

WESTERN CLARION

A Journal of
CURRENT
EVENTS

Official Organ of
THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

HISTORY
ECONOMICS
PHILOSOPHY

Number 828 Twice a Month

VANCOUVER, B. C., OCTOBER 1, 1920.

FIVE CENTS

The Right of Property

CERTAINLY the most important of the legal rights, from the point of view of economics, is that of Property.

"The right of private property is the main-spring of the whole mechanism of distribution (of wealth) in civilized societies."—Gide.

As we have already seen, there are concerned in this right:—

1. The "subject" of the right, that is, the person in whom the right of ownership is vested. This may be either a natural person or a partnership, or a corporation, which, by the act of incorporation becomes a legal person empowered to hold property and other rights and, in consequence, to sue or be sued. This person, whether natural or legal, possesses the exclusive right to use and control—

2. The "object" of the right. This may consist of tangible or intangible goods. Tangible goods would be represented by such things as:—

Land, including water, minerals, timber, hunting and fishing rights.

Slaves and other working and domestic cattle.

Buildings, machinery, food and clothing.

Intangible goods would include such things as:

Franchises, copyrights, patent rights, trade marks, "good-will" and special privileges of one kind and another.

Then there are stocks, bonds and shares—"credit documents to bearer." These, of course, are not themselves wealth but merely legal claims, or evidences of ownership. They are, however, of very great and increasing importance in a society in which "possession," properly so-called, is giving place to mere ownership. Then there is:—

3. The act or forbearance. This, in the case of property, means that:—

4. The person or persons against whom the right is effective must forbear from the use of the object of the right, or forbear from acting in such a manner as to interfere with its use by the owner. This means everybody else.

The whole thing boils down to the statement that Property is a right of ownership vested in one man, or set of men, as against the rest of society in respect of some object. In the words of Marx, it is a "social relationship." The State conserves and enforces this right. A right without the might to enforce it is no right at all. Consequently, the right lapses when the State withdraws its sanction, or when the State is destroyed.

There is here no question of "moral rights." These are alleged rights which have no legal sanction or what is left of a legal right upon the subtraction of the legal sanction. They are a matter of ethics or sentiment and, for our present purpose, may be disregarded.

Property may be legally acquired by purchase, gift or inheritance. It may also be acquired by chance or by theft which, while not always illegal, are not generally recognized by law. These means, however, imply the existence of property rights and do not, therefore, account for them. It is the "original accumulation" for which we have to account.

In the last analysis property depends on possession: in the case of land, of occupancy. Possession or occupancy was, as a rule, the result of appropriation generally accompanied by force. The fact of possession is fortified by prescription. That is to say that undisputed possession for a certain length of time gives a legal right as, for instance, the

squatter's right. Then there is what the lawyers call the right of accession by which

"Property in an object, whether movable or immovable, gives a right to all that it produces, and to all that is connected with it accessorially, either naturally or artificially."—Code Civile, Art. 546.

This principle is so important that Prof. Jenks, in his "History of Politics," defines property as "the right to absorb the various advantages (known and unknown) which are derivable from a thing." It is by virtue of this right that the land-owner may claim any improvements effected on his land or buildings which may be erected by his tenants: that the slave-owner took possession of the product of the slaves' labor and of any children they might procreate, and that the employer of labor owns the wealth produced by his employees.

We see then, as the common saying has it, that possession is nine points of the law. It is a fact, however, possessing no moral value whatever. This, of course, does not concern us but is, nevertheless, a matter of some concern to the apologists of the system. For this reason it has been sought to give the right of property some kind of moral sanction. We have, therefore, the doctrine of "Natural Right" now, as we have already seen, largely given up. As to this it is sufficient to say that if property be a natural right then it would be possessed by all men, which is notoriously untrue. If it be answered that the right of property is merely the right to possess property if one can get it, then the doctrine of natural rights is abandoned.

Then, again, it has been attempted to show that property is the result of labor. This also is untrue, as it is notorious that those who labor do not possess, and that those who possess do not labor. Lastly, there is the "Social Utility" argument. That is to say, that it is in the interest of society that private property should exist. This, as we have already seen, makes property a legal right resting on the general consensus of opinion.

In earlier times, as everyone knows, men acted on the

"Good old rule, the simple plan,
That they should take who have the power,
That they should keep who can."

Property was then a matter of actual possession. The owner of property had to occupy it and be prepared to defend it, arms in hand if necessary. The rise and development of the State, however, changed all this, and with the security thus brought about we find that possession has given place to a form of ownership depending on the possession of legal documents validated by the State, which enforces the due performance of the acts or payments indicated therein. All of this made necessary a strong, centralized State which has made possible the change from the "money economy" to the "credit economy" in which the exchange of values takes place. It has also brought into being forms of property by means of credit documents and book entries. It has also brought into being forms of property undreamed at one time. Many of these are of a somewhat unstable nature, such as stocks, bonds and shares, based as they often are on such intangible forms of property as patents, copyrights, franchises, business "goodwill" and so forth. Nevertheless, these things give their possessors the power to levy tribute upon the produce of labor to the extent of their claims.

It will be observed that while this question appears to resolve about the ownership of the land and the accumulated "savings," more or less mythical, of the capitalist class, it is, in reality, a question of the claim of that class to the product of labor. As we have seen, "the accessory follows the principle." The wealth of the world is produced annually. The machinery of wealth production must be continually renewed from the same source. This applies even to the land, apart from its attribute to mere extension (standing room).

In brief, the owning classes have a lien on the entire product of labor extending to all eternity. In late years this lien has grown to such an extent that the entire annual product is inadequate to meet the interest. This fact alone is strangling the system. This explains why the capitalist class cries out so insistently for increased production and greater economy—on the part of the laborer.

It has probably never been true that "a man could do what he liked with his own" and it is less true now than ever. There are certain limitations imposed by the State on the right of property, and the number of these has increased greatly of recent years.

There is the right of "eminent domain," by which the State may expropriate land or other property for its own use or in the interest of some corporation. There are taxation, fines and forfeitures by which the State confiscates all or part of the property of its subjects. Further, no man may keep his property in a condition or use it in such a manner as to constitute a nuisance. These considerations provide further proof that there is nothing sacred about the right of property. The State, which has created these rights, finds it necessary to modify them in the interest of public necessities. Society will have to do a lot more drastic work of the same kind if it desires to avoid the fate predicated for it.

L. H. Morgan is his "Ancient Society":—

"The dissolution of society bids fair to become the termination of a career of which property is the end and aim; because such a career contains the elements of self-destruction."

The capitalist class does not possess the grace to choose the better part. It is doubtful if they have the intelligence. I rather suspect they may not have the time.

GEORDIE.

HERE AND NOW.

Following One Dollar each:—J. A. McD, C. C. Wellerman, J. A. Lindberg, C. McMahon Smith, T. W. Nevinson, Chinese Labor Association, Ingwall Stuve, R. Sinclair, C. Neil, John Bayson, Mrs. Griffiths, C. Woolings, D. Stewart, F. Custance.

Following Two Dollars each:—J. A. La Fleche, A. Shepherd, Julius Mitchell, O. Erickson, R. C. McKay, M. Goudie.

J. Martin, Winnipeg, \$3; R. Garden, 50c; W. McQuoid, 50c; E. D. Mitchell, \$4; H. A. McKee, 50c.

Subscriptions received from 11th to 27th September, inclusive, total, \$34.50.

CLARION MAINTENANCE FUND.

F. S. F., \$1; Larson, \$2; C. Neil, \$7.25; C. K., \$10; J. Wardrope, \$1.

Contributions received from 11th to 27th September, inclusive—total, \$21.

Economic Causes of War

Article No. 13.

THE geographical position of Persia, with its valuable natural resources, has made it a bone of contention amongst the European Powers. In the past she has contributed much to the world in philosophy, science and poetry, but for many years the people have suffered beneath an Oriental despotism. Until 1906 the Shah of Persia was an absolute monarch. Some thirty years ago there arose a band of reformers whose aim was to check the extravagances of the Shah and to lead the country along the path of democracy. In 1891 an uprising occurred against the concession of a tobacco monopoly to a British company. As a result of this agitation the concession was cancelled, but the sum of \$2,500,000 was demanded by the company in compensation, which sum had to be borrowed from the Bank of Persia, a British owned concern, at 6 per cent. interest.

