Socialist Party Library

WESTERN CLARION

A Journal of CURRENT EVENTS

Official Organ of
THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

HISTORY ECONOMICS PHILOSOPHY

No. 880. EIGHTEENTH YEAR Twice a Month VANCOUVER, B. C., DECEMBER 1, 1922. FIVE CENTS

The War Documents

"When they invoke against us our Secret Treaty with Russia, we shall invoke our public Treaty with humanity."

(Jean Jaures, at Brussels, July 29, 1914).

THERE has been published already such a mass of material dealing with the events which led up to the world war of 1914-18 that at first glance it would seem superfluous to spend further time and space on the subject. In any consideration that has been given in this journal heretofore, or in the literature of the Socialist Party of Canada generally to the war and its causes, the prevailing note has been that wars between nations arise not in defence of the weak against the strong, not for national honor nor through ideal motives, but to advance the material welfare of one national group of propertied interests as against another, and that the reasons for alliance of resources between groups are marked out in the routes of trade and in projected or actual territorial dominance. (In this connection, if the reader has not already done so he will do well to read Peter T. Leckie's "Economic Causes of War." See Literature Price List, page 8). The soundness of that analysis is well borne out by the facts, and every document that has any bearing on the war and the diplomatic negotiations concerning it fully bears it out. It is with some of these documents we would deal here. There are Clarion readers in outlying districts, no doubt, who are unable to follow the investigations that have been made into the mire of diplomatic correspondence incidental to the war and the general mass of literature connected with it.

* * *

In "The Nation" (N. Y.) Oct. 11, 1922 there appeared an article entitled "They all Lied" by Lewis S. Gannett, and in the International Relations section of the same number there appeared some excerpts from various official documents, presented to show that the Entente Powers were not taken by surprise by the war and that they had been for years preparing for it. The "Manchester Guardian" last June carried articles of a similar nature, showing that the plea of an "unprovoked attack" on an unsuspecting France and Belgium as the outcome of a carefully planned German conspiracy was voiced by the British government to conceal the facts of the case, a course which in their judgment was necessary to the success of their war policy. We shall come to that in time. The mass of material is so great as to make it difficult to judge what to select. The work done in this particular field by E. D. Morel (now labor M. P. for Dundee) has received wide acknowledgment. Indeed, several books and many articles have been written based upon his work, and the documents now coming to light well bear out his conclusions. His point of view as to the primary power of international diplomacy in causing war is subject to question, but his point of view does not hinder the usefulness for us of his researches. We shall acknowledge Mr. Morel's help beforehand, therefore, for much of our material in what we have to say.

"The Nation" documents (beforementioned) are largely based on the "De Siebert" documents and on "Un Livre Noir" (A Black Book). Our readers will remember the text of the secret treaties of the Russian Imperial Archives reproduced from "Pravda" of Nov. 23 (and later) 1917, in the "New York Evening Post" and in the "Manchester Guardian." They have now come to be known as the "First Collection" of the documents of the Russian Imperial Archives. The De Siebert documents are known as the "Second Collection. — Entente Diplomacy and the World: Matrix of the History of Europe, 1909-14."—Contains in 762 pages 853 documents. (New York: G. P. Putnam and Son. $12.50). De Siebert was secretary of the Imperial Russian Embassy in London. The correspondence of Isvolsky, Russian Ex-Foreign Minister, is contained in the "Third Collection" to be published in two volumes, the first of which has already appeared as "A Black Book" under Soviet Government direction. (No attention is given to these documents by the press, but every attention is given to Clemenceau, or Lloyd George, or Lord Birkenhead or whoever is still prominent in maintaining the farcical story about Germany "willing" the war deliberately and exclusively). Lewis S. Gannet quotes also Professor S. R. Fay's "New Light on the Origins of the War", which is an analysis of Kautsky's disclosures of the German archives and of those of Richard Gooss in the Austrian archives. There is a point Mr. Gannett has missed in his documentation, and that is in quoting Sir Edward Grey's Note to M. Cambon, French Ambassador to London, November 22, 1912. His quotation is quite correct as it appeared in the British White Book, as follows:

From time to time in recent years the French and British naval and military experts have consulted together. It has always been understood that such consultation does not restrict the freedom of either government to decide at any future time whether or not to assist the other by armed force. We have agreed that consultation between experts is not and ought not to be regarded as an engagement that commits either government to action in a contingency that has not arisen and may never arise. The disposition, for instance, of the French and British fleets respectively at the present moment is not based upon an engagement to cooperate in war.

You have, however, pointed out that, if either government had grave reasons to expect an unprovoked attack by a third Power, it might become essential to know whether it could in that event depend upon the armed assistance of the other. I agree that if either Government had grave reason to expect an unprovoked attack by a third Power, or something that threatened the general peace, it should immediately discuss with the other whether both governments should act together to prevent aggression and to preserve peace, and if so what measures they would be prepared to take in common. **If these measures involved action the plans of the general staffs would at once be taken into consideration and the governments could then decide what effect should be given to them.**

That quotation is quite correct, as taken from the British White Book. But Sir Edward Grey read that note in his speech to Parliament, August 3, 1914, and he omitted entirely the last sentence, which we have placed in italics. The note as read by Grey appears in Hansard (Aug. 3,'14), Vol. 65, p. 1813 and is without the last sentence. Viviani, French Premier, read the full text in the French Chamber next day, and in full it was incorporated in the French Yellow Book. So it had to go in the British White Book in full. Viviani had no need to hide the truth—that there were definite Anglo-French military and naval plans laid beforehand, and jointly agreed upon as disclosed in that last sentence. He could rely upon French support against Germany, in view of the geographical position of France and the expected response to the French chauvinist appeal against Germany. But Grey had to conceal the policy the British Foreign office had pursued consistently since Lord Lansdowne's term of office as foreign minister, which policy had resulted in what has now come to be known as the "encircling offensive". Grey had to present his case in conformity with the many public declarations made previously by himself and other British government ministers: that the British Foreign office had entered into no agreements whatsoever of a military character with an outside power. Here is a reference to some of these declarations:

On 10th March 1913, Mr. Asquith, replying to a question in the Commons from Lord Hugh Cecil, denied that England was under an "obligation arising owing to an assurance given by the Ministry in the course of diplomatic negotiations, to send a very large armed force out of this country to operate in Europe." On 24th March 1913 he made similar denials in reply to questions from Sir W. Byles and Mr. King. On 14th April, 1913, Mr. Runciman in a speech at Birkenhead denied "in the most categorical way" the existence of a secret understanding with any foreign Power. On 3 May 1913 the Secretary for the Colonies, Mr. Harcourt, declared publicly that he "could conceive no circumstances in which Continental operations would not be a crime against the people of this country." On 28 June 1913 the under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Acland, declared publicly that "in no European question are we concerned to interfere with a big army." On July 1, 1913, Lord Loreburn (Lord Chancellor from 1906 to 1912) said, "that any British Government would be so guilty towards our country as to take up arms in a foreign quarrel is more than I can believe." On 28 April 1914 and again on 11 June 1914 Sir Edward Grey confirmed, in the House of Commons, Mr. Asquith's assertion, made 10 and 24 March 1913, of British freedom from engagements with Continental Powers. (Albert Jay Nock. The Myth of a Guilty Nation. Page 103).

It is thus very easy to see why Grey omitted that last sentence. His government had denied the existence of any committments of such a nature. By the time the British White Book was published the nations were at war and the admission was not then subject to effective discussion. In the meantime, on 3rd Aug. 1914 (same day as Grey's speech), Mr. Asquith said in the House of Commons:—

If I am asked what we are fighting for, I reply in two sentences: In the first place, to fulfil a solemn international obligation . . . . Secondly, we are fighting . . . . . to vindicate the principle that small nationalities are not to be crushed in defiance of international good faith.

The small nation, of course, was Belgium. The Belgian appeal was a great help to Sir Edward Grey. The "treaty" of 1839 was well used. It was a device used to present the case in a false light. The "German" had to become a "Hun." Let us quote Mr. Lloyd George as he expressed himself just eight months before the war broke out:—

The German army is vital, not merely to the existence of the German Empire, but to the very life and independence of the nation itself, surrounded as Germany is by other nations, each of which possesses armies about as

(Continued on page 2)

THE WAR DOCUMENTS

(Continued from page 1)

powerful as her own. We forget that, while we insist upon a 60 per cent. superiority (so far as our naval strength is concerned) over Germany being essential to guarantee the integrity of our own shores—Germany herself has nothing like that superiority over France alone, and she has, of course, in addition, to reckon with Russia on her eastern frontier. Germany has nothing which approximates to a two-Power standard. She has, therefore, become alarmed by recent events, and is spending huge sums of money on the expansion of her military resources. (D. Lloyd George in the "Daily Chronicle" (London), January 1st, 1914.

