

WESTERN CLARION

A Journal of
CURRENT
EVENTS

Official Organ of
THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

HISTORY
ECONOMICS
PHILOSOPHY

Number 828

Twice a Month

VANCOUVER, B. C., SEPTEMBER 1, 1920.

FIVE CENTS

Religion and Labor

By E. Belfort Bax in "Justice."

A congress was held some months ago to consider the attitude of the rising power of religion, in which various notabilities of the religious, labor and political world took part. It was hardly to be expected, we suppose, that the various religious sects should not make an attempt to "nobble" the Labor Party. By religion, these sects naturally understand the Christian religion in some form or shape. Now, if by religion meant an ideal aim of social life and conduct, I am far from ignoring the need for the formulation of such an ideal as concerns Socialism—regarded as the goal of the Labor movement. But the attempt of Christian sects and sentimentalists to pour the new wine of political-economic and social striving into the old Christian bottles of individualistic subsaving is another matter altogether. The Daily News remarked on this point not long ago that "many persons" deemed that the power of labor must evolve its own religious ideal, apart from extraneous influence. That such is the true view of the matter I regard as incontestable. And I further hold that it is the duty of Socialists to guard the movement from becoming infected with what I regard as the false idealism of the Christian faith in all its forms.

The time has come, I think, to speak out clearly on this issue. The Christian faith and its professors are loth to regard themselves as beaten. Driven from their clerical and dogmatic positions of yore, they are taking their stand on the ground of ethics and hero worship. It is surely important, harmless in this attenuated form if the Christian religion may appear to many, to oppose it equally with the dogmatic forms now beginning to "pale their ineffectual fire," if we are to clear our minds of cant. Labor generally, and more especially the Socialist Party, has to work its own religious, in the sense of idealistic, salvation—altogether apart from old hypotheses—out of its own innermost soul, and all harping upon superannuated catchwords and prejudices derived from bourgeois religious sentiment is an inevitable hindrance to this process of self-development.

The tendency of certain speeches at the Conference of Religion and Labor referred to, undoubtedly points in the above direction, whether we regard them as subtle devices of the enemy, of evil intent, or merely as the expression of the washy sentimentalism of narrow, if honest, minds.

Let us first of all take the somewhat stale denunciations of "materialism" which play so considerable a part in some of the speeches in question. Now "materialism" is an ambiguous word, and of this fact the partisans of current religion are not slow to take advantage.

"Materialism" may either mean low or sordid aims as opposed to higher idealistic and altruistic ones—money grubbing, profiteering, the sinking of the human soul in more selfish gratification, or the pursuit of gain—or it may mean a philosophical history of the world, intrinsically opposed to the theological outlook on the said world. Now these two meanings of the word "materialism" have nothing whatever in common with each other. The one stands for a mode of life and conduct the other for a theory of the universe. But it is the trick of the popular Christian controversialist to mix up these

two meanings of "materialism," and thus to keep the term swimming in vagueness, so that they may appeal first to one sense in which it is used, and then to the other. If hard-pressed they will perhaps trot out the time-honored but impudent falsehood that the one leads to the other.

In other words, they will imply that the materialist Communist of Paris in 1871, who, as he expressed it, sacrificed his life on the barricade for "human solidarity," or the partisan of Russian freedom of the late nineteenth century, the Kropotkins, the Bourzefiffs, equally materialistic in their theory of the world, were sordid creatures of low aims compared with the lordly squire of high degree who is a pillar of the Church of England, or the Nonconformist manufacturer or shopkeeper who may be heard singing Christian hymns at his local Nonconformist tabernacle. Every impartial man with any knowledge of history must recognize the fact that while of course you may have men of high aims and unselfish conduct on both sides, yet if there is any difference it is in favor of those who hold the materialistic theory of the universe. For humane instincts and devotion to social well-being, the "religious" man has proportionately, with all his belief in Divine Providence, not shown up favorably as against the frank and outspoken "materialist."

There is another point which the hypnotism of tradition has engraved on the mind of men, and which in the interests of truth and the expulsion of cant from our midst it is time to call attention to. It is the notion of perfection ascribed to the figure portrayed in the Gospels as that of the founder of Christianity. We may here leave out of account the controversies now raging concerning the historical reality of the figure itself. I am content to take the character as portrayed—it matters not whether it be wholly mythical, partly mythical, or what not—and to challenge those who dilate on its unsurpassed beauty and excellence to give a reason for their ecstatic lucubrations on the subject. We have here to do with two things, the teaching and the life as professedly recorded. As regards the first it is a common-places now among scholars that there is not a single principle or precept contained in the Gospels that had not been previously enunciated by either Buddhists, Confucians, Parsees, Jewish Rabbis, or Greek thinkers—in short, that the much-belauded moral teaching of the Gospels is a crude mass of plagiarism from beginning to end. Now I must confess personally to having an old-fashioned prejudice against the appropriation without acknowledgment of the thoughts of other men, and to those who are guilty of it, and I imagine there may be others who, when the facts are placed before them, will share my view.

We come then to the life—i.e., the character as portrayed, whether real or fictitious. Now, I ask, apart from the hypnotism of convention and tradition, whether anyone reading the New Testament candidly can truthfully say that, in the isolated and somewhat thin delineations of a personality there depicted, he can discover any superlative excellence placing it (say) above the best of his contemporaries. "Justice" is not the place to discuss this matter in detail. It is sufficient here, for my purpose, to leave the matter in the hands of any honest investigator.

I can only say for myself that I can find persons who have worked in our own Socialist movement, who have never boasted that they were "meek and lowly of heart," or pressed upon public attention their difficulties in obtaining a night's lodgings, whom I can personally admire much more than the belauded Gospel figure. This may be, after all, a matter of taste, but my object in introducing the subject here is to urge upon the Labor and Socialist movement that it should clear its ideal of this particular "taste," which seems to me so strongly to savour of cant. Their ideal has, "au fond," no more to do with the Gospel teaching than it has with the Buddhist scriptures or the cult of Mithras. Let us hope that Socialism will not rest content to harp back upon the stale formulae of "creeds outworn," but will work out its own conception of man's place as a social being in the universe.

Soviet Russia Medical Relief Committee

EDITOR'S NOTE—We are asked to publish the following financial statement. Dr. Wm. Mendelson writes to say that many of our readers have contributed to this fund.

TREASURER'S FINANCIAL REPORT STATEMENT,
JUNE, 1920.

August, 2nd, 1920.

Receipts.

Contributions	\$3,684.91
Mass Meeting Detroit, June 20th	1,000.00
	<hr/>
	\$4,684.91

Expenditure.

Printing and advertising	\$ 56.00
Clerical Help	115.00
Postage, Stationery and miscellaneous	158.62
Medical Supplies	2,500.00
	<hr/>
	\$2,829.62

TREASURER'S FINANCIAL STATEMENT, JULY, 1920

Receipts.

Contributions	\$2,777.36
Mass Meeting, Phila. Comm.	500.00
Mass Meeting, Wash. Comm.	80.00
Mass Meeting and collections, Vancouver, B.C.	104.60
N. Y. Esthonian sub-comm.	104.20
N. Y. Lithuanian sub-comm.	70.00
Phila. Comm.	300.00
Detroit Comm.	500.00
	<hr/>
	\$4,436.16

Expenditures.

Expenses Phila and Wash. meetings	\$ 95.00
Collection Canadian Cheques	16.35
Clerical help	75.00
Postage, Stationery and Miscellaneous	193.07
Medical Supplies	3,500.21
	<hr/>
	\$3,879.63

Balance

\$ 556.53
SUMMARIZED STATEMENT, APRIL TO JULY,
INCLUSIVE.

Receipts.

April, \$424.17; May, \$1,914.57; June, \$4,684.91; July,
\$4,436.16—\$11,459.81.

Expenditure.

April, \$126.26; May, \$1,779.01; June, \$2,829.62; July,
\$3,879.63—\$8,614.52. (\$7,000.21 for medical supplies).
August 1st, balance on hand, \$2,845.29.

The Progress of the Peasants' Revolt

Article No. 2.

IN the "Political History of England," by Hunt and Poole, we are told that "If financial and military problems alone had been troubling the realm in 1381, there would have been no outbreak of rebellion, despite of all the irritation caused by the circuits of the Commissioners of the poll tax." This hypothesis seems reasonable. The problems of finance and war were the concern of the ruling classes alone. Whatever differences of opinion might exist in regard to the methods of administering propertied affairs could certainly be adjusted without precipitating a rebellion of such a magnitude, and fraught with such terrible possibilities.