The extravagance of the Shah continued, and in 1900, when Britain was busy with the Boer War, Russia stepped in. Russia was, at this time, borrowing money from France, and was thus able to lend the Shah \$12,000,000, at 5 per cent., on the condition, however, that the previous debt to the Bank of Persia should be paid off. Thus Russia substituted her influence in Persia for that of Britain, and she strengthened her position two years later by another loan of \$5,000,000 at 4 per cent. In 1905, the Shah visited Russia and entered into a secret agreement to crush the reform movement and re-establish his autocracy. This movement, however, was too strong for him, and Russia, weakened by the war with Japan, could not give him much assistance. The people, through strikes and other methods, compelled him to grant a constitution. Russia also had internal troubles at this time. The Persian Parliament assembled in August, 1906, and commenced to free Persia from the tentacles of foreign finance and to regain her independence. In June, 1908, the Shah dissolved Parliament and the Parliament House was bombarded. After a year's fighting, the Nationalists compelled the Shah to reconfirm the constitution of 1906, but it was unfortunate for their plans that between 1906 and 1908 Britain and Russia had arrived at a decision on how to divide up Persia. Like all other treaties, this one begins by both parties pledging to uphold the integrity and independence of Persia. Russia, thwarted in her Asiatic expansion by the Japanese War, began to concentrate on Persia, and British gold flowed into the depleted Russian treasury, thus helping to quell the Russian revolution of 1905.

On August 21st, 1907, Britain and Russia agreed to respect the integrity and independence of Persia, but they both proceeded to partition the country into spheres of influence for commercial purposes. Gilbert Murray, in his book, "The Foreign Policy of Sir Edward Grey," in speaking of this agreement, says: (1) "North of a certain line Great Britain gave an understanding to seek no political or commercial concessions and refrain from opposing Russia the acquisition of such concessions by Russia." (2) "South of a certain line Russia gave a similar undertaking to Britain." (3) "Between these lines, which was a neutral zone, either countries could obtain concessions." (4) "Existing concessions to be respected." (5) "Should Persia fail to pay her debts to either Power each power reserved the right to pay itself out of the revenue of its own sphere of influence." In addition to the treaty Russia published a letter recognizing the special interests of Great Britain in the Persian Gulf, previously a place likely to cause a quarrel. Persia was not a party to this convention. Her people became alarmed, and to allay their fears, Sir Cecil Spring-Rice, the British Minister at Teheran, in a dispatch to the Persian Government, September 4th, 1907, said: "The object of the two Powers in making this agreement is in no way to attack, but rather to assure forever the independ-

ence of Persia, not only do they not wish to have an excuse for intervention, but their object in these friendly negotiations, was not to allow one another to intervene on the pretext of safe-guarding their interests. The two Powers hope that in future Persia will be forever delivered from the fear of foreign intervention and be thus perfectly free to manage her own affairs in her own way." Sir Edward Grey, in the British House of Commons, February 14th, 1908, stated: "That their spheres were not to be regarded as political partitions . . . They were only British and Russian spheres in a sense which is in no way derogatory to the independence and sovereignty of Persia."

Needless to say, Russia did not keep this promise. The Shah, assisted by the Russian Colonel Liakhoff, bombarded the Parliament and regained his autocratic rule with the full approval of the Czar. After a year's fighting the Nationalists won, and the Shah abdicated. Russia promised to prohibit the Shah taking part in any agitation against Persia, but this promise was not kept. Russian troops were poured into Persia on the pretext of protecting foreign lives, although no foreign lives had been lost. Russia fomented internal rebellions and used them as a pretext to send more troops. She forced the Persian Foreign Minister to resign, because he would not do their bidding, and combined with Britain, prevented Persia from raising a loan excepting a joint Anglo-Russian loan involving terms inconsistent with her independence. They prevented Persia from raising a loan through the London firm Seligmann, and from raising money on the crown jewels.

In 1911, Mr. Shuster, an American, was appointed to the office of Treasurer-General, recommended by President Taft. He arrived with a staff of American financial experts and began to place Persian finances on a sound basis. This was the last thing that Russia wanted and she began a movement which succeeded in expelling Shuster. Sir Edward Grey did not object. He wrote in November 16th, 1911: "If they (the Russian Government) thought that no satisfactory settlement could be reached without the dismissal of Mr. Shuster, I could urge no objections." Russia delivered an ultimatum to be complied with in 48 hours. It included the dismissal of Shuster, the paying of the expense of the Russian military expenditure in Persia, and gave to M. Leocoffre the power to veto all appointments of foreigners made in Persia. Four days later, on Persia appealing to Great Britain, Sir Edward Grey, whose heart beat then for Persia, as it did later for Belgium, honored the Persian "scrap of paper" by declaring: "That if the ultimatum were complied with at once, details might be arranged favorably afterwards."

Shuster went, and the Russians poured into Northern Persia, and the "Manchester Guardian" said of Grey's declaration: "It is a standing invitation to Russia to do as she pleases, and she has availed herself of it." The Russians executed every Constitutional leader they could lay their hands on. They hanged boys of twelve years of age, closed the schools, suppressed the newspapers, laid the town of Tabriz in ashes.

Russia and Britain forced Persia to conform to the policy of the Anglo-Russian convention of 1907, and to accept a joint loan at a high rate of interest. It is impossible to excel the Russian atrocities in Persia in 1912. R. G. Usher, in "Pan-Germanism," sian immigrants into the country. Britain was to prevent Germany from expanding in this direction, and on pages 167-8, says, when speaking of Shuster's dismissal: "Certainly, for the moment at any rate, the Baghdad Railway was outflanked and the possible extension of the German commercial route to the rich markets of the East was rendered for the time being improbable."

Just before the war Russia began to introduce her administrative methods in Persia, bought up large areas of land and directed swarms of Russian immigrants into the country. Britain was to

obtain the neutral zone of Persia and to have a free hand in Northern Persia. The object of adding the neutral zone was because of its valuable oil-fields. The property of the Anglo-Russian oil Company lies in the neutral zone, and the company holds a concession which gives it the monopoly of all the oil-fields in Persia except those in the extreme north. The wells where the company has been obtaining its oil are capable of producing 5,000,000 tons a year, so the chairman of the company said at the annual meeting in August, 1918. He also stated: "After allowing for depreciation, the trading profit was £1,516,994 3s. 9d." In 1914, the British Government, through Churchill, purchased £2,200,000 worth of shares in this company.

Persia was asked by the Allies to remain neutral, but she suffered severely from the fighting between the Turks and Russians on Persian soil. With the Russian revolution the hopes of Persia were renewed. The Bolsheviks repudiated the Anglo-Russian convention of 1907, and announced their intention of withdrawing Russian troops from Persia. Lord Curzon, January 21st, 1918, said that: "The great change by recent events in Russia has given to His Majesty's Government a welcomed opportunity of testifying their sincerity in repudiating any hostile designs on the integrity or political independence of the Persian kingdom . . . We have informed the Persian Government that we regard the agreement as being henceforth in suspense." The Persians, filled with hope, sent a mission to Paris to get the Great Four to abolish "All treaties, conventions, etc., aimed at destroying Persian independence and integrity," but only to find that the doors of the Peace Conference were barred. Three times it is said, they appealed for a hearing and could not get an audience with the Rulers of the World, and whilst they waited at Paris, behind their backs the champions of small nations concluded an agreement which makes Persia a second Egypt, and Persian independence a sham. The new agreement, which got some stinging criticism from the French press, as being done behind the backs of Britain's allies, and as being against the principle of the League of Nations, allows Britain to furnish expert advisers who shall be endowed with adequate power. Britain also supplies officers, equipment and ammunition for the army. She grants a loan of £2,000,000 at 7 per cent., receives the security of the Persian customs and other revenue, and co-operates (lovely word) "for the encouragement of Anglo-Persian enterprise, both by means of railway and construction and other forms of transport."

A correspondent writing from Paris, August 21st, 1919, declared that: "There were more grounds for friction between Britain and France in the Near East than there were at any time in the Fashoda incident." All the grandiloquent phrases of the war which made such excellent camouflage begin to fade when we apply the analysis of the Materialistic Conception of History. Arthur Ponsonby, M. P., and secretary of the late Campbell-Bannerman, pointed out in "Common Sense" that: "Egypt was no longer under Turkish Suzerainty but part of the British Empire, 350,000 square miles; Cyprus, 3,584 square miles; German South-west Africa, 322,450 square miles; German East Africa, 384,180 square miles; half of Togoland and the Cameroons, 112,415 square miles; Samoa, 1,050 square miles; German New Guinea and South Sea Islands, 90,000 square miles; Syria and Palestine, 11,000 square miles; Mesopotamia, 143,250 square miles; grand total, 1,417,929 square miles." Yet Asquith said in October, 1914: "We have no desire to add to our imperial burdens either in area or responsibility," and Lloyd George said on one occasion: "As the Lord liveth we do not want an inch of territory."