But the same Lloyd George altered all that later:

What are we fighting for? To defeat the most dangerous conspiracy ever plotted against the liberty of nations, carefully, clandestinely planned in every detail with ruthless, cynical determination. (D. Lloyd George, Queens Hall, London, 4 August 1917).

The argument of the Allied governments concerning their "unpreparedness" against the "unprovoked attack" precipitated upon them by the Central Powers falls down, not only through the story of the course of diplomacy among the Powers in the eight years (more or less) immediately preceeding 1914, but through an examination of the military and naval appropriations of the Powers concerned. Mr. Nock has examined these, and from 1909 to 1914 (inclusive), for naval construction Great Britain spent £92,672,524; France spent £43,-152,909; Russia spent £38,477,605; and Germany spent £66,099,111. That is to say, in that period Great Britain, France and Russia combined spent for naval purposes £240,402,149 against Germany's £66,099,111. Austria and Turkey are not counted in, and possible lesser costs either in construction or upkeep on the Central Powers' side are not considered, but neither is the weight of the Japanese navy accounted, and in any case the overwhelming supcriority of the Allies in this field is beyond a doubt. In the military field Germany and Austria combined spent £92,000,000 and Great Britain, France and Russia £142,000,000 in 1914 (pre war figures). Great Britain's expenditure for military purposes alone, appropriated in 1914 before war broke out, considered alone was greater by £4,000,000 than Austria's. Morel ("Tsardom's Part in the War") says:—

The combined excess of military and naval expenditure of Russia and France in combination over Germany and Austria in combination amounted in the decade 1895—1904 to £247,827,028; and in the decade 1905—14 to £229,868,853.

The "unpreparedness" argument has no foundation in fact. The late Italian Prime Minister Nitti explains its original purpose very well:

I cannot say that Germany and her allies were solely responsible for the war which devastated Europe ..... That statement, which we all made during the war, was a weapon to be used at the time; now that the war is over it cannot be used as a serious argument. ("Peaceless Europe," by Francesco Nitti. Cassel).

Let us go back to 1905, the year Sir E. Grey succeeded Lord Lansdowne as British Minister for Foreign Affairs, which post he held until 1916. On April 4th 1904, Lansdowne and Delcasse (French Minister for Foreign Affairs) succeeded in effecting the Anglo-French Agreement over Morocco (See "Economic Causes of War" page 91.) "The Round Table," March 1915, quotes the German historian Rachfahl in that connection as marking a definite period in the relationships of the Powers:

Under the surface of the Morocco affair lurked the deepest and most difficult problems of power, it was to be forseen that its course would prove to be a trial of strength of the first order.

The Anglo-French rapproachment was followed in 1907 by an agreement between Great Britain and Russia concerning boundaries in Tibet and Afghanistan and the division of Persia. "This Agreement with Russia," says "The Round Table" (last quoted), "unlike the spirit of the Entente with France, carried with it no suggestion of the possibility of common action in the event of German aggression, though it was facilitated by common apprehension of German designs."

That even then the press had set itself to deal carelessly with the truth in matters concerning Germany is evident from this:—

During the years 1905—8 instructions were given to all continental correspondents of the London "Times" by Sir Valentine Chirol to suppress everything that might have a beneficial influence or effect on Anglo-German relations, and magnify and bolster up everything which will embitter it. ("Revelations of an International Spy," p. 24. By I. T. T. Lincoln, (Liberal M.P. for Darlington, 1910) New York, 1916. Robert M. McBride & Co.)

I have never seen reference made to Mr. Lincoln's book anywhere. It was written in 1916 and finished while he was in jail in New York, arrested at the instigation of the British Consul's Department there. No doubt the entry of United States into the war on the side of the Allies silenced his book. It is sufficient to note here that the course of diplomacy covering some ten years before the war as outlined by him is very well borne out by the documents pub lished since, although it would be hard to find an author who shows more personal vanity. Sir Valentine Chirol is looked upon as an authority on questions affecting India, the Far East and the Balkans. He was Director of the Foreign Department, London "Times" 1899-1912. His instructions as given above were certainly not issued contrary to the wishes of the British Foreign Office.

Mr. Austin Chamberlain, in the House of Commons, Feby. 8th, 1922 said, "We found ourselves on a certain Monday (Aug. 3, 1914) listening to a speech by Lord Grey at this box which brought us face to face with war, and upon which followed our declaration. That was the first public notification to the country or to anyone, by the Government of the day, of the position of the British Government, and of the obligations which it had assumed." Note that by this time there is official recognition that the Government had "assumed obligations," in spite of the repeated previous denials of Mr. Asquith, Sir E. Grey, Mr. Runciman, Mr. Harcourt, Mr. Acland and Lord Loreburn. Besides the official documents of the war (which we shall come to in time) there have been published a great many books, diaries, histories and pamphlets, good, bad and indifferent, directly bearing on the preparations for war, and on the events of the war during its progress, among them Lord Loreburn's "How the War Came," Lord Fisher's "Memories," Col. Repington's "The First World War," Lord Haldane's "Before the War," Wilfred Scawen Blunt's "Diaries,"—not to forget Sir Julian Corbett's "Official History of the War." These round out the story. In his book Lord Loreburn escapes from his innocent position of July 1, 1913, in this way:

We were tied by the relations which our Foreign Office had created, without apparently realizing that they had created them.

Such a statement as that may appear reasonable to a Lord Chancellor, but it does not fit the facts. It is an excuse.

It is not without significance that the Campbell-Bannerman Government in 1905 secured Mr. Haldane (afterwards Lord Haldane) as Minister for War. Haldane's distinction lay in his attention to all things German. He specialized in German literature and was styled a "Hegelian." He had translated Schopenhauer. By the aid of, or in spite of such equipment he (as the "Daily Mail Year Book" says): "increased the efficiency of the War Office." Perhaps to justify (even if somewhat belated) his "The Meaning of Truth in History" of 1914, his book on the war reveals that in 1906, as Minister for War, in conjunction with the French military chiefs he was set the task of finding how to mobilise, transport, and concentrate at a place "which had been settled between the staffs of Britain and France," 160,000 British troops opposite the Belgian frontier. As the "Official History of the War" says:

Amongst the many false impressions that prevailed, when after the lapse of a century we found ourselves involved in a great war, not the least erroneous is the belief that we were not prepared for it. Whether the scale on which we prepared was as large as the signs of the times called for, whether we did right to cling to our long-tried system of a small army and large navy, are questions that will long be debated; but, given the scale which we deliberately chose to adopt, there is no doubt that the machinery for setting our forces in action had reached an ordered completeness in detail that has no parallel in our history ..... The power of armies they (the Germans) could calculate to a nicety—of the power of the sea they had no experience. All that was plain was that Great Britain was as ready as ever to play the old game, and had set the board with all the old skill.

That is devoted to naval operations. So much for "unpreparedness!"

It looks as if this article will be as long-drawn out a process as the war itself. At anyrate, this will have to do until next issue. In the meantime it is well to note that the newspapers are generally full of war talk these days. We know very well what wars are about and it is as well to know also how they come about. When that knowledge is a general possession there won't be so many good men among the dead men. E. M.

(To be continued)

THE CLARION MAIL BAG.

By Sid Earp.

TO those who have made a practical study of the economics of Capitalism, and who clearly understand its purpose as a social system, the gloomy faces and confused minds of its supporters and administrators appear almost comical. The industrial and financial groups now find themselves at cross purposes. Their political representatives are howling at one another in a style that marks them as chatterers devoid of any real understanding of the essential facts of social life. Among the great mass of the people, stubbornly clinging to traditional ideas and outworn customs, a merciless individual struggle for life goes on. Truly a huge social comedy and drama being enacted at once; may the curtain soon fall! However the Reds are not downcast; whatever faults may be charged up to them they are at least adaptive and cheery in their adaptation. The letters in the "Mail Bag" from week to week give ample proof of it.

Writing from Ottawa, the seat of governmental power and wisdom, Com. A. Lescaubeault sends kindly greetings to Winnipeg and Vancouver comrades. He turns in one sub to the "Clarion," and says he's on the job for more. From Stratford, Ont., Com. A. M. Davis sends a short resume of conditions in that district, with a personal opinion, with which we agree, of the slaves' mind. Also wishes the Party and the Clarion success in their effort, and encloses two dollars for a sub and the Maintenance Fund. A brief and cheerful letter comes from Com. Goudie, St. Johns, with an enclosure for sub and the Maintenance Fund of $13.50 from the comrades in that city. Bravo! Com. T. Hanwell sends sub from Brandon. Com. J. Cunningham sends kindly greetings and a renewal of his sub. from Cabrin, Sask.