But there were other problems. The whole social system was in a strained condition. The aftermath of the great plague was replete with changes. The relations existing between lord and serf could no longer be similar to those prevailing in the days of the Normans and Plantagenets. Industry, too, had developed considerably and merchant guilds and craft guilds had become but the shadow of what they once had been. The day of the journeyman and master was rapidly approaching. The wool which formerly was shipped to Flanders to be woven into cloth and re-shipped to England, was now, to a large degree, prepared and manufactured at home. Commerce had gradually penetrated the more important sections of Europe and the Orient, and was now a matter to be reckoned with.

In such unsettled conditions a social upheaval would naturally be expected and the short-sighted action of those in charge of governmental affairs materially hastened the impending catastrophe. The resentment against the poll tax, and the methods resorted to by the commissioners and collectors, were an incentive for the villein to launch his premeditated attack on the landlord; for the unchartered townsmen to try grips with the Abbott; and for the ruined tradesman to make a last desperate effort to evict the Flemish supplanter.

The spontaneous outburst in so many shires and towns, and among the members of so many different departments of activity, is sufficient proof of the unsatisfactory nature of the social base. On June 10th, 1381, the storm burst. The rural laborers were the first to rise in insurrection, and they marched to the citadel of master class power—London. East and West the same tale is told by the chroniclers of the time. Large masses of peasants rose in arms demanding that all grievances be speedily redressed.

Tyler, who in all probability had seen service in foreign wars, and who was apparently a man of outstanding ability, took his place at the head of the men of Kent. They liberated Ball from Maidstone gaol together with several others whom they considered to be unjustly imprisoned. Their military equipment was not up to the standard even of those days, but the intense enthusiasm prevailing prohibited a comparison between contending forces. In marching on London, Blackheath and Southwark were occupied, and a knight of the realm, Sir John Manley, was forced to communicate their terms to the king.

The fact that they were able to cross the bridge and enter London proves conclusively that even the rulers themselves within the city were far from unanimous in the desire to crush the movement and murder the leaders. Only a case of divided counsels could make possible such an entry as the rebels effected. A great struggle between the victualling guilds and the clothing guilds had been in existence for many years in London, and the wealthy on the side of the victuallers considered it to be in their interests to assist the insurgents. They had no particular love for the peasants and artisans, or the cause they represented, but political expediency directed their actions. Three aldermen of London were indicted for the part they played in the insurrection, and at York, Winchester, and other towns, there were similar results.

The advent of the peasant army in London was considered the propitious moment for the incensed

artisans and unskilled workers of the city to open the vials of their wrath on the hated Flemings. They had long been unpopular, both with the merchant and manufacturing classes, whom they were forcing out of business by their up-to-date and efficient methods on the industrial field, and by the workers, whom they managed to exploit to a greater degree. Many of the Flemish merchants were dragged from the churches, and their places of business, and summarily dispensed with.

In the ranks of the dominant ruling powers of London, consternation and confusion reigned. They had no time to deliberate. They must act and act quickly. A large and exasperated mob was in their midst, and there was no telling what atrocious crimes they were about to commit. Froissart, whose title was obtained from the crown, and who could always be depended upon to be the willing tool of his benefactors, in explaining the actions of the rebels says: "Thus these ungracious people demeaned themselves like people enraged so that day they did much sorrow in London." No doubt they did. But sorrow soon made way for anger, and anger for action.

The heads of the city, the lords, and the rich burgesses called a quick conference. Some of them were in favor of attacking the rebels at night while at their rest and asleep. It was thought that after their early successes the majority would be drunk, and could be murdered with ease. The heroism and gallantry of the British ruling class was manifested even at that date. Were it not for the fact that the residue of the commons might rise in revolt they would likely have counselled the king to attempt a massacre. To quote Froissart again: "The good men could have done this with ease, for they had in their houses their servants ready in harness." That the liveried lackeys, who attend to the personal wants of their masters, are never to be depended upon to assist in the struggles of the industrial workers is one of the unmistakable lessons of history. Their isolation from the remainder of the proletariat; their close intimacy with their employers, whose favors are essential to their success; make of the menial a practically hopeless slave both physically and mentally.

However, the chances of success attending such a venture as that contemplated looked none too bright. A safer method must be sought. Instead of a murderous assault, a conference was arranged with the rebellious peasants. After carefully reviewing the grounds for revolt, it was decided upon by the king and his counsellors that all matters in dispute should be rectified at once. Richard consented to serfdom being abolished all over the realm; that all feudal services should disappear; and that all holders in villeinage should become free tenants paying rent of 4d. per acre, per year, to the lord.

In addition to these drastic changes, others of a minor nature were also effected. All restrictions on buying and selling were to be eliminated, and market monopolies of all favored places were declared abolished. These latter concessions would seem to indicate that other sections of the community outside the peasantry had axes to grind, and deemed that the proper time and place to present their demands. A general amnesty was also conceded for all irregularities committed during the rising.

The king ordained more than thirty clerks to transfer to paper the conclusions of the conference, and letter patents, sealed with the king's seal were delivered to the embattled peasants. After gaining so decisive a victory, the mass left, but "the great venom remained behind." This, of course, included the leaders—Tyler, Ball and Straw.

What caused the reluctance of these rebels to depart is not easy to understand. The chroniclers would lead us to believe that intoxicated with success, they wanted to display their cruelty and brutality to the limit. A more probable reason, we think, was the fact that they fully realized the state of affairs, and felt certain that, without sufficient pressure being brought to bear, all the generous grants of a bewildered ruling class would be speed-

ily revoked.

Following the Mile End conference, the conduct of the insurgents began to appear so intolerable, a thing to lose saw that armed force must be brought into play to protect his life and property. The houses of several of the most despised rulers were burned, and many of the manor rolls sacked, but apart from a few detested officials of the realm, the number of murders committed was small. That ferocious antagonism towards the whole of the dominant section of society, displayed in France during the horrors of the Jacquerie, a few years previously, was not manifested in England. As in the case of the Peasants' War in Germany, a little over a century later, bloody deeds of violence were resorted to on but few occasions.

On June 13th, John Ball in Blackheath preached that ever in memorable sermon which has served as a platform for the Christian Socialists ever since. He recounted the story of creation, back to the Garden of Eden, when all men were created equal. Servitude of man to man was never introduced. It was wickedness made its hideous presence felt in the human family. If God had intended a distinction between peoples he would have started with it. The peasants of England now had an opportunity of gaining their freedom, and he strongly urged them to take advantage of the situation.

Ball undoubtedly wielded an enormous influence over the lower strata of English society. For one twenty years he had lived and worked among them in country and town. He well understood the division that existed in society and was keen and fearless in his advocacy of economic reform. But the time was not yet ripe for class emancipation as the productive forces had not yet become social in character, and many changes had yet to take place before such were the case.

As the rebels refused to disperse, the problem of the ruling class was still far from being solved. A second conference between contending parties was considered necessary. The appointment was made at Smithfield. Richard enquired as to the reason for the insurgents' delay. Tyler informed him that many urgent matters had yet to be attended to. But all was not satisfactorily arranged at the time of their first meeting. There must, insisted Tyler, be no law above the Statute of Winchester. No man should be outlawed as the result of legal proceedings. The estates of the church should be confiscated after provision was made for present holders and divided up among the laity. All men should be legally free with no differentiation between them except in the case of the king.

To this new list of demands the king practically refused to comply. The growing strength of the law-and-order party, the propertied class, enabled the rulers of the realm to take a very different view of the situation than on the occasion of the first conference. The unlooked for opposition on the part of the state roused the ire of Tyler, who made a personal attack on one of the king's attendants. In the altercation Tyler was slain by Watworth, the Lord Mayor, and fearing a violent outbreak with the probable massacre of the royal retinue, Richard offered his services as leader in place of the murdered Tyler.

But the rebellion by this time had worked itself out. Gradually, the peasants and artisans wended their way back to their respective shores either through fear, hunger, or the thought that they had fully accomplished what they attempted to obtain. Day after day the forces of the state were becoming consolidated in London, and now it was merely a question of time till Richard should have at his disposal a body of troops larger in number, and better trained and equipped than those who needly accepted his leadership when Tyler was killed.

With this formidable power at his back, Richard had no necessity to maintain his former compromising and conciliating attitude. He now possessed the requisite authority, and was prepared to act. What happened we shall see in our next.

J. A. McD.

Economic Causes of War.

Article No. 11.

