelligent "faith" of a conscientious financier. The one is impervious to contradiction; the other is oblivious to it. To them the common things of life—which are parallel organs of forces—are petrified "eternities." Not seeing in them the majesty of monistic unity, they cannot see in the wonder of their intricate interactions, the promise and herald of social harmony in this our only world of living men and fluent reality. Like the ancient land-wise, "fixity of tenure" is their creed. Condition is immaterial, relatively unangular, circumstance undynamic. If there is movement in society it is the circle of "eternal justice." If there is differentiation in status, it is shiftless and thriftless unambitiousness. If society is torn

asunder with deepening antagonisms it is the static of "human nature" which, like the laws of the Medes, changeth not. They juggle with evolution and creation in the same way as the ecclesiastical invertebrata juggle with science and religion; or as henchman science conjures with truth and the "unknown." And, in the end, they stand a-wondering before the problems of their deep confusion, as primitive man grovelled in awe before the mysteries of his animistic phantasies.

To Socialists the explanation of those things is simple enough and obvious enough. But simple only because Socialists, like the ancient Greeks, look the "gods" full in the face. That is, they accept no authority but unchallengeable fact, whether or not the fact promotes desire. But prejudice and tradition refuse to uncover their "souls." They tremble before the darkness of the end, and the possible chaos of social transition, and, because of their years, are hostile to omnipotent fact. As Haeckel phrases it, "they wish to be deceived." Unfortunately, in that "wish" is the substance of slavery, the material for the infinite diversity of social conflict; of confusionist schemes and cures and alleviations for the manifold evils of primary social miscomprehension. Only in the perception and acceptance of fact is the triumph of human life, and—come it as it may—social society.

Thus, to be a "leader of men" we must first have a society of men. Not a harlotry of bondage. A society, that is, where political freedom has given place to economic freedom. Then, when the social means of life are socially secure and undeniable, when life is not one long harassment of toil, uncertainty and disillusionment, when opportunity and culture are the prerogatives of society, then the "leader of men" shall be no hiring scribe or political bondsman, no industrial dictator or radical visionary. He will be the exponent of monistic unity, and his following will be men, appreciative of fact, nurtured on reality, cogent with logic of experience and critical with social understanding. In such a society leadership shall be real. For it will be the wisdom of reality. In such a society egotism will no longer allure with golden palaver. For it will be cut off from its sources of sustenance—confusion of terms and misinterpretation of fact.

To be anything, or do anything, or possess a philosophy of life which can meet the demands of life and satisfy its questionings, the great ego must be rigorously subordinated. The deeper implication of Socialism is humility. Not the false abasement of creeds—which is mainly political subterfuge (or, at its best, fantastic idealism); nor the scientific littleness of classic "finitism"—a sort of hybrid abstraction from "the universal wisdom." But individual submission to the comprehensive genius of society, conscious of social affinity with that genius and vibrant with the inspiration of its regnancy. For without society man would be no longer man, and without its overarching genius, no longer a creator. And service—the faithful companion of humility. Again, not the service of commerce and its degradation of profit, but the service of man to humanity.

That was what lay at the heart of the immortal Burns when he sang of "man's inhumanity to man; of the honest man that was king o' men; of the independent mind that could laugh at the pride of appearance; of the time when man to man the world ower shall brothers be, for a' that." It was the service of man to man that made him honest and hence a "king" in social purpose, i.e., the "ruler" of reality, thro' and because of the common association of fraternity.

It is precisely this genius and service which together connote the forces of progress, and which urge society through the groping and painful ways of experimentation to the communist concepts of social unity. To communist society of necessity. Because we have now social production and society can in no wise satisfy its new needs and aspirations by reverting to individual production. Indeed, it

couldn't, for craftsmanship is, in effect, a lost art. Secondly, the private ownership of industry prevents further social progress and denies to society even the satisfaction of sheer necessities. All roads to freedom are effectually barred by capitalist development—except the one avenue of social ownership of industry. When that is effected there is social ownership and social production, i.e., the fundamental prelude to communist society. Time will prove that social prosperity can obtain only with the cessation of capitalist property. Time will show that war shall cease only with the extinction of commerce. And time will vindicate the fact that individual independence is possible only in Socialist society. Then it will receive its highest glorification. For then every avenue of material wealth will be open to achievement, and achievement in turn will prosper and increase the riches of progress and sharpen invention for a yet greater triumph.