From Erskine, Alta. Com. A. McNeil sends a very interesting letter along with three subs to the Clarion. Among other things relating to the condition of the farmers he says "that if a lowered standard of living and all that it implies, will only be conducive to a social change, we are fast nearing the desired goal." He favors the continuance of the "Mail Bag" column and thinks it will serve to promote more interest in the Revolutionary movement.

T. Hughes sends a short note from Hillcrest enclosing a sub, and W. S. Grott, Hanna, does likewise. Gustave Lee writes a short note with best wishes from Camrose, Alta.

British Columbia is well represented this time. Com. T. Roberts is carrying on in Sandon. He sends a sub and an order for literature with a promise of more to follow. Com. Roy Addy is doing his bit in Alhambra. He sends in a sub. and renewal. Com. H. Judd does the same thing from Brackendale. He says the "Clarion" is as necessary to him as a "fag" is to a "Tommy." The analogy needs qualifying a trifle, yes?

A bright letter comes from Com. C. F. Orchard Kamloops. He says Chas. Lestor held a good meeting on Oct. 27th and a deal of good literature was

(Continued on page 4))

Economics for Workers

BY PETER T. LECKIE.

ECONOMICS FOR WORKERS.
RENT.

MARX deals with rent, like all other subjects, from an evolutionary basis. The subject is elaborately analysed through its evolutionary process from primitive labor rent up to the complicated money rent of today.

He points out that, "Labor Rent is the simplest and most primitive form of rent," This rent is the original form of surplus value. The identity of surplus value with unpaid labor of others does not need to be demonstrated by any analysis in this case, because it existed in a visible form, for the labor of the direct producer was separated by space and time from his labor for the landlord, and this labor appeared in the brutal form of forced labor for another. "In the same way the "quality" of the soil to produce a rent is here reduced to a tangibly open secret, for the nature which here furnishes the rent, also includes the human labor-power bound to the soil, and the property relation which compels the owner of labor-power to exert this quality and to keep it busy beyond the measure required for the satisfaction of his own material needs. The rent consists directly in the appropriation, by the landlord, of this surplus expenditure of labor-power. For the direct producer pays no other rent. Here, where surplus-value and rent are not only identical, but where surplus value obviously has the form of surplus labor, the natural conditions, or limits, of rent lie on the surface, because those of surplus value do.

"The direct producer must, (1), possess enough labor-power, and (2), the natural conditions of his labor, which means in the first place the soil cultivated by him, must be productive enough, in one word, the natural productivity of his labor must be so great that the possibility of some surplus labor over and above that required for the satisfaction of his own needs shall remain."

"It is not this possibility which creates the rent" ("Capital" vol. iii pp. 919-920.

Following labor-rent comes rent in kind. Rent in kind is the transformation of labor rent and requires a higher stage of economic development. The direct producer is driven by force of circumstances rather than direct coercion, or by legal enactment rather than by the whip to perform surplus labor on his own responsibility. A surplus beyond his indispensable needs he now produces upon soil exploited by himself and no longer upon the Lord's estate outside of his own land, as under labor rent.

The producer is master of the employment of his whole labor-time although part of his labor-time belongs to the landlord, only the landlord does not get this surplus value in its natural form (labor) but rather in the natural form of the product in which the rent is realized.

The labor of the producer for himself and his labor for the landlord are no longer separated by space and time as seen under the system of labor rent. Today we have reached the stage of money rent, which also entails a higher economic development.

The producer no longer turns over the product but its price to the landlord. Money rent is not only a reflex of a progressive economic development, but a transformation of the peasantry of a country into mere tenants, a freeing of the serfs. This transformation of rent in kind into money rent brought about the formation of a class of propertyless day laborers who hire themselves out for wages.

The surplus labor is not always separated into rent and profit. Marx says: "Where capitalist conceptions predominate as they did upon the American plantations, this entire surplus value is regarded as profit." "In places where the capitalist mode of production does not exist, nor the conceptions corresponding to it have been transferred from capitalist countries, it appears as rent. The differences of soil fertility or the advantages to be gained over inferior soil, or locations for reaching the markets, are transferred to the landlord in higher rents."

Rogers in his "Political Economy" says: "The landowners in this country (England) whose influence was overwhelming in the legislature, were well enough aware that high prices of agricultural products involved high rent in land." This is why the landowners of Britain endeavoured to maintain the corn laws. Rent in land is the surplus over and above cost of production plus average rate of profit.

If the average produce of a farm is worth £1000 and average cost of production plus profit £800 the average rent inafllibly would be £200 if let by open competition. Of course, like other businesses, exceptional skill or early adaptation of new discoveries may give one an advantage over another, but this becomes generally diffused and nothing prevents the excess finding its way to the landlord in the shape of rent. The same condition exists in the business centres as well as agricultural centres. If a trading house in one of the best thoroughfares of any city, through its location, does a good business the trader pays more rent because he recovers it in the business quality of the site. The same rule applies in coal mines. Marx says: "Mining rent, in its strict meaning, is determined in the same way as the agricultural rent. There are some mines, the product of which barely suffices to pay for the labor and to produce the capital invested in it together with the ordinary profit. They yielded some profit to the contractor, but no rent to the landlord. They can be worked to advantage only by the landowner, who in his capacity as a contractor makes the ordinary profit out of his invested capital. Many coal mines in Scotland are operated in this way, and cannot be operated in any other way. The landowner does not permit anybody to work them without the payment of rent, but no one can pay any rent for them." (Quoting Adam Smith, "Capital," vol iii, p. 900).

When Marx deals with Monopoly and Absolute Rent, he says: "If private ownership of land places obstacles in the way of the equalization of the values of commodities into prices of production, and appropriates absolute rent, then this absolute rent is limited by the excess of the value of the products of the soil over their prices of production, that is, by the excess of the surplus value in them over the rate of profit assigned to the capitals by the average rate of profit. This difference then forms the limit of the rent, which is always but a certain portion of surplus value produced and existing in commodities." "Just as the diversion of the newly added value of commodities into necessary and surplus labor, wages and surplus value, and its general division between revenues, finds its given and regulating limits, so the division of the surplus value itself into profit and ground rent finds its limit in the laws regulating the equalization of the rate of profit." (Vol. iii, pp. 1003-1004.)

It is too large a subject to detail like Marx, but let us see how much the rents of houses are regulated by the same laws as regulate the average rate of profit. The average worker believes that every increase of taxes the landlord pays is added to his rent, and trades councils and other labor bodies talk about paying the taxes. A discussion in the New York "Times" a number of years ago during municipal elections was put very clearly. "Rents do not rise with taxes, if they did the owner would merely pass the taxes on to the renter and be rid of the subject." The next day Mayor Gaynor in a letter to the "Times" quoted a message he had sent to the council the previous year: "Every landlord knows that he cannot add the taxes to the tenant's rent. If he could, he would not care how high taxes grew. He would simply throw them on his tenants." The landlords of Ottawa are aware of this as they invariably vote down money bylaws which would increase taxes.

The excuse made of increasing rents because of increased taxes can only be performed when houses are scarce and profit of investment in house building is too low to stimulate house building, making the demand for houses exceed the supply. This we have seen during the war period. Even Winston Churchill grasps some valuable facts in regards to rent. In his great liberal days and during Lloyd George's land reform campaign Churchill said: "If there is a rise in wages, rents are able to move forward because the workers can afford to pay a little more. If the opening of a new tramway or the institution of an improved service of workman's trains or the lowering of fares, or a new invention, or any other public conveyance affords a benefit to the workers in any particular district, it becomes easier for them to live there and therefor the landlord, and the ground lord, one on top of the other, are able to charge them more for the privilege of living there." I have illustrated this same condition in Ottawa where the plugs lived on the outskirts of the city to escape high rents. The car fare was reduced to 5 cents and building was stimulated, also tenants flocked out. The landlord was enabled to obtain the higher rents. During the war the car fare outside the city limits was increased to 10 cts, making the expense as high as renting in town, so that rents fell and the street cars are getting what the landlord loses. Therefore it is immaterial to the worker how the surplus is divided up.

The single taxer wants to eliminate the landowner by changing the system of taxation. The worker does not pay the taxes, so why trouble about them. No matter how they raise the taxes it comes from the surplus value which is exploited from labor. When Henry Ford increased his workers' wages there was such an influx of people seeking houses the landlord got all the increase. A better understanding of rent amongst the workers would have saved a lot of energy expended uselessly during the war period and since, advocating fixed Rent Bills.