EGYPT, which, next to India, is the greatest possession in the British Empire, was taken by force and is held by force. Since the Suez Canal was built in the sixties, Egypt has been the gateway to the trade of the East, and as such it became a tempting bait to England and France. Ismail I., ruler of that time, becoming entangled in extravagant schemes of development and dissipation, which he was encouraged by European money lenders, ran up the National Debt to about \$45,000,000. The financial conquest of the country soon led to its military conquest. Ismail, to meet his embarrassments, sold a huge quantity of his shares in the Suez Canal to the British Government, and then at the instigation of British and French usurers, the governments of France and Britain compelled him to accept their financial controllers who took over the management of all Egyptian finances. As a result the Egyptians became discontented with the interference of foreign powers and with the increased taxation. A national movement arose to break the power of the Ruler and to get the power of the government in the hands of the people themselves. We are told this national movement was a mere mutiny of the discontented, just as we have been told about Lenin and Trotsky in Russia, but the historical fact remains that the Arabi Revolution was a complete popular success. The Khedive was deprived of his power and the Government passed to the National Assembly which the Khedive was compelled to summon. So successful was this practically bloodless revolution, that the European money lenders, terror-stricken lest the Egyptian Parliament repudiate the debts of their autocratic ruler or fail to weather the financial storm, moved heaven and earth to stir the British and French Governments to stamp out the National Movement by force of arms. The French Government declined to have anything to do with so ghastly a proceeding. The British Government, on the other hand, tempted by the bait of the gateway to India, and lashed by the bondholders' whips from behind, bombarded Alexandria (without declaring war), then landed an army which crushed Egyptian nationalism with blood and iron.

This dastardly act alarmed the conscience of the world and aroused the jealousies of all the European Powers, to allay which the British Government announced that the occupation of Egypt would only be temporary, and would cease when the finances were put in order and a stable government established. This was in 1882, since which time the finances have been put in order, and every effort of the Egyptians to govern themselves has been suppressed.

On December 17th, 1914, Great Britain declared that Turkey had forfeited its rights in Egypt, over which Britain extended a protectorate. The Egyptian people showed their dissatisfaction, and England then declared the protectorate to be only temporary, and that it would cease with the war. Trusting in this promise the Egyptians came to the Allies' aid; Egypt became a base of operations in the East. The Egyptian army served at Sinai in Arabi, at the Suez Canal, in the defeat of the Turkish armies in Syria and Mesopotamia, and warded off the danger of an uprising in the Soudan. After fighting, and numbers dying for the cause of liberty, right, and self-determination, the Egyptians, like those who expect much, were greatly disappointed. When the armistice was signed they asked Britain to keep her word, but (oh, those scraps of paper) she failed to do so. The Prime Minister asked to be allowed to depart for London, but his request was refused. The people then delegated prominent men of all classes and political shades to go to the peace conference. Voting papers for this purpose were circulated, but were confiscated after having received more than 2,000,000 signatures. These papers contained the names of members of Parliament, and provincial and municipal councillors. The necessary passports being refused the delegates, the population rebelled and protested, in answer to which the English authorities arrested the members of the delegation and deported them to Malta, and the country was put under martial law. These repressive measures resulted in strikes, riots, and the destruction of railroad, telegraph lines, etc., but the people, having been previously disarmed, were eventually

crushed through force of arms. Then, Britain, having obtained secretly the recognition of a British protectorate over Egypt from President Wilson, permitted the deported Egyptians at Malta to proceed to Paris. The delegates endeavored to get an interview with this great man Wilson, but he informed them through his secretary he had not had an opportunity to see them. President Wilson left Paris without hearing the case of the Egyptians, nor did the Peace Conference permit them to state their case. This is the treatment delegates of Egypt, representing a population of 16,000,000, received from the exponent of international right and justice,—this great democrat whose platitudinal phrases of justice, liberty, and the saving of the world for democracy, were repeated in poll-parrot fashion all over the Allied countries, and who will be portrayed in the future as the greatest humbug the world ever saw. All the sentimental slush is of no avail when it conflicts with the financial and economic interests arising from the division of the spoils.

France, of all the European Powers, offered the greatest opposition to British occupation of Egypt, because she had considerable interests there herself, but she is acquiescent now, since this opposition was bought off by Britain supporting her in Morocco.

The stranded Egyptian delegates published a "White Book" of British rule in Egypt telling of the pillaging of villages, the lashing and flogging of men, and the killing of men who defended their wives, but as the reading of this book is not good for humble Britishers, the "Thought Controllers" decided that the book should be kept in the Index Expurgatorius; it is seditious, because it is propaganda for the workers.

This short history of Egypt, where the National Assembly was overthrown, Alexandria bombarded without a declaration of war, with the grand finale at the Peace Conference secretly allowing a British Protectorate over Egypt, shows how much respect Britain has for self-determination, or even for scraps of paper if they clash with her economic interests.

PETER T. LECKIE.

The Near Side of the Rubicon

TWO years ago, by their refusal to recognize, or countenance in any way the Soviet Government, the Allies made a fateful decision. For the preservation of privilege, they deemed it of first importance to crush that visible symbol of proletarian supremacy. And the Allies were right. But, after the fashion of all class tyrannies, to achieve this end they elaborated their own crude methods of force, and having made their choice, and failed, they are now face to face with the consequences of that historical decision. Consequences are becoming ominously clear, even to our purblind masters.

By means of the blockade, through the intrigues of Churchillian duplicity; through the mediocrity of Finnish interests and Estonian need; through the dark by-way of Caucasian diplomacy, Britain strove to destroy the hated Soviet. Conjointly with France and Hungary she attempted to stem the flowing tide of the revolution,—and ruined south-eastern Europe in the process. With the help of France, she builded her hope on Poland. With mandatory schemes, she sought to rear in new strength and cunning the barrier walls of Empire in the Middle East. And on all sides, the failure of force is overwhelmingly patent; on all sides their hypocrisy and deceit floods back on themselves, in rolling waves of disaster. And in the forefront of this Allied defeat,—and all the brighter, because of the pitiful treachery to all human inspiration and its infinite hope—stands out the indisputable proof of proletarian in-

telligence and proletarian competence to direct the further and higher destinies of society,—an intelligence daily displayed in its understanding of the world welter of capitalist frightfulness; a competence that goes, restrained, but unhesitant amidst the ruthless policies of class aggression.

At the time above-mentioned, Bolhevism was weak, isolated; its aims and aspirations unknown and obscure,—repudiated even by the intelligence of the homeland. Now Bolshevism is established beyond all overthrow. Internally, Russia is practically united against all foreign interference; its Sovietism has become the vanguard of social progress; its aims and objective are known, in spite of the infamy and calumny of the capitalist press; and its recognition is being sought (furtively and treacherously) by all capitalist countries, in order to save themselves from the pit of world panic.

To vanquish a world rival, Britain and France became allies. The rival vanquished, each becomes a claimant for imperialist dominance. But world dominance can only belong to one, and to that one only by the immemorial right of might. For this dominion the chances of France are hopeless. She is broken and bankrupt, holding together internally by force of martial control, and externally by the conditions and financial leniencies of the war alliances. Her only hope is the German indemnity, and the subjugation of Russia, which being interpreted, means, the ruin of Germany and the annihilation of Russia. But that alternative carries with it the immediate collapse of capitalism.

For those reasons, Britain and France cannot agree. Their imperialist needs and ambitions are contradictory, and it is the temporary union of those irreconcilable policies which has brought about

the present economic deadlock in the old world. If France remains obdurate, and continues in her present policies, she must eventually face the pressure—and force—of her quondam allies,—for her an impossibility, because the control of world resources is not in her hands. Per contra, if France compromises her German claims, and Russian credits, and relinquishes, even in part, her imperialist demands, the disorganization and difficulties of her capitalists will be no less complete, and such disorganization cannot fail to find a swift reflex in her population.

Finally, this subordination of French to British Imperialist aggression will entail new samples of Anglo-Saxon compromise. For with the breakdown of the Polish defence—the last real barrier against the "red" revolution—not only is Central Europe laid open to Soviet influence, not only will those nations find relief in their desperate straits from a proletarian Russia, but, with Berlin and Paris paralyzed, the one with an impossible peace, the other with an impossible victory, and with Soviet prestige enormously enhanced, and its power and influence positive and ascendant, from the Baltic to the Black Sea, from Danube to Indies, Lenin comes knocking at the gates of London, the very heart of capital. If, under those circumstances capitalist conferences do not give place to sterner action, and negotiation take a definite character and an infinitely more material bearing on the visible circumstances of society, it can only be because the social forces inherent in social production and class appropriation are so ripely developed, that all class resistance to the flood of their inevitability is utterly hopeless.

