

## Permanant Prosperity

BY F. CUSACK

SINCE the spring of last year the American daily press has been publishing glowing accounts of the great era of prosperity existing in the U. S. A. The glad tidings are heralded forth to the disinherited of other less happy lands that here is a sanctuary of refuge from unemployment, low wages, and other proletarian afflictions, in short—a haven of contentment, where every prospect pleases and only the labor agitator is vile. We are, or were assured by so great an authority as Herbert Hoover, that “we had arrived at permanent prosperity.” American capitalism had reached a point of perfection, where the purveyors of the standard blend of optimism and other worshippers at the shrine of Boosterism and Service might (to paraphrase the words of the late Mr. Roebuck), exclaim in chorus: “We look around us and ask, what is the state of these States?” Is not every honest workman able to get a job? Is not every business man who is inspired with the ideals of vision and service able to do business? We ask you whether the world over, or in past history, there is anything like it? Nothing. We pray, yea, we predict that our unrivalled happiness will last.

Recently, however, the prophets of the press, minor captains of industry, economists, industrial analysts and financial horoscopes, such as Roger Rabson, started to view with alarm where they formerly pointed with pride. Enemies of permanent prosperity, we are told, are on the march, in fact they are even now attacking the business front. These enemies are inflation, rising labor costs, labor shortage (?), rising prices, with the most insidious foe of them all—the Buyer's Strike, mopping up in the rear, to use a military expression. The inability of the wealth producers to buy back with their wages or other subsistence incomes the products of industry from the capitalist class who own the machinery of wealth production and operate it through the exploitation of labor-power for which they pay wages or cost of subsistence, is with unconscious humor dubbed a Buyer's Strike. Buyer's Lockout would have been an equally intelligent term.

As an explanation of the recurrence of economic depressions in capitalist society the “Buyer's Strike” should rank in historical significance and scientific accuracy with Prof. Senior's “spots on the sun” hypothesis. Somewhere in “Value, Price and Profit” there is a passage concerning wages, prices, etc., wherein it states “that it is not the scantiness of the contents of the pot—National Production—but the smallness of the spoons used by the workers” which is responsible for economic crises. At least that is the gist of the passage, as I remember it. Now, everyone knows that strikes occur. Who strikes? Workers of course. People who strike would undoubtedly commit any crime! They get the habit. If they strike for higher wages, what is more likely than that after they hold up their employers the rascals would go on a “Buyer's Strike?” Such a line of reasoning is in tune with the logic of the Kiwana, Rotarian, “Hello Bill” fraternity.

There are other indications that all is not well with Prosperity, the sharp conflict of editorial opinion over the immigration question, for instance.

During the controversy which ensued over the introduction of the Senate Bill to allow the admission of aliens in excess of the 3% quota, newspapers which had previously been publishing cartoons depicting Labor in bib-overalls and cap, and Capital, sitting cheek by jowl at the groaning festive board, carving the roast turkey of prosperity, with a baffled, be-whiskered “red” wearing a look similar to that which made Cassius famous, glowering on the happy scene—these newspapers switched over to pictures showing the dangers of an alien influx. One cartoon showed the ship of prosperity, heavily laden with wage-plugs, sinking by the stern (scuttled by aliens) in the ocean of business depression, the number of rafts and lifebelts, stencilled Steady Jobs, being totally inadequate for the number of passengers on board; the only resource left to the unfortunates who had not grabbed a life preserver (job) was to crowd together in the bows of the doomed ship singing “Nearer my God to Thee.” An illustration of what capitalism means to the unemployed workers, the cartoon was brutally realistic. At the same time covert and open attacks were made by these newspapers, on Judge Gary, Chairman of the U. S. Steel Corporation, one of the principal advocates of unrestricted immigration. Judge Gary and other advocates of freer immigration are accused of looking only to their immediate interests. One of the most anti-labor and militaristic papers in the country ironically asks hows Gary's plea “for turning towards Christian principle in business” squares with his advocacy of the 12-hour day.

Why this conflict of opinion on a matter of policy where we might expect an united front of the employing class, granting the existence of a labor shortage? Does it not tend to show on the part of certain business interests, a realization of the fact that the so-called prosperity is merely a temporary boom? Sections of the bourgeoisie who, unlike the U. S. Steel Corporation, are not employers of large masses of unskilled labor, fear crime waves, police expenses, and race riots between the native American and the foreign born workers, similar to the clashes which occurred in many northern industrial centres between white and negro workers during the post-war slump, due to the acute competition on the labor-market owing to the “scarcity of work.” Some of the propaganda put forth by those interests in favor of the new immigration policy should convince even the most obtuse worker as to his slave status in capitalist society. It splendidly illustrates the ruling class point of view concerning their fellow humans. For instance, the national Immigration League is out for the removal of present restrictions, and suggests callouses on the hands as the best test of the immigrant's fitness. “The more calloused the hands of an adult male immigrant, the more desirable he is.”

The Liberal Immigration League hold that the “need is not for voters but for workers.” Where does Harding's “pure democracy” fit in under the L. I. L. dispensation? The same organization suggests that aliens be put on probation for five years; those who make themselves undesirable to be liable to summary pedortation! What a glorious prospect

for the immigrant, flying from the ills he knows, to those he wot not of. Yet another league demands that the government have the right to “distribute,” “educate,” and “supervise” the alien, and suggests that the literary test be abolished. Education, no doubt, would be along lines calculated to increase the volume of mass production, with appropriate political indoctrination conducive to standardized citizenship, the preservation of established institutions, the main feature of the curriculum being inculcation of a profound respect for the sacredness of capitalist property rights.

We learn on the authority of the N. Y. Journal of Commerce, that “the unemployment situation in New York City industrial area is at last reduced to normal proportions.” Normal proportions have been shown by long experience to be 100,000. “There are approximately that many without work in the city now.” (March 1923). On the basis of the New York figures, the normal proportion of unemployed in the U. S. A., in times of prosperity, would number a million. Prosperity, therefore, arrives when there are only one million in the industrial reserve army.

What are the chief factors responsible for the business prosperity now blooming in the U. S.? Have the fundamental conditions of capitalist production altered to such a degree as to warrant the optimism of the permanent prosperity prophets? Many and varied are the opinions given as to the causes of the present expansion of business. Some cynics there are, and at least one journal of current comment which ascribes it to the flourishing condition of the bootleg industry, termed “America's largest single industry.” The smuggling of foreign liquors, the “manufacture and distribution” of the native “moon,” corn, dehorn, jackass, mule, seat and synthetic brands of hard “lieker,” employs an enormous number of workers, whiskey detectives, disbarred attorneys, druggists, and others who would otherwise flood the labor market. This industry, not requiring a large expenditure in constant capital, and returning large profits to the entrepreneur, appeals to the imagination and initiative of American and other workers who desire to succeed in life and become men of importance and influence in the community.

The above viewpoint may be worthy of consideration by students of economics. It should at least provide to the dry advocates material for a slogan such as “Prohibition and Prosperity go hand in hand.” The Washington Post informs us that only “3% of the total American production is exported to Europe,” that the U. S. A. is independent of the European market, the domestic consumption of the U. S. being equal to the present rate of production; ergo: permanent prosperity. On the other hand, there are other authorities who consider the present European situation as advantageous to American export trade. The best informed trade journals, both American and British, ascribe the present industrial activities to the remarkable expansion of the constructional industry, which has been, and is, the backbone of the boom. Advancing prices, which in turn tends to increasing capitalisation, lead some

(Continued on page 8)

# By the Way

HEGEL (1770-1831) was a German philosopher who greatly influenced the thought of the first three-quarters of the 19th century. His time has been termed, in the estimation of the more matter-of-fact standards of scientific thought of our day, a period of romanticism in historical theory and philosophy. My gibe in last issue at what I inferred were remnants of Hegelian romanticism infecting socialist theorizing on the social problem will have little value for purging our thought of such unrealities unless I add to it explanation. So herewith.

All individuals, whether they have consciously worked it over or not and regard it as their philosophy of life, have what is termed, an "outlook" on the universe of men and things. This outlook constitutes our standpoint of judgment; it is a mental approach or point of view whose standards constitute the bases of our opinions. Opinions may vary or change in a superficial sense, merely swinging, as it were, on the pivot of our fixed standards. But again, the standards of judgment themselves undergo change and modification, which is to say, there is a shift to another point of view in outlook on life involving opinions fundamentally different to those held previously. During transition periods, brought on by changing material conditions of social life, particularly so when the method of production has changed, there goes on in every mind a more or less unconscious and confused conflict between the old social standards that are in process of breaking down and the new ones evolving out of the discipline of habits of life and economic conditions brought on by the new material factors. The philosophies have, in the main, been the reflection of such conflict of social standards.

