WESTERN CLARION

A Journal of CURRENT EVENTS

Official Organ of
THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

HISTORY ECONOMICS PHILOSOPHY

No. 875. EIGHTEENTH YEAR Twice a Month VANCOUVER, B. C., SEPTEMBER 16, 1922. FIVE CENTS

The Genius

THERE is an idea, more evenly distributed than wealth, that there must arise a great man to arouse society into intelligent—or at least comprehensive—action: that society droops, like a lily in the sun, for lack of a Moses (or shall we say a Genghis?) to transform its petrified apathy into fruitful action; that indeed our case is hopeless, until the days of the conqueror shall be fulfilled. It is an idea quite plausible, but who shall deem it probable? It is not new, and it is eminently satisfying to our vanity—which it flatters, in its implication of values.—and to our steadfast veneration for deep-rooted custom and conservatism.

History gives little sanction to such hope. Yet it is no argument that what has not been, may not be. Far from it. and none may guage the tumultuous detail of the future. There is an ever gathering complex of social circumstance which, in interaction with all that is, contrives a steadily growing intricacy of social relation. The progress of technique, and with it the capacity for logical reason, presents a continually changing facade of experience, on which are sculptured out and intermingled with the relics of former experience the new forces of the dominating present. The process of thought is a process of growth, and like all growth it is multiple and multiform, bringing to being as determining circumstance shall decree, the blossoming ideation of progress. And it may be, in this limitless wealth of action and reaction, that as social climax approaches and "outworn creeds decay," the mental process may leap forward suddenly to new and higher vantages. A species of mental mutation (after the fashion of De Vries).

The advent of mind is a new factor in the cycle of development. It is a constantly increasing power in the motive of advancement. It lives in experience and grows from experience and stores up in the mighty granary of the subconscious, like credit in deposit, the living substance of experience. And in the days to come, subtly will it unfold the harvest of the centuries, and shower amidst the realities of a new society the wonders of its boundless potentialities. For social evolution differs from natural evolution in this, that whereas the latter is the entire subordination of the creature to circumstance, the former is the moulding of plastic condition, through the medium of the understanding mind to the benefit and satisfaction of the creature. Bourgeois commercialism—for its greater gain—turned the eyes of society on materialist science, i.e., on natural evolution. Thereby it saw the dependency of the organism on environment. In the specific urge of increasing competition, it was forced to take the initiative, to achieve success. Thereby it saw the lordship of mind over mass. It saw the interaction of organism and environment—for therein lay the way of profit. But it did not see the logical interaction of mind and matter, for in business enterprise it found the open door to success. And, success being the keynote of its culture, it looked no further. And it very quickly found in the turbulence of its young career that enlightenment (in all but the technical) was a menace to its privilege. Consequently it has sedulously cultivated the philosophy of success, turned human conservatism to its own ends, and harnessed social intent to its insatiate imperialism. In effect, it has turned society into a festering carcase, proving with an awful circumstance of evidence the fundamental interassociation of man and mass. That is the reason there is such an aversion to materialist philosophy; being understood only in its physical sense, it appears to deny the influential control of mind. Conversely, the philosophy of the ideal (falsely so-called) appeals to the ethic of today, because, since it judges by the appearance of the impress, it satisfies the egotist individualism of commercial society. They are in both cases the results of (1) a long standing misconception of the nature of reality, and (2) the incidental subordination of progress to the narrow orbit of temporary authority.

But all history shows—and all evolution too for that matter—that though variation is boundless, its direction is limited by and to all the laws and needs of native being. An animal, a plant, a seed, may produce a multitude of variations, but they prosper and flourish only as they accord with the laws of life, as they move in sympathy with the chords of inner being. And the constitution of inner being, determines the nature of the variation and sends it forth, not only complexed with immemorial heredity, but motived and moving in the particular channels of its own evolutionary limitations If they run counter to that fundamental necessity they disappear. Vitally (*) different, they cannot come into existence. So too will society, though it is not an organism but a relation of association. It acts and is acted upon by time environment. It is modified by time necessity. But it varies always in accordance, always in correllation with its particular constitution, always as a necessity of time-conditioned form. It is as tropic to its organisation as a flower to the sun. To move or progress prior to the influence or pressure of its time condition, it cannot. And although the mind is active, mobile, potent, directive in its centralisation of causality, it is nevertheless a product of growth, and social growth, and flourishes by and in the progression of contemporary environment. Influential as the mind may be upon its time condition, it is yet motived by condition, and derivable in its thought content from condition.

The effect of time condition on individuals is as varied as the number effected. There is no duality, either in physical or mental temperament. The psychology of the individual is marked and peculiar to itself. To the same circumstances at the same time, each reacts differently. Even although the common interest of the moment creates a common understanding. In the particularisation of individual concepts the cleavage of idea and reaction is sharp and clear. The idea is born of condition; the reaction is as the time. Obviously. And as the time concepts of today are the class concepts of capitalist property, it is natural that the social ethic should be the ethic of class, of private interest. Furthermore, it is natural as capitalist development that particular groups should gravitate round particular interests. And because of the mechanics of capitalist development—the concentration of wealth on one side, and of poverty on the other—it is clearly certain that the social majority must reach the frontiers of social principle. For principle is but the sublination of interest. But to reach the clear green hills of principle we must slough, as the snake sloughs its skin, the heavy burden of property interest. We must leave the gods and the idols of today in the wilderness which gave them birth. For on the plane of the civilized commune class rights change into social equity, and individual interest mingles in, and is conserved by, the harmony of social concordance. And we will do this for exactly the same reasons as the lowly snake does—not because we wish to, by volition—but because we wish to under the virile compulsion of pressing necessity.

Individuals acquire their concepts of principle in precisely the same manner as they come by their concepts of interest. By reaction to the accrued wealth of social experience. But whereas the concepts of interest are confined and narrowed down to the transient conditions and immediate wants of man or class, the concepts of principle embrace the total contingent satisfaction of man in society. The former concentrate on the momentary need of self; the latter on enduring society. Interest always unites on the needs of the day; principle divides on the essentials of tomorrow. That is why interest is always arranged to do battle for the "right,"—the right of class ethic,—and why principle is the patient handmaid of progress.

The process of evolution tends to uniformity of conditions. Daily conditions and race preservation demand compliance with the adaptations of selection; and it is round this slowly shifting centre of attraction that the numberless variety of form and force circulate. There are numerous individuals outstanding, above or below this mean level, but the average mass conforms to the necessitarian adaptations of its day and generation. As in nature, so in society. The individual complies with the general usages of the society into which he is born, and which creates both himself and his cherished customs. From society he derives his gifts of imagination and his hallowed idols of illusion; in society he is lord or slave; by society he is lifted up or cast down. He stands always on association; never in individualism, and he finds his personal sustenance, his happiness, his welfare, in the same proportion as they are guaranteed to him and, in his time, society. Above and below, there are outstanding examples which complicate but do not dominate development; which triumph or suffer (as units), as the cycle of progress favors or uproots. But below the mean average, the social group cannot fall and continue to exist, because it is a reaction to conditions which have passed away; while above the uniformity it may not rise, for then it contains the implication of conditions which have not yet matured.

It is the maturing of these conditions which determines the movement of progress. Their ripening depends on the conditional organisation of society, and the reaction of the social forces at maturity is beguiled by the same conditioning. Development may be swift; it may be laggard. It may be helped or hindered. But it cannot be hastened by our will, or governed to our liking. And from the birth of a star to the birth of a soul, the sorrow of travail is determined by the vitally dominant circumstance of constituted being. Thus the constitution of society, being in terms of interest, in terms of interest it progresses. In the moulding and remolding of pro-

(Continued on page 8)

(*) "Vital," considered in its physical sense, not in a relative one.

The Origin of the World

By R. McMillan.

THE CARBONIFEROUS.

CHAPTER XVI.

How rapidly I have run over the origin of the world, and what a lot of questions you would like to ask, if you got the chance! I'll tell you what to do. Whenever you come to a puzzle—and you will come to many—Make a note of it; and when you have finished the story, write and ask me all the questions you have noted down. That will be fair, won't it? I shall have had my say; then you can have yours!

I hope you understand that I don't pretend to know all about the origin of the world, or "all about" anything. I trust you won't take all my figures as perfectly exact. I don't pretend to teach you exact things, or to fill you up with facts. I want simply to give you an idea of the scientific explanations of the origin of the world, and leave you to think out for yourself. If you simply read this as you would a novel, and then throw it aside, you won't get much good out of it, and I don't think you will be much interested either. But I am hoping that you and your grandfather are both sufficiently interested in my story to have followed me so far.

Now I want to stop for a little while, and go back—to repeat things, as it were, so as to make them plainer. So be sure that you fully understand what I have said.