At any rate, let us be diligent while we may, for beyond all evil, we are standing on the threshold of momentous events.

R.

Western Clarion

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

Published twice a month by the Socialist Party of Canada, 401 Pender Street East, Vancouver, B. C. Phone Highland 2583.

Editor Ewen MacLeod

Subscription:

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

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

VANCOUVER, B. C., SEPTEMBER 1st, 1920

EDITORIAL

THE POOR INVESTOR.

SOME folk with a taste for statistics and a point of view of their own to advance, are able to turn figures upside down and arrange them so to their liking, that we sometimes think there must be a charm in arithmetic which our school days failed utterly to bring home to us.

As for instance "The Buzzer,"—presumably the "Official Organ" of the B. C. Electric Ry. Co., Limited.

It regularly presents in each issue a formidable array of figures which would demonstrate to you, if you didn't know better, that the matter of owning a street railway and electric lighting system is a thankless and unprofitable task, undertaken first in order to meet the needs of the people, and then to pocket an always negligible profit, but this last only if such should happen to be left over after expenses are met and the system kept in good running order.

"The Buzzer" is printed in green ink, and that's appropriate anyway. We don't mean appropriate to its casual readers either, for in spite of the quite commendable advantages that accrue from an average school education, the apprentice on his way "home" from the slave pen, knows well enough that "The Buzzer" is intended to show him how well public utilities are managed these days, even if he considers himself deserving of all the credit that would belong to a squirrel for managing to squeeze his way in.

But we set out to admire the arithmetic under the caption "Missing—\$95.50." We are told that Mrs. Blank, of Liverpool, bought \$100 worth of ordinary B. C. E. Ry. stock in 1908. Mrs. Blank, of course, saved a little money "by her work." But for that \$100 worth of stock she paid \$145 because it was then at a premium. Since then she has received an average annual return of 3.6 per cent, on an investment of \$145. So there you are.

In the first place you are expected to learn that the street railway company's owners are all moulded after the fashion of Mrs. Blank (who saved her \$100 by her work), and you are supposed to feel sorry for them because they cannot realize more material substance than 3.6 per cent, upon the labor of those who run and operate their street railway for them.

Let's look at Mrs. Blank's case again. The paragraph says her stock was bought at a par value of \$100, and that she paid \$145 for it, as it was regarded as a gilt-edged security in those days (1908). Today, because public utility securities are not good investments or "for some reason," her stock is worth only \$49.50—and so we have the caption—"Missing—\$95.50."

You are supposed to infer that the B. C. E. R. Co. received \$145 for that stock, and that it has paid its return percentage upon that basis. Here are the columns:

1908	88.00	1914	48.00
1909	8.00	1915	Nil
1910	8.00	1916	Nil
1911	8.00	1917	Nil
1912	8.00	1918	Nil
1913	8.00	1919	3.00 dividend 3.00 bonus

"The Buzzer" says she consequently received an average annual return of 3.6 per cent, on an investment of \$145.00. This is quite true, but she did not pay that sum to the company; the stock was sold on the market and she paid \$145 to the private stockholder who paid no more than \$100 for it. So that all the B. C. E. Ry. has to account for is \$100, and with that amount at its disposal it paid, instead of 3.6,—5.1 per cent, per annum upon all of poor Mrs. Blank's money that came its way.

Not that we are concerned at all with the difference between these rates of interest. Financial concerns have always been anxious to hide away from public knowledge the actual figures of their returns, and this is only a local example of a carefully presented statement, which, however dexterous its figuring may be, yet shows that the workers of that company presented to somebody who did not work for it value to the amount of \$62. So that the actual sum missing is \$62.

And who "missed" it? The street railway workers.

THE WAGE SLAVE.

IN order that human needs may be satisfied we carry on what is usually referred to as wealth production. This is the process of producing food, clothing and shelter for the human family.

The methods employed in this wealth production have varied with the different periods and stages that society has passed through in its development. Not always had we the alarm clock to startle us from slumber, the steam whistle to prompt us, as to time, nor the gigantic machinery we use today in our labor.

But while the forms under which wealth has been produced have changed, there never has been any process whereby the needs of humankind could be satisfied without labor. From nature the material has been obtained wherewith to fashion and construct all things useful to man, that is, obtained by the hand of labor. Nature provides the needed material and labor moulds it to suit the requirements of mankind.

In past systems, men have been able to produce for their individual requirements by their own efforts. Today the process of wealth production is characterized by a sub-division of labor, so that the workers are dependent upon each other in mutual effort.

But all do not work. We have classes. An employing class and an employed class. The employing class own the machinery of wealth production. The employed or wage-working class own nothing but their labor-power, which they sell to the owners of the machinery of wealth production, and that labor-power or energy is spent in the process of wealth production. The worker sells this energy in order to obtain food, clothing and shelter, and he obtains of these but a bare share.

He works for wages. His constant desire and effort is to get as much as he can—to sell his energy at as high a figure as possible. His employer's interest is to pay him as little as possible. His employer's purpose in buying his labor-power is to realize a profit. The wage worker is not paid for his labor. He is paid for his labor-power, to maintain which a given amount is required of commodities in the shape of food, clothing and shelter. The wages he receives reflect the prices of these things, and to the product of his labor he has no title. The product of his labor belongs to his master, who owns the machinery necessary to the process of production.

The worker is a slave. He produces more than he receives. The surplus belongs to his master, whose existence is maintained through the exploitation of labor.

Today on every hand the workers manifest dissatisfaction and unrest. Their attention is becoming more and more keenly applied to their status as wage slaves in a system wherein they serve to maintain a slave state built upon the exploitation of their labor.

The problem that confronts the wage worker who is conscious of his position is the enlightenment of

the mass of wage workers who are not. That enlightenment will spell emancipation from wage slavery.

SOCIALISM.

WE are becoming used to the sight of the word Socialism in the public press these days. The next thing will be that the bewildered readers of the news items will themselves institute enquiries as to the meaning of the word that is always thrust at them as something so very terrible and with meaning so hurtful to them and their security of life that it will destroy their home life and cause to perish their every good impulse and notion of healthy life.

The world-wide movement that is embraced in the word Socialism may be understood by all who will learn, by all who are willing to undertake to examine the developing stages through which society passes in its struggle to grow and expand.

Socialists explain their present surroundings through the historical method; that is, they examine the past in order to understand the present and the conditions from which it grew.

Socialists maintain that the ideas prevalent in any stage of society are based upon and change with the methods used in that stage to obtain the necessities of life, which are usually summarized as, food, clothing and shelter.

The average man today knows that steam and electricity were not always used in the labor process of society in all its stages. He knows that a century or more ago crude tools were employed in production. Within his own time he has seen crude labor replaced by machine, and he has grown so accustomed to entering a factory, workshop, or mine that he has not considered or questioned the matter of the ownership of these "tools of production" which he must have access to in order to live.

The employing class are the owners of the machinery the wage workers operate. Property ownership is the keynote of the system. And the laws, the laws, moral precepts and the functions of the State generally, operate in such a way that will tend to render secure that private property.

The nature of the production process brings men together. They are learning, or they will learn that together they must operate, not only to produce wealth, but to enjoy it when it is produced. Society develops. It has developed today to what we call social production.

Socialism is the social ownership of the needs of life that are socially produced.

"INDUSTRIAL UNION NEWS" EDITOR RESIGNS.

THERE appeared in the "Industrial Union News" (Detroit), official organ of the W. I. U., a discussion upon the need and possibility of a revolutionary (i.e., Socialist) industrial union as a pre-requisite to the attainment of Socialism.

The discussion, which ran through three issues, May 15th, May 22nd and July 10th, 1920, was between the editor "I. U. News," Mervyn Smith, and E. S. Faulkner, who is a regular contributor to the columns of the CLARION.

The subject matter of the discussion is well known, and the discussion has happily been carried on without rancour and with an evident effort towards thorough mutual understanding.

However, although Mervyn Smith has now been deported from the United States, or has been expelled by the authorities of that country to leave it "voluntarily," he has, independent of that fact altogether, resigned as editor of the "I. U. News," declaring himself in disagreement with the W. I. U. position and conceptions. His letter of resignation is presented below. Our friends of the "Weekly People," allow it to go as a "remarkable case of change of views."

Mervyn Smith's open statement is worthy of a man whose mind is not closed to the light of reason. His future readers will experience the fruits of his

straightforward pronouncement, which follows upon an earnest reconsideration of his principles examined under mature and balanced judgment. His letter follows:

LETTER OF RESIGNATION

P. O. Box 651, Detroit, Mich. July 26, 1920.

To the Members of the G. E. B. Fellow Workers: I am herewith placing in your hands my resignation as Editor of the Industrial Union News.