I suppose being God's chosen to preach the gospel, Providence is merely kind.

PETER T. LECKIE

Family Life Through The Ages

(In Three Parts).

PART I.

THE Marxian Socialist understands the social system in which we live. He does not find it necessary to consult mediums or ouija boards in order to explain political and economic events. Since the appearance of the "Communist Manifesto" in 1847, we have a key that unlocks the mysteries of the past and present. This key is the Materialist Conception of History. A proper understanding of historical materialism is the only requisite for an explanation of how the present social structure evolved out of preceding forms, and what must take the place when it, in turn, ceases to function.

When the Socialist asserts that capitalism must eventually make way for social ownership of the means of production, the contention is not based on noise or rhetoric. A scientific analysis of the matter at hand leads inevitably to this conclusion. If we examine the various institutions of today and yesterday, laying particular emphasis on the laws behind their changes, we can easily see the lack of permanency in the system which those institutions reflect.

In the early years of capitalism there was naturally a harmonious response between "the social requirements" and their "means of fulfillment." The institutions may be classified as the organs of society and, so long as the social system remains in perfect working order, those organs can be depended upon to function smoothly and well. But, under adverse conditions, the opposite obtains. The decaying tendencies of the system are certain to manifest themselves through the machinery of society.

No matter which institution we enquire into we get the same results. Half a century ago, the various modes of legislation in vogue throughout the capitalist world were well fitted to the requirements. Senates, Congresses, Commons, Lords and Reichstags, adequately functioned in legislative matters. During the recent war, however, a drastic change became necessary. Business specialist, and technical expert, were called into action to co-operate with, or usurp the function of, the old established legislative institutions. Also the necessity for labor representation in capitalist councils became apparent, and practically all the belligerent nations drafted into service such labor leaders as they could safely trust to maintain intact the present system of class rule.

In the financial, educational, religious, artistic, legal, and other institutions the same absence of harmonious response between the requirements of society, and the means for satisfying those requirements reveals itself.

In this essay we will endeavor to explain the nature of the domestic institutions of today, and trace its development through the ages. Like all the other sections of the social machinery referred to, the family system, in twentieth century capitalism, is sufficiently rotten to correctly portray the condition of the social structure in which it operates.

Look where we will along the trail of human development we cannot discover a more putrid, incongruous, repulsive state of affairs than that which exists at present in the family relations between men and women. The only instances in which anything approaching the present family relations can be unearthed pertain to the closing years of other social reforms.

Prior to the French Revolution of 1789, as well as back in the years previous to the collapse of the Roman Republic, a replica on a smaller scale of present family conditions is encountered. The abortions, sexual excesses, and perverted desires, rampant among all sections of society in France and Rome, have been lavishly dilated upon by the satir-

ists, poets, dramatists and historians of those times.

Today we view a condition similar in kind, but magnified a thousand-fold over the darkest period of any previous system. A glance at the columns of the daily press anent marriages, separations, divorces, and clandestine arrangements between the sexes suffices to warrant our contention in full.

In Britain during the anet-bellum days divorces were rarely obtained. There was no great incentive to prompt the members of any section of British society to sue for annulment of marriage. Among the nobility and aristocracy, monogamy was always more of an assumption than a reality. They had no necessity for divorce as they only cohabited on State occasions. Among the proletariat the urge was also lacking, but for other reasons. In the industrial centres where men and women left their huts and hovels in early morning to slave in mills, mines, factories, and fields till late at night, they were not together long enough to start a fight of sufficient magnitude to warrant divorce.

But the war, here as elsewhere, played a notable part. Men conscripted into the army had ample leisure to shatter their conjugal fidelity. Women at home, either the recipients of a state allotment, or working under comparatively favorable conditions, had new opportunities for light coquetry, and loose amours. With such a favorable soil for their development, little wonder that divorces are now such a common occurrence in the British courts. Formerly three-quarters of the applicants for divorce were women. Today the majority are men. The prosperity is accountable.

Even in staid, Presbyterian Scotland, where womanly chastity was second only to the sanctity of the Sabbath, the conditions have drastically changed. One judge, as reported in the British press, stated that he disposed of more than a hundred divorce cases, in the city of Glasgow, where almost all the applicants were men, and the charge adultery. The great prominence given to divorce bills, and other measures of domestic importance, in the recent session of parliament removes all doubt as to the gravity of the situation.

But how are we to understand the problem and arrive at a satisfactory conclusion? Skimming along the surface and merely noting the effects, may be an interesting pastime and afford mental relaxation for the literary rabble, but such a method can never supply the reasons for this phenomenon. We must dig beneath the surface and examine the very foundation of society. A Shaw, France, Ibsen, London, or Drieser can present a vivid picture of domestic affairs as they appear today. The changes that are taking place in society; the new relationships that are being established between classes due to the development of the machine; and the advanced means of investigation available, have resulted in a prolific crop of novelists, dramatists, and poets, who specialize in presenting pictures of home and family happenings.

But, startling as may be their disclosures, satirical their presentation, or lurid their coloring, they only, at best, hover around the effects without ever molesting the causes behind them. Perhaps no literary man of any age has contributed more toward erasing the rough spots in capitalist society than Charles Dickens. His consistent onslaught on such institutions as debtors prisons, boarding schools and orphan's homes, will long be remembered by an army of reader. But what was the result? Even when these antiquated domiciles were entirely eliminated, what did it profit the workers of Britain? Were they not still wage slaves whose physical and mental energy had to be peddled in return for a bare subsistence? Is it not reasonable to suppose that the degree of exploitation was accentuated rather than retarded by the introduction of these remedial measures?

We find it necessary, then, to get down to rock

bottom and analyze the economic base before attempting to decorate and illumine the superstructure. To do this we must have access to works on biology, ethnology, sociology, and other branches of science. Morgan, Engels, Marx, Darwin, and many other lesser lights have all contributed useful matter on the origin and development of family life.

The marriage rules, and moral codes, of evolving man were undoubtedly on a par with those of the other organisms in the world around him. Such things were absent in all cases. There must be a stage of considerable development attained before it becomes possible to formulate even crude and simple regulations of human affairs.

The consanguine family is the first to merit our scrutiny. This form, as the title implies, was one of blood relationship, and founded upon the intermarriage of brothers and sisters in a group. Such a family system has not existed anywhere during the historical period. But sufficient evidence is obtainable to warrant us making the deduction that this system of consanguinity did exist at one period in ancient society.

In fact there is every reason to believe that previous to the existence of even this primitive group form, that a much more loosely constructed order of sexual relationship prevailed. Promiscuous intercourse, or free sexual license, is the logical deduction we must draw if we impartially retrace family development back from the earliest authentic mode. All the tendencies point to this one conclusion. That even in this relationship there may have been some order established, eliminating the idea of a haphazard, catch-as-catch-can form of intercourse, is a reasonable supposition. The term **unrestricted** can be utilized only in a broad sense, and implies that subsequent barriers erected by custom did not then exist.

From the earliest known form of sexual relationship, up to that of today, the tendency has ever been in the direction of limiting the dimensions of the group, and gradually contracting the circle, till one man and one woman became the established unit of family life.

The first diminution of group activity, in matters sexual, came with the barrier drawn between persons of different generations. Mutual sexual intercourse between such persons was prohibited. Next came the exclusion of brothers and sisters, followed by that of first cousins and, then, into more remote degrees of relationship.

Just as to what motives actuated primitive man in placing restrictions in the way of any person, or groups, we cannot say for certainty. Any reasons adduced are still a matter of conjecture. However, it does seem logical to suppose that even while the power of abstract reasoning was outside a possibility among our early ancestors, still, that their powers of observation were keen and alert is clearly deducible from the data at hand.

If they could not argue and explain they could observe. The deteriorating effects of close inbreeding would, through time, become visible to savage man. To curb the continuance of such an injurious manner of intercourse would be the natural sequence to a proper estimation of its effects. As to who inaugurated the change, or when it first took place, we do not know. We cannot easily ascertain. The revelation is enshrouded by the misty darkness of the past. But one conclusion seems well founded. Some comparatively advanced peoples instituted the innovation. By so doing they enhanced their own progress, and the more backward tribes, or packs, either saw the necessity of following suit, and did so, or continued their previous mode of relationship till they finally disappeared from the stage of events.

What transpired along the remainder of the journey, and why, will occupy our attention in the next.