The Irish Act of 1881 which intended to give a benefit to the tenants and secure a large share of the produce of the land, by giving them fixed rents in specified annual sums of money, was a failure, because the tenant was bound to deliver a much larger share of the produce, as the prices of his produce fell so rapidly that each successive payment became more oppressive until finally it was impossible and the Irish Acts of 1881, 1885 and 1891 we are told became fruitful sources of difficulty, to those for whose benefit they were intended.

The benefits of land reform in New Zealand, and other reforms there have accrued to the owners of land and property. The nationalization or municipalization of ground rent, or unearned increment, or single tax, is to eliminate the parasitical landlord, the capitalist having no particular reason for wishing to be burdened with a class of landlords who obtain a part of the surplus value.

Not only do industrial capitalists pay big rents themselves to the landlord, but the rent which appears to be paid by the workers, indirectly is paid by the industrial capitalists.

In concluding these articles, I hope they have served the purpose intended. That is, to save the energy of the workers being expended on chasing reform bunk, and to strengthen the movement for the abolition of the wage system of slavery.

THE END.

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

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

VANCOUVER, B. C., DECEMBER 1, 1922.

THE DIFFERENCE.

"By working 10 hours instead of 8 hours, production will be so much increased that there will be more and cheaper goods for the German consumer. In other words, by working 10 hours the German people will reduce the cost of living while raising the standard of living.

"The time will come when the workers will realize that by working only 8 hours they can earn enough to keep alive, whereby working 10 hours they can earn not only the minimum for existence, but a margin for better living."

—Hugo Stinnes.

HERR Stinnes puts it very nicely: appealingly: with the deep feelings of conviction. He is almost as anxious as David "the Wizard" over the small rights of labor. It is a pity to break in on a good man's dream. But that is the way of capital—it cannot permit society to realise its aspirations.

Quite obviously labor is the fountain head of wealth. It is equally obvious that the more labor—in production—the more wealth. And if there is more wealth, there is also a greater available abundance of comfort, and a better potential standard of living. So the remedy for want is work; for misery, more work. Why not adopt the simple remedy? Because the Capitalist class owns the kite and flies it—as circumstances determine—to suit itself.

The Capitalist class, owning the means of life, operates them soldly for profit. If the market is brisk, Capitalist "prosperity" prevails; if it is not, the process of competition drives the index of efficiency to a higher level; the standard of living to keener economics. It is true the expansion of capital is the expansion of labor. But it is via the world market. And in opening up the world market for exploitation, labor is expanded for the same purpose. But the competitive conditions of production induce cheap production; cheap production compels more and greater machinery; more and regulated organisation, and more standardised production. Therefor, although the expansion of Capital involves the expansion of labor, the reproduction of capital reduces the production of labor. For, the more machinery is in operation, and the more efficiency is developed, the more labor is displaced and the greater is the amount of production per man; while the more hours the man can be induced to work, without physical exhaustion, the more profits are realisable from the surplus values in production. So that the greater the volume of net production per man per hour, the cheaper is production as a whole, the wider is its possible market and the greater the volume of surplus.

Since labor-power exchanges equitably in terms of the market, the cheapening of the cost of production means the cheapening of employment. Consequently the distribution of the wealth produced increases on the side of the owner and decreases on the side of the worker. For, although efficiency methods may maintain—or even raise—the wages of the necessary labor, they depress the living standards of the general laboring class. And ultimately they reduce the wages of the actual workers by competitive pressure, thus continually balancing cost and value. Consequently the relative value of surplus (profit) is constantly augmented to the master class; the relative value of wages constantly diminished. So that the difference between the 8 and 10 hour day is, to the former an increase in the volume of cheap production—therefor of trade—therefor of profit; to the latter a more exhaustive exploitation and a more precarious existence.

There is another side to the picture. The wealth of the world is the labor of the world; hence the market of the world is the producing nations themselves. If giant machinery, by cheapening production gains entry to the possible market simultaneously, by progressively increasing unemployment it progressively consumes purchasing power. Prices may be cheap, but there is a constantly growing proportion unable to purchase at all. The market shrinks steadily, production falls, stagnation ensues on the stimulus of profit, till crises, deeper, darker, larger, shroud the seething world in misery.

Increased production inevitably means increased unemplopment. Cheap production means an ebbing standard of life, not a rising one. Increasing wealth signifies a contraction of social prosperity. And the "margin for a better living" is no rose-lipped laughter of happiness, but a fear whose image has distorted the mind, as its substance has already corrupted the world. If it is impossible for labor to maintain itself on 8 hours' work, it will be increasingly impossible on 10. If the standard of life declines on the former, it must decline more rapidly on the latter. If prices fall in the readjustments of profit-production, social life must grovel in its deeper degradation. And if the capitalist sees nothing but ruin in the system of 8 hours, the application of 10 hours to the same system can have no other effect than the acceleration of the procession of ruin. So that the difference between the 8 and 10 hour day is not merely a difference in the degree of capitalist "prosperity:" it is witness to a steeper gradient in the inclined plane of capitalist dissolution. And that Herr Stinnes, in common with his industrial kin, is forced to this reversal of the social forces of production is evidence that, however stormy the end is like to be, it cannot be long delayed. R.

CLARION MAIL BAG.

(Continued from page 3)

sold. He also expresses the hope that more meetings will be held in the future and encloses a sub.

Vancouver Island shows distinct signs of life this time. Writing from Victoria. Com. C. Bright sends a sub. renewal and a dollar for the Maintenance Fund. An enquiry for books and an order comes from J. E. Brown, Comberland. He also encloses a sub. renewal and a dollar for the Maintenance Fund.

Com. J. Cartwright sends a brief letter from East Wellington with two subs. and enquiries about two previous ones which he sent in on Oct. 22nd. We received them alright, but did not include them in Nov. 1st. "Clarion", as the list was already made up and at the printers. An order for literature comes from Port Alice, also a sub. from Gibson's Landing. A short letter from Com. J. A. McDonald enclosing an order for literature was received. He says the lectures and classes are doing well, and prospects for the future are good in San Francisco. The Proletarian Party also send a renewal of their Clarion bundle subscription from that city. Subs. from Bakersfield and Los Angelos were also received. Writing from Cleveland, Ohio. Com. Swanson organizer for the Proletarian Party states that they have rented permanent Headquarters in the Labor Temple, and that study classes are being held. They have been busy all summer on the street corners, and Charles O'brien spoke at a meeting on Nov. 18th. The Local meets every Tuesday evening and any S. P. of C. members visiting Cleveland will be made welcome. The National Student Forum, Broadway, New York, have sent in a list of questions to be discussed at their conference on Dec. 26, 27, 20th. Com. E. Anderson, sends a sub. and greetings from Huntley, New Zealand. This summarizes the correspondence up to Nov. 11.

Lack of space precludes lengthy comment upon the correspondence received since the above was written, but we are gratified to note the earnestness shown by comrades far afield in advancing the philosophy of Socialism among the working class. From Ottawa, Com. Wm. Pasch sends a short letter enclosing a sub. renewal and wishing the movement towards education every success; he is sparing no effort in attracting subscribers but says it is "some job." And we know it. Com. Auddell, formerly of Ottawa, but now in Montreal, contributes a good letter and two subs. Describing his experiences in Montreal, he says there is a good field for propaganda. He addressed four meetings and literature sales were good. Having the advantage of a knowledge of both French and English languages, Com. Auddell should be of great use to the movement in Montreal, but he is unable to stay there very long. His future address will be 374 Market St., S. Lawrence, Mass.

Com. Rose sends a brief note and a sub. from Winnipeg, and Com. Moore does likewise. A long letter containing an order for literature comes from "Sandy," the live wire of Winnipeg Local.

Writing from Brandon, Com. G. Craig sends a long letter in which he comments upon McNey's article on the I. W. W. He is of the opinion that we know words more by sound than by their real meaning, and suggests that a glossary of words used by students, inserted in the "Clarion," would be of advantage to everybody.

From Youngstown, Alta., Com. Hughes sends two subs. From Whitla, Com. B. Polinkos sends four subs. and a literature order to the amount of $2.25. Good work! Com. Gus. Albers of Edberg, and Com. J. Knor of Eckville, Alta., are also doing their bit for the "Clarion." Writing from Hanna, Alta., Com. Chas. Lestor says that he has held two good meetings there, and also three meetings at Stanmore. Audiences are appreciative, in many cases having to come a long distance to the meeting place. Com. Lestor wishes to thank those who are assisting him on his tour. From Swalwell, Alta., Com. G. Beagrie sends a short discriptive letter of Lestor's meeting in that district. In Swalwell they are much interested and are asking for more. He encloses four subs. to the "Clarion." Com. McNeil writes again from Erskine, Alta., enclosing a sub.