If the egotist was grounded in evolution, he would—in principle—recognize and appreciate the interwoven forces that mingle in the criss-cross of ambition and initiative, making or marring their opportunity and development. If he understood the nature of social development he would not be guilty of such egregious folly as to ask for the plan of Socialist society. He would know that society was a process of growth, and its "plan" the reflex ideology of material conditions. In other words, he would cease to be an egotist. But not understanding either of those processes, and primarily conscious of the warranty of the ruling "S," he blunders along the avenues of self, regarding Socialism as a means to his own advantage and fearful lest the turmoil of its initial stages should overwhelm him in the whirlpool of its probable chaos. And because the facts of actual development run counter to his utopian phantasies of advancement, he mocks at the contumacy of the "commonality," rails at the weak; condemns the helpless; lashes the ignorant; jeers at the doped children of tradition, and, with true bourgeois superficiality, denies to the slaves the capacity of self-control, self-expression and responsibility. Even in the face of overwhelming evidence to the contrary.

It is true we need "leaders." Always there must be an agent expressing material condition, a medium to connect fact and concept. But not the "leader" of political subterfuge, or social "superiority." The leader of Socialism is a power of condition, not the will of man. That power is sustained on the strong soil of necessity. It is visualized in a central organization of delegated authority. Its authority, therefore, expresses the demands and aspirations of an awakened working class whose leadership consists in the clear-cut issue of transforming the demands of that class into the actuality of fact. The development of Capitalism has made the working class the greatest magnitude in society. It has forced that class to the van of social progress. The further development of capital can only increase the effect. It must enroach deeper on the social life and needs of the majority. It must blot out the self-complacent middle class, and its cheap ideation of ambition and interest. It must more imperatively deny the prerogatives of social satisfaction. It must volte face on its own most cherished institutions. But in the cutting of its pound of flesh it sheds the life blood of its civilization. It develops an industry so automatic and cheap, that social coherence is no longer possible. It transforms its society of "free" labor into a society of bonded unemployment, and its craftsmen of franchised equality into the social equality of the proletariat. That is, a people stripped of property and its illusions, of life and its satisfactions, naked and lean—but unbroken—in the grip of the oligarchy of finance.

Thus does society disintegrate into one class, the proletariat, and the proletariat consolidate into one society, with one ambition: the necessary ownership and control of the social means of life. And consciously or not—but certainly conscious in its triumph—the working class represents the wider

(Continued on page 8)

Happiness

JUST about this time of year is when good resolutions are made and broken, and storekeepers and wholesalers, carried away by the prevailing spirit, ladle out with reckless, open-handed generosity in printed notices to their "friends and patrons," hearty wishes for prosperity and happiness. In doing this, they know they can't go far wrong, as it is the desire for happiness or to avoid pain, that is the leading motive and constant demand of all living creatures. Yes, even when a mother plunges into a burning house to save her child and thereby sacrifices her own life, she is obeying her instinct to do what, above all, gives her most pleasure. However, it is such examples as this that make one characterise Kropotkin's description of the master motive as "the lust for pleasure" in the words of old Polonius, as "an ill phrase, a vile phrase." So it seems there are several degrees and kinds of pleasure, but all sorts and conditions of men and women "obey that impulse." Even the evenly-balanced and unemotional Anglo-Saxons have their proverb: "All work and no play makes Jack a dull boy," which is quite in keeping with the genius of a race that, above all others, is devoted to sport as their ideal vehicle of happiness—too often to the exclusion of what will achieve lasting well-being.