Human conduct, in its social aspects, religious, political, economic, is predetermined by the individual's outlook on the world, i.e., on his personal philosophy of life. The competency of the philosophy as a guide to conduct is thus of great moment. For, a philosophy that does not square with the facts enlarges the reign of accident. The facts—facts of politics, facts of economies, facts of human nature—all facts break you if you ignore them. Nevertheless, it is never wholly a question of having a great collection of data, it is also necessary to have a correct point of view or method of approach to facts in order to make proper selection of those facts relevant and significant in whatever relation may be, say, for example, that of social improvement.

It is an all too common mistake to assume that the great systems of philosophy in history are the artificial creations of the study and so without social significance as having no connection with the ideas and common needs and aspirations of human beings of their time. On the contrary, "a philosophical theory is not an accident or whim but an exponent of its age and handing on its results to the future." Of course, it is true enough of the philosophers that, "the past, as they represented it was a masked, and disguised, and mythical and mystical substitute for the real experience of earlier men. The past as having been, and as having some sort of message for the present, had always, and especially since the Renaissance, brooded in and over the minds of European thinkers." Nevertheless, those philosophies that did become influential, did so because they satisfied the felt need of great social groups for a unified consistent system of thought which would express their social traditions, needs and aspirations. And whatever of survival value they have for mankind in general in all succeeding times, becomes selected and absorbed, disappearing as it were, into the general current of thought. Sometimes that which is useless also survives, but merely to justify the cults.

The Germany that our generation knew prior to the great war, a nation welded into a unity under a centralized government with an almost absolute

monarchy, was not the Germany of Hegel's time. In his time it was a loose, shuffling mixture of independent principalities, politically weak and impotent and industrially backward, all within a ring fence of the ambitions and comparatively consolidated nationalities, of Russia, Austria, France and perfide Albion. In this situation, the peoples of the German principalities, whatever their mutual jealousies and quarrels, had much too strong racial, cultural affinities and common economic interests not to yearn for a more perfect political unity; and beginning with a few, the will for it spread as the passing of time demonstrated more and more its need both as a protective measure and for the more ambitious project for a "place in the sun" which was to mature later on in the culmination of 1871 for which Bismark is given the credit. A sensitive soul, there are many world currents, religious, scientific and political sweeping through Hegel's philosophy, while he was at the same time, one of the articulate voices of the German desire for national unity, which, though still far over the horizon, was itself only one particular case of a general tendency in the political life of the whole world.

I am now coming to my point on what, according to our later matter-of-fact standards, is the romantic element in Hegel's philosophy. In his youth, under the influence of the ideas of the French revolution, Hegel had been a glorifier of liberty when to do so was to be revolutionary. However, with the passing of years, and as he developed his theories, he became more and more conservative and one of the chief justifiers of the Prussian State. The concept of revolutionary social change became abhorrent to him as something impossible of realization. For this direction of his thought some credit may be due to the first Napoleon who raised the devil in Continental Europe, and who, with his conquering French legions and his dictatorship, was one of the strange disillusionizing progeny of the French revolution. Perhaps also, the Prussian State, by the subtle flattery of professorial appointments drew the unconscious Hegel into its service, for until he received its favors his lot in life had been one of bitter poverty. Be that as it may, the man was undoubtedly honest in his beliefs. In the main his social theory assumed the character it did because he rested the whole weight of his interpretation of history upon the principle of "continuity"—a very great truth, though not the whole truth. History of course is more than a mere succession of events, there is a casual continuity, whatever of divergent factors of causation there be. Now "continuity" taught that "any present social situation is linked by a never entirely broken chain of historical antecedents to a past that reaches back beyond discoverable beginnings." The Conservatives interpreted that to mean that the dead hand of the past, in tradition, thought, habit and custom laid upon every generation rigid limits to the possibilities of change. Because human nature is so ancient, they said, and so persistent, social changes can only be brought about very slowly, if at all.

But there is a companion principle to the factor of "continuity" in history, to which Hegel and the Conservatives of his time gave no credit; and perhaps could not if its importance was the discovery of a later generation of psychologists and students of social group cultures, customs and institutions. The companion principle is this: "that men in groups may merge their volitions so as to supersede the predominance of historical factors and so either nullify them or relegate them to a subordinate position." Thus we see the possibility of change is enlarged. While still recognizing that a social factor never ceases to be a social factor, that every present social situation is conditioned by previous situations, nevertheless, this principle relieves us of at least some of the supposed inescapable heritage of the traditional past. So we now look into the material conditions of the present for factors at work in the formation of new habits, dispositions and

standards that may supersede the traditional. At the same time, we are free to place a new higher value on the taking thought of ways and means of social changes and of human inventiveness and ingenuity in working them out. In the scheme of things as a whole, man is shown now as more of a dynamic factor with increasing possibilities of power to control his conditions of life as his knowledge increases. As might be expected, however, it is the habit of those who desire things to remain as they are, to stress the principles of "continuity," while those who are for change are liable to rest their case mainly in the companion principle. In spite of the extremists, however, the truth lies in a due and proper appreciation of both principles in history. We may take it that the universal manner of social cause and effect is **gradualism** rather than **catastrophism**, but with the possibility of a more accelerated movement than the Conservative interests would care for.

I will now briefly outline Hegel's conception of the universal process after a recent reading of the article on him and his work in the "Britannica." As for the matter of the two historical principles, readers will find them expertly elucidated by Albion Small (Chicago University) in "the American Journal of Sociology" for May.

To the eye of our philosopher, the universe is a process of development in the background of which is a universal spirit or, as he terms it, the "absolute" eternally present. The movements of the process are the self-unfolding of the "absolute," i.e., God revealing himself in the natural world, as a series of materialized forces and forms of life; and in the spiritual world as the human soul, the legal and moral order of society, and the creations of art, religion and philosophy. So to Hegel, the community was very much more than a mere aggregation of individuals. It was an organic whole rooted in its cultural past. There was to him, in a real sense, a community spirit, partaking of the divine, ever-developing and unfolding to the end of attaining an ideal, self-realization in the centralized state, the supposed highest expression of the community spirit. He pictured the stages on to this ideal as the outcome of a process of social forms, evolving out of other forms through everlasting self-generation.

What should man do in that preconditioned scheme of things, then, except seek, not his own will, but the will of God which was to materialize itself, so happily (?) for the then disorganized Germany, in the will of the centralized (Prussian) State. Hegelianism resolved itself into this, that, in the beginning, man was created for the service of the State and not the State for the service of man. Hegel is dead of course, but his soul goes marching on. I even hear socialists, generally unwitting of the further implications of their contentions, arguing along those lines.

Marx, who was a Hegelian of the materialist "Left" in his youth, said that Hegel stood the world upon its head, meaning that the philosopher saw the historical process as the working out of the "idea." But Marx, the materialist, did not say that with the intention of disparaging the power of ideas or of relegating man to a position of mere driftwood in the complex of social forces. What he was calling attention to was that the material conditions of production in society were the primary factors conditioning the character of the social, political and spiritual processes of life. But that is without prejudice to the fact that both the social cause and the effects are the result of man's activities. Marx' materialist philosophy however has come down through rows and rows of lesser men, and often it is a mere play-room where animistic conceptions and traits of personality disport themselves. Spirituality is impudently to where only purposeless mechanism obtains. Holding fast to Hegel's "spiritualism" on its one side, directive and even discretionary powers are denied to men and credited to the impersonal forces of the environment. Hegel, himself, was not so fatalistic as all that, though he saw man's power to change his social life narrowly limited by traditional factors and conceived of the will of the ideal citizen as wholly submerged in the will of the "absolute" political State. Differing from Hegel in

social theory, Marx' own life-long struggle to break the continuity of social tradition showed that he saw man's duplex nature both as individual and social being and conceived of him as a dynamic factor and the only purposive factor in the complex of blind social forces. In formulating his materialistic interpretation of history, Marx merely wished to put the world upon its feet, with its head, such as it is, right side up.