Writing from Eyebrow, Sask., Com. Thos. Foulston sends a sub, renewal and a dollar to the Maintenance Fund. He says that if the weather is favorable when Com. Lestor gets in that district, he could arrange to hold two or three lectures in school houses.

From Edgewood, B. C. Com. Shipmaker sends a short note with a sub. renewal. He says that when he was an industrial slave, he occasionally had a dollar to spare, but since he became a stump rancher, a dollar has become a rare thing to him; he agrees with the doctor "that while there's life there's hope." Com. F. Harman sends word from Victoria that they are making an effort to get a History Class going, but the attendance is very small so far. Com. J. Hubble is with them just now, but his health is still very poor.

Com. N. MacAulay writes from San Francisco, enclosing a sub. renewal and two dollars for C. M. F. From Los Angelos, Calif. Com. Ulrich sends four dollars for the "Clarion," and expresses the hope that the Party will be able to publish in pamphlet form the continuous articles running through the "Clarion."

From New York, Com. J. F. Maguire sends greetings to W. A. P. and enquires for Frank Cassidy's address. He is glad to know that we are still holding Sunday propaganda meetings, something they cannot do in New York, also says the movement there is still chaotic. Sends two dollars for Maintenance Fund. From Des Moines, Iowa, comes a lengthy letter from Com. Frank Williams enclosing three subs. and a dollar for the Maintenance Fund. He has been in Des Moines for two months and has come in contact with the S. P. A. local. He proposes to start a study class in history and economics for the benefit of the younger comrades, and hopes to be sending in a few subs. to the "Clarion" before long. Our best wishes go to Com. Williams in the fine effort he is making in spite of adverse circumstances. This summarizes the correspondence up to Nov. 25th.

A Brief Review of Current History

By Robert Kirk.

STUDENTS of current history, especially in Europe and the Near East, may be somewhat puzzled by the apparent friendly relations now existing between the representatives of British and French imperialism on the eve of the Lausanne conference. From 1919 until the signing of the Armistice with the Turks at Mudania, their wonted pose had always been one of arrogance and disdain. And until the signing of that Armistice, they had been more or less constantly fighting each other, by proxy, in the Near East over such matters as the distribution of the loot taken from the ruling class of Turkey. But, according to press dispatches, it seems that an agreement has been reached which goes far to bridge the gulf that opened between them since the conference of Sevres and Versailles.

The anamoly, here stated, may be explained on the ground that Britain fears to fight a battle lone handed in the Near East which probably would cause the collapse of the empire. While France may perceive the fact that an open and violent breach of the peace as a result of their divergent policies, would entail the loss of a money market so essential for the practice of war. Such a situation would not only leave France without this vital factor but it would also discover Britain seriously affected by the loss of a very important food market. Both countries being equally dependent to a great extent on the United States for these necessities. And as both owe, jointly, a sum in the neighborhood of eleven billion dollars to the latter country for credits obtained during the past war, it should be needless for me to pursue the argument beyond this point—if the reader would only keep in view the distressed minds of the American financiers towards debtors in general. Sooner or later these gentry must tell the simple facts to the very unsophisticated ratepayers of America, that they must bear the expenses of their adventure in international politics. Or it will suddenly dawn on that large community of producers that the only ones to profit by war are the big financiers and a few big industrialists.

That Britain desires peace is quite obvious to anyone following the trend of current events, and this opinion is borne out by the fact that she has disgorged twenty-five per cent of her oil gains in the Near East to France, along with a promise of support in the matter of German reparations. The fact that she desires peace does not imply that it springs from a contrite heart doing penance for past sins, but rather from a fear of the storm that may sweep away her financial interests in foreign possessions. The loss of these would affect the prestige of the empire builders in every corner of the world market, and though support to France may ultimately lead to French possession of the Ruhr and control over the dye industry of Germany, thus jeopardising the steel and woolen industries of Britain, as well as her coal trade, nevertheless the loss is small compared with what would result if the entire forces of the Mohammedan world were arrayed against her in a war which she would have to fight single-handed. Nor would it be to the material advantage of either France or the United States, unless pushed by dire necessity, to allow Britain to bear the brunt of such a fight, as in the end the consequences of such would react upon themselves. The downfall of the British empire would shake the world of capitalism even more than the collapse of the Austria-Hungarian dynasty and the institutions surrounding it. Some notion of this has arisen in the minds of the more responsible heads of the separate States.

The world of 1922 is altogether different from of 1914; everywhere tremendous changes have taken place affecting all classes and institutions, political and social. Events in Russia have affected the people of adjacent countries, and nowhere any more so than among the people of the East. In some parts like India an entire change in the industrial character of the country is advocated not only by the workers but also among the more intellectual members of the country. Among these, representatives of all castes, feelings of dissatisfaction with general conditions, which have resulted from large scale production and foreign monopolies is evident throughout this great community. The Ghandi movement, the most articulate expression of this dissatisfaction still continues to enlist support and sympathy from scores of thousands of the native population. Nor has British rule in its many-sided aspects been such that it has escaped the destructive criticism of the most able of the Ghandi propagandists. The virility and earnestness of their purpose can only be disguised from the general public by the most discreet of censorships that holds back the news that many thousands are arrested daily. And every measure adopted by the representatives of the British ruling class in India has in no wise affected the strength of the movement but rather tends to lend stimulus to it.

Not only is India affected by traditional methods of politicians opplied to economic problems of recent origin, but the same condition is found among the people of the Near East, intensified if anything by more irritating circumstances. The statesmen of the western capitalist class were responsible for this condition when they, with great conceit in their abilities as peacemakers, decided to change the map of Turkey as they had changed the map of Europe. This started a revolution in the administrative form of the State. The old Sultan Khalif, head of the Church and State, was deposed, the parasitical swarm that kept Turkey in pawn to British, French and Greek financiers, were swept from office, and the National Assembly, bearing close resemblance to the Soviet form of administration, was set up at Angora. One correspondent writing from Constantinople of the "Manchester Guardian," has this to say:

The Grand National Assembly is a purely secular body. The Nationalist army fought for the political and territorial restoration of Turkey, not for Islamic expansion. It was a national, not a holy war.

* * *

The problem is not confined to Turkey, the whole Islamic world is torn by nationalist as distinct from religious movements.

These changes could not have been wrought without the whole-hearted support of the workers and peasants, who naturally are as much affected by the spread of social ideas, and the quickening of a class-consciousness, as are the workers of the West. And the leaders of the Nationalists are much more radical than the leaders of the Young Turk movement a generation past. All of this goes to show that the British and French representatives at Lausanne will meet a different type of Turk from that which faced their predecessors on numerous occasions prior to 1914. And one most likely to stand by his demand for a restored Turkey on the lines which marked the map of 1913.

Here, then is a pretty kettle of fish. The return, for instance of Mosul, Thrace and Constantinople, three places which appear in Turkish demands, means disappointment for American, British, French and Greek interests. Mosul being the rich oil district out of which Britain promised America and France twenty-five per cent each of the shares, and in Thrace, Greece loses a fertile country for the growing of grains, while sharing at the same time in the loss of Constantinople as an international port, a loss which would be borne in part of the British and the French. Should the claims of the Turkish nationalists be conceded at Lausanne, they would be followed by immediate reactions: the losers asking for other compensations. It was characteristic, however, of British diplomacy to enlist the support of American and French oil interests by sharing a much coveted place between them, but it remains to be seen how they will act in face of Turkish opposition. Nor is the strength of this opposition easily measured by the forces under Kemal, for much further back and away from Turkey itself are forces that lend strength to the Angora government.

It may be found in Germany who still pays for her "crime against society," and the payment is shared in by her equally guilty accusers. She produces commodities to pay reparations and among her former customers the most absurd tariffs are used to keep these goods off the markets. She needs gold to meet many of her payments and she must purchase these from her customers at the rate of 1,500 marks for a dollar. She must have the gold, her credit having gone, and the number of suckers biting today is less than formerly. And still people wonder why trade is dead.

And Turkey may find assistance in Russia, whose efforts to resume trading relations with the rest of the world has been frustrated by politics everywhere. A country requiring enough to keep many countries busy for years to come, whose resources to pay are beyond dispute. Despite which, however, famine still stalks the land, blighting the hopes of the people, rendering them inert and senseless. A condition which the world is paying for just as sure as summer's sun extracts its tribute from the sea. Here then are forces, not to mention the Arabs and the Egyptians who may support the Grand National Assembly of Turkey in its demands from Britain, France and Greece. And for such a proposition as this the master class send politicians, whose methods belong to the centuries that are past, whose interests are more evenly divided between serving themselves and their paymasters, than it is between the trading class and the producers, who in the end are the ones who pay for all. 'Tis strange that while the master has at his command those who could render him a service of a lasting kind yet he is blind. Touchstone was right: "It's a mad world."