The first mist I began with was the primal start of the world. The force and energy inherent in matter were what started the whirling motion, and gave rise to all the movements of the sun and the planets. We saw that the moon cooled off from the gaseous state, and grew cold and dead, and we combined and formed water and solids, and there grew a crust over the central gaseous mass. That crust was frequently broken by the intenser heat of the central gas, and the poor earth had a very troublous time in getting fairly set. The water tore the solid earth to pieces over and over again, and re-deposited the material in the water. The volcanic forces tended to raise hills and mountains; the rains and the rivers, and the savage tides, tended to reduce them all to a dead level; and this world was the battle ground of the enormous forces of nature. The air was dense, and full of a steamy vapour, and long ages passed in that state, while the gases were entering into new combinations with each other, and the waters cooled. I expect that the first living things developed in the sea were simple sea-weeds and protoplasmic jellies. That only happened when and where the water cooled sufficiently to allow of such combinations, because no life can occur in boiling water, and at first all the water was boiling. But time was on the side of change, and the water cooled, and life began, and long ages of rock tearing and wearing took place, and equally long ages of re-formations, of sinking and upheavals, of strife and stress, ensued, and we had several different ages of rocks deposited, not on top of each other certainly, but in a definite order for all that. We call that deposit the "earliest" in which the simplest forms of life appeared. And when you come to read the Stone Books for yourself, as I hope you will, you soon find that there has been a gradual development of life from then—from the dawn of life in the sea—up to the present day. It is so wonderful, so true, so simple.

Now I want you to image that we have seen the origin of the world up to that time which the geologists call the Carboniferous Age. I want to pause at that, because I think it is the most wonderful and the most important, and the most clearly marked of all the geological epochs.

Before we go any further, let me make this clear. There are no geological epochs at all in nature. The process of world-building has gone on from the first fire mist till now, without a pause, without a break, without an intermission of any kind. When I speak about the "Carboniferous Age" I only mean the time when the coal was laid down, and the air began to clear, and life on the land for air-breathing animals became possible. But always remember what the Latin poet said: Natura non fecit saltum—Nature never jumps. That was one of the first things I learned in geology.

Now I feel that, with all this explanation, I may do what I have wanted to do, and that is to give you a long quotation from Edward Clodd about coal and the Carboniferous Age. It seems to me that he tells us far more briefly than I could do what is meant by the Carboniferous Age. He is a much more learned man than I am, and that must be my excuse for the quotation:—

"Coal is formed of compressed and chemically-altered plants, and occurs in all water-laid rocks, although in very different states and kinds. Sachs remarks that every experiment on nutrition with green-leaved plants confirms the theory that their carbon is derived solely from the atmosphere, and we get some idea how enormously large that derivation has been on 'reflecting that the deposits of coal, lignite, and turf spread over the whole earth, and the bituminous substances, as great or even greater in quantity, which permeate mountain formations, besides asphalt, petroleum, etc., are products of the decomposition of earlier vegetations, which, in the course of millions of years, have taken from the atmosphere the carbon contained in these substances, and transformed it into organic substance.'

"The climate and soil, during long eras of the Carboniferous system, specially favored the growth of plants most fitted for coal formation. A large part of Europe (and the like conditions apply wherever the true coal measures abound) was then covered with shallow waters, both salt and fresh, divided by low ridges, the bases of future mountain chains, and dotted with islands; while numerous rivers traversed the land, and silted up lagoons and lakes with the derbis worn from older rocks. Vegetation flourished apace on these river banks and marshy flats, and, with intermittent subsidence of the soil occurring again and again, was buried under sand and mud, becoming changed into coal of varying seams of thickness. Hence the abundance of this mineral in the Carboniferous strata, which, as a whole, yield more of value and variety for the service of man than all the other systems put together. Sandstones for building, marbles for decoration, metals for machines, coals wherewith to drive them, purest oil from muddy shale, jet for the lapidary's art, loveliest colours, exquisite perfumes, and curative drugs from gas-tar, even sugar therefrom, three hundred times sweeter than that from the cane—these are the rich gifts of the deep rocks, which, struck by a more magic rod than Moses wielded, have given up their treasures for man's need and delight.

"Of the plants forming the coal measures, the larger number are obliterated; but they all belong to the lower orders, as do the club-mosses, tree-ferns, and other forms which, in the warm moist atmosphere of those times, reached a gigantic size, and had a world-wide range far into north polar regions, where coal seams have been found. Of the animal life that dwelt among them we know very little, nor do the extant fragments represent a tithe of the forms then flourishing. In the later deposits the lower sub-kingdoms are represented by spiders and large scorpions; by land-snails, beetles, cockroaches (of which above eighty species occur), walking-stick insects a foot long, huge May-flies, and other insects; the honey-seeking, pollen-carrying species being still absent from the sombre forests. The first-known land vertebrates appear in the salamander-like and long-extinct amphibians called labyrinthodonts, from the labyrinthine structure of their teeth. The marine remains are still dominant. The lower types persist; the trilobites are on the verge of extinction, but higher forms of the same group, allied more nearly to the lobster and the shrimp, succeed. The first-known oysters appear, and, to the joy of the epicure, have survived all changes until now, spreading themselves over the whole northern hemisphere. Forerunners of the beautiful ammonites are found; and the fish, while still of the armoured species, have a more reptilian character than their Devonian ancestors."

Next Lesson: The Beasts of the Carboniferous.

The Clarion Mail Bag

BY SID EARP

CORRESPONDENCE received since last issue is quite satisfactory and would justify a renewal of activity on the part of any comrade who wearies of the struggle for working class advancement.

A fine revolutionary spirit of enquiry is displayed in a number of letters and whatever is done in the way of encouragement is well worth while. Short letters containing subs to the "Clarion" come from Sydney Mines N. S. Amherst, N. S. and Ottawa.

Also a splendid letter from Com. Goudie, St. John, N. B. containing eleven dollars for the "Clarion" from the Reds of that city. This is a desirable form of revolutionary action, more power to you St. John.

There is little news from Winnipeg this time, but Brandon is better represented by enquiries, subs, and renewals. A new reader from Winnipegosis asks for an understanding of the "antagonism of the international powers in the oil fields." So that he may read the daily press better. He thinks the "Clarion" could do this well.

A comrade in Fiske, Saskatchewan, sends a renewal of his sub, also an order for "Communism and Christianism," and "Pritchard's Address to the Jury." A renewal of "Clarion" sub comes from Moose Jaw.

A hearty letter arrived from Com. Chambers who is in Tofield Alberta at present. He encloses a sub and expresses satisfaction with the "Clarion" which he states, enables him to read between the lines of the capitalist papers. He hopes the masses will soon reach the stage of intelligence to throw off their yoke. Our sentiments exactly; but we see considerable digging ahead. F. Cusack writes from a place on the Alta-B. C. boundary. He is on irrigation work and "lives" in a travelling van with sixteen others, "like circus animals," no lamps or light. Fall out at 6 a.m. and fall in at 8 p.m. to sleep, perchance to dream. He says it is a Mormon outfit and doubts his ability to write an article under present circumstances. We seem to hear Cusack talking as we read his letter, and the faint echo of his laugh.

Lamont writes a forceful and descriptive letter from a logging camp in B. C. He is working in his own way upon the slavish mentality and general ignorance in that particular district. Sends best wishes and two dollars for varied pamphlets.

British Columbia is well represented in the "Mail Bag" this time.

Com. Moore sends for the "Clarion" He is in Lund at present and quite prepared to receive the "mental dynamite." Com. Andrews sends notice of change of address to Vernon, also encloses a dollar for "Clarion" renewal.

Enquiries come from Powell River and Penticton respecting the "Clarion." Subs arrived from Prince Rupert also from Chancellor Channel, B. C. Com. Corlan writes from Namu, too briefly, "Enclosed find 2 bucks, keep my "Clarion" coming." We'll do it!

Com. Goodspeed writes from Port Hardy for advice regarding immigration to Russia, also for books on the Russian language, also sends a sub to the "Clarion." The best thing to do is to communicate with the agent of the Kubas enterprise—E. Levitt, Box 301 Seattle, Wash.

(Continued on page 3)

Economics for Workers

BY PETER T. LECKIE.

PROFITS AND SURPLUS VALUE

ALL through our economic discussions we have seen that the production of a surplus value, the creation of a profit, is the direct object of capitalist production, in fact it is the all-compelling motive and immediate purpose.

This profit cannot convert the capital invested into a greater value unless the capitalist exchanges his variable capital for living labor and exploits this labor. But as he cannot exploit this labor unless he advances the constant capital along with his variable capital, although it is only the variable capital that creates the surplus, he slumps them together and the actual rate of gain although produced by the variable is proportioned to the total capital which gives him the rate of profit but does not give the rate of surplus value or exploitation.

The gain measured by the total capital is the rate of profit. But the gain measured by the variable capital is the rate of surplus value.