My reason for this step is that in addition to my desire to return to Canada, I have gradually found myself in disagreement with the W. I. U. position and conceptions, and this disagreement has proceeded so far that I am no longer satisfied in holding the position of editor, in which position I am bound to defend certain principles and tactics—a task which, with my changed ideas, I am not able to perform.

I hold, briefly, that the political party play a more important role than would be admitted in W. I. U. circles; and the attitude and methods of the political party toward economic organizations, which I believe should be adopted, are not those with which the W. I. U. would be likely to agree.

Again, the W. I. U. practically works on the assumption that the Social Revolution is impossible unless as a preliminary step the industrial organization of the workers is effected, which reasoning results in the effort to build Socialist Industrial Unions under capitalism as a part of the process of building the new society within the shell of the old. This argument in some of its phases is open to the same objection made against parliamentary reformism which seeks to attain Socialism "a step at a time." I have had to discard the idea that it was possible to effect Socialist Industrial Unionism under capitalism. A fundamental change in my views has resulted, and I am much closer to the position I had previously in Canada.

While I realized some weeks ago that this tendency of my reasoning would make it necessary for me to resign, the decision of the authorities to deport me made it unnecessary. However, the carrying out of the decision may be delayed, or it may even be reversed, and since it has already been postponed I would wish my action considered independently and without regard to what the outcome may be. Even if decided favorably I would nevertheless give up the position for the reasons stated above.

I hope that unless I am compelled to leave the United States within a few days through the action of the authorities, I will be relieved by the G. E. B. of this position, which, of course, I desire to leave as soon as possible, and should not hold longer than is required to make a few necessary arrangements for a substitute etc.

Yours fraternally, (Signed) Mervyn Smith, Editor, Industrial Union News.

Russia and Us

MARX has stated that each succeeding change in the structure of society brings into being a corresponding change in men's ideas.

The changes which have taken place in Russia within these past three years, furnish us with possibly the best illustration of just how quickly ideas can change, and how divergent those ideas can be.

Labor organizations and parties, whose former "revolutionary" activities did not exceed the election of members to parliaments, schemes for nationalization of railroads or mines, better housing, etc., now glory in the name of Bolshevism, and point to Russia as the classic example of their schemes in operation. Many of these people (few of whom have the slightest knowledge of scientific Socialism) now tell us that the Russian proletariat by their actions have completely disproved the theories of Marx anent the conditions and forces necessary to the bringing about of a proletarian revolution.

"Here," they say, "was a country in which capitalism was only in its infancy, yet all overnight the working class are able to overthrow the existing ruling class, and install themselves as dictators."

In so far as the working slaves in Russia becoming dictators is concerned, our friends of much enthusiasm and scant acquaintance with political economy are correct. When they say, however, that the Marxian philosophy has been proven erroneous, they betray a woeful ignorance of Marx's works; either such, or a pitiful lack of reasoning faculty.

The capitalist class are no longer the dictators in Russia, but let our friends remember that capitalism still prevails under the Soviets, and will no doubt continue to do so for some time.

This condition of affairs is being changed just as

fast as the Soviet authorities can enlighten the illiterate peasantry, and suppress the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie. The proletarian revolution comes when capitalist production is most highly developed. Capitalism is not confined to Great Britain, United States, or any other country, as so many superficial thinkers, and labor zealots seem to have on their minds when trying to apply what smattering of Marxism they may have to the Russian situation.

Capitalism is a method of producing wealth, with of course the social organization, the ideas, etc., in conformity with such. Capitalism was at its highest stage of development, and it broke as a chain does, at its weakest link, i.e., Russia.

Other types of critics are those who are not given to hysteria, who look on things coolly and dispassionately, and who, having thoroughly digested the works of Marx, Engels, and all the recognized authorities on scientific socialism, can show Lenin and Trotsky, or any other of the executive heads of the Bolsheviki just where they made their initial mistakes, and how they continue to make an ever increasing number from day to day.

"There are the peasants," they say, "who will always present a barrier to communism. How is Lenin going to eradicate private property concepts from the minds of the Russian peasants, who make up about 80 per cent of the population?" Strange that men of the type of Lenin and Trotsky had not given thought to such questions before. From the pamphlets and articles of Lenin one would credit him with being a thoroughly well grounded Marxist, a keen thinker, in fact the last one in the world to make such stupendous mistakes as pointed out by this peculiar type of critic. It is again argued that a proletarian dictatorship does not exist in Russia, that some 500,000 or 600,000 Communists control the affairs of 120 millions of people. This condition, from the point of view of the few alleged Marxists who take that position, cannot last, as the vast majority are bound to become more and more reactionary, until finally the revolution is washed away in a sea of blood.

Well, as to the fact, pointed out by Lenin himself that some 500,000 or 600,000 Communists control the destinies of 120 million in Russia: It is doubtful if any dictatorship has ever before been vested in so many. A handful of Grand Dukes formerly dictated affairs in Russia; likewise a few merchant princes and financiers dictate the affairs of the United States, of Great Britain, France or any other capitalist dictatorship. So there is really no room for sound opposition or criticism in such a point as this. The worst feature about this type of criticism is that those who adopt this attitude allow themselves to change from casual critics to direct opponents of the Bolsheviki, and to smilingly speak of any setbacks that come to the Reds from the organized capitalist armies without or from counter-revolutionaries within, as the breakdown which they foretold.

Fortunately these people are few, and have little influence. Between these two classes of people, the enthusiasts who see the refutation of Marxism in the Russian revolution, and the others who (it would seem more through contrariness than logic) pour cold water on the efforts of the Bolsheviki, we find an active section of the working class who expend all their surplus energy in propagating the class struggle, taking advantage of every opportunity which presents itself to furthering the knowledge of Socialism, and thus hastening the day of working class emancipation.

Get on the job. FRANK CASSIDY.

"A brother of mine has just retired with a fortune of \$50,000. This fortune was acquired through years of honest toil, economy, conscientious effort to give full value for every dollar he was paid, indomitable perseverance, and the death of an uncle who left him \$49,999.75."

"Winnipeg El. Ry. Svce. News."

No Gas Shortage Here

"The Republican Party would not stand aloof from Europe, but would preserve American Freedom."

"Steps towards world compact and universal peace favored."

"Nation called on to work and save as only way to reduce cost of living."

"Stands for collective bargain, but gives every man right to work."

"Demands highest possible wages for workers, but asks full work for full pay."

Above gems from Harding's speech of acceptance.

There are more, but are not these enough? Workers invited to furnish their own comment.

F. S. F.

Here and Now

Following, One Dollar each — E. Simpson, W. Abernethy, H. M. Thomas, A. C. Wells, C. E. Scharff, G. Clark, J. T. Bryne, Sid Earp, W. Breeze, S. Rose, Com., Back, J. T. Stott, C. Aylward, J. Schulthus, J. W. Dargie, S. R. Keeling.

W. F. Rampe, \$1.30; A. Tree, \$5; N. Booth, \$1.97; W. Hoare, \$2; R. Sinclair, \$3; F. Ewald, 50c; Joe Naylor, \$3; N. H. Tallentire, \$10; Alex. Beaton, \$2; J. Watson (Winnipeg), \$8; J. F. Maguire, \$4; J. Martin (Winnipeg), \$10; Alex. Shepherd, \$5; Wm. Staples, \$6.

Above subscriptions received from 12th to 26th August, inclusive. Total, \$77.77.

Clarion Maintenance Fund

Nels Johnson, \$5; Dave Watt, \$5; N McArthur, \$2; Steve Waskan, \$1; J. Schulthus, \$1.

Contributions received from 12th to 26th August, inclusive. Total, \$14.

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-growing 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 irrespressible 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 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.

The Destiny of Man

By J. G. Peters, in "Forward" (Glasgow).

SCHOLARS have very little doubt about the final arrest of the human creature. In certain directions man himself has interfered with the work of Evolution. He could not wait until that marvelous instrument, the human eye, attained the vision of the eagle. His inquisitiveness, his thirst for knowledge, his love of mystery, attracted him to the sparkling orbs of the evening sky, the fair moon and her starry sisters. He invented optical instruments to improve the power of his natural vision. We have not the splendid sight of the bird of prey, nor is it necessary, since we have the powerful lens of the field glass. Ceaseless toil under wretched conditions has caused a deterioration in the eyesight of the race. One-third of the people surely walk about with spectacles perched upon their noses, and the remaining two-thirds really need them.