J. A. McD.

Western Clarion

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

Published twice a month by the Socialist Party of
Canada 401 Pender Street East, Vancouver, B. C.
Phone Highland 2533

Editor Ewen MacLeod

Subscription:

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

829

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

VANCOUVER, B. C., OCTOBER 1, 1920.

EDITORIAL

SOCIALIST STUDY CLASSES.

SOMETIME during this month the commencement will be made of classes on history and economics—on other subjects too, perhaps, but upon these certainly.

It is the function of the S. P. of C. to advance the education of the workers in such matters as affect them as a class suffering exploitation of their labor in capitalistic society.

In general, the workers today do not understand the basis of their operations as producers of wealth. They have learned to produce wealth, and the educational institutions of capitalism have been content to furnish them with such instruction as is necessary to their efficiency as producers of wealth.

Throughout the Socialist movement, lectures, propaganda, class studies and literature generally, deal mostly with history and economics. The educational institutions of capitalism may be relied upon to properly guide the student in astronomy, botany, biology, physics, grammar, mathematics, etc., but to the study of economics and history there enters a consideration affecting capitalism itself as an institution. To study history and economics is to examine the roots of society itself, to consider the growth and development of human relationships up to the point of present day society, and to examine the part played in present day society by all persons within it, that is, as persons assisting in the production of the things necessary to feed and clothe society.

Socialists find that the workers generally are suffering from class education. The ideas of the ruling class concerning the growth and development of society, and the root principles underlying the system of wealth production now obtaining, have been imposed upon the workers. They have been taught to strive for efficiency in labor, to be honest, and to save. In their succeeding generations they have followed the teaching and their lot has not been improved. The Socialist educational system is an effort to rescue economics and history from the biased channels of capitalist learning. The institutions of capitalist learning are crumbling against a positive Socialist onslaught. The measure of their decay lies in capitalism itself; when its processes of production, of exchange, of expansion, are out of order, these schools are rendered weak, because they have to uphold a system which is not smooth running, which, most of the time, is struggling with its own mechanism. They are apologists for a system of wealth production which is readily seen to be crumbling, as failing to provide for the wants of its population.

The study classes will take up history and economics, and those who pass through these classes, provided they are equipped, not so much with super-intelligence as with earnestness and diligence, will understand why the "lot" of the workers, under capitalism, is to produce as much as what they consume will allow, and to leave the rest to their masters.

SECRETARIAL NOTES.

Comrade Frank Cassidy has gone east from Vancouver on an organizing and lecturing tour in the inner B. C. country. He began at Merritt, and has

visited Princeton and Hedley. He reports good meetings held at Merritt and Hedley particularly. He intends to go through the Crow's Nest Pass, and will visit any location where good meetings are likely along that route. So that comrades who can give us any local information tending to facilitate Socialist propaganda that may be useful as a guidance to a propagandist touring their district, will do well to write to us. Frank is in constant touch with us, and we can pass the word along.

Comrade Charlie Lestor leaves Vancouver on the 2nd October for England. He will speak wherever meetings can be arranged within the time at his disposal in Canada on the way east. His first meeting will be in Fernie, where he will speak on the 6th October, and if meetings can be arranged he will speak at places immediately east of that point. The Winnipeg comrades are likely to hear him talking for a week or more to as many bewildered natives as they can assemble. Comrade Lestor expects to be away three or more months. We hope to be able to present his viewpoint on working-class matters as they appear in Great Britain, in these columns in course of time.

Places to which the CLARION goes are, among others, Norway, Switzerland, Denmark, France, Holland and China. The latest territorial recruit on the subscription list is Czeko-Slovakia, Bohemia, where (therefore) anything may happen soon. But what about places like Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario and Quebec, to say nothing of Alberta and B. C.?

It helps, of course, to educate the heathen abroad, but let us worry away at our own heathen as much as we can.

The Fifth Edition of the MANIFESTO of the S. P. of C. is on the press. This contains the preface to the Fourth Edition, and also the preface which appeared in our last issue. This last mentioned preface directs attention to the summary of events as contained in the preface to the Fourth Edition, and points to the position of the S. P. of C. towards the war and the events connected therewith as being sound and well judged.

As we went to press last issue we were informed that the John McLean who has been writing articles on industrial matters, in the "Free Press" (Winnipeg), is not an ex-professor of mathematics as the article in our last issue stated. It was understood that he had been a professor of mathematics in the University of Manitoba, but we are informed that some of the student bodies in that mental gymnasium have protested the insinuation. We understand now that he graduated as a Rhodes scholar from Oxford, and that since then he has been connected with what is sometimes called the "educational system" of India. He is now a Winnipeg barrister. So the shivering mathematicians have saved their faces after all, and our circle of acquaintances among the dusty minded citizens is increased by one. These legal gentlemen seem to have one jealous eye on their precious legal superstructure and the other on us at all times, and if we don't go breaking legal windows now and then, they manage to explain in the press how we should.

"The Revolutionary Socialist," (S. L. P., Sydney, N. S. W.), August 14th, reproduces "What Commerce Means," by J. A. McD., from our issue of 1st June, 1920.

The following sums have been collected by Julius Mitchell for **Soviet Russia Medical Relief**, and the amount of \$7.50 has been sent to Dr. John Guttman, secretary, by us:—Clarence Vreeland, 50c; George Vreeland, 50c; George Hucliek, 50c; J. McKinnon, 50c; Karl Houds, \$1; Julius Mitchell, \$3; Hugh Hansieton, 50c; E. U. Landry, 50c; T. Bolhuis, 50c; total, \$7.50.

Two more articles of "Economic Causes of War," by Comrade Peter T. Leckie remain to be printed. After that we shall attend to the printing of the book, which, judging by the appreciation accorded these articles, should have a good reception. Comrade Leckie commences in this issue a new series of articles: "Materialistic Interpretation of History," written particularly for the attention of beginners in the systematic study of History. It is hoped that these articles may prove useful to history classes throughout the country this winter.

John A. Maguire is the secretary of the **Alberta and Saskatchewan Provincial Executive Committee**. He will welcome correspondence or enquiries rela-

tive to Party matters from Alberta and Saskatchewan. Address: 93—10016 Street, Edmonton.

We expect to be able to present an article soon from the pen of C. M. C. His last article in these columns was "Armenia," (March 1st, 1920).

Comrade Stephenson has promised to end his Veblenese meditations soon. From which we conclude that our readers are to hear from him. Next to Veblen himself, in the interpretation of his sayings, Chris. usually makes the greatest number of correct guesses. (We'll suffer for this).

If number 829 appears on your address label, your subscription expires with the next issue. Renew at once or you may miss an issue or two.

A LETTER

Editor, WESTERN CLARION:

In your issue for August 16th, there is an article on the "Dictatorship of the Proletariat," by F. S. F. In it he says: "... it becomes tragic ... to find temperamental personalities like Debs linking hands with shuffling Kautsky, and affirming their belief in "democracy" as opposed to dictatorship."

It is well to bear in mind the actual words used by Debs to the committee bearing his nomination to his grand residence in Atlanta. I quote from the July "Liberator": "I regret that the convention did not see its way clear to affiliate with the Third International without qualification. There is some difficulty about that phrase about the dictatorship of the proletariat. A 'dictatorship' does not imply what we mean. It is a misnomer. Dictatorship is autocracy. There is no autocracy in the rule of the masses. During the transition period the Revolution must protect itself." These words of Debs surely clear him of the charge. His support of the Moscow International practically pigeon-holes him for the substance of that dictatorship whether he likes the phrase or not, and "phrases do not make a revolution."

This is submitted, not in any hero worship of Debs, but because it is well worth while to get as far away as possible from the religious habit of being inexact.

F. W. THOMPSON.

IN REPLY.

In reply to Comrade Thompson, who infers that my statement in regards to Comrade Debs is 'inexact,' I think, if he will read the whole of Debs' speech of acceptance, he will find, as near as I can remember, these words also:

"We Socialists are utterly opposed to dictatorship in any form ... we believe in democracy for everyone."

Well, in Russia, there is a dictatorship of the Communist Party, in the interest of the working class, that is just exactly what the word means, and it is not in the least what is called democratic. So I think Comrade Debs has "the religious habit of being inexact," for a Dictatorship is a Dictatorship.

As to whether he is for the substance or not, that would be hard to say, till he got up against it, for he, too, is one of those lovable characters that think "kindness and tolerance are worth more than all the creeds in the world."

Debs can support Lenin, yet Berger can support Debs, and Berger has no use for Lenin.

Ah, well, "Gene is a man for a' that."

FRED S. FAULKNER.