Profits are a disguise of surplus value and are defined as the legitimate earnings of capital, and the "unpardonable sin" of Karl Marx is that he discovered and laid bare the process of the exploitation of the worker. Marx has pointed out that the exploitation of the worker takes place at the point of production.

In former slaveries this exploitation was quite noticeable, but because the surplus value is not realized until commodities enter the process of circulation, it is assumed that the surplus arises by buying cheap and selling dear; "but as every buyer is also a seller what he gains as a seller he loses as a buyer." The laborer produces a surplus value because the difference between the price of labor-power and the result of the labor performed are not quivalent values. The required amount of labor to produce the laborer's keep (value of labor power) is below the amount of labor performed. This surplus labor equals surplus value; in other words it is unpaid labor. Whether this surplus value is pocketed by the industrial capitalists or has to be divided up with the money lender and landlord in interest and rent is no concern of the worker. The surplus is produced before the division takes place. The laborers being unable to buy back that which they have produced, we have a state called over-production, not because of the laborers' limited consuming capacity, but because of their limited purchasing power.

Marx points out how some economists deny the fact of over-production of commodities and speak of the over-production of capital instead. Marx points out that capital consists of commodities, and an over-production of capital implies an over-production of commodities. A commodity is produced for the world's market, not for the locality wherein it is produced.

The investor is not primarily interested in the profit made on each individual commodity but the profit on his total investment of 5, 10, or 20 thousand dollars, as the case may be.

Freight, advertisement, etc., are figured into the average cost, not merely on the commodity that abroad than at home, where produced; that is part output. Very often a commodity sells cheaper abroad than at home, where produced, that is part of the process, but remember commodities are produced for a world's market.

Marx points out in Vol. III., p. 572-573 an instance of selling cheap abroad with the expectation of buying tea in exchange and selling it at a profit on the home market, to make the loss good.

The "Literary Digest," November, 1920 reviewed a book, "The Case for Capitalism," where the writer says: "The capitalist—the man who owns the plant and takes the risk of enterprise—does not rob the worker of surplus value created by the latter, because the surplus value is due to the existence of the plant, and is shared by the laborer through the far better standard of life that the equipment of industry has enabled him to secure. Without the plant the laborer could only supply himself with a bare subsistence, if that . . It is true the most of the plant has been made and put there by labor, but this was only possible because the wage earners were paid to do so under the direction of capitalists, who, instead of spending their money on immediate enjoyment invested part of it in industry, creating surplus value for the whole civilized world."

This is a "strong" case for capitalism, admitting labor produced the capital and also created the surplus value.

In connection with surplus value a question arises about the "Great Contradiction." This question is briefly stated in J. B. Cross's "Essentials of Socialism" to the effect "that if, as Marx exclaims, labor is the creator of surplus value, and if it is through the appropriation that the capitalist becomes wealthy, why is it that they are so anxious to replace labor by the means of machinery? Or to state it somewhat differently, how does Marx explain why a capitalist, hiring much labor and using very little machinery, secures no more than the average rate of profit obtained by an employer who uses much machinery with very little labor?"

We saw in the introduction of the power-loom the effect of machinery and how it has reduced the necessary time to produce the laborer's sustenance, lowering the value of labor-time, which resulted in less hours to produce labor-power value, making a greater surplus value through greater surplus hours worked. The answer to the average rate of profit question is discussed from many angles by Marx.

In "Capital" (vol. iii., p. 367) Marx says: "If the yearly general rate of profit is 15 per cent. and the merchant advances £100 sterling, which he turns over once a year, then he will sell his commodities at 115. If his capital is turned over five times per year, then he will sell a commodity-capital of 100 purchase price five times per year at 103, which will amount in one year to a commodity-capital of 500 sold 515. This constitutes the same annual profit of 15 per cent. on his advanced capital of 100 as before. If this were not so, then the merchants' capital would yield a much higher profit in proportion to the number of its turnovers than the industrial capital, and this would be a contradiction to the law of the average rate of profit."

If the industrial capital is turned over four times a year instead of two it obtains twice as much surplus value and profit so long as the capital has the monopoly of the improved mode of production to which it owes the accelerated turnover; small profits and quick turnovers is the principle followed today very closely, but the munitions industry illustrated how the abnormal profits soon fell to the average rate of profit.

Marx points out that the law of tunrovers of merchants' capital holds good in each line of commerce only for the average turnovers made by the entire merchants capital invested in each particular line. "The capital of A, who deals in the same line as B, may make more or less than the average number of turnovers. This does not alter the turnover of the total mass of merchants capital invested in this line. But this is of decisive moment for the individual merchant or shopkeeper. He makes in this case an extra profit, just as the industrial capitalists make extra profits, if they produce under conditions more favorable than the average. If competition compels him, he can sell cheaper than his competitors without lowering his profit below the average. If the conditions, which would enable him to turn his capital over more rapidly, are themselves for sale, such as a favorable location of the shop, he can pay extra rent for it, that is to say, a portion of his surplus profit is converted into ground rent." We will notice this under the discussion of rent.

Marx says, vol. iii., p. 431: "If the prices of commodities in a certain sphere are below or above the price of production . . . . . a balance is effected by an expansion or restriction of production."

We saw this effect in gold mining and munitions when dealing with prices,—how regulation of supply and demand operated. In the profit question the same law applies. Marx says: "It is by such a compensation of the average market prices of commodities to prices of production that the deviations of specific rates of profit from the general or average rate of profit are corrected." The rate of profit is always smaller than the rate of surplus value because the variable capital is always smaller than the total capital, which is the sum of variable plus constant capital.

This is the key to the secret of surplus value. This is where the mystified surplus value as profit is dissected by Marx, and exploitation laid bare, which I will endeavor to show in continuing Profit and Surplus Value.

:o:

CLARION MAIL BAG.

(Continued from page 3)

Enquiries and subs arrived from Nelson, Nanaimo, North Vancouver and Victoria. A letter from Com. Braes, Cumberland, was received, in which he refers to the recent mine explosion. Two of his personal friends were killed outright and another terribly injured. Mining slaves take terrible chances to get the price to live. He encloses five dollars for the "Clarion" two of which are from Com. Russell, who in addition writes from Comox sending a renewal of sub and a dollar to Maintenance Fund.

Cheering letters from Los Angeles and San Fransisco were received containing orders for literature and subs.

Com. Thompson who is in Hercules, Cal., sends best regards to "the dialecticians" and enquiries for mail.

Thos. Davies writes from Bay City, Mich. enclosing two dollars as renewal of subs to "Clarion."

Things in Vancouver are steadily improving. The weather is beautiful and outdoor propaganda meetings are drawing big crowds. Headquarters are quiet these days, but an exceptionally good programme of classes and informal talks will be going on soon when the boys come home. The future looks good to us.

CLARION MAINTENANCE FUND.

C. Lee $1; Joe Wedin $1.70; Hugh Russell $1; J. Douglas 25 cents; Anonymous $1; St. John, N. B, Comrades, per M. Goudie $10.25.

Above, C. M. F. contributions received from 30th Aug. to 14th Sept., inclusive, total $15.20.

Socialist Party of Canada

PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

STAR THEATRE, 300 Block, Main Street

SUNDAY SEPTEMBER 17.
Speaker: J. HARRINGTON

SUNDAY SEPTEMBER 24th
Speaker: T. O'CONNOR

MEETINGS EVERY SUNDAY.
All meetings at 8 p.m.

Questions. Discussion.

Western Clarion

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

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

Editor.....Ewen MacLeod

SUBSCRIPTION:

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

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

VANCOUVER, B. C., SEPTEMBER 16, 1922.

HONORABLE MEN!

AT the recent annual conference of the Canadian Bar Association held recently in Vancouver, the utterances of the specialists in law aroused considerable interest. The general theme of the speeches was, of course, justice. Gather together a coterie of lawyers anywhere and they are sure to feature justice and their general anxiety about it. Jurisprudence, they tell us, gives everybody a fair deal in the courts and guarantees impartial judgment, rendered by the very best minds the legal profession produces, who are, they say, appointed to the bench by reason of their proven worth and fitness, absolutely as impartial judges.

Lord Shaw has insisted upon this being recognized. The "binding force of justice" is his favorite theme, "and it (justice) is a living institution." Lord Shaw is a member of the judical committee of the Privy Council. The most serious case that has come before that body in the present year has been the appeal case in the Grand Trunk award, a case which very well typifies the niceties of the law and its function in present day society, which is to define justice in disputes concerning property rights, in uniformity with general State administration. In this business the Privy Council spends most of its time and if, occasionally (as in the case of the Russell appeal from the decision of the Manitoba Courts) there appears a case which is not directly involved in determining the nature of or in identifying ownership in any specific property right, such a case can be traced ultmately to the root foundations of society itself today, to property rights in the essentials of social life.