A Presbyterian minister who, along with a number of others in the "public" eye, was asked by the usual "able editor" to weigh in with a speil on Optimism via a New Year message to a hopelessly bankrupt farming community, stated that he preferred the word joy to that of happiness. Joy, said he, springs from within; happiness originally meant the result of happenings—haphazard, depending more or less on luck or chance. But, he continued, no matter what the external circumstances are, we may still have joy; because it is a result of our attitude to life; a result of our faith; our trust; our religion—it is a bliss, not of condition, but of character. Quite a characteristically clerical and Coe-istic-New Thought utterance this, as it avoids the awkward consequences of tampering (as it is scientifically necessary to do) with the material bases of health and welfare. Seeing that, as Marx points out in connection with another branch of the Church, it will more willingly endure attacks upon 38-39ths of its principles than upon 1-39th of its income; "able editors" and ministers are all in the same box—neither can afford to offend their best customers and principal sources of revenue. As for delving into word derivations to explain facts, this was just what made Engels jump on Feuerbach. Trace back the evil word villain to its origin and we arrive at nothing worse than a simple, uneducated farm or estate slave, serf or villein.

If all reports turn out to be true, there is one bunch, at any rate, who believe something more than unaided joy-thoughts is necessary, and that is the Vancouver Mounted Police dope traffickers. Material dope for the addicts and hard cash for the alleged traders, are the tangible, solid bases of their joy! Which reminds one that January, too, is the month when the Children of the Heather invariably resuscitate and celebrate "the immortal memory" of one who, in his time, was no slouch in both seeking and making joy for himself—let alone others! Of course, the reference is to the famous Scottish poet, Robert Burns. But, so far as his experience went, he was inclined to affirm that:

" . . . pleasures are like poppies spread—
You seize the flower, its bloom is shed;
Or like the snowfall in the river,
A moment white—then melts forever;
Or like the Borealis race,
That flit ere you can point their place;
Or like the rainbow's lovely form
Evanishing amid the storm."

However, a study of Burns' career reveals how powerful in making or marring existence, are the material influences. Right at the start of his life,

the blight of evil conditions surrounded him; for, as Lord Rosebery said, he was a peasant, born in a cottage that no modern sanitary inspector would for a moment tolerate. All his life he fought with poverty or the fear of it, and finally died, as he himself foresaw—a pauper, and his struggles constantly reflect themselves in his poetry and other writings. In one of his rhymed letters, he writes in view of a probable helpless old age, that "the last o't, is only but to beg." He often alludes to the fear of being reduced to this dire strait.

In our analytical, scientific times, few estimates of personality are complete, that do not take into account the hereditary, physical condition and character of their subjects. Burns, then, as he himself said, inherited a deep, incurable taint of melancholia that poisoned his existence and was torn by passions that carried him to the point of insanity. This was to be expected from the Celtic elements in him and from the fact that he was, as regards complexion and hair, very swarthy; for, as our modern psychologists of salesmanship aver, this overtendency towards pessimism is one of the characteristic drawbacks of the dark-hued members of the race. He was also subject to rheumatic complaints, a condition that had been aggravated by the laborious toil and privations of his youth and, in later life, by the exposure and fatigue of his long horseback rides as an exciseman.

Further consideration of the economic phases of Burns' life, shows that when, finally, he was compelled to look forward to this none too suitable or noble a job of exciseman, for a sensitive poet like himself, as an escape from poverty, he wrote political epistles on the subject to different men begging their political influence on his behalf. In one of these, whilst taking into account the possible failure of securing the "boon" he requested, he says that—his farming life still remaining open to him—"on eighteen pence a week I've lived before"—a happy experience and prospect indeed, to "live" on 36 cents a week, even in those days.

Just as in our day, so also in the poet's, there was the same stimulating atmosphere of "hard times," for, writing to a lady, he says, "We have had a brilliant theatre here this season; only, as all other business does, it experiences a stagnation of trade from the epidemical complaint of the country—want of cash."

When, finally, he did get his gauger's job, he was compelled to vegetate on a salary about one-third of what he looked forward to receiving, and, indeed, he just, and no more, escaped dismissal altogether, and all because of the openly-expressed rebel political opinions. Consequently, he was a disappointed man and like many others of his artistic temperament, he became, in later life, a victim to alcoholism and the pleasures of unregulated social life; the more so, as Rosebery remarks, because his own home life could not have been very exhilarating. Hence, one winter's evening too many spent midst the warmth and joviality of the Globe inn, followed by exposure to cold, on leaving, by sleeping out on the stable steps, and he had signed his own death warrant, to be duly executed about five months thereafter.