MANIFESTO

— of the —

SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

(Fifth Edition)

Per copy 10 cents

Per 25 copies \$2

Post Paid

Materialist Interpretation of History

FOR BEGINNERS

LESSON I

ALTHOUGH there is hardly a subject more adapted to broaden the mind, than history, yet our public schools confine themselves mostly to national history, and impart very meagre instruction, if any at all, in the history of the world. History is taught as if it were nothing else but a chronology of events, springing from the heroism or the wisdom of certain individuals. It has been presented to us as the events of the lives of conspicuous characters, Kings, Generals and Politicians, to celebrate their political successes, or records of wars, and make as much as possible of all this pomp and show.

The historian has almost always written with the purpose of cultivating the goodwill of the class that is in power, and applauding the nation of which he wrote. For instance, I was taught in Scotland of the daring deeds of Scotland's national heroes, Wallace and Bruce, against the English at Stirling and Bannockburn. What necessity is history of that description, in a country united to its former enemy, unless for the purpose of creating a race hatred so that the ruling class can divide the people, to enable them to maintain their power?

Buckle, in his "History of Civilization in England," says:

"History has been written by men so inadequate to the great task they have undertaken, that few of the necessary materials have been brought together. Instead of telling us those things which alone have any value, instead of giving us information respecting the progress of knowledge, instead of these things, the vast majority of historians fill their works with most trifling and miserable details and personal anecdotes of kings and courts, interminable relations of what was said by one minister and what was said by another, and what is worst of all, long accounts of campaigns, battles and sieges, very interesting no doubt to those who engaged in them, but of very little interest if any at all, to us, because they neither furnished us with new truths, nor do they supply the means whereby new truths can be discovered."

Vol. I., p. 183, Buckle says:

"As long as books, either from the difficulty of their style or from the general incuriosity of people, found but few readers, it is evident, authors had to rely on the generosity and patronage of the wealthy. And as men are always inclined to flatter those upon whom they depend, it too often happened our greatest writers prostituted their ability by fawning upon the prejudices of their patrons. And servility was paid during the 16th and 17th centuries and early part of the 18th century. A sum of money was invariably presented to the author in return for his dedication; of course, the greater the flattery, the greater the sum of money."

Buckle tells us that Louis XIV. of France induced an Italian named Abbe Primi, then residing in Paris, to write a history of himself. He was delighted with the idea of perpetuating his fame, and conferred several rewards upon the author. Arrangements were made to compose the work in Italian and translate it into the French, but when the work was finished there were some circumstances found in it which it was thought ought not to be disclosed. On this account Louis caused the book to be suppressed, the papers of the author seized, and the author himself thrown into the Bastille. The French authors wriggled out of doing the work through fear.

Rogers, in his "Work and Wages," says:

"If there had been any inclination to search into the lives and doings of the great mass of our forefathers, instead of skimming the froth of our foreign policy of wars, royal marriages and successions, and the personal characters of puppets who have strutted on the stage of public life, I might have dispensed with this marshalling of facts and figures. But even in English history, writers have only attempted to deal with antiquated forms and not with the

realities which lie beneath these forms; much less have they attempted to revive the life of a single village of mediaeval England."

Today, there is a movement on foot to change the school history of the U. S. A., because of its antagonism to the friendly relations entered into with Britain, as Allies in the Great War.

The Great War theory was the favorite theory put forth to explain the phenomenon of history up until the middle of the 19th century. The theory was that once in a while through some infinite mercy and supernatural power, a great man was sent to this earth and gave humanity a lift to a higher level, there to go along in a hum-drum way until another great man was sent to us. One of the finest flowers in this school of thought is Carlyle's "Heroes and Hero Worship."

This theory may have given an Utopian idea for men to strive for, but it gave us no scientific clue to history. If this great man was a supernatural phenomenon, a gift of God, then history has no scientific basis and all progress would depend on the caprices of God. If, on the other hand, the great man was a natural phenomenon, the theory stopped short of its goal, for it gives us no explanation of the genesis of the great man, nor the reason of the supernatural power attributed to him.

Mr Mallock, one of capitalism's servile apologists, has attempted to revise and revive the great man theory and give it a scientific form. He attributes all progress to great men, but with the brutal frankness of bourgeois capitalism gives us a new definition of the great man. According to Mallock, the great man is the man who makes money. This has long been the working theory of modern capitalistic society, and Mallock is amongst the first to have the stupidity to confess it.

By this confession, Mallock admits the truth (unconsciously), of the fundamental premise of modern scientific Socialism (our Socialism), that the economic factor in life is the dominant factor. So that one of capitalism's ablest champions admits unconsciously, the truth of the Materialist Conception of History.

Herbert's Spencer's "Study of Sociology" is one of the most brilliant refutations of the Great Man Theory. Yet no one man really killed the theory. The spread and acceptance of Darwinism created an intellectual atmosphere wherein the theory could no longer live than a fish could live out of water.

By Darwinism we mean the transmutation of the species by variation and natural selection, a selection mainly, if not wholly, by the struggle for existence. This doctrine of organic development and change, which was by Russell and Darwin a purely biological doctrine, was transported into the field of sociology and used with great force by Herbert Spencer to all human institutions, legal, moral, economic and religious. Herbert Spencer has taught the world that our social institutions are fluid and not fixed. As Karl Marx has said in his 1st edition of his great work, "Capital":

"The present society is no solid crystal, but an organization capable of change, and is constantly changing."

Prof. Ely, in "Evolution of Industry," p. 20, says:

"The economic world is constantly changing, that it is expressed in additional words in our vocabulary, such expressions as Socialists, scab, government by injunction, walking delegate, collective bargaining, sliding scale, water stock, wheat-pit, bonanza farming, co-operation and profit-sharing, captain of industry, full dinner-pail, municipal ownership, mail order business, are mostly terms George Washington would not have understood at all."

In a footnote Ely says: "In recent years a high position amongst the world thinkers has been attributed to Karl Marx by non-Socialists," and mentions Prof. E. R. A. Seligman, of Columbia University, in this connection, and refers the reader to his book

(Seligman's) "Economic Interpretation of History."

Karl Marx, in the 2nd edition of "Capital," says:

"Every historical social developed form is in a fluid movement."

This is the theory of evolution in its broadest sense, and it has struck a death blow to the conception of permanence so dear to the hearts of the capitalist class, who love to sing to their great god, private property, "as it was in the beginning, is now and ever shall be, amen."

Before natural science had revolutionized the intellectual atmosphere, great men might have rained from heaven proclaiming the doctrines of Socialism yet there would have been no Socialist movement. In fact, many of its ideas have found utterance centuries ago, but the economic conditions not being ripe, the ideas were either still-born or died in infancy.

The story of the birth of Darwinism is a proof itself of the fallacy of the Great Man Theory, and a confirmation of the view that new ideas, theories, and discoveries emanate from material conditions. We need men who are capable of perceiving the essential relations and significance of facts and drawing correct inductions therefrom. Such men are rare, but there is always enough of them to perform these functions, and the so-called great men, born before the material and economic conditions are ripe, can effect nothing. When conditions are ripe, the same idea occurs to more than one mind, that is, the same conditions and facts, force the same idea on different minds. It is true, there is always some man who is best able to marshal the facts, and the new idea becomes linked up with his name, and the human race perpetuates his memory. This double discovery of Darwin and Russell holds good of all great discoveries, which I will point out in our next issue.

PETER T. LECKIE

:o:

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 all workers to organize under the banner of the Socialist Party of Canada, with the object of conquering the political powers, for the purpose of setting up and enforcing the economic programme of the working class, as follows:

1. The transformation, as rapidly as possible, of capitalist property in the means of wealth production (natural resources, factories, mills, railroads, etc.) into collective means of production.
2. The organization and management of industry by the working class.
3. The establishment, as speedily as possible, of production for use instead of production for profit.

Social Unrest in the U.S.

LESS than two months till election day. The enormous amount of discontent bottled up and suppressed for three years, under the capitalist dictatorship behind Wilson and Co., is still gathering momentum; and after scanning primary results it seems that the best hated man in this land, and his notorious reactionary understrappers, are due to see the people sweep them and their party into well deserved oblivion.

Even though the Democrats have an alleged radical for presidential candidate, in Cox, who is ready to be all things to all men, wet in wet states, and dry in dry ones, who makes an "issue" out of the big fund alleged to be behind the Republicans (why shouldn't a party get its funds from the economic interests it aspires to serve?) yet; the people are indifferent to his pleas; the Wilson record is too much of a handicap.