However, we are not very much impressed with Lord Shaw's figure in the face of facts as we find them. He appears to be a highly specialized oldtimer in the law, his head stuffed full of its fictions and his viewpoint out of focus with the trend of modern thought. His speeches at the Conference, in so far as they had a bearing on the "rights" of labor as being equal in the eyes of the law with the employer, with whom it is "free to enter into contract," have been long since well summarized by Andrew Carnegie:

"Now the poorest laborer in America or in England, or indeed throughout the civilized world, who can handle a pick or shovel, stands upon equal terms with the purchaser of his labor. He sells or withholds, as it may seem best to him. He negotiates, and thus rises to the dignity of an independent contractor. Not only has the laborer conquered his political and personal freedom, he has achieved industral freedom as well."—(Gospel of Wealth.—Carnegie).

The "selling and withholding" takes place in West Virginia, Pennsylvania, Kentucky, Montana, Albany, Manitoba, Vancouver Island, Nova Scotia, The Rand, British engineering trades and coal areas,—and we recall also memories of the Homestead riots where Mr. Carnegie very well upheld his end in the "bargaining" process.

This calls to mind the remarks of Sir Francois Lemieux, Chief Justice of the Superior Court of Quebec, made at the Conference:

"Many times the courts have been blamed for their supposed hostile attitude towards labor. This accusation is unfounded and sometimes utterly baseless. They lie in the assumption that the courts are responsible for the social and economic grievances of labor."—"Province," Vancouver, 19th August, 1921.

"Sometimes utterly baseless," says Sir Francois, which, of course, means "sometimes" not. A statement like that, applied particularly in the U. S. A. at the present time, is to be regarded as nothing other than a joke—a popular legal fiction. If the law as constituted stands in the way of regulating labor in the interests of capital, then the case is made to fit such suitable section of the law as may apply. Canada imitates the course in a small way, but effectively.

As to the impartial judicial mind and the manner of its appointment to the bench, Chief Justice Hunter, of the Supreme Court of B. C. is quite candid. At the Bar Association convention he said that "such appointments were made on a basis of 75 per cent. politics, 10 per cent, religion, 10 per cent. geographical location, and 5 per cent. legal attainment." Of course it is! Nobody but the lawyers pretend to believe otherwise. The only matter that may be questioned is the matter of proportion in "attainments" determining appointments.

Charles Dickens caused Mr. Bumble to proclaim, "the law is a hass," but it is not. Emerson said the same thing of the devil, quite as appropriately. The law operates as a corrective to the consequencies of a class society. Like the divinity department administrators, the legal profession try to build up the assumption of a superior moral code. The sanctity of property, of which they are the guardians, demands it. Honorableness lies in accord with a veneration for the property foundation. But, as Belfort Bax says, the one administrator of the law, the judge, "cannot be regarded in any more honorable light than its other 'administrator,' the hangman."

When the working people of any civilized country prove troublesome to their masters at any time the name of the law is at once invoked. If they are very troublesome, all the agencies of the master class will be employed to unite in presenting a case against them. As workers they are to be regarded as likely law breakers, this concept having, perhaps, a more reasonable basis than appears at first sight. The worker's task is to work for the profit of his master at the master's behest. All the powers of State regulate the performance of the task and guarantee to the employing class the product of labor. The law recognizes the product as the private property of the employer. Here end labor's rights and its interest in the law. Justice is wrapped in the garments of property right, and its administration by the law is given in terms of the standards and concepts of property right. The moral standards are in accord. The sanctity of the law is the sanctity of private property, the mainstay of the Honorable Men.

:o:

NO MORE WAR?

THE universally observed "No More War" demonstrations have hardly had time to adjourn when the thought of war as a likely happening again on a big scale takes shape. Greek and Turk have been contending since 1919 over Greek occupation of Turkish territory, and the bigger interests of the Allied governments have been from time to time brought to the surface in consequence of the various antagonisms and alignments shown in Asia Minor.

It has been British policy for years to control, directly or indirectly the Port of Constantinople and the Straits. With Turkey under German political influence Britain appeared willing to look upon Russian influence as a lesser evil in Turkish affairs. The Secret Treaties made public by the Soviets revealed that fact. Since the Armistice, in the interplay of politics in the near East the mistrust existing among the Allies has united in mutual watchfulness in the joint occupation and administration of Constantinople. Since then the Allies have been in divided council, a condition which has been to the strategic advantage of the dispossessed Turk, operating from Angora. He has managed to find ground for agreement in some measure with France and a Treaty was made about a year ago, the clauses of which are still unknown. The appearance of it is that France has "backed the winner," as the newspapers say. The situation is a little more complicated than that however. Allies have a habit of quarrelling with one another under changing circumstances. The Turk-Angora government last May entered into a Treaty with Soviet Ukraine, recognising existing boundary lines, cancelling mutual debts, entering as far as possible into trade and diplomatic relationships and undertaking joint resolve to secure for Russian produce freedom of passage through the Straits. Thus Russia, recognised in 1915 by the Allies in this connection—to the extent of promised domination of Constantinople at that time—makes the position of the Allies more complicated than ever in Turkey. The newspapers talk of a Holy War. Holiness has nothing to do with the matter. It is true that religious caste and creed holds the traditional Greek and Turk divided. Religious intolerance has been subject to and used by political and military influence for the furtherance of its purposes, extended toward the control of desirable territory or routes of trade. How often have the "Turkish atrocities" been featured, and how often have the Greek Christian horrors been suppressed in report. Cruelty is not the monopoly of any one religious creed, nor of any one race either. But its advertisement may be exploited and is exploited regularly nowadays for the furtherance of "spheres of influence" and the sanctioning thereof by political sentiment.

* * *

No More War, as a cry for international peace is attractive to those good people who don't realise what wars are about or what causes them. So long as the issue or the point of possible conflict of interests remains undefined, so long as comparatively peaceful times reveal no decisive, quarrelsome question that may on surface appearances give cause for war, the good people pass harmless and generally well meant resolutions. As soon as the question takes definite shape and becomes wrapped in the garments of nationalism, bolstered up with its attendant patriotism, to which is added the support of the press, the pulpit, the business interests, all concentrated on imposing upon the public mind a code of war morals—generally for freedom's sake, and that on both sides—when the question is then brought forward definitely the good people forthwith "join up" for freedom's sake! Quite obviously, "No More War" means nothing at all while the conditions exist that bring war forth. Socialists anyway have no such illusions. The one real last war is the class war. When that's over we'll have peace, and not until then.

HERE AND NOW.

Clarion readers who have been anxiously awaiting Here and Now totals issue by issue have been rewarded by the appearance of a total in the last two issues (and in this one) that is a little more weighty than in the dark days of yore. The dark days we hope are gone, never to return.

But you can't be too careful. The totals have been maintained largely through the efforts of comrades here and there who have managed—adroitly—somehow—to extract a dollar from people who had destined it to other purposes.

Which means to say that to maintain the totals we depend on the interest of Clarion readers. Don't keep a good thing to yourself. Pass it along.

Following $1 each: J. Chrystall, A. J. Bell, C. Perry, Hugh Russell, Dr. Hawkins, W. Benoit, R. Kirkman, E. D. Mitchell, J. Nyholt, W. Smith, P. J. Hunt, J. Douglas, M. J. Andruss, B. Tishler, Jim Marshall, A. G. Birch, Geo. Jackson, A. A. Siebert, J. Mitchell, W. A. Pritchard, J. A. Goodspeed, E. Chambers, Peter Brown, W. Lyall, P. W. L. Briar, E. Deroll, H. Adie, Abe Karme, W. McGillivray, S. Lewis, J. Marshall, T. McPherson, G. Andrew, T. A. Barnard, R. Fraser, M. Olsen ,(per M. Goudie), P. Danluck, Geo. Rupert, L. B. La Darche, W. E. Dickens, A. Manson.

A. W. Osterberg $3; Sid Earp $3; Jim Lott $2; Wm. Braes $3; Wm. Allen $2; Wm. Craig $3; T. J. Davies $2; M. Talbot 50 cents; P. A. Askew $3.25; A. Corlan $2.

Above, Clarion subscriptions received from 30 Aug. to 14 Sept., inclusive, total $64.75.

Parliament or Cabinet—Which ?

By John A. McDonald

IN two issues of the "Clarion" which have recently reached me, there are two articles dealing with the question of Parliament from the pens of Comrades Harrington and "R." These contributions are both useful and timely so far as they demonstrate the necessity for a re-statement of the case.

Says Comrade "R" in his article, "The Will of the People," "Clarion" No. 853, "Parliament . . is no more than a name. It lives on the prestige of its ancient traditions. It is stripped of all real authority; it has been shorn of its privileges; its functions have passed into the higher control of the modern cabinet, and its powers are but the mockery of 'sanctioning' what the cabinet decrees."