The power to smell is one of the lost arts of mankind; the lower animals have still retained it. In matters of speed, we are hopelessly outstripped. If our food depended upon our fleetness of foot, we should go hungry. Speed is unnecessary now that the rifle bullet can intercept the nimblest game. Early man was glad to gnaw the hard tough roots of the wilderness, until the primitive husbandman discovered that it was possible, under cultivation, to transform the original roots of the wilds into large and juicy vegetables. We have not the hard sticky roots of our progenitors to chew, nor have we the same sound teeth. Much of our food is factory made and digested for us. Modern civilization has brought about a degeneration in our teeth; they are such a nuisance at times that we are glad to employ the dentist to get rid of them for us.

All things seem to indicate that the human frame has reached perfection. Nature has at last produced a man to her liking. She seems to say: For millions and millions of years have I toiled and toiled, rejecting, mending, improving, oh so slowly and painstakingly, but I have achieved the right thing at last. Man is here, and with him I shall do wondrous things.

By the exercise of his ingenious hands, which long ago were only employed in the sharpening of a fallen branch to enable him to cope with his enemies, or facilitate the despatch of his game, man has achieved one wonder after another until today we find there is no ocean in the wide world his ships cannot cross. After years of experimentation, he has perfected a machine to carry him through the air. Another startling vessel bears him on a voyage through the depths of the sea. Trains hurl him at terrific speed all over the globe, and where once he had but a small corner of the forest for his dwelling-place he is now able to claim the whole world as his home. And yet, with all his inventive enterprise, man has so far failed to find the correct way to live.

It would appear that the ethical development of man has not kept pace with the perfection of his physical nature. This thought long baffled thinking men. Before the coming of Darwin, whose splendid discoveries, fortified by years of heroic and patient study, scattered the dry bones of science, educated men spied no solution to the problem of life. What of Life! Why are we here? To those inquiries there was no satisfactory answer. Life in their eyes was but a prison-house; its boundaries were unalterable; there was no escape. They did not know to what end the great god Nature was shaping; they did not understand Nature. They separated variations of species, gave them Latin names, stuffed specimens in glass cases, pinned insects on a card, and called that Nature. But the great Darwin came along with a well-founded theory of Creation, a new philosophy, a new vision for mankind, comforting to the soul, and opening the eyes of man to undreamed of possibilities. Years before the coming of the great English scholar, Galileo, the Italian seer, had made a startling discovery.

He declared that the world moves. There could be no doubt. He found that the world moves from west to east. Darwin also discovered that the world moves, but he declared that it moved from low to high; from lowly beginnings it struggled towards the great: the grandest truth ever won by science.

Life does not stand still; the work of Nature must go on; there shall be no pause. Having perfected the outside man, she must bestir herself and create a nobler being. Though it may require ages upon ages of time to develop that super-man. Nature shall pursue her work of higher progress. Though the ascendancy of man may be retarded by his own foolishness, his ignorant interference, Nature must finally triumph over the base. Though revolution after revolution shake society, and war follow war in endless succession, the glorious task of Nature must go on. Millions of individual lives may go down in the great struggle for progress, but Nature will finally win through. She cannot be thwarted in her task of seeking world perfection.

Animals which herded together for mutual protection have contrived to carry their species down the ages. Co-operation, and not competition, is the determining factor in the preservation of life. Man must therefore perfect his system of life before he is able to assist Nature in the working out of her great ideal. This is why we must have co-operation, a system offering each individual absolute freedom to develop the nobility of his nature to the full. Socialism is nothing but the bare corridor through which we enter the Higher Kingdom of which poets prate and prophets tell. Yesterday was the Age of Darkness. Today we have reached the Scientific Age; To-morrow shall dawn the Age of Freedom. Capitalism is tampering with the soul of man, and corrupting it. It is barring the road that leads to peace and happiness to every individual under the sun. If human nature is bad, wicked, and depraved, Capitalism has had a big share in the spoilation of the human heart.

Mankind would sweep it away if he knew how, but he has not yet learned the way to simplify the business of life. Systems built upon force breed but wars. We can no longer submit to the haphazard methods of Capitalism. The business of life must be conducted along scientific lines. I may be wrong in my outlook upon humanity as it is seen today, but in the ceaseless strikes, agitations of every order, demands for higher wages, and the like, I see the human soul struggling to extricate itself from the burdens imposed upon it by a false interpretation of life. It is the groping of a blind mob for light, and yet more light. It is the travail of a people trying to find an ideal. No rest shall these misled, misguided, people know until the system under which they live is utterly changed. Socialism must come, at whatever cost.

Systems of Wealth Production

Production has taken place under three distinct systems, namely chattel slave, serf and wage systems.

Lewis H. Morgan in his researches among the American Indians and later among the European nations discovered that mankind existed for a long period in the tribal form of society and that all races have developed, some earlier some later in their struggle for existence along the lines of the tools of production.

During this period man hunted his food and the tribe partook of it in common. Any captive taken at their tribal feuds was killed or adopted into the tribe. Later, as hunting grew scarce, the domesticating and breeding of animals occurred. Herding began, furnishing food with less effort for larger

groups. As herds increased grazing became scarce, rude agricultural implements came into existence.

With these two advances in food production a faint change comes over society. The captive is now set to work on the soil or herding cattle and made to produce, not only his own sustenance, but a surplus for his captor. From this beginning arose the chattel slave system. The earlier civilization arose on this method of production, but when the great wealth produced accumulated in the hands of a few, the masses of people becoming slaves, the system disintegrated and broke up with the downfall of Rome, being unable to provide for the necessities of a growing society.

A period of non-production and anarchy followed until the people were forced back to the soil when the land became again the means of production and the serf system arose under the feudal form of government. The worker was tied to soil. Rude handicrafts arose again and developed. Later began, a new trading class formed, which with the discovery of steam and various sciences converted them into a manufacturing class. Capitalism reigned.

With the development of big machinery the serf was freed from the land and his tools, becoming a machine worker, selling his labor power to the owner of the means of production at its value. The buyer using that labor power to produce more surplus which he appropriates, as under the former system, the worker getting a living wage. The means of production accumulating again in the hands of a few the many are starving. Society has once more outgrown its method of production. History has made another cycle. KATHERINE SMITH.

Literature Price List

- Communist Manifesto. Single copies, 10c; 25 copies, \$2.00.
- Wage-Labor and Capital. Single copies, 10c; 25 copies, \$2.00.
- The Present Economic System. (Prof. W. A. Bonger). Single copies, 10c; 25 copies, \$1.50.
- Capitalist Production. (First Nine and the Chapters, "Capital," Vol. I. Marx). Paper, single copies, 50c; cloth, single copies, \$1.00; cloth, 10 copies, 75c each.
- Socialism, Utopian and Scientific. Single copies, 15c; 25 copies, \$3.25.
- Slave of the Farm. Single copies, 10c; 25 copies, \$1.50.
- Manifesto, S. P. of C., single copy, 10 cents; 25 copies, \$1.50.
- Red Europe. (F. Anstey, M.P.). Single copies, 50c. Ten copies or more 30c each.
- The Story of the Evolution of Life. (T. F. Palmer). Single copies, 10c.
- Evolution of Man. (Prof. Bolsche). Single copies, 20c; 25 copies, \$3.75.
- The Nature and Uses of Sabotage (Prof. T. Vahlen). Single copies 5 cents, 25 copies \$1.
- The Criminal Court Judge, and The Odd Trick (E. B. Bax). Single copies, 5 cents; per 25 copies, 75c.
- Evolution of the Idea of God (Grant Allen), 8c per copy.
- Ancient Society (Louis H. Morgan), \$2 1/2
- Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State (F. Engels) 8c
- Value, Price and Profit (Marx)—Single copies, 15c; 25 copies, \$3.25.
- Feuerbach: The Roots of the Socialist Philosophy (Engels) 8c
- Introduction to Sociology (Arthur M. Lewis), \$1.75.
- W. A. Pritchard's Address to Jury, 25 cents per copy.

Make all moneys payable to E. MacLeod, 401 Pender Street East, Vancouver, B. C. Add discount on cheques.

(All above post free).

Culture Development

CULTURE is an attitude, to all things, acquired by association with material surroundings and social environment. Knowledge is the developing memory of the facts of life, acquired by experience of the individual and the race. "Man dies, but the race is eternal." So too the collective memory, knowledge or consciousness, expressed in culture or attitude which, in turn is conditioned by material and social environment.