HERE AND NOW.

OUR financial pulse is rising. We are very nearly pleased with the totals as per this issue and last. The people who are keen on fine distinctions, however, will agree that you can be pleased although not satisfied. But it seems that the less encouragement we indite, the more encouragment we receive—Here and Now. So we'll hold our peace, in great expectation of the figures to come. Observe the present muster:—

Following $1 each: J. Olson, F. Warder, F. E. Moore, E. E. Cole, W. R. Miller, T. Faulston, D. R. McLean, A. A. McNeill, H. Maitland, Gus Albers, T. Moore, K. H. Machlin, Wm. Pasch, J. F. Knorr, J. Pryde, J. Johnstone, G. Craig, C. Lestor, A. V. Lawrence, Tom Dorrill, G. D. McKenzie, Will Bayliss, J. E. Palmer, R. W. Hatley, Geo. Kennedy (per J. Mitchell), Tom O'Conner.

Following $2 each: J. V. Hull, Geo. Aspden, E. T. Hughes, P. W. Bishop, G. Donaldson, Dr. W. J. Curry, H. Schwartz, G. W. Lohr.

L. Audell $1.50; W. Shipmaker $1.50; G. R. Ronald $1.20; G. R. Randall 60 cents; Jim Cartwright $3; Frank Williams $3; G. Beagrie $4; B. E. Polinkos $4. G. Alley $4; W. A. Pritchard $10.50.

Above, Clarion subscriptions received from 15th to 30th Nov., inclusive, total $75.30.

CLARION MAINTENANCE FUND.

Following $1 each: Frank Cusack; T. Faulston; Gus Albers; Frank Williams; A. Lieu; Will Bayliss; Geo. Kennedy (per J. Mitchell); J. G. Randall.

G. R. Ronald, 30 cents; J. E. Palmer, $2.05; Dr. W. J. Curry, $3; "C. K.," $10.00.

Above, C. M. F. receipts from 15th to 30th Nov., inclusive total $23.35.

Soviet Russia, from the S. P. of C. Viewpoint

Socialist Party Attitude Towards Soviet Russia.

AT this point the Manifesto essays to treat specifically on the attitude of the Socialist Party of Canada towards Soviet Russia and its administration.

The Russian revolution contained, for the producing masses of today, significant features, in degree if not in kind, unprecedented in the history of civilization. On a great national scale, the producing masses of Russia, both agrarian and industrial town workers, successfully united to seize control of the state. Czarism and the short-lived Kerensky government cleared out of the way, the new executive went to office on a clear mandate for the abolition of parasitism (parasitic landlordism and parasitic capitalism), the means of production to be operated for the benefit of the country as a whole.

By reason of that mandate the Socialist Party of Canada, being a party of the revolutionary working class, has more than a student's interest in Russia as the scene of a social experiment: class-consciousness and feelings of comradeship in the world wide class struggle, enlist the party members with the producing masses of Russia. And so, in spite of how far short of realisation that mandate may be, and no matter how ill-conceived or ill-executed the means to its realization, the Party recognises the mandate as a call for unstinted loyalty from the workers of the rest of the world to those of Soviet Russia and to their executives.

But loyalty to those wielding power in Russia and to the people of Russia does not entail concurrence in what may seem to us suicidal policies. There exists a bad tendency to resign freedom of thought and action throughout the working class movement in all parts of the world, into the hands of external authority. To any such sovereignty the Party can not submit and holds to the exercise of a free intelligence as its prerogative. In its estimation, the other way spells stagnation in ideas and rot and decay in the movement. As some one has wisely said: "However we may long to escape from the strain of perplexity and thinking incidental to the social problem by resigning it to external authority, the proposal to do so is a short-cut solution which will never get rid of the conflict and problem." And, in any case, it is certain that loyalty both to those in Russia and to the working class movement at large, far from entailing surrender of our discriminating and discretionary powers, on the contrary, compels their active participation in its cause.

In that spirit of loyalty the Party discussions, on the platform and in its official organ the "Western Clarion," as to Russian affairs have been carried on. Furthermore, it has always been kept in mind, in dealing with those affairs, that the Soviet regime inherited social havoc in Russia from Czarism, while, in foreign countries, fate's decrees fell athwart revolutionary hopes everywhere in the failure of their working classes to render adequate support to the new Russia. So that, in addition to the all-sufficient task of economic and social reconstruction, that country was harassed by foreign imperialistic interventions, the fomenting of domestic counter-revolutions, financed and munitioned by the Allied governments. In addition, these "civilizers" established for years an economic blockade so effective that not even medical comforts could be got through it, though the people of Russia were being decimated by typhus and the black death—pestilential legacies of the war and years of malnutrition.

Largely because of the failure of the international working class to adequately support Russia when that country was leaving behind the old social landmarks and beaten paths and venturing into the uncharted future, the years since the revolution have been years of bitter travail for its peoples; and for the administration, its course has been set amidst mountainous troubles. As to why the working masses of other lands failed to respond to Russia's need, the S. P. of C. holds that it was because they were yet too deeply steeped in old social loyalties; they yet lacked the knowledge that emancipates the mind from the deadening hand of the past; they yet lacked that vision that comes with class-consciousness and which would have enabled them to see that the fight of Russia's producing classes for emancipation from social parasitism was their fight also. Ergo: One such experience should suffice. Educate!

The Process of Revolutionary Change.

To those discouraged at what may appear to them as the slow progress or even failure of the social revolution in Russia, it may be said that even under the most favorable circumstances there has always been conceived of a more or less protracted transition period whose line of progress would be experimental and evolutionary. Technical facts, it has seemed, would mainly determine what industries would be operated communally or individually. Such industry as remains small-scale in character on a par with peasant farming, may never be communally operated, though, in some indirect way, social control in the interest of the community would be exercised.

The small individual producer supplies a social need, and only an advance in the state of the industrial arts may in some degree eliminate him. In some countries, as he is in Russia (and perhaps in Canada), he is a majority of the population, and in others, so considerable a minority as to be reckoned with. It is certain, that the revolutionary future must be worked out by a coalition of all classes of producers against economic exploitation. The following distinction drawn between two kinds of property may illustrate the principle on which the wage worker, and the small individual producer owning his own means of production, may act together for that purpose.

Ownership, as in peasant proprietorship, when the owner is also "user" of the productive property, is not capitalist ownership. The owner in this case is producing for a livelihood.

When the owner of productive property is an absentee-owner (or to the extent that he is not the whole "user" of it) and employs other people to use the property productively, and out of the proceeds of industry derives a profit by mere right of ownership, that is capitalist ownership. It is a case of production for profit. The owner is an exploiter of labor.

The characteristic features of the capitalist method of production, are large-scale production entailing large capital investments—operation by the co-operative labor of many wage-workers—production for profit. History shows the capitalist method of production as growing up out of the handicraft method of medieval times, which was—small-scale individual production—owner of productive property, also the user—its nature was, production for a livelihood.

Today, both the propertyless wage-worker and the small individual "owner-producer" are exploited under the capitalist system: The wage-worker, directly, by means of the wages system, and the small "owner-producer," indirectly, through the market in the thousand ways of control over economic processes and the institution of credit exercised by the vested interests of capital by means of its prescriptive, legal rights and privileges, to something for nothing.

During the handicraft period, the habitual condition in that sphere of social life was that "owner" and "user" were one and the same person. The idea that an "owner" had a natural and inviolable right to his means of production and the products that were the issue thereof, conformed to the prevailing industrial situation. The idea was the "common-sense" of the time and became incorporated as a foundation principle into the body of legal theory known as the "system of natural rights" which lies at the basis of modern jurisprudence covering property and contractual relations. That system of "rights" first received systematic elaboration at the hands of 18th century legalists and moral philosophers. But even at the time this legal theory, enactment and practice, together with the appropriate moralities were being elaborated, the condition of "owner-user" as one and the same person had already passed away as the dominant, characteristic fact in the industrial situation. An advance in the industrial arts had come on. Large-scale production requiring the co-operative labor of many workers had become prevalent, and involved each enterprise in capital investments too large for any one individual to encompass out of the proceeds of a life-time of his own personal labor.

To meet this change in the state of the industrial arts, the surplus capital was necessary of the wealthier merchant and trading class, who were rising to prominence in economic and social status consequent on the constant increase of products for exchange, and the opening up of a world market. Under the attraction of large profits to be obtained in large-scale production, this surplus capital of the merchant and trading class was finding its way more and more into industrial enterprises. "Owner" and "user" of productive property were fast becoming no longer one and the same person; could not be. The "owner" had become the capitalist employer and the "users'" had become wage workers. Owner-users were being eliminated, the users being separated from ownership in the means of wealth production by the competition of large-scale industry and thus forced, in order to live, to sell their labor power for wages to the large capitalist owners of productive property.