Comrade Harrington, "Clarion" No. 847, has it: "Parliament as we knew it a decade ago has changed. Today it appears as a formal body giving legality to the will of a select committee known as the cabinet. Members of parliament have repeatedly deplored the subordinate, if not obsequious nature of their office." (*)

Parliament is, indeed, a superflous institution. By the same mode of reasoning could we not go a step further and say that cabinets cease to function as they are generally dominated by the will of one individual? A story is told of President Lincoln who, at a meeting of his cabinet in 1864 was opposed by all his ministers on a certain issue. Lincoln called for a vote and announced: "One aye and seven nays; the ayes have it." In the American cabinet the President dominates. The secretaries of the various departments are his appointees, and are not dependent on the will of the people for their positions. When an estrangement takes place between president and secretary the latter is easily disposed of. The case of President Wilson and his two Secretaries of State, Bryan and Lansing, adequately portrays the manner of disposal. In the English cabinet, while the various ministers are elected by the people, or chosen from the upper house, the Premier is the dominant character. I have heard it stated by four different premiers, in as many houses of parliament, that a vote is seldom called for at cabinet meetings. One strong man rules, and cabinet decisions are largely the reflex of his opinions.

But, in regard to Parliament itself I am not satisfied with the position outlined by our two comrades. During the past twelve years I have given careful attention to the deliberations of many Parliaments in the five chief English-speaking countries of the world. I have heard no members, excepting those in opposition, deplore the subordinate nature of their office, and opposition members have made such declarations for a much longer period than ten years. Comrade Harrington tells us that the statement: "Parliament has ceased to function," is correct, "if we view the institution as functioning in the interest of all." When did Parliament function in the interest of all? Since its inception it appears to have been a class weapon, serving the interests of but one section of society. As such, it is surely nothing new to learn that it has ceased to function in the interests of all.

Comrade "R," after declaring that Parliament is the result of a long evolutionary process, seems to forget that there are decisive points or revolutions in the course of this process. The modern Parliament is no more the logical and natural development from the hundred moot, and the shire moot, than that trades unions are the natural outcome of the craft guilds. Social and industrial revolutions make necessary new institutions which are not accorded the privilege of slowly evolving out of others which functioned in previous periods.

Prof. Jenks in his "Short History of Politics," describing the inception of the medieval Parliament says: "It was not in any sense of the term a **popular** institution. On the other hand for many years after its appearance, it was intensely unpopular both with 'constituencies' and representatives. The counties hated it, because they did not want to acknowledge the secular authority. The boroughs hated it, because the parliamentary boroughs paid a higher scale of taxation than their humbler sisters. And all hated it, because a Parliament invariably meant **taxation.** The notion that Parliaments were the result of a spontaneous democratic movement, can be held by no one who has studied, ever so slightly, the facts of history." (Emphasis original).

Through the course of several centuries the institution changed. As the trading and manufacturing class developed to that stage where it became the dominant class in European society, Parliament became its most important weapon in the administration of class property, as well as in the coercion of the propertyless masses comprising the proletariat.

Parliament is, today, the instrument by which the capitalist class imposes its desires on the people, and controls the public forces in all countries of the world. The fact that during the war a number of Boards such as the Railway War Board, the Munition Board, the Food Supply Board and others were created to attend to the various departments of administration in no way refutes the contention that Parliament rules. All these Boards owed their existence to Parliament. It was to this same institution that they submitted their plans and decisions, and received instructions concerning their maintenance and functions. The great responsibility of effectively carrying on a military campaign necessitated the construction of special Boards for the purpose but, as these were answerable in every case to the body that created them, there was obviously no diminution in the powers of Parliament.

The Cabinet bogey is likewise easily dispersed. What is the Cabinet excepting a committee chosen by the majority in Parliament to carry out its dictates? This Cabinet can be over-ridden or dissolved at any time the majority in Parliament may decide. To make the statement that Parliament does not directly supervise the business affairs of a nation in no way discounts its importance. One has only to glance over the political events of the two most advanced capitalist nations in the world—the United States and Great Britain—to see the relationship existing between Cabinet and Parliament. When the U. S. Cabinet endorsed the Versailles Treaty, the League of Nations and the Shantung "steal," its decision, far from becoming law, was soon reversed by the Senate and Congress, and ultimately by the will of the people expressed at the polls. The recent events in Britain in regard to the miners' strike and the Irish settlement amply portray the fact that Parliament is still the law-making body in that country. The roundabout method of approach is made necessary by the increasing complexity of the present social system, but the change in method does not obviate the fact that the power to enact or repeal legislation resides in Parliament.

In Soviet Russia today we have the intermediary branches of control between the Urban and Rural Soviets, elected by the people, and the All-Russian Congress of Soviets, in whose control the affairs of the country are placed. But this form of structure does not detract from the democratic nature of the State machinery. All these branches are necessary to ensure the desires of the people being expeditiously carried out. The workers at the base rule, and can recall their elected officials in each department should they fail to function properly.

While the affairs of State in highly developed capitalist countries are manipulated through the instrumentality of the Cabinet, this body is itself obeying the wishes of its maker, or in such cases as it anticipates those wishes the sanction of Parliament must be received before any act becomes a law of the land. Even Orders-in-Council are subject to reversion by Parliament, and have often been annulled when considered inimical to the welfare of the ruling class.

:o:

REPLY BY J. HARRINGTON

SO far as I can judge, Comrade McDonald has not made clear where he disagrees with me in the general view of Parliament—that it does function.

I hold that Parliament is neither powerless nor superfluous, and to combat the sentiment that it is was precisely the purpose of my article.

In matters of fact, however, I am entirely at odds with Comrade McDonald. He says: "Parliament is indeed a superfluous institution. By the same mode of reasoning could we not go a step further and say that Cabinets have ceased to function as they are generally dominated by the will of an individual?" Then we have a story of Lincoln which may or may not be true of some minor matter, and which can be regarded purely as a joke. I recollect that Seward, Cameron, and the other serious minded men who were his cabinet ministers had their patience tried more than once by his untimely and, to them, unseemly jokes. But cabinets are **not** dominated by the will of any individual; rather by the needs of a class. If Comrade McDonald will review his own statements of the United States and the League of Nations this will be apparent.

In the American Cabinet the President dominates by virtue of his constitutional powers, which are greater than those of any other governmental official in the world. **But he is not elected by the people.** Yet who does not remember the sorry plight of Wilson in the closing days of his office, and who shall say that he was not prompted—I might say forced—to alter his tactics absolutely during his second term of office.

Again, the British Cabinet is not elected by the people or chosen from the Upper House. In theory, the king asks someone to form a government, and the people then accept or reject it. Actually, two at least of the ministers, the Foreign and Home Secretaries are chosen by the Manchester cotton lords and the Birmingham steel lords, and in the Foreign Office, no matter what political complexion the government may have, continuity of policy is and has long been unconditionally maintained.

I can very well believe, not on the say so of four, or forty-four premiers, that a vote is seldom called for in cabinet meetings, though not because "one strong man rules," etc., but because the entire gang has already received a hint, a strong hint, as to how they are expected to act. Take Lloyd George, the one dominator who has survived the mercurial nature of "capital today" and its requirements. Bullitt tells us that Lloyd George said to him, "as long as the British press is doing this kind of thing how can you expect me to be sensible about Russia?" (Bullitt Mission to Russia, p. 66).

But let us take what the logicians call a deductive view, that is, from general conditions to a particular consequence. When I said that Parliament had ceased to function in the interest of all, I had in mind all those represented. When the vote was extended to the workers, with each enlargement of the franchise, we find an increasing interest in their welfare manifested by the politicians. It is quite patent that even in the bewildered state of slave mentality as we see it, voters will resent any interference with what they consider their rights. And any politician from a working-class centre who dared to consistently attack these rights would very soon realize that, while dealing with the "lower orders" tra la, he was not dealing with mud and clay exactly. It is equally plain that political experience would enlarge their political vision and demands. As these demands came from a propertyless class, their intrusion into an institution which concerned itself almost entirely with property would, of course, cause

* **Editor's Note:** The two articles mentioned were reprinted in last issue (Sept. 1st). The replies of Comrades Harrington and "R" to Comrade McDonald's criticism now presented are subjoined hereto.

some annoyance. When, through various arrangements, men from this propertyless class became members of Parliament, the annoyance became a positive menace. Assuming that to withdraw the franchise would hardly be practicable, some action would be required to enable Parliament to devote its energies to the proper ordering of property relations in face of obstruction tactics on the part of members representing and answerable to the propertyless. Maine, the author of "Ancient Law," had all this in mind when he said: "No multitudinous assembly which seeks really to govern can possibly be free from it; and it will probably lead to a constitutional revolution, the House of Commons abandoning the greater part of its legislative authority to a Cabinet of Executive Ministers." (Popular Governments, p. 95).