\* \* \* \* \*

In my previous discussion of the problem of social change, I have assumed a long transition period out of Capitalism. How long I have no idea, one reason for which is, that I do not know, nor does anyone else know concretely where we are going. The ideal society of the future is variously termed Communism, the Co-operative Commonwealth, the Great Society, etc. The first two terms at least give an impression of a more extended co-operative life than at present obtains. They express, as such, a recognition of and a reaction against the evil effects on human beings of the competitive conditions of the social life of our days. In fact, the social problem has been traced to its source as institutional; concretely, that of private ownership and control of social means of production and distribution in the interest of private profit and aggrandisement at the expense of the underlying population. In this scheme of things, the welfare of the community as a whole is a secondary, in fact solely an accidental eventuality. In the new order it is proposed to place the community welfare in the paramount position by placing the means of production within the control of the community, or, at least, those means of production upon which the community as a whole is dependent. The measure of private control and the measure of social control best serving the interest of the community will, I think, be a matter of expediency and constant adjustments until the end of time. The immediate aim of our day, however, is a greater extension of social control to eliminate the admittedly serious and menacing social conditions resulting from private control of economic powers. To a large extent ownership over the more socialized industrial and economic instrumentalities will be involved in order to make social control effective. Over other enterprises upon which the communities are less dependent control may be asserted in some other indirect manner. Various forms of social organization for the future have long been under discussion,—Collectivism, with the State as owner and employer, the defect of which, its opponents allege, is the danger of a huge bureaucracy; Guild Socialism, with the management downwards to the laborers in the trades guilds as virtual owners of the industry, having control of the industrial processes and conditions of work, and the State as the real owner and representative of the general public as consumer. Another scheme advocates two parliaments, one an industrial parliament with representatives from the various industries, and the other representative of the consumer and general citizenship interests. Whatever experience may dictate in the actual working out of the problem of organization, the preliminary discussions have great value so long as they are centred upon known and permanent factors common both to the present and the future—our common human nature, organized social life, the machine process, and a world economy of production and distribution. Otherwise, evil consequences arise from constructing "ideally" the future State out of imagination spurred by mere desire. We then are sure to construct a compensatory dream world, and living in it as an escape from harsh reality so become impractical in criticism and in action. Knowing of Confucius, Buddha, Jesus, Socrates, the wise, the great, the good, we are apt to model our future society for an abstract man who, all one undifferentiated interest, lives only for "humanity as a whole." It is perhaps forgotten that the reputation of those ancients has come down to us through the cults and kindly tradition, and that we shall never know them as their wives knew them or as their contemporary rivals in religious or philosophical theory knew them. With some lucky reputations, it is the evil that is oft interred with

men's bones while the good that men do lives after them—and grows and grows and grows.

Let us be practical, take a practical view of human nature, a thing of many interests, both individual and social and often only reconciled by sacrifice.

The beginning of wisdom, to quote from Beard's "Economic Basis of Politics," is to recognize that there is no rest for mankind, no final solutions of eternal contradictions, for of such is the design of the universe. Whatever may be the formula for the ownership of property, there will always be an agricultural interest, a railway interest, a transport interest, and an engineering interest, a manufacturing interest, a mining interest, a fishing interest, a public official interest with many lesser interests grown up of necessity in all great societies and divided into different classes actuated by different sentiments and views. The regulation of these various, interfering interests is the task of the future and will involve the spirit of party in the necessary and ordinary operations of administration.

\* \* \* \* \*

I often hear it said in reference to Russia, "Oh, that is not Socialism," and as often wonder what the standpoint of estimation really is. I know it is sometimes necessary to imagine we have halted the continuous, flowing processes of life, compartmentalized, so to say, and put each section away under proper headings for reference. So here we have the matriarchal and patriarchal societies, and in succession the political societies, Feudalism and Capitalism. But here is handicraft production and small trade carried on for a livelihood. Where? In both Capitalism and Feudalism! And here is large scale machine production, wage labor and production for profit also in both Capitalism and Feudalism. Yet production for a livelihood belongs characteristically to Feudalism, while production for profit dominates in Capitalism. It is whatever method dominates that gives its name to an epoch. Moreover, the question of distinguishing what is what of forms of society at certain transitional stages is still further complicated by the political aspect of things, for often in such a stage of social flux military or political power may not at all times lie in the hands of the same class who hold a predominance of economic power, or at least, the ratio of the distribution of these powers, may not be equal. So the landed aristocracy with their military power long lorded it over the bourgeoisie of Europe. The days, the months, the years, the centuries are arbitrarily fixed marks in time eras, but ages, epochs, periods and times, who shall delimit the twilight zones where they merge in the great procession of things and say which is which? But some will not see the world in process and their ready answer is always "Yea, Yea!" or "Nay, Nay!" Nevertheless, every form of society contains institutional furniture carried over from previous societies, while already within it are coming into existence embryo-like, those institutions which will serve men's purposes, in the next order.

To estimate progress in social change to a new order in Russia or elsewhere, I can not take my stand in some indefinite future in I know not what organization of things. Some there are who are surer of the social structure of the future than I am, but I question their foreseeing powers and the source of their conception. What is their standpoint erected out of for judging present progress—the future is always the prolific home of Utopia, the "wish" disports itself too freely in its spacious corridors. What is such standpoint worth for criticism? It might vary with every individual and by its very nature, in the absence of facts, it can not be a matter-of-fact standpoint but only one of a matter of opinion.

On the other hand, I am content to take my stand in the present and look backward to measure progress. I know where I am now and what we are trying to get away from. Here I take my stand on known ground and I can estimate advance by the character of the measures introduced, the evils overcome, the advances made in control, security and social well-being—say, for illustration, I drive a stake in at the year 1923 and ten years hence at 1933 when we get there, or any other period which the

pessimistic or optimistic reader may think fit, and size the interval up. Knowing what we are trying to get away from and the character of the ways and means adopted to do so, I am now all along dealing in known quantities, and the facts will check me up if I start romancing. As to taking a standpoint in the future to pass judgment on any decade of our days, we have no warrant in science or from the historic past to claim certitude that humanity could make the grade, or that it would be in its interests if it did so, to any of our best laid schemes for a time so far away over the horizon of the years. We never could and never will pour human kind into any mold of our preconceiving. The future is experimental, as many an all-powerful autocracy has found to its cost in the past. And I make the prediction that as the masses of the people throw off economic slavery and take a real directive control over their social life that by experimentation in progress conditioned on the material of the immediate situations rather than by preconceived dogmas they will create a life so amazing in variety and richness as to put to shame the best schemes our shabby and shoddy mentalities of today could conceive of. As I see it, it is for us here and now to deal with things within our reach and power and leave the rest.

\* \* \* \* \*

Mainly, for us of the working class, the question of progress is a question of control, a question of the gradual acquirement of control in order to influence the policies of the State. We may make bad use of such power as we may get at first and suffer for it, but we shall learn better from experience. And in that regard I differ with the old lady's advice to her daughter who asked her permission to go to swim:

Oh, yes, my darling daughter!

Hang your clothes on a hickory limb,

But don't go near the water.

However ignorant the working class may be of history, economics and politics, gladly would I see them take the plunge into the stream of political activity as an economic group, because, as any swimmer or blacksmith, farmer, seaman, housewife or administrator of whatever kind knows, there is a kind of knowledge that is only to be got from practical experience. Politics is not the land of romantic abstractions, but a branch of social engineering dealing with concrete human beings and the regulation and improvement of the conditions of their social life. In this practice of life, industrial and political principles can only act as guides to the working out of problems. Furthermore, the satisfying of working class needs today will drive them in the main to attacks in the foundations of capitalist class privilege. Every once in a while in history the needs of a submerged social class coincides with the historically developed need of society as a whole for fundamental change. So it was at the break up of the feudal system when the burgesses of the towns were the leading interests in the political struggles against feudal privileges. Shortsighted, ignorant of the further reaching consequences of their acts in a historical and wide social sense as such a class may be, yet their very immediate needs for the removal of a tithe, toll or impost on industry or trade led them in the direction of undermining and throwing down the established order. In the main, such a class can do no wrong for they have given to them, as it were, a true sense of direction once they become initiating factors in social change. It is so with the working masses of today.

I hope next issue to deal with the constitution of a Labor Party. C.