That process of separating usership from ownership, resulting in the formation of a class of owners of productive property who performed no industrial function, and of another class of industrial producers who were without ownership in the means of production, has continued progressively down to this day. But legal theory and practice and the dominant moralities still guarantee to ownership the right to the usufruct of industry by mere "right" of ownership; usership being no longer thought a necessary conjunction with ownership in the common-sense of the orthodox kind. The old common-sense of the handicraft period is, however, gaining headway again, though not yet incorporated in law and custom, domains least responsive to the forces of social change. As an offset to it, a legal "fiction" or metaphysical "make-believe" has been conceived for the law and orthodox moralities, that "Capital" is a productive factor and so is entitled to its share of industry as well as labor.

Thus it is that we are all made equal in the eyes of a system of law that recognizes no economic disabilities brought on by a change in the state of the industrial arts. A phrase has set us free; great are our modern practitioners of magic! Has not Anatole France bitterly said: "The majestic equality of the law forbids the millionaire as well as the penniless outcast to sleep out under bridges at night?" In the present order of society the economic institutions are capitalistic, and so long as the capitalist class remain economically, politically and socially dominant, the function of law is to maintain and prosper those institutions, as such, and the function of the moralists to justify them. "The law is a projection in idea of the de facto authority of the community, and this authority has its ultimate root and sanction in the status, power, and preferences of the ruling class in the community. On the whole, by and large, it is for this class that the moralists speak." (H. M. Kallen, in the "New Republic," May, 24, 1922.)

In conclusion, under this heading, we can say to the wage-worker of large industry and to the individual owner-producer, that in its broad and fundamental aspect the mandate of the social revolution is for the abolition of capitalist class ownership in the means of wealth production of society. And that, instead of the mere title of ownership constituting a claim on an increment from industry, the principle to be established is, that the right to hold land and natural resources, or to share in the pro-

ducts of industry, must be based on personal labor in producing goods and services.

But there are no ready-made plans for the future. Far better, indeed, it is to keep a free intelligence to work out that future. As Bernard Shaw has said: "The socialist future is not a house of refuge for the decrepit and old, but a great adventure."

On the Effort to Re-establish Foreign Relations.

To return to the Russian question. The efforts of the Soviet administration to re-establish economic and political relations with foreign capitalist nations has been watched with some anxiety and even disapproval by many revolutionists. Nevertheless, for economic reasons alone, vital to the life of Russia, such efforts were inevitable. No people can exist as a hermit nation once they have advanced beyond the primitive wants and self-sufficient productive economy of the fragmentary communities of barbarism. History records many instances of civilized peoples who have fallen back to more primitive states, and some who even failed to stay a retrograde movement to extinction, but all have gone back involuntarily and catastrophically. If social revolutions appeared on order, then we might have them in all countries at once, thus artfully simplifying the problem of social change. They are, however, the outcome of necessary conditions in time and place, and no pre-vision can tell when and where and how, except within very broad limits, so complex and obscure are the factors engaged. With Russia, for instance, a linked series of unforeseeable factors, and a sudden conjuncture of circumstances forced a long, oppressive, and tyrannical authority and all its machinery of administration to collapse amid the hatred of all classes, through its rottenness and incompetency to deal with an unprecedented situation. So Russia was forced to the forefront of revolutionary change.

The following reasons appear valid as to why Russia, as with any other country in which a revolutionary movement may attain power, must continue to maintain economic and political relations with the rest of the world.

The civilized peoples of today have long drifted or evolved away from an all-round, complete, self-supporting economy. From primitive times on, the principle of subdivision of labor has been one of the most fruitful factors in developing the industrial arts, as well as furthering other of life's activities. In the industrial arts of modern times, under the capitalist method of production, that principle has become effective on an international scale to a degree unknown before.

The competition on the world's market, and the additional factor of the machine process entailing quantity production, have forced modern nations to specialize in producing those lines of commodities in which they can surpass or hold their own against their competitors. Each nation has now become dependent on other nations for raw materials of industry, and for those commodities in which the competition of foreign products has stifled domestic enterprise, or which the country is incapable of producing itself by reason of unsuitability of climate, soils, etc. Not alone are the nations devoid of the material means of a complete self-supporting economy, but, what is vastly more vital, their populations have lost the skill and knowledge of the industrial arts, together with the primitive wants and desires and habits of life and thought that are necessary to make life endurable in such an economy. In short, the patriotically conceived national entities, sovereign states, insensate jostling rivals for nature's stored up resources and for the gateways, highways and marts of trade and commerce, are but interdependent economic units, special parts of a world economy.

The mechanism of this modern world economy is a delicately balanced affair, and the continued well-being of any single country rests on a precarious foundation. Its maintenance depends on an unbroken continuity of imports from foreign countries, in exchange for which domestic products must be exported. In such a situation it is obvious that the primal responsibility resting on a revolutionary administration is to safeguard the economic life of its people by keeping up contact with foreign markets for her surplus products and for sources of supplies for her own needs. It should be needless to say that commercial relations with foreign countries entail political relations with their governments. In short, in the respect of Russia's necessities it may be taken as axiomatic that suicide is not a revolutionary act. The thought of Russia as a hermit nation is intolerable. That way spells a stagnant society incapable of contributing anything to, or receiving anything from the progressive stream of industrial and cultural life of the great world. It is, in fact, to Russia's interest and to the interest of the social revolution in the world at large that she enter, if need be by force, on to the busy streets of international life.

As to Soviet Mistakes.

The Soviet administration has made mistakes, some that they must be held in part responsible for and others that were only discoverable in the light of after-events. But then, all human activity is experimental in the sense that all the factors in a problem are never known. In Russian affairs the element of time has been a fateful factor. Crucial problems crowded thick and fast upon the administration and demanded instant action. Measures had to be thought out and put into operation with a single eye to immediate situations which the quick stepping of events often rendered inoperative in short time. In some such cases the administration has been unduly reproached for lack of foresight as, for instance, in the so-called extremist policies of the first years of the regime—the communalization of factory production, the abolition of free trading and the centralization of the state powers.

Yet it is the testimony of impartial and trained investigators who were in Russia at the time that those extremist policies were the only practical ones in the chaotic state of Russia. Further, they testify that the Communists were the only group with the energy and mental grasp of Russia's problems together with the confidence of the masses in their possession necessary to deal with it. Amongst those so testifying, it may be sufficient to name three, no one of whom subscribes to Communist theory—Arthur Ransome and Professor Goode of the "Manchester Guardian," and Colonel Raymond Robins of the American Red Cross, whose writings and lectures on Soviet Russia since 1917 have had world-wide publicity.

The following reflections, extracted in summary fashion from the philosophizing of a thinker of note of our day, in which due respect is paid to the part played by luck or fate in the life of man, seem here to be pertinent and to offer a rational perspective on the administrative activities of the Soviet government:

"It may be said, that it is always the part of wisdom not to neglect present needs, for after all, in so far as the future is an effect of the present, the present constitutes our only control of the future. As for the rest—the rest is luck, the pure contingency of a world which was not made for us and does not care for us, a world of cosmic forces indifferent to the scheme of man or his welfare. If we have freedom in this world, we have it in just that degree that, knowing the facts, we are enabled to master them; to over-rule their coercion and vary our plans; to influence events by the power of our desire and choice. The ways of freedom are thus, activities of intelligence. Knowledge of the present and the tendencies of things, i.e. their future meanings, is essential in so far as we may predetermine the future within the limits set by fate. The present is what we work on; the future is what we work out."

And so, with that, the exposition of our Socialist perspective closes. In the opening remarks it was assumed that the faults of judgment in regard to Russian affairs were, in the main, due to faults of perspective. We have labored to correct those faults. May we be justified!

We have confiedence in the revolutionary integrity of the Soviet administration. The greatest dangers menacing that administration have not been internal ones but external—the menace of hostile foreign interests. These, we think, will continue to be the source of its greatest dangers. Therefore, it follows that the greatest service we can render Soviet Russia is to make Socialists here, in Canada—everywhere.

Let us, then, turn to our work of implanting in the minds of the working masses the vision and intention for the new social order. To do that, we must supplant knowledge for ignorance, pride for humility and a disciplined will for blind emotion.

Moral: "The present is what we work on—as for the rest, it is fate!" "Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof!"

Erratum: In the first part of the Manifesto, published in our last issue, there appears a misplaced line. See (in that issue) page 3, column 3, last sentence of second paragraph from the top, which should read: In fact, being the root cause of the distresses, those institutions themselves obstucted relief.