The present state of the franchise makes this more than ever necessary. When the franchise was edged about with property restrictions, the assumption of such powers by the cabinet would have been hazardous; while an instrument of class rule, there were sections of the master class whose interests were opposed, indeed, through this very fact the extension of the franchise was, if not consummated, at least accelerated, And while these sections contended for political advantage, with varying fortunes, Parliament nevertheless functioned in the interest of **all represented.**

Failure to observe this has caused many who pride themselves on their Marxism to proclaim against Parliament as obsolete and useless. Parliament is just as potent as it ever was, for in it and it alone rests the **constitutional power** to make any course legal or illegal. War Boards have nothing to do with the case at all. It is a qnestion of constitutional practice. And Comrade McDonald, when he seeks to dispose of the "Cabinet bogey," merely ignores it. In fact he says that the Cabinet's powers are "the result of the increasing complexity of the present social system." But Parliament was quite equal to this complexity until personal matters commenced to gum the machinery, and in my opinion these powers result from an increasing danger of working class obstruction, if not usurpation, and I mean in matters of a reform character.

However, as regards members of Parliament—and government members at that—deploring the obsequious nature of their office, the periodic press during the last ten years is full of it. The fight against "Cannonism" in the United States was one of its results. In fact there exists in the files of such magazines as the "Atlantic," the "Contemporary," the "Century," the "Living Age," etc., ample material for an excellent and timely book on Parliament if anyone has the time and opportunity to tackle the job.

We read further that "this Cabinet can be overridden or dissolved at any time Parliament may decide." True enough, but does Comrade McDonald not know that in this event Parliament is itself dissolved? And that sooner than permit such a political disaster even the Labor Party has **voted against its own measure** in the British House?

We then have the League of Nations and the American Cabinet; but so far as I have been able to gather the American Cabinet was divided on that very question, and the "strong man," the President, was the sponsor for it. That doubtless will remain a mystery for a few years yet. However, the Treaty and the League were entirely against American interests, from Yap to Armenia, mandate, protocol and protectorate, east, west, north and south, and my article covers that entirely. I said Parliament was in the last resort the place where any policy was made legal.

The British incidents mentioned by Comrade McDonald are different. The Irish question was an excellent example of the traditional British policy of muddling through, and I question if even Wilson, with all his stupidity (or is it lack of vision?) made a worse job of the Treaty. The miners' strike, on the other hand, was a superb piece of political jockeying. But why, reverting to Wilson, was "the will of the people expressed at the polls" not carried out after the 1916 election cry of "He kept us out of war?"

The people have no will. It is manufactured for them by time proven methods. They cannot have a will until they become conscious of the source of their troubles. When the slaves possess a will, a consciousness, they will give some evidence of it. Those who rave against Parliament are, like Ajax defying his mother-in-law, but testifying to their own impotence.

That governmental methods have changed should require no proof. But it is a matter of fact that the British Prime Minister **as such** had until recently no legal standing, no salary, no official rank except as a Privy Councillor—and in that was outranked by many of the Cabinet—Home Secretary, etc., and was not recognized by any Act of Parliament. Very recently, a matter of a few years, he has been legally assigned a position, but I am a little vague in this and lack the opportunity to verify it. Side by side with this usurpation of power without formal enactment but through and by precedent in Britain grew the power of the United States courts. But as I pointed out and Comrade McDonald, I think, agrees with me, Parliament is the recognized place of power.

REPLY BY "R."

THERE would appear to be no very great difference between Comrade J. A. McD. and myself. Yet his interpretation does not accord with the spirit of the article in question. It was written in terms of a political issue; Comrade McD. makes it an academic discussion. It was treating of Parliament as a popular ideological concept; Com. Mc. regards it as a constitutional idealism. Surely, in such circumstances, it would require far-reaching qualifications to sustain the contention that "Parliament rules." However, as theory and fact must coincide we shall look into it.

It appears to be the formula which our comrade objects to. For he says "Parliament is a superfluous institution." It is—as an expression of the will of the people. And if Parliament is "the instrument whereby the capitalist class imposes its desires on the people," it can hardly be, at the same time, the reflex of social interest. It is, therefore, the theoretical form of Parliament which is under consideration. As such we might concede our comrade's contention. But it would be an empty concession. For, in the thing that matters—the practical operation—Parliament has ceased to function as a living creative force. It is a pettifogger in legislation, living only on the scraps of petty reform, uncomprehending the mighty issues, sweeping in fluxing power, across a tortured world.

It may be that "the Cabinet is a committee chosen by a majority in Parliament." But, in effect, the Premier receives his appointment from the Crown (i.e., the master class); and he (the Premier) also recommends his Cabinet colleagues, i.e., he chooses them. Formally, Parliament sanctions the proceedings. But as in the nature of things, the ruling class can always whip up a majority in the House, the rule of Parliament has little to do with the matter. So that, de facto, we have a Premier appointed by the master, a Cabinet appointed by the Premier, and a Parliament selected by the general capitalist class. Theoretically, the Cabinet can be overridden by Parliament. (That is a very infrequent event. Is it not?) In practice the Cabinet usually overrides both the hypothetical Crown and the suppositionary House. It is also an unsound argument to imply that the "Cabinet ceases to function because it is (sometimes "R") dominated by an individual will." There have been occasions when particular incumbents, in particular circumstances, have imposed decisions. Palmerston did it; and Gladstone; and Roosevelt, and Bismark. But they could do so only because their action favored a dominant interest. Normally, this dominion is the expression of business interests. The domination is similar to the authority of a foreman in a public works, he is allowed a greater or less latitude in the methods to be pursued for the attainment of a desired objective. In other words, he dominates but he does not rule. Parliament (*) can question the Foreign Secretary—and the Foreign Secretary can always evade. It can vote war supplies; but Crown and Cabinet declare the war. It can discuss treaties; but the Cabinet signs them. True, Parliament never had much power on those lines; but it has less now than ever. In other countries it is theoretically different, but practically the same.

Not long ago the "Manchester Guardian" said editorially that the country had practically passed under Cabinet control. The London "Nation," quoting Vanderlip, says: "The world of Europe and the lives of 440 millions of people await the outcome of a conversation between two men." Lloyd George and Poincare, i.e., the Cabinets of Britain and France. "Recently the U. S. recognised the Baltic Republics. Russia and the European Powers recognized them long ago. But our State department, its policy controlled by a group of pan-Russian exiles, has stood out and insisted that it must wait till Russia is restored." ("Nation," N. Y., August 9.) "All the months of Public Committee meetings, which precede the drafting of a Tariff Bill, are the merest camouflage. The bargain and sale go on behind closed doors; they are no respecter of persons or sections; and relate not at all to the real needs of any industry. Senate and Congress swap favors in a cold blooded give and take for their States and their own personal aggrandisement, and a most elaborate system of deals is worked out." (Same paper, same date.) In his presidential campaign (1912) Woodrow Wilson said that "a small group of Senators blocked the way to needed reforms demanded by the people," and that "Congress was but the foster-child of the big interests." President Harding, speaking to Congress (August 18) on the recent "strike atrocities," said: "I have felt the deep current of popular resentment, that the Federal Government has been tolerant of the failure of justice in Illinois. It is the regrettable fact that the Federal Government cannot act under the law." The meaning at the back of that statement is that organized strikers are disorganizing the whole business and industry of the country; and that those interests are clamouring for further powers (under the law) for the protection of workers who are willing to work. That is, to force starving necessity to labor under the ruthless dictation of the Trusts. What a mockery of Parliamentary representation.

Let us glance at the idealist side of it. Com. McD. says I "forget that there are decisive points in the evolution of Parliament,—that the modern Parliament is no more the logical development of the (medieval) moot, than trades unions are the natural outcome of the craft guilds." Quite true—as regards their class or physical form. But quite otherwise with respect to their social idea. This is where the misconception takes place. The trend of the matter under criticism was to show how inextricably interwoven is modern thought with the ideology of bygone time, how, in spite of ourselves, we judge the present, unconsciously biassed with the traditions of the past; and because of that, how little the concept of popular representation, represented the popular will. Fundamentally the idea of popular will is social welfare and social interest, and if the machinery of the popular will is traversed for class privilege, it is so because of the idealist conceptions of yesterday. That is to say, the lack of social understanding. That is the key to the whole matter. Did we truly comprehend social development, the administrative machinery would function to our will. But then it would not be capitalist society, and we would not be weighted down with its biassed and prejudiced ideation.