The need of man is to live. To live he must acquire food. To get food he competes or co-operates with his fellows to use and develop his material surroundings: to shape, modify and adapt raw material into articles of general use. The active results of increased experience show in increased productivity. In the process are formed habits and customs which become principles, standards, codes, statutes social, legal and religious. Man's habits, his very thoughts and ideas are necessarily conditioned and originate from and by his environment, material and social. His prime need, to live and obtain food, clothing and shelter, takes up (and more especially in modern life) most of his time and energies, therefore, the production of wealth for himself and others, the economic factor as it is called, becomes the major or dominant factor in human, social progression.

The progress of man follows his inventions. His inventions are the result of his economic experience and the desire to increase productivity. Any change in the tools and machinery used in wealth production necessitated by the urge to live (or in these times the terror to live), so that the individual groups or classes may have the terror minimized, changes the organization, customs, habits, principles, and codes, moral, legal or religious.

The high cost of living seems a terrible thing for the worker. The high cost of "heaven" may be a terrible thing for the wealthy, as witness the churches driving for millions of dollars towards "forward movements," organized efforts to stem the flood of changing ideas and attitudes of the common people, prompted by changes in methods of wealth production.

This developing dominant factor, i.e., economic conditions, the changing economic process from individual handcraft work to collective, associative labor, from personally used tools to collectively operated machines, has not yet been accompanied

by the corresponding change in ownership. Hence the crucial contradiction round which the battle rages: the capitalist retaining ownership, the reformer seeking moral suasion and change of heart of the capitalist, the revolutionist seeking direct action to ensure social ownership of the socially operated machinery of wealth production.

The machinery of wealth production is so big and the process so involved that the capitalist cannot directly own or defend it, in fact, ownership and defence is maintained by politics, law, and the established moral code of capitalism, made possible by the control of the State, with its adjuncts, church and school, which serve to maintain it in conformity with its statutes. The State is the public power of coercion, utilized in the making and enforcing of laws, of school curriculum and church dictation. It levies and collects taxes for its maintenance as an institution, and it manifests its rule through police and militia.

Capitalism, in the past few years has apparently over-reached itself. It has taken huge aggregations of men through a murderous, bloody ordeal and while capitalist group antagonisms have perhaps managed to settle themselves through the subjugation of one over another, they have mutually exhausted themselves in the process, and class antagonism is now the issue in every land. Slowly it is dawning on the workers of every land that on the present basis of wealth production and distribution their interests and their masters' interests are distant as the opposite poles. The thunder of a passing epoch is sounding—Capitalism lingers, dying in pain, with its accompanying ferocity. Its rulers cannot, nor can we, will or wish the future any more than we could the past. Unlike the Utopian reformer, we cannot baptize the future before it is born.

Today, Russia has blazed the trail. It is for us, the workers of other lands, to throw the light of truth on the malicious propoganda used against Russia by the minions of capital: the press: the pulpit: the scurrilous platform.

It is the now changing order that concerns us. The plague of capitalism is in us and around us. Let us understand its cause and cure. By educating ourselves as to our own condition we will be able to understand the class position of our struggling comrades in Russia. Our help and sympathy will then demonstrate themselves. This is our working class "culture." D.S.

ply of foodstuffs, and no doubt it also helped to firmly establish slavery, as the captive could aid production: he could produce enough for himself and a surplus for his captor. So began civilization, successive orders of human slavery.

Chattel slave and serf alike were attached to the land. Both produced wealth for their masters. The difference between chattel slavery and serfdom was partly a matter of form. But there was a social need for things outside of agriculture. Handcraft production on a small scale developed through social need, and with the development of the art of production developed also the early stages of production for sale. So there grew up centuries of handcraft production. Hand tools grew to machinery through a social need for greater power than the simple animal strength of man could furnish directly. This industrial revolution sealed the doom of feudalism.

Under a machine system of production, it became less and less possible for the individual worker to own the tools he operated, through the concentration of the means of production. And today, the essential condition of capitalist production is the exploitation of non-owners, wage-workers, "free" producers. Capitalism is based upon commodity production. That is to say, what it produces it produces to sell. A commodity is principally something that is produced for sale. Whether they be bibles or guns makes no difference to the capitalist, so long as they sell.

In other stages of society man also bought and sold, but only surplus articles were exchanged. Towards their slaves in those societies the masters had

certain obligations. Whether he was engaged in work or not, sick or well, he had to be fed and clothed by his individual master. Today the wage slave considers himself a free man. He is not compelled to work for any individual master, but he must sell his labor-power to some master in order to gain a livelihood under the rule of capital. Today the capitalist has no direct property interest or possession in the wage-worker he may employ and exploit. He does not own him. He merely buys so much labor-power from him, in much the same manner as he buys electric power for his plant. When he no longer requires power—labor-power, or electric power,—he refrains from buying.

The development of machinery has displaced many workers, and unemployment usually accentuates the miseries of life for the workers under capitalism. When they are employed the workers produce more wealth than the workers of any previous stage of society. When they are unemployed they endure more misery. And continuously, the number of available wage-workers is in excess of the average needs of capital.

From the savage, hunting his prey to provide his wants, to the worker of today is a far cry. Yet while the worker of today is able to provide his wants, he lacks opportunity, unless that is granted to him by the owners of the machinery of wealth production, to which he must apply his energy if he is to live. When the savage brought down his prey the reward was his. But while the worker today produces enough for himself, he produces so much more that periodically his master must suspend employment in order to get rid of the accumulating surplus.

Production today is for sale. No longer is man at the mercy of the elements. Starvation is no longer due to his inability to provide for his wants. He has but one problem—the problem of ownership—how to own the product of his labor.

He will solve that problem just as soon as he sees it. Y. P. S. L.

THE PEACEFUL CAPITALIST.

I saw him once, I see him now, a grey-haired man with furrowed brow. He is a Capitalist, I vow, and wants no war, no trouble, no row. He is a man of peace, quite right! Even in war-time will not fight, believes sincerely Right is Might, and acts according to His Light. The "Light" he has is good horse-sense, it keeps him right without pretence, to stay at home and mind His pence. Fight? No! He is not quite so dense. War, if it must be, is for those whose trade it is—all history shows, and it is wrong. God knows, God knows he sympathizes with C.O.'s. War is for those whose blood is hot—as hot as sun in hot Mesopot. But tell me this or tell me not, what have the WORKERS got who fought? Why did the WORKERS fight and moil?—Was it for Anglo-Persian Oil? Or was it for their native soil? Or were they caught in Derby's toil? Or was it that their blood was mad to see the City of Baghdad? And plant in desert sands a Flag?—A Rag! Give it another thought my lad! Why Henry fought, and Willie and John marched with a suit of khaki on, was a puzzle to me. But now the Dawn has caused my darkness to flee—Read on. Nobody knows at the start of a war what all the noise and shouting is for. It is only when PEACE is signed, good Lor', that you realize what a war is for. The war was for Freedom and Oil and Coal. Pacific Islands and Belgium's Soul, the RIGHTS of the Serbs, the WRONGS of the Pole, also the trade that the Germans stole. But, as far as I see, the FREEDOM won was Freedom to pinch the coal from the Hun, the Oil from the Arabs, the place in the Sun, for all who have Power—FROM THOSE WHO HAVE NONE. And now that THEY have got the Fruits of the War the WORKERS won—the Brutes declare they do not want Disputes 'bout Wages, Hours, or Price of Boots. They don't want Quarrel, they don't want row, they don't believe in fighting now. "Get back to work, and work, you cow! or we'll give you the sack! Bow-wow! Bow-wow!" They never fought—they never will. They never wrought—they haven't the skill. But they've got the cheek of Kaiser Bill (whom Lloyd George hanged on the highest hill). —"Forward," Glasgow.

Production for Sale

SOCIALISM treats with the economic and social laws that exist according to the different stages of development of society. It shows that each stage of society must naturally develop from its predecessor.

Earlier types of Socialists, such as Robert Owen of the Utopian school, criticized the existing capitalist mode of production and its consequences, but could not explain it. For them things as they existed were bad and unjust. They did not understand the law of change.

In the early part of the 19th century, Hegel systematized the dialectic method of reasoning, but he had things standing on their head. With him, conditions followed upon the idea. Following Hegel, Marx outlined development and change, but with the idea of things based upon conditions. Nature is shown to produce change in form constantly, and Darwin has demonstrated that organic life, plants, animals and man himself are the products of a process of change—evolution.

Lewis H. Morgan divides the history of society into three epochs: Savagery; Barbarism and Civilization. He holds that each stage in the development of society is dependent upon conditions able to produce the necessities of life. Even when the improved stick and stone as weapons added game and fish to his diet of wild fruits, nuts, and roots, the predatory life of the savage was insecure from want. The domestication of animals and the cultivation of the soil held promise of a greater sup-

Stupidus and Sapiens

About Russia

By D. G. McKenzie.