Voters have short memories, but they still bear in mind the 1916 slogan: "He kept us out of war." So they are going to take revenge by electing Phonograph Harding and the G. O. P. The hatred for Wilson is shown in the election of Tom Watson to the Senate, from Georgia, a solid Democratic State (a nomination there being as good as election) who toured the States telling the voters: "If you approve of anything Wilson has done, don't vote for me." His bitter denunciation of Wilson as an "egomaniac" who ought to be in jail, instead of Debs," didn't cost him any votes, in a Democratic State, so one can see what is coming.

Maine goes overwhelmingly Republican, and in New Hampshire, reactionary Moses, anti-suffragist, gets nominated by large majority; (oh, those women). It is even probable that the Farmer-Labor Party will nose the Dems. out for second place in November. This party is likely to carry two or three states, and will make a good showing in several others in this northwest. They will also get most of the old Socialist Party vote; though Debs will poll a larger personal vote than Christiansen, Debs being the living symbol to all idealists here, of outraged humanity. It is difficult to say what the S. L. P. will poll, they being a dwindling party, and but poorly organized. In many places they never hold meetings from one year's end to another, where sections do exist, though their members freely scoff at all other efforts made to teach the slaves anything.

In this State of Washington, for example, the Socialist Party was once quite strong and thriving, keeping organizers out regularly, and men of good calibre too at times, were they. The entry of the U. S. into war saw a big decline in membership, diverging views on course to assume; persecution of members, etc., being responsible. The balance split over decision to join the C. L. P. Persecution of C. L. P.'s followed, and it is doubtful whether there can be said to be such an organization left. Groups exist in several places, Seattle, Tacoma, Everett, etc., calling themselves Socialist Party, but they are unaffiliated with any national party, so far as the writer knows. The bulk of the old membership will be found now in the Farmer-Labor Party, formerly Triple Alliance. The various Socialist groups under the able tuition of J. Fisher, are forming Marxian clubs, for the study of economics, history, philosophy, from the Marxian or commonsense viewpoint.

This is good business and great interest is being manifested by all who attend, larger numbers continually coming. S. L. P.'s as stated, are totally unable to appreciate the value of such things, because forsooth; industrial organization is not at all times set forward as the prime prerequisite to the Revolution particularly, the former **only** Industrial Union, the W. I. I. U., which stand is now modified so far as to claim the O. B. U., Garment Workers, and so on, as its children. Anyway, **some** place must be found in the **scheme** of things for the W. I. I. U., or else it simply can't be good.

Apropos of the Revolution, that many good people are continually looking for, it would not be

amiss to here point out that the process of changes they are worried about is now going on, **only**, it has not yet reached that peculiarly agitated, visible, shape, which so many people imagine is all there is to **change**, and dubbed Revolution.

The processes of wealth production here, are far in advance of the average human's ideas. He dimly sees something is wrong, when wealth is turned out so easily, and wasted so prodigally, as for instance at Hog Island; yet because his ideas or consciousness still linger in the old frontier days, and persistently tell him that he can get ahead if he tries, he keeps on trying. He has an awful "hangover."

Again: he has the idea that all wrongs may be rectified by sending "good" men to a legislature to enact just laws for the benefit of the common people.

True, ideas are a reflex of material phenomena; but ideas are not necessarily up-to-date on that account. Impressions are continually without pause, being registered in the reception rooms of the skull, impressions by the million that we are utterly unconscious of, in the sense that we perceptibly note each new arrival and classify it, pigeonhole it, compare it to some prior impression, and produce the thought result. Impressions crowd in ever more swiftly these days of lightning news service, a veritable flood is poured through our sense gates, to be moulded into ideas—some day, not now—but later.

All the impressions do influence our actions, and quite unconscious to our thinking selves, it can be called automatic. It is only the trained individuals among us that keep our ideas approximately up-to-date, and only a few of these have the materialist key to unravel the maze we wander in.

And all of us as we get older get "out of date," the body gets older, breaks down, the brain cells disintegrate, new impressions though received, are not utilized with the old speed; the habit of thinking gets wearisome; the old formed ideas become a sheet anchor to cling to, while all about, is uncomprehended chaos, till the end is reached, and body, cells, impressions and all, go back to the dust and the sod.

Some recorded reflections are passed on, and become of use to the new "lords of the universe." To the extent they are utilized as material to be examined, and ideas re-extracted and renovated, or give birth to some better idea, by comparison with present day experience, it is good.

But when the old record becomes a guide to the mental footsteps of those who should know better; without criticism, because criticism of the past is sacrilege, and blasphemy, it becomes the Alp that crushes the brain of the living.

But the latter is the rule. The human will not only try a thing once, but when it comes to looking ahead, and adapting himself to conditions as men of reason would do, he will even sooner try everything not only once, but many times.

Driven to association with his fellows though he is, Mr. Average Man still mentally lives in the days when he was a law unto himself, or the early impressions of his youth's teachings still guide him, he being so much the more receptive, and the gray matter easily moulded then. In the minds of the vast majority of the people here, private property, even in utilities socially used, is a most sacred thing. Hence, all the symptoms of present day unrest, and signs of the coming birth agony manifested in the political field, outside a few groups, avoid touching the root cause of the troubles.

The landowning farmers hate high taxes, and want high prices for their produce, so join the non-Partisan League, elect men pledged to achieve the unachievable, and restlessly await results.

Organized craft union labor, fuming under the relentless downward pressure of "high" prices and smarting because they can't keep wages even level with prices, now forms political alliance with the group of farmers who **want** higher prices, to capture political power, and oust the lackeys who serve

the villain, Mr. Middleman, the scoundrel who is responsible for all their suffering. He charges labor like Sam Hill, and gives Farmer a mere hand out.

That's the guy. Let's get him!

Students of Marx. Now, I ask you?

-And legions of self-styled Socialists, unversed in political economy, "raised" on "Appeal" slop, and saturated with "Direct Action" slush besides, have rushed in to help; sure, it is a working class party and is going in the "right" direction.

"Oh, yes; we'll vote for Debs, but this is the Party that's come to stay, we'll make it **revolutionary**."

It will fail, as all similar movements have failed, because of irreconcilable interests, and the big fact that they are opposing the evolutionary process, but don't know it.

The slaves will doubtless then say, "To hell with politics," and try solidarity in an O.B.U.: that can tie up a whole industry at once, and force the boss to loosen up on his ill-gotten gains.

They too, will fail. But they will try this way, that road, back and forward for years before they are seized with the correct idea, to produce wealth for themselves, instead of handing it to the boss class, demanding or begging for **more** of what they gave away entirely.

To those whose "deferred hope is making the heart sick," we can only say, keep your eyes open, and explain the position of the rival classes to each other. That is better than running around **hoping** for the **revolution**. The revolution is going on, the switch to the G. O. P., to the F. L. P., or O. B. U., or any other combination of the **alphabet** is indication that the populace is seeking, but has not yet found.

As no relief from the misery prevalent is possible under the wage system, or while private ownership of the means of production exists, it follows, that some time, some way, and somehow, the working class will be faced with the alternative of revolt or death of civilization itself.

Whether at that time they have a political party, or a well organized industrial union, or both; they will be confronted with the necessity of a trial of strength between the power and physical force in their working class organizations, and what can be mustered by the capitalist executive committee on the other hand. And before they reach the point where such a revolutionary situation exists, much has to be done.

This thing cannot be started; it is going on, has always gone on; it is the continuation of a process of life development that must have existed before man and his fusses were known of.

It is Evolution.

We cannot start what is taking place. We can make the process of evolution, the expropriation of wealth, and class exploitation, clear to all we can reach.

That is the purpose of Marxian groups.

The more we reach, the easier the society birth when it comes, because more trained midwives will be on the job.

We reach the masses in political campaigns. We explain in the unions why they must change their object, seek the abolition of slavery, instead of its palliation.

We welcome solidarity, but we want class consciousness, and the knowledge springing from study, more.

We are not worrying about the name given to the action that will be taken in that decisive moment when the last slave class squares accounts with its masters.

It is a long way off in these United States, yet, but it is fatedly bound to come. Let us work to increase the number and power of the teachers of Marx, that the clashes that occur, marred with bloody slaughter for the ignorant, inexperienced working class, may be few in number, and the guide of reason be to some extent substituted for stern experience.

F. S. F.

Is it the Dictatorship of the Proletariat?

IN the last issue of the "Clarion," F. S. F. deals with, but does not explain, what Dictatorship of the Proletariat means. Shedding tears over Kautsky and the S. P. of G. B. does not tell us what is meant by the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. What do we mean when we use this term anyway? Does it mean a dictatorship of a minority? If so, than Faulkner has cast overboard all the ideas he expressed in the August, 1919, issue of "The Proletarian." Dictatorship as a form of government in Russia means disarming the opposition, by taking away the franchise, liberty of the press and combination of opponents. Does the working class have to employ such measures?