## MANIFESTO

— of the —  
SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA  
(Fifth Edition)

Per copy ..... 10 cents

Per 25 copies ..... \$2

Post Paid

# 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

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

VANCOUVER, B. C., JUNE 16, 1923.

## SECRETARIAL NOTES.

**L**OCAL (Vancouver) No. 1, some time ago appointed a committee to find ways and means to secure headquarters suitable to the work on hand. The committee, finding—as similar committees have found in the past—that the matter of renting headquarters for the Socialist Party is no easy task, and being somewhat resentful concerning the permanent homelessness of the Local, recommended to the Local that the committee be constituted as a Building Committee, to open a subscription list to secure funds for building or buying a place of suitable size and convenience, that could be counted on as permanent. In this connection letters and lists have been drawn up by the committee and some comrades have received copies in outlying districts already.

In accord with the request of the chairman of the committee, we promised to reproduce their letter outlining the matter, as of interest and moment to the general Clarion reader. Now, however, space forbids. These few words will serve, however, to centre attention on the letter, which will appear next issue. In the meantime, a request to P. O. Box 710 will bring information to all who may be interested.

Comrade Lestor held a meeting in Edmonton, Alberta, on June 10th, at Meeting Creek, June 13th. From there he has gone to Stettler and Alix. From there he goes to Swalwell, thence to Calgary. Then he leaves Calgary June 18, 6.05 p.m., arrives Hanna June 19, 12.10 a.m.; leaves Hanna June 20, 12.10 a.m., arrives Stanmore June 20, 1.06 a.m.; leaves Stanmore June 23, 1.06 a.m., arrives Youngstown June 23, 1.38 a.m.; leaves Youngstown June 25th, 1.38 a.m., arrives Excel June 25th, 2.50 a.m.; leaves Excel July 1, 2.50 a.m., arrives Fiske to remain at Fiske one week.

Arrangements for return to Calgary are delayed until further information is received.

Clarion Mail Bag is held over until next issue.

## HERE AND NOW.

Being as short of space as of cash we are at the printer's mercy twice over. As a consequence his demand is for cash on hand. He brightly informs us that copy is not negotiable at the bank—not Clarion copy. Clarion cash would be as good as any other, if we had any. We have earned a reputation for impudence in handing the hungry printer this since last issue:—

Following \$1 each—W. A. Alexander, H. Williams, D. Aloise, C. A. Smith, B. Tamarkin, W. H. Jenkins, C. MacDonald, W. J. Churchill, J. Marshall, F. W. Moore, A. W. Osterberg, W. H. Cottrell, T. Hanwell, J. J. Albers, G. Duffell, J. McKinlay, A. Gardener, Mrs. Griffith.

R. O. Childers, \$2; Wm. Allen, \$2; J. McLennan, \$2; M. Milliken, 25c; A. Jordan, \$1.60; E. Simpson, \$2; N. Z. Communist Party (per G. E. W.), \$6.75; H. Noaks, \$1.50; Frisco Labor College (per J. K.), \$9.60; J. O'Brien (per T. A. L.), \$1; T. A. L., \$2. Clarion subs. from 30th May to 14 June, inclusive—total, \$48.70.

## CLARION MAINTENANCE FUND

Following \$1 each—Marshall Erwin, G. D. (per Sid Earp), Mrs. A. Hollingshead, Mr. A. Hollingshead, J. Untinen, R. Burns, E. Price. Following per T. A. L., D. Gibbs, \$1; A. Tree, \$1; T. A. L., \$1—total by T. A. L., \$3; A. Jordan, 40 cents; St. John comrades per M. Goudie, \$9.

Above, C. M. F. receipts from 30th May to 14th June, inclusive—total, \$21.40.

## REVOLUTIONS, POLITICAL AND SOCIAL.

BY J. HARRINGTON

### Seventh Article

**W**E have been, so far, discussing the open season on kings and kingdoms, principalities and powers. Europe presented the appearance of an old Aunt Sally show, three balls a penny, with the most blue blooded families at the back of the lot.

Before taking up the revolutionary movement again we had better glance over the constitution and disposition of the European powers. In Central Europe we find a collection of small states, the inhabitants speaking various dialects of Slav and German. These with some parts of Italy had composed the Holy Roman Empire; Austria was by far the strongest and most aggressive and had so far dominated. And so far, religion, language and geographical location had a great influence on social affairs, owing to the feudal conditions which prevailed over much of this country. Italy was striving in a blind fashion for national unity, as were Hungary, Bohemia and Germany.

Outside of France, and to a less degree south Germany and the Rhineland, which had been Gallicised or, if you like it better, Frenchified by the Napoleonic conquests, very little was heard of proletarian demands. Outside of this territory very little machine production prevailed. The inherited traditions, the songs and heroes, were as different on each side of the Danube as either was from the Isle of Skye. Pressburg, the seat of the Magyar assembly, had nothing in common with Vienna, where the German language and traditions prevailed, though separated by but a few miles and the blue Danube. And the Magyars, who sat with such revolutionary vigor at Pressburg, could claim no common traditions and sympathy with the people immediately surrounding them—the Poles, the Croats, the Czechs, the Slavs in short. As the Gaj intimated to Kussuth, the Slav ocean in which the Magyar island was set should not be dispised. To conclude the metaphor, the island did try to subject the ocean. And neither being one or the other, both suffered disaster.

Italy had seized the opportunity offered by Austria's extremity to throw off their foreign yoke, and the Austrians were gradually being driven over the border. We will take up this briefly before going into the Slavonic disaster.

Divided into a dozen different governments, four of which might either force or guide Italy into a national unity, this country had been the classic land of the medieval city. While Mazzini, Garibaldi and Cavour, with all the courage, energy and foresight possible, fought and schemed day and night, the desires of Venice were just as far from their ideals as are those of childhood from manhood. The same might be said of several other sections. Austria ruled down to Venice and Milan; the House of Savoy ruled Sardinia and Piedmont; the Bourbons, Naples and the south; the Papal states lay immediately to the north, while between them and the Austrians were several Duchies. All were resolved on the expulsion of Austria; each had its own ultimate design, while each also had a revolutionary movement of which it was desperately afraid.

The expulsion of the Austrians lent a temporary unity to the native ruling houses and the Pope; but no sooner had the initial successes been made than the different interests set the Italians at each others throats. When the Neapolitan army left to assist against the Austrians an attempt was made to establish a republic, barricades were thrown up and Ferdinand II. (King Bomba as he was to be nicknamed a year later for the bombing of Messina, which bombing, I might add while still in parenthesis, threw Thiers into such a fit of righteous wrath) fled. The attempt was crushed, and the Neapolitan army was recalled. This on the very day, May 15th, that the workers and students of Vienna had demonstrated that reaction would not be tolerated, and the Emperor and his court had fled to the army in Italy.

The peasantry of Austria, having received ma-

terial advantages from the revolution and having so far enjoyed these unchallenged, however strenuously the assault on the towns was maintained, were quite ready to fight the good fight. And fresh Austrian armies soon put the aspiring Italians to flight and thus furnished an occasion for the return to sanity of the revolutionaries. And but a few months later the very students and workers of Vienna were enthusiastic warriors, fighting their country's battles in Venetia and Lombardy. So that when old Radetzky, in command of this army, received orders from the government at Vienna, he could well reply: "These men are not the government of Austria; that is now in my camp; I and my army, we are Austria; and when we shall have beaten the Italians we shall re-conquer the Empire for the Emperor!" The Pope also, who had declared war on Austria, withdrew, as he well might, considering that country was the mainstay of the Church. The King of Sardinia was soon forced to retire, and while Venice and Milan still held out Austria's star was in the ascendant. The Slavonic people, repulsed at Pressburg, at Berlin, at Frankfort, found that the overthrow of autocracy did not mean the supremacy of their nation, did not even mean in a pronounced way equality with the Germans and Magyars.

Meanwhile the Pan-Slavic Congress met at Prague. And notwithstanding the cry of "Slava" while the speeches were being made in the early days of the revolution, when they met together their tongues had developed on such diverse lines that they were unable to understand each other. They could, individually, converse together and get along in a hit or miss fashion, but in a deliberative body, where gesture and grimace can be of very little service and when the flow and fire of speech will not permit constant interruption, and particularly when so many different explanations would be required it was found that some other medium would have to be used. So that, as Marx puts it, the people who were united on but one issue, hatred of Germans and the German language, had to fall back on this hated language as the only one generally understood.