Those same decisive points—Magna Charter; the Bill of Rights; the English and French Revolutions; the Reform period; Confederation and Independence, have all left deep impressions on the social mind. And the social mind adjudges and premises in the static terms of its classic discipline. The outward form and show of Parliament ideally acclaimed since the 18th century as the will of all the people may still remain; but its inward spirit and first intent have been entirely changed and controverted. The skeptical idealists of the 18th century never dreamed of the financial monarchy of the 20th. The

(*) British.

idealism of Kant and Hegel have culminated in the autocracy of the Prussian State. The "freedom and equality" of 1789 quickly vanished in the corruption of the "contractors" and the rule of the Corsican; and from that to the politically entrenched bondholders of the new third estate. The Liberalism of the mid-Victorian period, with its national aspirations and reformist Parliament, has become—the dictatorship of the Foreign Office; and the "life, liberty and pursuit of happiness" era of Washington has yielded to the oligarchy of Wall Street. Surely there is a world of difference between the Parliament of "national freedom," "individual liberty"; and "personal initiative" of the days of Bright and Cobden, of Wilberforce and Shaftesbury, and the Coalition of Lloyd George. The Gladstone of "free trade" and "Home Rule" and "Manchesterianism" developed into the standard-bearer of Imperialism; and his political descendents now render homage to Cromer and Curzon, to Milner and Rhodes. Surely the Lincoln who dominated the Cabinet of the 60's expressed a social equity that has no existence at the political bargain counter of today. A difference not alone in aim and scope, but also in means and power.

It is natural in the terms of capital that representation in the period of its growth should embrace a wider body of interests that in its day of decline. It is just as natural that power and control should go with it, in steady procession, from social interest to political trust. And no matter whether President or King, or Parliament or man that forms the medium, if there is privilege to save, privilege shall find a way of salvation. From the common point of view that Parliament represents social interest it is consequently true that Parliament has ceased to function. It is beside the point to say it never did so completely. The relevancy is in the social belief that it really does so, and the undoubted fact that it once represented a wider following. The apathy of the modern electorate would seem itself to indicate that. With the development of business from national industry to Imperialist finance, the function of Parliament, as the bulwark of property in national industry, has been considerably abrogated and transferred, medially through the Cabinet to the Foreign Office. For as the ruling class of today is the (foreign) syndicate and concession holder, its will and law, its life and being, is summarized in the Foreign Office. The Foreign Office is its hope and profit, in the Foreign Office it holds absolute power, and the Foreign Office is entirely beyond the reach of Parliament—as presently constituted.

Consequently, when Comrade McD. says that "although Parliament does not directly supervise the affairs of a nation, it in no way discounts its importance," he voices a sentiment more than a fact. Because the affairs of the nation have given way to the affairs of the foreign concessionaire. Because Imperialist finance, not national industry, is the centre of social gravity; and because the export of capital has necessitated an authority whose scope has broadened from the concrete nationalism of the 19th century to the mandatory internationalism of the 20th. That is why the Cabinet—observed in general, and not in isolated cases—dominates Parliament. And that is why, if one holds a preponderant influence in the Cabinet, that one (visible or invisible) will be the Secretary for Foreign Affairs. Also, that is why Boards of Trade and Munitions; local councils and committees; Food Control and Railway Rating, and all the growing—but at the same time subordinate—paraphernalia of national affairs is committed and submitted to the care of the National Parliament. It has been created and equipped for local government. It is endowed with national powers of control, and to its care is entrusted the domestic regulation of industrial property. But it is subservient to the greater finance, and confused and entangled with the intriguing departments and committees of foreign investments. And in this specialized—yet interdependent—government, where the full data of affairs is centralized in the Foreign Office, the old time national parliament has no real control. For it does not know what is transpiring in the Machiavellian counterplay of the international chancellories. It can act—like a marionette—only after the trap is sprung; and then only in acquiescence.

It is in the light of such considerations that I said—and still say—that Parliament is but a name; that it lives on the prestige of tradition; that it is stripped of real authority, and that its functions are but the sanctioning of Cabinet decrees.

The Melting Pot

By Katherine Smith

THE September number of "Scribner's Magazine" contains an article by Frederick C. Howe, former Commissioner of Immigration port of New York, entitled "Has the Westward Tide of People Come to an End?" Of course, with his very unusual chances for observation and compiling of statistics he shows a more profound knowledge of the causes underlying emigration than is often found among bourgeois writers who undertake to educate the people on such subjects. Though his statements are in no wise intended to confirm the Socialist position so much straight shooting could hardly fail to hit the bull's eye occasionally, and throughout a very interesting article there continually creeps out the strain of economic determinism.

After reviewing in a pregnant paragraph the movement of peoples dating from the emigration of whole nations from India and Persia and Central Asia to Europe, to the centuries after the over-running of the old Roman Empire by the various eastern tribes which obliterated old cultures, he has this to say:

"For six or seven centuries immigration came to an end. Population increased. The struggle for existence became more severe. The feudal system reduced the worker and the farmer to serfdom. Wherever the conditions of life were most difficult there the desire to escape was the most insistent. With the opening up of America the westward movement began again. It started from England, not because of a desire for religious liberty so much as because England possessed ships, while conditions of life in England, following the enclosure of the common lands, made it necessary for people to escape. The same was true of Scotland as it was of Ireland. For three centuries old Europe has been depopulating herself in response to the urge of greater economic opportunities in the new lands to the west."

The old Puritan legend could hardly be betted dispelled by a Peter Leckie or any other Socialist writer. Then after some statistics of the quotas of the various nations contributing of their peoples and their priorities he says:

"Just as economic conditions in Europe crowded the population out, so economic conditions in America shaped our attitude toward immigration and our laws on the subject as well. We think of immigration in terms of races. We assume that the problem is an ethnic one. Our thoughts and our discussions run along human, religious, moral lines. The protest of the 'old immigration' against the "new immigration' is based on the illiteracy of those who are coming now, on their lower standard of living, on their alien culture, by many on their alleged different standards of morality. **More recently there has been a general assumption that the 'new immigration' was not adapted to parliamentary government and American political institutions.** The discusions in the press, in the books, and in Congress have been along these lines."

Then follows a paragraph dealing with the feeling of race superiority with the tendency to engulf the Anglo-Saxon race by the greater fertility of those of the Latin and Slavic races, especially the latter, then:

"Despite the emphasis placed in the ethnic side of the question our immigration policies have been determined by economic rather than racial considerations. They have followed changes in the economic conditions in the older countries. For emigration out of Europe has been shaped by the poverty of Europe. The alien has come from countries when the struggle for existence has been most severe. The filling in of America has been controlled by the poverty of Europe rather than by any policy of our own. At the same time our attitude toward immigration has been moulded by economic considerations in this country. It was largely, almost exclusively, moulded by the free lands of the west. So long as there was land to be had for the asking there was no protest against immigration. Rather every influence urged the freest possible admissions. Up to seventy years ago, and even later, people generally felt that the great west would never be filled with people. It was hardly conceivable that the land would all be taken up. Land speculators preceded the settlers. They took up land. They laid out towns. They owned the press. They influenced men in Congress. Western States cried out for settlers. They cared not whence they came. That was true up to 1895. Then we began to appreciate that the land was fast filling in. As a matter of fact there was little free land as late as 1890.

"About this time our industries began to take on enlarged form. Mines, mills, and factories grew with great rapidity. Our industrial development in the twenty years before the war was both rapid and in the direction of massing of capital into big units. Railroads were being built, cities and towns were growing with great rapidity. There was need of workers of every kind, especially for artisans that we had not trained in this country, and for unskilled workers which were not to be had. So the employers and the contractors urged that the gates be left open. They organized agencies to stimulate immigration. They joined with the steamship companies and sent runners to central and southern Europe to speed up the movement. For twenty years our immigration policy was shaped by contractors, employers and steamship companies. It was supported by public opinion, in the main eager for industrial development. During these years central and southern Europe emptied itself of 15,000,000 people, of whom one third or onefourth returned to their native lands."

Though the whole article is well worth while, the columns of the "Clarion" will hardly permit it in its entirety. However, to those to whom thirty-five cents does not constitute a fortune, an investment in "Scribner's" of September would afford much food for thought, as there is also another article on "The Immigration Problem" in the same number, which rounds out and completes that of Mr. Howe.

Having given a fine statistical account of immigration to the United States, and, incidentally, a bit to Canada, he remarks:

"In all probability the age-long movement from the East toward the West has come to an end. America is no longer the hospitable mother of the restless, the discontented and the impoverished of other worlds."

This after dealing with the laws recently enacted to restrict immigration:

"This is a portentous fact. It is possibly the most portentous fact in our recent history."