A government that has the support of the masses has not the least occasion to interfere with democracy. Why fear the few who oppose working class rule? Let them rave on. The working class wants Socialism and the ravings of a few defenders of the institution of private property will not deter them from the right path. Or is it a dictatorship of a small section of the working class over the great mass of workers? Can a Socialist system of production be built on this foundation? State organization of production by society, a bureaucracy by the dictatorship of a small section of the people does eratic control of industry. Socialism pre-supposes matic control of industry. Socialism pre-supposes a working class that is capable of running the wheels of industry more efficiently than under Capitalism. Again, a dictatorship may mean civil war. An ignorant working class can easily be induced to support reaction. Chronic civil war or its alternatives, apathy and opposition by the mass under a dictatorship, would render the organization of a Socialist system of production well nigh impossible. And yet we are asked to defend a dictatorship of a minority which helps to produce anarchy and chaos.

In the subsequent issue of the "Clarion," Frank Cassidy defends minority action. He quotes from Lenin as to the existence of a dictatorship of a minority in Russia. To prove this form of action to be correct, Cassidy uses such childish arguments: "Well, as to the fact, pointed out by Lenin himself, that some 500,000 to 600,000 Communists control the destinies of Russia. It is doubtful if any dictatorship has ever before been vested in so many. A handful of Grand Dukes formerly dictated affairs in Russia; likewise a few merchant princes and financiers dictate the affairs of the United States, of Great Britain, France or any other capitalist dictatorship." What a consolation it must be to the other 179,500,000 to know that the present dictatorship is more numerous than that during the Czarist regime.

Then again, F. S. F. is fearful of what might happen if a revolutionary Socialist ticket were to poll an overwhelming vote in November. He is quite sure that the capitalists will not surrender their power without a struggle. In the first place what has that to do with a dictatorship of the proletariat? And again we must realize that should a ruling class under the supposition here discussed, resort to force, it would do so precisely because it feared the consequences of democracy, and its violence would be nothing but the subversion of democracy. Therefore not the uselessness of democracy for the working class is demonstrated by anticipated attempts of the ruling classes to destroy democracy but rather the necessity of the working class to defend democracy with tooth and nail. It was only through heavy sacrifices that the working class did get the democratic privileges of today. The mass of people are everywhere too attached to their political privileges and will not abandon them without a struggle. The ruling classes realize that, and are therefore not attempting to antagonize the working class by taking from them their political instruments. A few ignorant public officials have done so, but their actions have been condemned by all

sections of the ruling class. We must not forget that the more democratic a State is, the more dependent are the forces exerted by the executive dependent on public opinion. It was necessary for the ruling class of America to enlist the support of the masses before it could wage war on Germany. Military experts hinge everything on the morale of an army. It is difficult to see why we should be fearful of what might happen if the working class is victorious at the polls.

Even Marx thought it possible and even probable that in England and America, the working class might peacefully conquer political power. At a meeting at the Hague Marx stated: "We know that the institutions, the manners and the customs of the various countries might be considered, and we do not deny that there are countries like England and America, and, if I understand your arrangements, I might even add Holland, where the worker may attain his object by peaceful means. But not in all countries is this the case." We know, however, that gradually the capitalists of all countries are compelled to grant the workers the franchise and other liberties. The workers of Japan are duplicating the heroic efforts of the British worker of fifty years ago.

In August, 1919, issue of "The Proletarian," F. S. F. points out that minority action is fraught with danger for the working class. Here are his exact words: "Do these mass actionists ever think of the tragic fate of Finland, or of the Liebknecht week in Berlin?" And we might add the tragedies that were enacted in Budapest and Munich. But in the "Clarion" he changes his ideas. "And the truth about the Russian situation was that the Bolsheviks were forced to seize power, or see reaction sweep them and the advanced workers away as the Finns were swept away, and the Hungarians also." On one hand, he criticizes the mass actionists and on the other hand he raves about "opportunity." The only difference between the mass actionists and F. S. F. is that the mass actionists believe that the time is now ripe for a revolutionary change and all that is necessary is mass action, whereas F. S. F. does not believe the time is as yet ripe but, no doubt in the "sweet bye-and-bye" will ape our mass actionist friends.

No, F. S. F., you cannot get Socialism by Dictatorship of the Proletariat. Bela Kun, Levien, Liebknecht, and others tried your method, but the result was that thousands of workers are rotting in unknown graves. What then are the pre-requisites of Socialism? The will to Socialism is the first condition for its accomplishment. The will is created by the gigantic development of industry. Where small production is universal in a society, the masses are possessed of the means of industry. Small production creates the will to uphold the institution of private property. Again with the development of industry, great numbers of peasants are uprooted from the soil and are compelled to enter industry. To the ripening of the conditions for Socialism must be added the maturity of the working class. Capitalism itself organizes the workers, trains them and gradually makes them fit to assume control of industry. Whenever the working class desires Socialism, we will have Socialism. It is impossible to have Socialism in a country where small production is general as in the case of Russia. It is also impossible to have Socialism in a country where the huge mass of people do not desire it. In other words, Socialism without Democracy is unthinkable. These are the views not only of Kautsky and the S. P. of G. B. but of Pritchard as well. F. S. F. no doubt remembers that Pritchard pointed out to the jury trying him, that the S. P. of C. expected to get Socialism only through the support of a majority of the population of Canada.

It is not long since the "Clarion" reproduced the article, "What is Democracy," from the "Socialist

Standard," which clearly expressed the necessary democratic implication of Socialism. Surely the members of the S. P. of C. realize how dangerous minority rule would be in their party, and the actions of small groups in the S. P. of A. and other parties to dominate the membership should sufficiently show the dangers of minority rule.

JOHN TYLER.

Experiments

SOME Socialist speakers and writers have the habit of referring to the Russian Soviet Government as an experiment.

Peoples and nations act when forces over which they have no control impel them to, and their actions are guided by the amount of knowledge they possess as to these forces. When slavery was introduced into communistic society, it was no scheme or experiment on the part of certain sections of that society then existing, notwithstanding the fact that it was a new departure, and this applies—as every student of economics must be aware—to all those changes that have taken place in the evolution of mankind.

The only feasible solution to the present chaos the world over, when capitalism, or the system of production for profit and the private ownership of the means of life is in its decay, is to replace it by a system of production for use and social ownership of the means of life, and it is that solution that is being applied in Russia today. The human race must periodically adjust itself to the constant economic changes taking place, and the existing turmoil is a natural outcome resulting from a dying system and the birth of a new system that will more satisfactorily meet the needs of society.

All new changes that have taken place in society during its long and arduous struggle have been forced upon it, and we do not hear that slavery, feudalism, capitalism, were experiments emanating from the giant brains of individuals, nor Christianity, or the many wars of the past, including the great war, rebellions, and finally the war we are now in the midst of—the war between capital and labor, being waged in every capitalist country—we do not hear that these are experiments. Then why claim that the first country to make a decisive attempt to throw off the chains of slavery of the workers—an attempt that so far as can reasonably be seen will be successfully followed by every other nation—is an experiment? Such a claim is entirely opposed to the materialist conception of history and the class struggle. O. M.

THE "WESTERN CLARION" IS ON SALE AT:

CALGARY, ALTA.—Alexander News Stand, 204 Eighth Avenue West.

Labor News Stand, 814a—2nd Street East.

MONTREAL—S. Feigelman, 421 St. Lawrence Boulevard
Frierman and Baranowski, 12 Ontario Street East.

NEW WESTMINSTER—News Stand, B. C. E. R. Depot.

SEATTLE—Raymer's Old Book Store, 1330 First Ave.

PORT ARTHUR—Viking Book Store, 264 Bay Street

TORONTO—D. Goodman, Blind News Agent, corner Queen and Chestnut Streets.

VANCOUVER — Columbia News Stand, corner Hastings and Columbia Streets.

John Green, Carrall Street

W Love, Hastings Street East.

WINNIPEG—Reformers' Book Agency, 222a Phoenix Block

BUFFALO, N.Y.—Onward Book Store, 196 Gold Street

CHICAGO—Radical Book Shop, 867 N. Clark Street

Walden Book Shop, 307 Plymouth Court

ROCHESTER, N.Y.—Proletarian Party, 580 St. Paul Street

TACOMA—Raymer's Old Book Store, 1317 Pacific Avenue

Labor Defence Fund

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

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

Central Collection Agency: J. Law, Secretary, Defence Fund, 220 Bannatyne Ave., Winnipeg.