In the south and east the Serbs, Croats and Ulaeks demanded national recognition; and however passionately Kussuth might declaim on Freedom, when these peoples made, as an alternative to their demand, the threat to seek satisfaction elsewhere than at Pressburg, he just as passionately exclaimed, "Then the sword must decide." The victory at Vienna and Berlin had evidently released a new crop of despots, whose right to rule was immediately challenged.

Marx's well known hatred of Russia is nowhere more plainly revealed than in his summary of this muddle: "Thus in the studies of a few Slavonian dilettanti of historical science was this ludicrous, this anti-historical movement got up, a movement which intended nothing less than to subjugate the civilized West under the barbarian East, the town under the country; trade, manufacturers, intelligence, under the primitive agriculture of Slavonian Serfs. But behind this ludicrous theory stood the terrible reality of the Russian Empire; that empire which by every movement proclaims the pretention of considering all Europe as the domain of the Slavonic race." Plainly, Marx was in a temper. He has stated elsewhere (The Eastern Question) that since the 1848 revolution "there are in reality but two powers on the continent of Europe—Russia and Absolutism, the Revolution and Democracy," from which it will be seen that to err is human. All the more so that in his own account of the Revolution some of the most dastardly acts possible were recorded of those who would necessarily be included in his category of trade manufacture and intelligence.

In the First place the revolution had scarce buried its dead when German warriors marched into Poland and smothered the Polish movement in blood and fire. In the second, revolutionary, atheistic France marched into Italy and drove that mighty man of revolt, Garibaldi, out of Rome in the name of God and for the good of the Pope, two years

(Continued on page 7)

# Tactics

IN TWO PARTS.

Part One.

NOT possessing a dictionary, I do not know the precise definition of "tactics," but I presume it means specific methods adopted for the attainment of definite ends. According to our conception of the aims to be won, we direct our activities; and in proportion as fact and conception coincide, so strategy justifies itself in its ultimate results. We don't mean the Jesuitical dictum that "the end justifies the means," but that the final end is consistent with the primal clarity of concept. An understanding of the objective is essential, but not enough. With that understanding there must be a balanced estimate of the totality of factors conditioning and determining the active method. Without the latter the former is but an idealism—and it may be "a bar sinister" to the cause it advocates.

If such a definition is justified, then tactics is governed by the nature of the objective; its characterisation intimately dependant upon the particular circumstances through which that objective is to be pursued. This nature and the attendant circumstance are to be arrived at by no haphazard process of conjecture, but by conscious perception of the stubborn facts of existence, of which, both they—and their hunter, man—are the latest products. This is no ideal occupation, nor is it a whole class concern, and it has none of the fascination accorded to the deft weavers of heart's desire. Nevertheless, as a class we must take up the task—and consistently. For reality reacts upon us relentlessly; and, if unprepared for it, disastrously. No lesson of history is more clear.

The objective of socialists is socialism. That is the social ownership and administration of the common means of life. The tactics to be adopted for its consummation is determined by the totality of conditions obtaining within the society in which it exists. What the tactics is to be, therefore, is a product of our conception of social organization. The visualisation of the one is the determinant of the other; and their certainty necessitates clear comprehension of the social reality which occasions them, a certainty which development feeds to full blossomed maturity.

Capitalist society is class ownership of the common means of life, operated in the terms of sale for the profit of private benefit. Consequently, fundamentally, capitalism and socialism are direct antagonisms. They are irreconcilable philosophies of human activity, and between them there can be neither peace nor truce. Capitalist society, organized on private ownership of social necessities, necessarily gives to ownership the usufruct of possession. Possession gives dominance over the non-possessing class. The class that possesses nothing but its labor power must ask the class that possesses all for the means of its life. Thus asking, it betrays its servitude; betrays itself as a slave class, and its "rights" but the servitors of class interest. Property right is the right of class ownership in the means of life. Class ownership is political society; and political society is the right of ownership to maintain and defend its property in the means of life.

But while this is true, the inner manner of it is not just so badly simple. During, and because of social development man "has sought out many inventions." Social development is indeed the development of invention. Necessity continually drives society to the satisfaction of its necessities. Yet, paradoxically, necessity is never satisfied. It becomes but the advocate of a wider process. Through thousands of years—lean and painful years—man organized to overcome the adversities of nature. But the organization to fight nature matured into agencies that fought man for dominion. With its triumph it demolished the fundamental ties on which society organized—common and mutual association in the struggle for existence; substituting, gradually and

by divers methods, society organized round the common means of life, in private possession.

The first processes in the drama of social change divided society into economic classes, with its inevitable accompaniment of social differentiation. The latter phase of that process is exactly the opposite—the elimination of social distinction and the reamalgamation of society into one economic unity. The earlier development of progress, that united society in primitive necessity, becomes transformed in its latest stages into the Imperialist impulse that breaks up the rival and individual interests of economic groups; and reacts constantly more stringently on their social status, rendering the struggle for place more difficult, more impossible; and drawing them ever nearer to the fundamental realities of life. Just as society in growth evolved its virile conflicts for power and dominion so the same society in decadence induces its confused struggles for prestige and privilege; its reactionary radicalism, and illusionary interests of amelioration. Naturally the political clamor grows louder, and the spreading demands of crushed effort more insistent. Yet being deluded with the catch-phrases of political device, clinging dourly to the love of another period, failing to disintegrate the lingering concepts of yesterday from their advanced incidence of today; "being deceived of themselves," i.e., misinterpreting the long abortion of natural human aspirations for life and the substance of life, the clamor subsides with the manipulation of political gestures, and its new figures of opportunity; and the crushed endeavor of long suffering humanity drifts into new cul-de-sac's of palliation, to find itself once more shattered in the pitiless barrage of political dominion.

Political dominion is the substantiation of economic dominion. It has achieved that dominion because it reflected the economic progress of society. And it holds that dominion because, in the conceptual equivalences of its time-spirit, it appears to further that progress. But, as stated, economic progress unfolds the dynamic rivalries of economic interests; and those interests, active with the impulse of growth, and motived with the necessities of time-condition, seek to perpetuate themselves by and through whatever influences they can command.

Naturally the struggle for existence involves the destruction of its victims. Not all survive. But the survivors grow more powerful and more entrenched in their privilege. Commercial practice brings forth experiments in method and principle; and the world market is the arbiter of success. But the world market is also the Moloch of society, violating and desecrating its whole social intention; and to sustain that violation, i.e., to sustain the right of privilege against the need of society, requires political control. Consequently, the happenings in the political world are the manifests of its economic organization; the manifests of specific groups, seeking to advance specific interests, mutually antagonistic because competitive in character; mutually associative in nature. And they obtain that "democratic" government by consent, because society, misunderstanding the terms of the political, construes them in the widely different and infinitely more complex terms of democratic humanity.

It is true that political power cannot fly in the face of the tempered "rights and privileges" of a new generation, oriented by new conditions of life. But it is also true that political power has made the conventions of the new generation, with all their differing aspects, subservient to their great advantage. And although the new creations of dynamic conditions, shepherded with haphazard care, have benefited certain sections of society, both master and slave, yet they have neither prevented the growth and desolation of slavery—as a condition—nor the degeneration of society as a civilisation. The representation of the 19th century, with all its political pigmentation remained the represent-

ation of commercial expansion. And the representation of the 20th, so far, has but assumed the aspect of political repression. In the first case, the peaceable exploitation of the world's resources for the private benefit of the mercantile bourgeoisie. In the second, the political repression, peacefully construed of rival Imperialisms bloated with exploitation, for the benefit of an international oligarchy, drunk on the bondage of a ruined civilisation. We talk of our rights—rights of speech, of thought, of assembly, of freedom of life, of happiness, even—ye gods and fishes little,—the right to work or to strike. Yet all these are but variations of the principles of bourgeois individualism, molded to different functions by different times. They are the giant echoes of old commercial struggles, with little application to wage-dominion. Commercial competition developed new technology; new technology produced new responses in thought and action; and required new practice both in the government of subjugation and in its exploitation. The slave of today can vote: yesterday he could not. The slave of absolute monarchy was forced to his task by the rigors of primitive production. The slave of commercial democracy is no less forced by the consent of machine abundance. The rights of the slave class are but hostages of possession, partly grown wily by experience, but mainly derivations from necessitarian technology. Proof? We acquiesce in the councils of Imperialism. We approve—the subjugation of peoples. We avow—the right of individualism. We work—when we are permitted. We assemble—in the ranks of unemployment. We are free—to do as we are bidden. We speak—the language of dominion. We think—the substance of privilege. We enjoy life—in the justice of opportunity. We are happy—in the glory of Empire.