Then he gives the reasons, always economic, of the trend eastward of the immigration of the future, including a neat little history of the effect of the development of machinery to the present and a prognosis of its effect in the future, always evading the possibility of a proletarian revolution in this country, but accentuating the probability of a great response in the call of the east, and ending with:

"If men can satisfy their wants easier in Europe than in America, if they can escape from the status of workers and become owners, if they can rise in the social scale, if they can solve the problem of life easier in some other country than they can here they will surely do so. If the history of man is any guide to us, men will go where conditions of life are easiest. **They will follow the call of their stomach.** They will venture a new life as the farmers of the west ventured into Canada, as the forefathers ventured to America, and later to the prairies of the west. There may, in fact, be an exodus from this country within the next ten years. The history of all America testifies to this as does the history of the human race. For man has been an immigrant from the beginning of time. He has eared little for the heat of the sun or the cold of the Arctic circle. He has cared little whether he was governed by a Pope, by a King or by himself. Given a chance to rise in the world and to **keep what he produced** man has followed that call, and the world is what it is today largely because of that fact. It may be that the raw material that America has received from Europe will return to the countries from which it came. It may be that one of our great contributions to the future of the world will be the men who go from our mills, our factories, our mines our cities, to contribute their training and their abilities to the re-building of the countries that gave us so generously of their children in the past."

To the last of which we students of the Materialist Conception of History can say "Amen," and to most of which we can irreverently say, "We told you so."

THE GENIUS

(Continued from page 1)

gressive interests, in the subjugation of man to the means of life, of human welfare to personal profit, the petty, the small, the weak, the unessential are eliminated, the doors of opportunity are steadily closed, the avenues to success and security blocked, the pursuit of happiness made impossible; the great seething mass, like a glacier in the mountains, is forced to take the only path left for it to take—the subjugation of the means of life to the use and need of man. It is the pressure of social need that gives us the definite vision of the thing we want. For in spite of the mystical habilaments of an ancient tradition, the vision of society is the vision of reality. And as that vision, that need, that reality, are in definite antagonism to the ethic that is, society shall set in motion the train of circumstances which can only culminate in the social society of tomorrow. It is not the human equation that is important, but the social perception of reality. That awakening is primarily and principally a process of economic development, and the "great man" who can sway society to his will must wait till the great circumstance has motived society by its necessity.

Consequently, the "genius" though he could and would influence the mode of the day, could not by the power of will or ability conjure society out of its explicit status of time vision. He might preach and practice, but he could not fulfil. To accomplish is a power vested solely in the composite genius of society. It is wholly beyond the province of the individual. And it is so because society centres and lives and has its being on the cogent necessities and sweeping ambitions of engrossing, present interest; while the individual draws his inspiration from an ideal which, truthful as it may be, and glorious as it appears is, as yet, but the harbinger of a future society to which the present is as a "people that walk in great darkness."

We do not dispute the power of mind over mass, nor the influence of ability over the prosaic. Nor do we dispute the power of mind to react on environment in an ever growing degree. But the assumption is implicit in the admission that the mind has acquired the consciousness of its power, the glamorous vision of its regnant ability. So long as that consciousness rests merely on the unit, that power remains but an ideal. It glows ruddy with eager life only when it flashes through the awakened mind of society. Lloyd George dominated the war period, not by the might of his greatness but because he expressed the socially accepted interpretations of political democracy. A quarter of a century ago the same Lloyd George could not move Britain against the Boer war, because he did not preach the ethics of Dominant society. Lenin and Trotsky could influence a people conscious of necessary change, but neither of them though they understood society as well could perform the miracle in 1905. Because Russian society was not ready for the task. George Washington did not achieve American independence by virtue of his genius but by the social ethic of bourgeois freedom (trader's rights). Lincoln did not free the slaves of the South because of righteousness and genius, but because the profit lust of the great industry expounded the cost of production in the terms of wage slavery. The great Napoleon was not defeated at Waterloo by the "great" Wellington, but at Dresden and by all Europe, because the upstart democracy of the Third Estate was obnoxious, alike to the commercial right of England and the feudal regime of Europe. Knox could force himself upon the Catholic Mary of Scotland, not by the power of a Jewish god but by the support of a Protestant Elizabeth. And he had that support because the Protestant religion was the garb of the gods of trade, while Catholicism expressed the sanctity of the medieval fief. Huss was burned at Prague—and under a safe guard of protection—for preaching the same doctrine as Luther. And the science of today can expound with impunity principles which forced Copernicus to silence, brought Bruno to the stake at Rome, and nearly entailed a similar fate on Galileo.

Not the man that counts, but the society; not individual genius, but social necessity; not idealist perception, but time condition. When the time is actually accomplished and the new society, grown lusty within the shell of the old order breaks its way out in the light of a new day, out of that pulsing mass will come the "leaders" who will guide its first struggling hours towards the harmony of the new society. And they will be able to do this, not by superior ability but as instruments of superior circumstance. They may—or they may not—stand above the crowd in detailed perception of understanding, but they are successful in the broad circumstance of time only because they grasp in intimate consequence the omnipotence of the social forces which in a vaguer—but definite—way impel the general social mind. The minds of man and mass are gratified by the progress of social technique and the "greatness" of leaders consists only in this that they have been able to co-ordinate and integrate the widely ramifying influence and wealth of ideas derived from social progress; and their "glory" that they are the means, in the logic of time, to accomplish the revivification of a perishing society. That is the "genius" which will arise to lead the world to victory, which will inspire the sordid wrecks with fresh hope, which will electrify the apathy of degradation, which will kindle and fan the fire of a wonderful idealism, and endow society, in the eagerness of enthusiasm, with the rainbow wings of regeneration.

R.

ALBERTA NOTES.

Alberta and Saskatchewan P. E. C. of the S. P. of C. Secretary R. Burns, 134a 9th Avenue, West, Calgary, Alta.

Local Calgary. Same address as above. Business meetings every alternate Tuesday, 8 p.m. Propaganda meeting every Sunday, St. George's Island (under big tree) at 3 p.m.

Correspondence with all comrades in these provinces invited, and all help in co-ordinating activity invited.

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 organise 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 organisation and management of industry by the working class.

3—The establishment, as speedily as possible, of production for use instead of production for profit.

MANIFESTO

— of the —

SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

(Fifth Edition)

Per copy ..... 10 cents

Per 25 copies $2

Post Paid

Literature Price List

Cloth Bound	Per Copy
Positive Outcome of Philosophy	$1.25
A. B. C. of Evolution (McCabe)	$1.15
Economic Determinism	$1.65
Evolution of the Idea of God (Grant Allen	$1.15
Darwinism and Race Progress (Haycraft)	$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)	$1.50
Ancient Society	$1.85
Philosophical Essays	$1.65
Theoretical System of Karl Marx	$1.65
Landmarks of Scientific Socialism	$1.65
Socialism and Philosophy	$1.65
Essays on the Materialistic Conception of History	$1.65
Capitalist Production (First Nine and 32nd Chapters "Capital," vol. 1, (Marx)	$1.00
Savage Survivals (Moore)	$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
The American Empire (Nearing)	60c
Eighteenth Brumaire	80c
The End of the World	80c
Science and Superstition	80c

Paper Covers	Per Copy
Two Essays on History (C. Stephenson and G. Deville)	5c
Communist Manifesto	10c
Wage-Labor and Capital	10c
The Present Economic System (Prof. W. A. Bonger)	10c
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific	15c
Slave of the Farm	10c
Manifesto, S. P. of C.	10c
Evolution of Man (Prof. Bolsche)	20c
Causes of Belief in God (Lafargue)	10c
The Structure of Soviet Russia (Humphries	20c
Shop Talks on Economics (Marcy)	15c
The State and Revolution (Lenin)	25c
Value, Price and Profit (Marx)	15c
Economic Causes of War (Leckie)	25c
The Protection of Labor in Soviet Russia (Kaplun)	15c
Civil War in France (Marx)	35c
Eighteenth Brumaire (Marx)	35c
Christianism and Communism (Bishop W. M. Brown)	25c
Psychology of Marxian Socialism	30c
W. A. Pritchard's Address to the Jury, (State Trials, Winnipeg, Man., Fall Assizes 1919-20)	25c

Quantity Rates on Paper Covered Pamphlets.

Two Essays on History	25 copies	75c
Communist Manifesto	25 copies	$2.00
Wage-Labor and Capital	25 copies	$2.00
Present Economic System	25 copies	$1.50
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific	25 copies	$3.25
Slave of the Farm	25 copies	$1.50
Manifesto of S. P. of C.	25 copies	$2.00
Evolution of Man	25 copies	$3.75
Causes of Belief in God	25 copies	$2.00
Value, Price and Profit	25 copies	$3.25
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

:o:

All prices include Postage.

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

All above literature can be obtained from J. M. Sanderson, Box 2354, Winnipeg, Manitoba.

SUBSCRIPTION FORM.

(This is as handy a way as any to send your subs.)

Western Clarion, P. O. Box, 710.
Vancouver, B. C.

Official organ of the S. P. of C. Published twice a month.

Subscriptions: Canada, 20 issues, $1; Foreign: 16 issues $1.

Enclosed find .....

Send "Western Clarion" to .....

.....

.....