Such, with all our boasted command over Nature, is the life that, for centuries, the most advanced sections of the human race have been living! No wonder the Art of Happiness is so feebly mastered. The fact is, the masses exist in a hunted, fear-tortured condition of barbarism, with, as their dominant principle, "Let us eat, drink and be merry, for to-morrow—we may be out of a job!" We hear of tribes that eat, when a good kill results after a long hunt, till they gorge themselves and have to lie and sleep off the effects, and the same applies to us. In Scotland (and doubtless something similar in other countries) the children repeat a mock grace, which runs like this:

"Adam and Eve,
Cain and Abel,
Bless us a'
About the table;
Eat yer fill
An' POOCH NANE,
Halleluiah, Amen!"

From the myths, folk-lore, songs and sayings of a people, we gain an insight into their past life. So this childish bit of ribaldry is eloquent about economic conditions; for "pooch nane" (pocket nothing), implies so usual a state of semi-starvation that, when opportunity for a real feed presents itself, there is a constant danger by greedily secreting food, that the laws of "good breeding and restraint" would be broken. Even here, it is common, in a "stag" boarding-house, to see the crowd just before meals, waiting for the dining-room door to be opened, so that they might make one wild tumultuous scramble for their seats at the table!

Indeed, our eating customs are as much in need of revolutionising as are any of the other functions of the capitalist world. The small, private household meals, and means of providing and cooking the same, do not offer the highest in freedom, health and efficiency. There, much of the "take it or leave it" element obtains. Nor may one eat when most convenient, for, doing this involves the terrible offence, because a hardship to the poor house-slave, of not turning up to meals at the set hours. Hence, so many become wretched "slaves of the meal hour!" because we do not like to make, as Burns says, a "sulky, sullen dame, gathering her brows like gathering storm, nursing her wrath to keep it warm."

So it is in the larger restaurant life—a form of communal eating—that we get a hint of what the future communal house-life will be, because, within limits, one can eat when and what is most suitable. But what interferes with the efficiency of both hotel and restaurant life, is the commercial and profit-seeking elements; as, if one does not eat, drink and be merry in a sufficient degree, and irrespective of the effects on oneself, to pay the proprietors, one is an "undesirable." Therefore, only under a non-production for profit system, that is, under Communism, will healthful eating and drinking customs be possible. Meantime, in vivid contrast to this in Germany, the Capitalist-caused famine compels the people to rake the garbage cans for food! "The damned human race," as Mark Twain in late life kept on irritatingly repeating!

Given the practically certain prospect of calmly and leisurely enjoying a long life of completely satisfied desires, the present feverish and unhealthy endeavors to achieve Happiness would die as natural a death as will the Capitalist "Stage." Under such conditions, it has truly been affirmed, and with a shorter work-day too, it would be possible to muster out the wealth-producers at the age of 42, as veterans in the only kind of war that would then be necessary—the War against Want, and so free them either for a justly-earned leisure, or to engage in any sort of private or semi-public occupation their own fancy might dictate.

But it is Communism alone that will make the above possible and such is the present condition of the civilized world that Communism is now an immediate, pressing and stern necessity. But if its opponents will persist in describing it as a mere dream, does not the following quotation from a current newspaper, represent a hideous nightmare?:

"The prairie provinces, with less than two millions population, produced enough wheat and meat this summer to feed about fifty million people, yet thousands of families are very poor, their children cannot attend school for want of clothing, and hundreds of families on the treeless prairies, it is stated, have not sufficient money to buy coal. Why, with such great production are there so many in want?"

And as regards "school," in many parts of the country the children "cannot attend" it because such districts cannot afford to keep the schools open at all!

PROGRESS.

THE EGOTIST.