Reprinted (by request) from the Clarion,
April 29th, 1911.

THE vista opened out by the patient research of the archaeologist the ethnologist and the biologist in the attempt to unravel the unwritten history of man is one in which the most exuberant fancy can revel endlessly. Gradually there has been unfolded to us picture after picture until we see, far in the past, beyond even the earliest tradition, man first emerging from the forest gloom of primeval days. Low of brow, long of arm, short legged, huge muscled, grim of aspect, the direct forbear of the human race, yet lacking all vestige of aught we are accustomed to associate with humanity. Dwelling as the beasts of the forest, wandering through the day in search of food, grubbing for roots, climbing for fruits or nuts, crouching at night in a cave or on the limbs of a tree; mating as the beast. A beast in all things, naked and unashamed. Where do we find in him any of that human nature we speak of so glibly? Where any conception of good or evil, of decency, of morality, or faith, hope and charity. Where is the soul which has been source of so much anxiety to his posterity? Where the habits and customs, where the laws, human and "divine"?

As says our Haji:

"What reck'd he, say, of Good or Ill,
Who in the hill hole made his lair;
The blood fed rav'n'g beast of prey,
Wildier than wildest wolf or bear?
"How long in man's pre-Adamite days
To feed and swill, to sleep and breed,
Were the Brute-biped's only life,
A perfect life sans Code or Creed

Yet, this is a man, blood of our blood, and bone of our bone. Our relationship to him is undeniable, and its closeness a mere matter of a few hundred thousand years. A long time? Not it! A mere turn of the glass compared to the ages between that ancestor of ours and his faraway forbear, the slimy, formless amoeba.

That man, urged onward by the same mute irresistible forces that have brought him to the threshold of manhood, passes over that threshold, and, generation by generation, approaches us of today, just as we are pressed onward to the tomorrow we know not. At the stern mandate of necessity he adapts himself to new conditions, devises new means of gaining his livelihood, creates tools and weapons, and ever improves upon them.

"Yet, as long ages rolled he learned
From beaver, ape and ant to build
Shelter for sire and dam and brood,
From blast and blaze that hurt and killed"

Age by age, we can trace the march of our fathers towards us, ever, as they come, profiting painfully and slowly by the accumulated experience of past generations; growing in knowledge, growing greater in brain and less brutish in body. Ever impelled by the stern necessity of obtaining a better hold upon the means of life. Improving their dwellings, their boats, their clothing, their tools and weapons. Discarding the rough stone weapon for the polished, that for the flint, thence to copper, to bronze, to iron.

Free, wandering, warring, hunting, lawless, propertyless, "ignorant" savages. Living thus for nigh three hundred thousand years before the first dawn of barbarism even. Then, finding a new source of food supply in the cultivation of the soil, swinging open the gates of Eden and passing out on the way that led to labor and to slavery, to progress and to civilization.

That ancient forbear of ours, the child of the man-ape, the scientists call "homo stupidus"—stupid man. Us they call "homo sapiens"—wise man. Oh, fond conceit! Wise man! We, who revere the antiquity of a civilization barely ten thousand years old, and that with lapses. Who invest with a halo of heaven-born sanctity a mushroom system of property of little better than a century's growth. Who bow before the altars of "eternal" deities discovered but yesterday. Who crystalize our miserable modern characteristics as "human nature"—as it was in the beginning and always shall be. Who elevate to the ludicrous dignity of divine law an upstart moral code co-eval with shop-keeping. Who conceitedly plume ourselves upon the possession of a higher ethical sense than our rude forbears, and daily and habitually stoop to practices which the most untutored savage would abhor. Who lie, and cheat, and thieve, and prey upon one another. Who rob, ravish and oppress the weak and cringe before the strong; who pander to lust and prostitute for a pittance; who traffic, traffic, traffic in all things—in manly "honor," in womanly "virtue," in childish defencelessness, in the flesh and blood of kith and kin, in the holiest of holies or in the abomination of abominations; and who crown our achievements by pouring over the festering heap of our iniquities the leprous, foetid slime of hypocrisy.

Wise man! Wonderful creature! Lord of creation! Hub of the universe! For whose uses all things, the quick and the dead, were especially created; the stars and the planets, the sun by day and the moon by night to light him; the earth, the seasons, the winds, the rain, the waters, the lightning, the metals, the mountains, the plains, the valleys, the forests, the fruits, the beasts, the fishes, the birds, the bees, the fleas and the flies and the corned beef and cabbage.

Labor Defence Fund

Send all money and make all cheques payable to
A. S. Wells, B. C. Federationist, Labor Temple, Van-
couver, B. C.

Collection agency for Alberta: A. Broatch, 1203
Eighth Avenue East, Calgary, Alta.

Central Collection Agency: J. Law, Secretary, De-
fence Fund, Room 1, 530 Main Street, Winnipeg,

SUBSCRIPTION FORM.

WESTERN CLARION.

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

Official Organ of the Socialist Party of Canada

Issued twice-a-month, at 401 Pender Street East,
Vancouver, B. C. Phone: High. 2583.

Rate: 20 Issues for One Dollar. Make all moneys
payable to E. MacLeod.

For enclosed herewith,

send issues to—

Name

Address

IN a note dated December 24th, 1918, one of the many offers of peace addressed by the Soviet Government to its enemies, Maxim Litvinov stated clearly the alternatives then open to the capitalist powers. One choice, he said, was "to come to an understanding with the Soviet Government, to withdraw foreign troops from Russian territory, to raise the economic blockade, to help Russia to regain her own sources of supply, and to give her technical advice how to exploit her natural riches in the most effective way, for the benefit of countries badly in need of foodstuffs and raw materials." The other alternative was "continued open or disguised intervention on the present or on a still larger scale, which means prolongation of war, further embitterment of the Russian masses, intensification of internal strife, unexampled bloodshed." The choice has always been open and still remains open. So long, indeed, as the imperialist leaders are permitted the power to make any choice, these alternatives remain open to them: peace with Soviet Russia for the benefit of all people, or war. During the nineteen months that have elapsed since Litvinov stated the case, the imperialists have held their power and have made always the same choice. Under one pretext or another, by dint of every imaginable intrigue and conspiracy, they have managed to keep up the war. It was no easy task. They have had to lie to their own peoples, they have had to lie to one another, they have, we do not doubt, even had to lie to themselves, in order that the war for slaughter and destruction should not lag. The peoples sickened of carnage, and the need for foodstuffs and raw materials grew month by month. From Soviet Russia came repeated offers of peace, over and over again, to every nation, to every ruler, to all peoples. But the choice remained for war. While there was still a man to be conscripted or a puppet state to be thrust into the fire of national ambitions, the leaders held to their course.

The truth is, of course, that they never seriously considered the alternative of peace; nor will these leaders ever voluntarily choose the way of peace while the power remains to them to make war. Soviet Russia again offers them the alternative. But if there are still men who can be summoned or driven to fight against the Workers' Republic, and if there are still other men who will make munitions and transport them to the battle, we know that the choice of capitalist rulers will be as before. The war will go on. But if at last the decision is for peace, we shall know what that means. We shall see these same leaders hiding their impotence and chagrin under a false masquerade of statesmanship and diplomacy. But we shall know that they have made peace only because they no longer had the power to make war.—"Soviet Russia"

Mr. Lloyd George's policy, deals with Europe as a condition rather than as a theory. He does not like the Bolsheviks and says so; yet he admits that the Poles made an unjustified attack upon the Russians, and he does not attempt to duck the too obvious parallel between Soviet terms to Poland and Entente terms to Germany. He says in effect that England will not interfere unless the Russians attempt to enforce severer terms upon the Poles than the Entente did upon the Germans. And when he rose to speak in the House of Commons, he was probably already aware that the Soviet terms to Poland—rapid demobilization of the Polish army to 60,000 men, cessation of foreign military support, surrender of surplus munitions and arms, a commercial outlet to the Baltic, and distribution of Polish land to Polish soldiers—were very much more generous and humane terms than those which the Entente imposed upon Germany. For the benefit of his Tory majority in the House of Commons, of course, he had to do a certain amount of ranting against the Bolsheviks. We cannot praise Mr. Lloyd George's principles, for if he has any he has concealed or violated them as often as he has upheld them, but we are glad that there is one Entente statesman with sufficient political adaptability to face the fact that the Bolsheviks are the Russian government today, and must be dealt with.—"The Nation" (New York).