It is all those things and factors which build up what Bacon calls "the idols of the market and the theatre,"—the struggle of different and rival interests for private gain. That is why there is such confusion in terms and practice. It is biased with prejudice, excited with sentiment, colored with obscure preconceptions,—both of time and eternity. That is why radical reformism is so shadowy in thought, and so undeterminate in practice. And that is why the great, gaunt, harried mass of society tolerates so patiently the "Pepper's ghost" of political illusion.

Thus it is that the institutions of society represent the interests of society—as a whole. But the developing economies of society distorts their application, and subverts their functioning, almost automatically as it were, transforming social interest into class privilege. So it is that the power of privilege, parasitic on production, but also active in its control, grows greater, while social interest, paralysed by private property, grows less; and as the power of class waxes more obdurate, the functioning of social institutions calls more insistently for redress. Society feels this. It feels, and resents it most bitterly. It sees its "liberties" curtailed, its "rights" foreshortened, its justice violated, i.e., it sees the ethic of enthusiastically propagated freedom—the old bourgeois freedom of individualism,—set aside, and shorn of its amalgamation that storms in triumph the citadel of mercantile individualist enterprise. Carries it because it is in harmony with the further development of the social forces. But not knowing that political society is slave society, not understanding that private possession entails social subjugation, recognizing itself neither as a slave form, nor its developed institutions as agencies of capitalist import, it attacks, not the primal organization of its institutions but the accrued (and in that direction, invincible) results of their misdirected functioning. Following the immediacy of the moment, it must, of course, conform to the situations imposed by the exigencies of the moment. Those conditions are the determinant of

(Continued on page 8)

# Rambling Remarks on Revolution

BY AGNES HOLLINGSHEAD

## AN OPEN AIR ADDRESS

ON several occasions you have seen me standing here recommending you to buy our literature. It occurred to me that it would be advisable to let you know something of the contents. For my subject this evening I think a good title would be "Rambling Remarks on Revolution." Most of these remarks are based upon this little pamphlet and what it has suggested to me while I read it. It is the Manifesto of the Socialist Party of Canada. It sets forth clearly the attitude taken by the party, and in dealing with it I shall endeavor as usual to suit my remarks to the mental capacity of those who are beginning to be interested in the study of scientific Socialism. The well informed students—and we are all students—and always students—will have to exercise patience over my reiteration.

The first edition of this pamphlet appeared fifteen years ago. This is now the fifth edition, so we may take it that any theoretical errors have been corrected, and any obscurities have been clarified.

One of the first questions which an enquirer asks when he meets a Socialist, or when he opens a Socialist book, is "How do they mean to bring about the Revolution?" Now we may as reasonably ask "How do YOU mean to bring it about?" It is your problem in as great a degree as it is the problem of the Socialist. But revolutions are not made, they arise out of certain conditions. I tell you frankly that we cannot hope to outline a revolution. We have to recognize the well-nigh impossibility of such an undertaking. But we can at least try to understand one when it occurs. One thing we can do, we can keep our minds open and flexible in order to recognize conditions when they arise, and to avail ourselves of opportunities when they present themselves. Without study we will never be able to do this. Remember that because a thing has been done in a certain way for many years, or because a system has lasted for many years, it does not prove that that way is the best, or that that system will not change. No, the only thing we can be sure of is change; and so long as perfection is unattainable, so long will there be people devoting every possible minute to attaining it. Such people are revolutionists. True, they are in the minority. Every man with an overmastering idea is in the minority, sometimes even a minority of one. Their ideas meet with apathy in many cases, or with ridicule. I will allude here only to one instance as it was so ably dealt with in the "Clarion" a short time ago. I refer to the timely remarks by Comrade Adrian C. Thrupp against vivisection, and urging the need of revolution in the medical profession. All such minorities are bold and have tenacity of purpose in their endeavors to overrun long established abuses. We should remember that there is no finality to progress. We are in line with progress when we seek to effect the change of a system which can no longer support the masses it has subjugated.

The first change a Socialist seeks to effect is one in the mental attitude of the wage worker. He may not always be wise in his choice of words. Possibly he begins by telling the members of the working class that they are enslaved. I remember well the first time I learned I was a slave, I did not like it. I had accepted as an axiom that I was free to choose my job, the world was wide and I loved to be in it; but experience of the wide world leads me to agree with the Socialist when he tells us we are a slave class, and in the face of bitter opposition tries to press this truth home. His words generally arouse great indignation in the minds of even the poorest. It is not difficult to understand why. Have not our teachers and preachers taught us that contentment with our lot is great gain, and that meekness and humility are the qualities that best become a Christian; and have they not instilled into our being that we are free-born Britons? The country matters not; at school

children are taught to be proud of their country. The little Britisher, ragged and underfed, recites Blake's lines "I am glad that I was born a little British-boy." The American citizen, far from the land of his birth though he may be, learns that "All that well becomes a man marks the true American." It comes then as a shock to most people when a Socialist tells them that they are enslaved. But if we once realize this, then our minds are ready to be told how this condition came about and, what presents greater attraction, how to find a way out.

Our literature furnishes this information. I am quoting freely from it, and I would ask you to devote as much time as you can from your wage earning pursuits to this study. We all have at least the elements of education, enough to make us efficient wage slaves and patriotic soldiers. Our masters have provided this for us, and we cannot expect them to do more. It now rests with us to educate ourselves for the accomplishment of our release from wage slavery. No need to say you have not the time nor the money. I cannot believe this when the picture houses are crowded, the hockey matches attended by shouting multitudes, and the literature of the master class finding such a ready sale. But what about any paper that is published in the interests of our own class? If it does not go under, all it can do at the best is to clear expenses. This shows the apathy of the working class towards forwarding their own emancipation.

The little pamphlet I mentioned at the beginning of my remarks is a suitable one for commencing the study of Socialism. I do not wish to deceive you by telling you that it is recreative; it is not. Our purpose is to instruct the workers and show them how certain historical facts have influenced their methods of obtaining a living; to lead them to see that certain effects have been produced by certain causes. Our literature abounds with information which discloses the economic motive underlying every act of the governing class, even every move of the recent fruitless conferences following as a result of the great war and the altered conditions arising out of the peace. You remember how the patriotic orators lauded you as a nation whose people showed such courage, fortitude and sound sense in the recent terrible war. Now we hear the Duke of York announcing that he cannot help being an optimist as he belongs to a nation whose men and women have so bravely and so uncomplainingly endured the even harder trials of peace. The even harder trials of peace! Do you "get" the full significance of this? Are we optimists then because we find peace supportable after the strenuous times of the war?

The Socialist writers show conclusively that economic conditions are the only causes of war, and they warned us during the war that the outbreak of peace would be as cataclysmic as the outbreak of war; but they did not claim to be optimists nor prophets for telling us this. You all know how the workers flung themselves into the conflict regardless of the consequences to themselves. You know how master and worker agreed to sink their differences and meet the common foe, the German. Those in what we may call affluent circumstances rallied to such slogans as "My country, British Honor and Justice." The sentimental ones could not resist the appeal of the weaker nations; those on the breadline, the shiftless, the careless, the worthless, perhaps after all had the most defensible reason for going to war. Think what it means to a hungry man to live again, to feel clean and well clad in His Majesty's uniform and to know that his bread would be given and his water would be sure. They were not devoid of sentiment either. They knew those dependant upon them would be relieved from the uncertainty of the periods of depression existing before the war. They became useful to their country. They earned respect as our deliverers. Do you remember one of the posters

with Burns' verse inscribed:

"For gold the merchant ploughs the main,  
The farmer tills the manor,  
But glory is the soldier's pride,  
The soldier's wealth is honour."