(Continued from page 6)

hopes and fuller designs of society. It will meet with conflict and resistance in every rank of society. But it will draw the breath of life from every conflict. It will receive adherents and enthusiasts to its ideals from all society. And it is the only vehicle for the new form of expression of the social forces of progress, hemmed in by political usage, struggling for new freedom and wider activity; budding like the verdant spring with a new mantle of beauty and a deeper power of inspiration. The common viewpoint of that issue will, at one and the same time, determine and govern the momentum of central authority. And in that authority the human expression of its force will be the understanding individuality of social kinship and social genius.

R.

BY THE WAY.

(Continued from page 1)

have been recognized. The political state can not create, but it can be used to clear away obstructions to social well-being and to organize opportunities. To a greater degree I am sure than many people think, the future of "production for use" must be the creation of the peoples themselves; will very largely depend on their own initiative and enterprise; the state can assist, that is all. This value, however, political democracy has had among others, if we can see this era as the preparation for the next (even a savage African chief could say to a traveller, "One event is always the son of another, and we must never forget the parentage"). Political democracy is introducing to us the civilized and civilizing arts and habits of discussion, persuasion, criticism and the necessity of creating opinion as well as the habit of accepting majority verdicts. Interest is turned on social questions and public affairs, opinion meets opinion in discussion and so opinion becomes an active principle in the life of the whole community. Under political democracy, though we are not all equally educable or interested in social questions, yet the

general standard of interest, knowledge, and intelligence is raised. In the raising of that standard there lies before us the possibility of more rational, peaceful and continuous social adjustments in the future. We become fitted for political democracy, and for clearing up social evils not alone by reading books or listening to lectures, but also, and mainly by practice—practice makes perfect, they say. Well, here, in this matter, we may be satisfied to say approximately perfect. "Perfectionism" is a commendable goal for angels; man is a critter.

As it was with political democracy, so the ideal of industrial democracy will be gradually realized. The struggle for every advance and the advances gained will be steps up to our City on the Hill. The new habits formed by one advance will be levers for still further advances. We shall learn by mistakes the wiser ways. Did not Italy furnish a lesson? On the seizure of the factories by the workers in September, 1920, the accountants, the technicians and managers withdrew. The workers found themselves cut off from supplies of raw materials which they did not know how to get. They were also cut off at the distributive end. The technical staffs and the accountants and managers were discovered to be indispensable to the conduct of the industry. So up went the white flag. The whole affair was a fiasco and completed the disillusionment of the workers of Italy which had been started by the failure of a general strike throughout the country the same year. The general strike, it was supposed, would effect the revolution.

The lesson stands out in this shape, that modern industry will not work without its complement of trained specialists in both the distributive and the productive ends. The more scientific production becomes, the more indispensable these key men become. So that the co-operation of the managers, the engineers, accountants and economists of the productive and distributive functions are essential to the progress of the movement to industrial democracy. And both in Great Britain and Italy some progress has already been made towards building the approach between all technical vocations, from managerial staffs to the general body of workers in the spheres of production and distribution. Much discussion has taken place and a proposal has been advanced by Ramsay Macdonald for a national industrial council of all vocations to be established as a consultative and surveying body. As an initial move, sponsored by Labor, towards considering the whole vast mechanism of production and exchange as a community enterprise, even if a capitalistically-owned one, the survey may be considered as indicating a trend in the direction of community control. And in the order of things in the transition period, consideration shows that control comes first. The question of ownership is of secondary importance, I think, and will be dealt with on the merits of technical efficiency and use very largely.

Posterity came to me in a dream and said: "Cut out your one-idea programmes because we will kick em' to smithereens when the mundane world picks us up. We shall have in our time, just as much of Collectivism, of Guild Socialism, of Syndicalism and of Capitalism as we think fit to have. You'd better look at the future as an experimental one!" All right, I replied, "these are early days!"

"C"

REVOLUTIONS, SOCIAL AND POLITICAL.

(Continued from page 2)

iron. From 1866 to 1914 the development of these industries was almost Aladdin. Potassium, almost negligible in 1866, had in 1871 375,000 tons, and in ten more years almost a million tons production. What Bourgeois multitude could long continue to hate a government from whose gracious and generous hand such lavish gifts were bestowed. The Bourgeoisie passed bodily over to the government, and so there never was a Liberal Party in that country. The Liberals were absorbed in the Social Democracy. But we anticipate, and will return to the political development of Germany next time.