Concerning Value

Article No. 1.—The Necessity of Right Conception

IT was Karl Marx and Frederick Engels who first gave to the world the sociological law of economic determinism in this classical statement:

"In every historical epoch, the prevailing mode of economic production and exchange, and the social organization necessarily following from it, form the basis upon which is built up, and from which alone can be explained, the political and intellectual history of that epoch; that consequently the whole history of mankind (since the dissolution of primitive tribal society, holding land in common ownership) has been the history of class struggles, contests between exploiting and exploited, ruling and oppressed classes.... that the history of these class struggles forms a series of evolution in which, now-a-days a stage has been reached where the exploited and the oppressed class—the proletariat—cannot attain its emancipation from the sway of the exploiting and ruling class—the bourgeoisie—without, at the same time, and once and for all, emancipating society at large from all exploitation, oppression, class-distinction and class struggles."

The study of history in the light of economic determinism displaced the old presentation of certain events in the lives of conspicuous personalities, such as kings and potentates, celebrating their political successes, recording their wars, and making all possible of their pomp and trappings of State. The facts presented have been those which would lend themselves to the glorification of great personages, and the reasoning upon them has been theological in its methods.

With the advent of economic determinism as the interpretator of human history the death-knell of theological history was sounded. For the Economic Interpretation of History proceeds by quite different methods—it aims at the whole truth, and its effect upon the human mind is altogether different than that wrought by the theologians. Says Parce in "Economic Determinism":

"It is the study of the development of society, and by society is meant the whole of the people, with their facilities for getting a living, their institutions and ideas. It has very little to do with either special events or particular individuals. An individual has no importance at all, excepting in his relation to all the people, and then the people are the important thing; he is merely an incident. And the mainspring of growth and action is found not in any outside power. But above all, it traces the ways in which the races of men get their living, for all other developments depend upon changes and improvements in the ways of producing the food and clothing of the race." (Emphasis mine).

And:

"When a person sees that the conditions in which he lives are due to causes which can and do change from time to time, and when he sees that such changes are the result of new knowledge put to practical use, or of new inventions and discoveries made by common men like himself, it puts new hope and courage into him. When he sees that improvements can be made by people simply getting together and making them, he takes a new attitude altogether. Whereas he was a negative and passive creature before, whose life was simply an endurance test, he now becomes alert and positive. He wants to learn about the facts of life, and what they mean and what opportunities for improvement they offer; then he wants to put his shoulder to the wheel and push."—"Economic Determinism," pp. 11-12.

With the sure guide of economic determinism there fell to the ground the old ideas of society, the old concepts of history, the old supremacy of witch-craft and mysticism. Man began to realize that he was master of his own destiny, that he could become the master, and cease to be the slave of Nature.

Moreover, Marx and Engels, by the discovery of the law of economic determinism, placed sociology on the sure foundations of a science. Or, as Engels himself says:

"History for the first time was placed upon its real foundation; the obvious fact hitherto ignored, that first of all man must eat, drink, have shelter and clothing, and therefore work, before they can struggle for supremacy or devote themselves to politics, religion, philosophy, etc.—this fact at last found historical recognition."

This historical recognition of economic determinism brought with it the realization of the importance of the economic forces which make and re-make society. For the first time man was conscious of the important fact that he could become the master of the trend of social evolution. Instead of the old concept of guiding powers from other worlds and the hapless slavery to an Omnipotent God, there came the new and hopeful concept of man's part in the moulding of social institutions and the realization of man's power to become master and not slave.

The value of such a guide to history is so apparent that there is little need for the writer to tell the tale and point the moral. Sufficient to his present purpose that he emphasises the importance of economic determinism as a guide to sociological development.

The acceptance of economic determinism implies the acceptance of the necessity of a close and careful study of the economic structure of the existing social order. If, as the Socialist states, the determining factor in social evolution is the means of wealth production and distribution, then it follows, as does night day, that only by a scientific analysis of the existing economic system can we appreciate to the full the trend of social evolution. The incessant change and urge of economic forces, the causes of those forces of which they are the effects—this must be the subject matter of all those who would take the existing social order, and:

"Shatter it to bits,

To remould it nearer to the heart's desire."

In such a study, we must start, as Marx himself has pointed out, with the production of a single commodity. The science of economics deals with the production and distribution of a nation's wealth, and in order to understand that process it is essential that we examine it in relation to a single, given commodity. A single commodity is a unit in that accumulation of commodities which comprise the wealth of any nation, and by the careful analysis of the processes whereby that commodity is produced and exchanged, we shall arrive at a clear conception of the processes whereby the whole of the wealth of any given system of society is produced and distributed.

In such a study of the economic structure of the existing social order, it is imperative that we possess a thorough understanding of the meaning of the term Value. Prof. Stanley Jevons (of whom more anon) says:

"Exchange is so important a process in the maximising of utility (read value) and the saving of labor, that some economists have regarded their science as treating of this operation alone . . . It is impossible to have a correct idea of the science of Economics without a perfect comprehension of the Theory of Exchange."—"The Theory of Political Economy," pp. 75-6.

And he continues that a thorough understanding of that theory necessitates a clear conception of the term Value.

Says the "Encyclopaedia Britannica":

"In most departments of economic theory it is convenient to use as the basis of exposition the opinions of J. S. Mill, not only because he has embodied in his treatise in a remarkable manner nearly everything of importance from the theoretical standpoint in the work of his predecessors, but also because most of the recent advances in economic science have been made by way of criticism or development of his views. This observation is especially true of the theory of value."—Sect. re "Value."

And this "remarkable" economist says:

"Almost every speculation respecting the economical interests of a society thus constituted implies some theory of value; the smallest error on that subject infects with correspond-

ing error all our other conclusions; and anything vague or misty in our conception of it creates confusion and uncertainty in everything else."—"Principles of Political Economy," book 3, chap. 1.

I might fill all the space of this article with quotations from political economists of note to the same effect. It is sufficient for my purpose that we recognize the necessity of a study of Value and a clear conception of what Value means.

It is the purpose of this and the following articles to call attention to the study of Value. There has been no term in the science of economics which has caused so much confusion of thought. Indeed, Jevons states that:

"I must, in the first place, point out the thoroughly ambiguous and unscientific character of the term value"—"Theory of Political Economy," p. 76.

This ambiguity and complexity has been recognized by all economists, but their analysis has only, for the most part, rendered confusion worse confounded. Mill, with his inveterate eclecticism, contrives, on this point of value to make one page carefully contradict another, but is bold enough to state:

"Happily, there is nothing in the laws of Value which remains for the present or any future writer to clear up; the theory of the subject is complete."—"Principles of Political Economy," book 3, chap. 1.

Be that as it may, I shall endeavor, in the following articles to analyse, with care and without prejudice, the various theories of Value which have been advanced from time to time, in order that we may arrive at as clear a conception as is possible, of this important phase of political economy.

Next Article: "The Classical School."

: o :

Literature Price List

Communist Manifesto. Single copies, 10c; 25 copies, \$2.00.

Wage-Labor and Capital. Single copies, 10c; 25 copies, \$2.00.

The Present Economic System. (Prof. W. A. Bonger). Single copies, 10c; 25 copies, \$1.50.

Capitalist Production. (First Nine and 32nd Chapters, "Capital," Vol. I. Marx). Paper, single copies, 50c; cloth, single copies, \$1.00; cloth, 10 copies, 75c each.

Socialism, Utopian and Scientific. Single copies, 15c; 25 copies, \$3.25.

Slave of the Farm. Single copies, 10c; 25 copies, \$1.50.

Manifesto, S. P. of C., single copy, 10 cents; 25 Copies \$2.00

Red Europe. (F. Anstey, M.P.). Single copies, 50c. Ten copies or more 30c each.

The Story of the Evolution of Life. (T. F. Palmer). Single copies, 10c.

Evolution of Man. (Prof. Bolsche). Single copies, 20c; 25 copies, \$3.75.

The Nature and Uses of Sabotage (Prof. T. Veblen). Single copies 5 cents, 25 copies \$1.

The Criminal Court Judge, and The Odd Trick (E. B. Bax). Single copies, 5 cents; per 25 copies, 75c.

Evolution of the Idea of God (Grant Allen), 55c per copy.

Ancient Society (Louis H Morgan), \$2 15

Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State (F. Engels) 90c

Value, Price and Profit (Marx)—Single copies, 15c; 25 copies, \$3.25.

Feuerbach: The Roots of the Socialist Philosophy (F. Engels) 90c

Introduction to Sociology (Arthur M. Lewis), \$1.75.

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

(All above post free).