Small wonder then that they were thrilled. It would take a heart as hard as the heart of Pharaoh not to succumb to this. They went and fought their masters' battles once again, but they were ignorant of the most far-reaching historical fact that victory meant loss to them as workers, for in any war the victorious State has ever been the stronger to oppress its own workers, the defeated State ever the weaker to resist their demands. Many a time have I heard Socialist speakers say this at the commencement of the war. Who shall say in the light of subsequent events, that they did not know? The veterans have experienced the soundness of that statement. As sympathetic human beings we may deplore the war and shudder at the spectacle of man kind butchering each other, but as scientific Socialists we have to study it as an inevitable part of a world process and to a process slaughter is of no moment. Indeed, as far as social advancement is concerned, what we call good times are as deadening to the intellect as a period of war, though we prefer to take a chance on the good times. The great war is over, but do we know the outcome of it yet? The war has not given what it promised. There have been conferences in Europe but no satisfactory solution has yet been found for the problems of Europe. We know not what the outcome will be, only this is certain, that it must carry us towards the social revolution. Are we ready for it? The Socialist Party is trying to prepare the minds of the workers. Every change entails an amount of uncertainty, possibly of suffering. The sounder our knowledge of society and the more people who are willing to give themselves to an understanding of it, the easier will be the transition from capitalism to Socialism. The surest way to make ready for the new order is to learn the life story of the human race, the evolution of human society. Society as it is now is not the same as it was in the past. Throughout the ages there has been a process of growth from the simple to the complex. Savage society decayed because the technique of progress was not sufficiently advanced to enable it to support itself, and the political society of today is dying because it can no longer sustain the masses it has subjugated. I am quoting again from the Manifesto. The wealth of the former society was freedom—access to life's necessities; the wealth of the latter society is subjugated labor—the cause of its disruption. Until labor recognizes its subjugation and abolishes capitalistic exploitation it must remain poor, miserable, degraded, ministering to the pleasure of the ruling classes, a contented slave class. Is there anything more contemptible than a contented slave? Our mission is to rouse the workers, to urge them to put aside apathy and sluggishness. Being ourselves members of the working class we strive to point out the cause of our misery and the reason for the change. There are those of us who yearn for action, for something now. There is neither blame nor wonder to that; but we must submit to the weariness of waiting—weariness indeed—but wait we must. Just as we cannot put back the hand of time, neither can we advance it. Working class history is red with the blood of those who have revolted on impulse before the fullness of time. I may cite the case of the Spartans in the days of ancient Rome. They revolted and managed to hold the master class at bay for years, but failed and were ruthlessly crushed in the end because society was not developed on the only basis on which freedom can flourish—socialization of resources and production; social ownership and administration and the consequent elimination of class distinction. This point we must come to before we can be free. As long as you

look up to the exploiters as your betters, nay, even as your benefactors, slaves will you be.

By class ignorance alone are the workers kept in servitude to their masters, and by no better means can that ignorance be dispelled than by the continued support of the propaganda of revolutionary ideas. Continued support I say. Good intentions, although the Almighty accepts them, are of no use to our fellow men unless they be carried into operation. Well meant promises to be there when the time comes are valueless. The time has come for being well informed and more waiting will not help one particle. Get into line with the educational movement, for it is a truth indeed that the working class can have their freedom whenever they know how to take it and keep it. The time for acquiring this knowledge has come. To the revolutionist these invitations for support are unnecessary. As he values himself and desires to live like a man, so will he act with his fellow men like a skilled workmen knowing what has to be done and how to do it.

The revolutionary movement is going on. It cannot do otherwise; but what the movement lacks at present is more revolutionists, more wage slaves who recognize their identity of interests. We read in the Manifesto a quotation from Thucydides, who said: "Identity of interest is the surest of bonds, whether between states or individuals." That is another way of saying that union is strength; but the union must be on the mental plane. We must admit that the capitalist groups in society understand this identity if interest much better than the working class. They strive to hold what they have by any means which is effective; moral and sentimental scruples have no weight with them. They are the owners of capital, weak in numbers, but in spite of their relative weakness, by virtue of ownership they are the lords of society.

Opposing this group is the revolutionary element of the working class, also few in numbers but clear in its demands for freedom from the dictates of capital. This is the section of the working class that understands the identity of interest. Between these two opposing groups there is the huge inarticulate mass of toilers, convulsed in an effort towards adaptation to a social environment which is constantly changing in its complications, supporting union to a certain extent, groping for a united front, but still accepting a position of wage slavery and talking about understandings between capital and labor, some of them even asking for more work with less wages rather than be laid off for a day or two in the week.

Now what is this leading to? This continual acceptance either placidly or even under protest by the working class of the system of wage slavery must eventually bring them face to face with a crisis where compromise will no longer be possible. A tremendous increase in unemployment is no doubtful speculation; it is a certainty. With it must come also a corresponding increase in the distribution of surplus value in the shape of charitable doles from the master class, or, a working class revolt. By the regular development of capital the attempts of the working class in dispute with their masters over declining wages are doomed to failure. The result of recent strikes furnish proof of this. It seems to me that a strike with so little to gain is a dissipation of energy. As workers and fighters the wage slaves of modern capitalism have proved their worth beyond possible doubt. Courage and vitality are not lacking, but hitherto these qualities have been expended in the interests of the oppressing class. That which is of supreme importance to us is either totally absent, or vague and indefinite in its character. This needful quality is class consciousness, an understanding of the nature of wage slavery which by its operation constitutes the wealth of modern society which the workers bring into being but do not, dare not, use.

The task to which the revolutionary working class movement has by circumstances been allotted consists in spreading among the wage slaves of capital a knowledge of their real status in life, giving them a correct understanding of the relations between man and man under the present social order. By directing the thoughts of the working class into the chan-

nel of scientific socialism will come a power before which the entire armories of capitalist defence will not avail. We ask you not to wait till the time comes. Get over your mental laziness, your present indifference to social and political questions. Do not harbor the idea that emancipation is nothing more than a dream. We dream, but with well directed effort based on knowledge our castles in the air will materialize. The western slave does not yet understand the need for effort; he does not see his captivity and therefore feels no need for freedom. I do not find fault with my audience, but what of those who are not here, who would not listen to us, who, through mental deficiency try to ridicule the movement? If they realized that they are slaves surely they would seek every opportunity to learn how to gain their freedom. But need we be discouraged because of their indifference? No, we shall carry on with fortitude, nay, even with cheerfulness. Why are we so fearless, why are we even gay? Because we know; we understand what is happening; history supports us in our prognostications. Few in numbers though we be the ruling class fear us. That is why they will not permit us to mount the soap box in this (Calgary) city. Why are they afraid of a score of socialists intent on study? It is because of the ideas and the knowledge we spread. Ideas and knowledge are uncrushable, and the people who hold them are uncrushable. We have ardor and enthusiasm, and these estimable qualities are anchored to clear vision and class consciousness. It is this very class consciousness that compels us to advocate freedom in the land of the free.

The study of socialism by the workers leads to their organizing for emancipation, to struggle for freedom being the last right left them and the only task worthy of class conscious slaves. We have no such war cries, no such frothy declamations as "Long Live the Class Struggle." Our whole existence has been a struggle; we would welcome the end of that struggle. The working class today is the majority class and the class which represents social progress and which embraces all that is essential within our industrial process. This is the class which has done the fighting in all previous wars and which must now fight for themselves. When this class has overthrown the present system the social revolution will be an accomplished fact. I do not mean by this that we are to repeat the struggles of the French Revolutionaries at the barricades; such methods in our day find their place only in the melodramas and the cinemas; they are what the playwright would call anachronisms. What could the workers in revolt hope to accomplish against the modern methods of warfare such as aeroplanes and poison gas?

A man who would try to precipitate such a revolt before the minds of the people are ready for it and before the people have the power, I do not like to call him a knave or a fool, but he is certainly misguided. We seek to stimulate the intelligence of the workers, realizing that our emancipation lies in the application of knowledge and experience. The stories of the barricades may be thrilling but such exploits would be futile in our days. Some of our opponents tell us to go back to our books; I consider it wise to take their advice as well meant. The movement requires all the study we can devote to it.

#### REVOLUTIONS, POLITICAL AND SOCIAL.

(Continued from page 4)

previous to Marx writing these words. Nor has Russia ever equaled in cowardly ferocity, the France of June 1848 or May 1871.

It is perhaps not the least of history's ironies that the country heralded by most revolutionaries, and especially by the most consistent and influential revolutionary of them all, as the seat of all reaction and the reserve army for all counter revolutionary powers—the barrier to all rebellion—should have had to beat back with her own revolutionary armies every last one of those countries in whose enlightened breasts alone beat the pulse of freedom.