Editor's Note.—The Manifesto, written by Comrade C. Stephenson, has the endorsation of the D.E.C. It will be seen that its viewpoint expresses a continuity of the Party attitude outlined in the "Western Clarion" continuously since 1918, in the "Red Flag" and "Indicator," and in the S. P. of C. Manifesto, Preface to Fifth Edition, 1920.

STRAWS.

THERE are so many straws that show which way the economic, or shall we say "trade winds," are blowing that they can hardly be enumerated?

The sudden cessation of the peace barrage behind which the dominant nations prepared to put their fighting machines on an up-to-date, scientific basis, by scrapping a few superfluous ships which had proved too cumbersome for practical use and saving their expensive up-keep to reinvest later in modern means of warfare, a proceeding which certainly entitles the U. S. administration to its claim of being a business administration, and of which it made the most in the recent election, is perhaps the most noticeable straw. For the Washington Conference held the middle of the stage while it lasted.

The breaking up of old parties here and the formation of new alignments abroad under which to keep up the imperialistic game are also receiving the best efforts of the world's politicians. The notification of British labor that they would not support another war and the downfall of the Lloyd George government, which was an encouragement to French cockiness, the announcement by Bonar Law that the same policy in the Near East would be pursued and which took the cock out of French cockiness and which has sent the Tiger of France speeding westward to whisper into the ear of Uncle Sam the advisability of liquidating the French debt in oil, which will come in handy to lubricate the machinery of a re-constructed merchant marine and which can be had in abundance at the expense of their erstwhile allies if he will but sustain her in her Near Eastern policies.

The calling of a special session of Congress for the purpose of crowding through the Ship Subsidy Bill, while the crowding is good, in order to take care of the growing South American trade which was the spoils won by the U. S. for participation in the late war.

The Armistice Day speech of Mr. Harding, casting at least a shadow of coming events and helping to create a psychology with which to pave the way for those events, together with the sudden demand by Wall Street that the bars to future immigration be let down almost immediately after they were erected. All these are straws which show how easterly the winds are blowing.

The watching, waiting policy of Uncle Sam until such time as the weakened position of the European powers will enable him to come to their assistance with the best advantage to himself, and having gained the indisputed hegemony of the Western Continent he can well afford to turn his face eastward, for is there not there, not a new, but an old world to conquer?

KATHERINE SMITH.

The Origin of the World

By R. McMillan.

EARLY MEN.

CHAPTER XXI.

Once upon a time I heard a story, from the Arabic, which interested me very greatly. It was the story of a garden in the Persian country. The rose said to the lily: "I think that our gardener is a very wonderful man." "Yes," replied the lily, "I quite agree with you. What a long time he lives, and he never changes!" "That is a curious thing about him," said the rose; and here her voice sank to a mysterious whisper as she added: "I think he lives for ever, because the rose that died soon after I was born, an old rose, said that he was just the same when she was born." The lily bowed her gentle head, and replied: "Yes I think he lives for ever."

You see, little girl, it all depends on the point of view. To the roses in the garden, the man who looked after them appeared to be immortal, simply because their lives were so very short. So the mountains appear to us to be everlasting, because we live such a little while. And the world appears to us like the gardener—to live for ever. But nothing lives for ever! All things pass—worlds, suns, systems—everything has its day, and then fades away. Nothing vanishes, as far as we know; but everything changes its shape. We cannot think of real things going to nothing, any more than we can think of something coming from nothing. This may seem to be an out-of-the-way subject, yet it all belongs to the question of the origin of the world. Such a lot of things belong to it! Everything belongs to it, I think.

You have never been to England, have you? Perhaps you will go some day. When you get to London, you will find there the mightiest city in the world, with nearly twice as many people in it as there are in the whole of Australia. And yet history goes back to the time when London was only a village, by a great river, with a few poor fishermen on its banks. Two thousand year ago there was no London at all, for when the Romans were in England they did not seem to think that the bank of the Thames was a great place; nor did the people who came after them realize for a long time how important the river was. When the kings were first crowned in England they were crowned at Winchester. London is quite modern, but when you drive through it on the top of a 'bus it seems to have always been. Nothing has always been! Nothing endures in the whole wide world. Everything fades and fails in all the wide universe, even men. A great poet once wrote:—

For that which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts;
Even one thing befalleth them;
As the one dieth, so dieth the other;
Yea, they have all one breath;
So that a man hath no pre-eminence above a beast;
For all is vanity.
All go unto one place;
All are of the dust,
And all turn to dust again.

There are many people who think this is not true, but I never argue with a poet. You will find these lines in the Bible, an old and noble book, with which few people appear to be acquainted.

What I want you to understand is that London was not always the same as it is now. I think you understand that, do you not? But the climate used to be different also. When you hear a man say, "I think the seasons are changing; they are nothing like what they were when I was a boy," you can afford to smile to yourself. But be sure that you do it to yourself. The seasons never change in the lifetime of a man. The seasons change only in millions of years. It was colder in London 240,000 years ago than it is now. You may, indeed, take it as a fact that the climate of London has been different several times. Let me tell you a curious thing, on the authority of Edward Clodd. When they were digging for the foundation of Drummond's new bank, at Charing Cross, in London, a few years ago, they found some strange bones, which were identified as those of the Cave Lion, a long extinct beast; the tusks and bones of the mammoth, or woolly-haired elephant, the bones of the Irish deer, the rhinoceros, extinct oxen, red deer, etc. How had they come where they were? Think of a bold rhinoceros roaming about where London is now! Think of a woolly-haired elephant there, too!

It seems to me to be quite impossible till I remember the changes that the world has seen. I think you understand that the climate of the Coal Age must have been hot and steamy. Well, coal was formed near to the place we now call the South Pole. Professor David and all his merry men, when they went with the Shackleton expedition, found it hidden under the ice and snow of the Antartic world. There must have been a time when the weather was hot at the Poles. How long since? I do not know. Nobody knows; but, anyway, years would be of no value to measure with in such a case. We are in the position of the rose and the lily: our lives are so short that we cannot realize these tremendous stretches of time.

But where were men all this time? There were men of a sort, even when the woolly elephant was living in London. But they were of a very poor type. I have some pictures of the skulls of the very early men; but they are quite different from those of the Greeks, or from our own. The first men were of a very low, bestial type, and yet they were different from the monkeys, or any of the other beasts. I feel I ought not to speak for myself here, as the subject is a deep one, and requires a specialist to deal with it. The greatest and most honoured specialist that I know of is Sir E. Ray Lankester, who has been President of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, Director of the British Museum, and lots of other things. He wrote a book called The Kingdom of Man, which was really founded on three addresses he delivered at Oxford and other places. I want to quote his words, which will show you that man is very ancient. He says ("Nature's Insurgent Son," Chap. VII):—

"The immense antiquity of man was established and accepted on all sides just before Mr. Darwin published his book on The Origin of Species. The palaeolithic elements of the river gravels, though probably made much more than 150,000 years ago, do not, any more than do the imperfect skulls occasionally found in association with them, indicate a condition of the human race greatly more monkey-like than is presented by existing savage races. The implements themselves are manufactured with great skill and artistic feeling. Within the last ten years much rougher flint implements, of peculiar types, have been discovered in gravel which are 500 feet above the level of the existing rivers. These eoliths of the south of England indicate a race of men of less developed skill than the makers of the palaeolithic, and carry the antiquity of man at least as far back beyond the palaeoliths as these are from the present day. We have as yet found no remains giving the direct basis for conclusions on the subject; but, judging by the analogy (not by any means a conclusive method) furnished by the history of other large animals now living alongside of man—such as the horse, the rhinoceros, the tapir, the wolf, the hyena, and the bear—it is not improbable that it was in the remote period known as the lower Miocene—remote even as compared with the gravels in which eoliths occur—that Natural Selection began to favour that increase in the size of the brain of a large and not very powerful semi-erect ape, which eventuated, after some hundreds of thousands of years, in the breeding-out of a being with a relatively enormous brain-case, a skilful hand, and an inveterate tendency to throw stones, flourish sticks, protect himself in caves, and in general to defeat aggression, and satisfy his natural appetites by the use of his wits, rather than by strength alone, in which, however, he was not deficient."

Next Lesson:
THE CONCLUSION OF THE MATTER.

Literature Price List

Cloth Bound	Per Copy
Positive Outcome of Philosophy	$1.85
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
Independent Working Class Education	10c
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
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
A Worker Looks at History (Starr)	80c
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.

Socialist Party of Canada

PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

STAR THEATRE, 300 Block, Main Street

SUNDAY DECEMBER 3.

Speaker: SID. EARP.

MEETINGS EVERY SUNDAY.

All meetings at 8 p.m.

Questions. Discussion.