HERE AND NOW.

We delight in recording a sort of stabilization in currency, Here and Now, and present a somewhat improved monetary complexion over the last quarter of last issue. The hungry printer asserts that there is no more room, for comment. He agrees, however, that there is room for a further improvement in currency matters. Give us a real inflation in the totals, says he. Come then!

Following, \$1 each: J. Harrington, H. Williams, J. Caldwell, W. T. Grieves, A. V. Watson, Walter Pryde, R. Temple, J. R. Macdonald, A. Miller, D. Holliday, J. Gandy, M. S. Oulton, G. Darts, J. Donaldson, C. Carlson, J. Lundstrom, G. Thomas.

Following \$2 each: H. Vindeg, G. Beagrie, D. Peters, Dan Strigley, J. W. Allan, A. Eische.

Frank Williams \$3; C. Foster \$3; C. Lester \$6; Wiley Orr \$8; T. Twelvetree \$5; E. Staples \$2.25.

Above, Clarion subs received from 29th December to 10th January, inclusive, total \$56.25.

CLARION MAINTENANCE FUND.

Following \$1 each: Harry Grand, W. T. Grieves, R. Temple, Abe Karme, J. R. MacDonald, M. S. Oulton, G. Darts.

B. L. \$2; Proceeds from Local No. 1's Social and Dance \$5; Dan Strigley \$2.

Above, C. M. F. receipts, from 29th December to 10th January inclusive, total \$16.

Literature Price List

	Cloth Bound	Per Copy
A. B. C. of Evolution (McCabe)		\$1.15
Economic Determinism		\$1.65
Evolution of the Idea of God (Grant Allen)		\$1.15
Evolution of Property (Lafargue)		\$1.15
Critique of Political Economy		\$1.65
Revolution and Counter Revolution (Marx)		\$1.15
History of Paris Commune (Lissagaray)		\$1.65
Ancient Society		\$1.65
Philosophical Essays		\$1.65
Theoretical System of Karl Marx		\$1.65
Landmarks of Scientific Socialism		\$1.65
Socialism and Philosophy		\$1.65
Capitalist Production (First Nine and 32nd Chapters)		
"Capital," vol. 1, (Marx)		\$1.00
Vital Problems in Social Evolution		80c
Science and Revolution		80c
The Militant Proletariat		80c
Evolution Social and Organic		80c
Puritanism		80c
Ethics and History		80c
Germs of Mind in Plants		80c
The Triumph of Life		80c
Anarchism and Socialism		80c
Feuerback		80c
Socialism Positive and Negative		80c
Eighteenth Brumaire		80c
Science and Superstition		80c
	Paper Covers	Per Copy
Two Essays on History (C. Stephenson and G. Daville)		8c
Independent Working Class Education		10c
Communist Manifesto		10c
Wage-Labor and Capital		10c
The Present Economic System (Prof. W. A. Bongor)		10c
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific		15c
Slave of the Farm		10c
Manifesto, S. P. of C.		10c
Evolution of Man (Prof. Bolsche)		80c
Causes of Belief in God (Lafargue)		10c
Shop Talks on Economics (Marcy)		15c
The State and Revolution (Lenin)		85c
Value, Price and Profit (Marx)		15c
Economic Causes of War (Leckie)		35c
Civil War in France (Marx)		35c
Eighteenth Brumaire (Marx)		35c
Christianism and Communism (Bishop W. M. Brown)		35c
Psychology of Marxian Socialism		30c
W. A. Pritchard's Address to the Jury, (State Trials, Winnipeg, Man., Fall Assizes 1919-20)		35c
	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	\$2.50
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
Psychology of Marxian Socialism	10 copies	\$2.50
W. A. Pritchard's Address to the Jury (State Trials, Winnipeg, Man., Fall Assizes 1919-20)	10 copies	\$2.00
	All prices include Postage.	
	Make all moneys payable to E. McLeod, P. O. Box 710, Vancouver, B. C. Add discount on cheques.	

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.