But the Slavonic Congress at Prague furnished the occasion for another victory for reaction. Marx's bitter comments on this fiasco were no doubt

prompted by the fact that here the loyal troops again regained that confidence they had quite evidently lost. The Congress ended in a riot and while the revolutionists were settling their differences, said by several historians, but not noted by Marx, to have been engendered by Hungarian provocateurs, sent by Kussuth, an Austrian army under Prince Windischgratz fell upon them, and after a few days' battle the revolution in Bohemia was at an end and a fine crop of hatred filed for later consideration.

One more important situation only, have we space for: The German speaking Duchies of Schleswig and Holstein were troubling European diplomats. The ruling Prince Frederick VII was without an heir. The Danes, realizing that his death would open the way to a seizure, decided to take the matter, while yet cold. But the Germans rose in revolt and declared for independence. They would have been easily overwhelmed but the Federal Diet at Frankfort were induced to send troops to help their fellow countrymen. This army, Marx points out, was composed almost entirely of young revolutionaries, whose zeal for the cause could well expend itself fighting for Freedom and self-determination of small nations (except Bohemia).

It is remarkable that the nation which was in the next quarter century to be victor in the most brilliant and easily won campaign of the century, should have received so humiliating a defeat at the hand of Denmark. Whether by design, or the hand of God, this territory, so vital to the interest of industrialised Germany, through which the Kiel canal was built, remained after a war for its possession in the hands of a small state like Denmark. Be that as it may, it furnished another opportunity for reaction to again assert itself.

The Frankfort Government (remember this is the Government won by the Revolution) submitted to the signing of an armistice by Prussia which left Denmark in a very advantageous position. The Frankfort Assembly rejected this armistice by a majority of three, and the Government resigned. This caused the Assembly to reconsider the vote, and three days later the armistice was approved. As this left the rebels at the mercy of a victorious government, and surrendered a revolutionary principle, the barricades were again erected, and again, whether by the hand of God or design a large force of loyal troops were at hand, and after six hours' fighting the revolt was crushed; it was quite general, but the real government was prepared for it, even if they did not engineer it.

So the Revolutionary Government were saddled with the crime of butchering their own friends, just six months after the storm which had evidently shaken the autocracy of Europe down to and beyond its very foundation.

We know what we are, but we know not what we may be said the ill-starred Ophelia. And so that ought to do for now.

## SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

### PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

EVERY SUNDAY

STAR THEATRE, 300 Block, Main Street

JUNE 17th.

Speaker: J. HARRINGTON

JUNE 24th.

Speaker: D. Mac PHERSON

All meetings at 8 p.m.  
Questions. Discussion.

(Continued from page 1)

American observers to think that the reaction will come much sooner than has generally been supposed by British observers. Gary, of the Steel Trust, speaking in New York, May 25th, declares that he does not anticipate a substantial diminution of the demand for finished steel for at least six months. Permanent prosperity for at least six months! The occupation of the Rhur valley by the French has benefited the American steel and coal industries temporarily. Germany, normally an exporter of steel, is now endeavouring to buy it in Sweden, and Sweden, who formally obtained it from the Rhur is seeking for it in the U. S. A. Thus the extreme need of Europe is beneficial to the American manufacturers. Here we have an explanation of the large measure of support accorded by the American press, including the Washington Post, an administration organ, to the French occupancy of the Ruhr. Here are some of the paradoxical incidents in international trade between the U. S. and Great Britain and other countries. Coal is being shipped both ways. Orders placed in Britain at the time of the American coal strike are still being delivered to Atlantic ports, and crossing steamers carry U. S. coal to Europe under the pressure of the new emergency. At the same time while large consignments of English and continental pig iron have in the last few months been sold along the Atlantic seaboard, Great Britain is now importing iron and coke from the U. S. and so are Sweden and Holland. The editorial optimism of the Washington Post regarding American independence of the European market does not fit in with the above trade reports.

Carrying coals to Newcastle, at one time considered wasted effort, now seems quite a necessity to the smooth operation of the profit system. Of course, it is not exactly a new departure in business. Fish caught off Nova Scotia appear for sale in B. C. and vice versa. Strawberry jam made in Quebec is being sold next door to the jam factory in Mission, B. C. Reverse the places of manufacture and sale and there is an example of part of what Engels termed the anarchy of the capitalist mode of production.

Failing the outbreak of war, and the consequent "market" for the surplus values produced by the industrial and agricultural workers, a contingency not likely to occur in the immediate future, the inevitable glut of those commodities which re-appear in the process of production as constant capital, i.e., machinery, steel products, etc., will automatically throw millions of slaves out of employment. Gary's estimate of six months is as good a guess as any other. The American farmers have not recovered from the agricultural slump of three years ago. Their purchasing power has not increased in ratio to the expansion of business and consequent rise of prices in other lines. The "Spokesman's Review" of May 30th, quotes Senator Copeland as follows:

"We are living in a fool's paradise," Senator Copeland declared. "In certain lines in America we have prosperity, but the idleness of the rest of the world should warn us that our prosperity is likely to be transient."

Discussing the lack of prosperity among farmers and its causes, the senator said he was surprised recently by a letter sent to a New York newspaper by a Virginia farmer in which was given a comparison of food values on the farm and labor engaged in the building trades.

"This statement," he said, "shows that it takes 63½ dozen or 762 eggs to pay a plasterer for one day of eight hours; it takes 17½ bushels of corn or a year's receipts from half an acre to pay a bricklayer one day; it takes 23 chickens weighing three pounds each to pay a painter for one day's work in New York; it takes 42 pounds of butter, or the output of 14 cows, fed and milked for 24 hours, to pay a plumber \$14 a day, and it takes a hog weighing 175 pounds, representing eight months of feeding and care, to pay a carpenter for one day's work."

The farmers, not having the wherewithal to buy with, are nevertheless referred to as being on a "Buyer's Strike." To remedy this sad condition, the U. S. Government have instituted Farmers Loan Banks, which loan money to farmers at 7%, through the intermediary of Trust and Mortgage companies.

As an indication of some local conditions confronting American farmers, the following petition is illuminating.

"We the undersigned farmers of Whitman county, the best and richest wheat growing section of the United States and the world, owning the best improved farms in the United States, find it impossible to longer continue in the production of wheat. Our horses will soon be too old for service, our harness and equipment is badly worn, and we are now and will be unable to replace them.

"Therefore we ask the government of the United States to take over these farms, pay off our obligations, that have been incurred in the raising of wheat, and allow us to remain on the farms and pay us wages, so that we may have some of the comforts of life and all of the necessities. We are in no condition financially to harvest the growing crop and ask that congress be convened at once and take over these farms before harvest."

Socialists do not doubt the existence of prosperity, but they modestly enquire, Who are the prosperous ones? How come?

TACTICS

(Continued from page 5)

party activities; and party activity is, in turn, governed by its social perspective—its insight into social phenomena; its interpretation of current events, its concepts of the nature of social relationships and its understanding of social organizations not merely theoretical, but in practical and actual operation. The scope of activity will be determined by the historic cumulus of the day, and instinct with purpose and direction in sympathy with the vision of its objective.

Consequently, if the aim is the removal of particular grievances, the practical amelioration of effects, then active energy will be devoted to the end of their present alleviation and the tactics adopted must of necessity conform with the legitimist practice of political association. It must work through the legality of political organizations, in the body of political power,—a body dedicated to the sanctity of property right. It must work through the formality of government, steeped in the precedents of possession, and overcome the stalwart prejudices of generations, through organization devoted to law and order, impatient of "extremist" demands, "sobered with the responsibilities of power," and supported by masses struggling for the wages of necessity and divided on the main issues of its life. What that struggle has achieved we know; what its continuance may produce we may guess. Maybe, e.g., labor government, more or less capitalist minded, fervent on the issues of trade (for the welfare of the masses and the immediate relief of unemployment), conciliation to possession, ideally just to subject races (who must await the expiry of "contract" for their freedom), and finally being overwhelmed in their inevitable inability to fulfil the obligation of the immediate.

But if the aim is revolution; its offensive will be the utter abolition of wage slavery, as immediately as it can possibly be achieved. And being revolutionary, and therefore more or less cognisant of the social complex of relations, its tactics can be no illusive struggle of crucial excitements; no challenge of un-matured conditions; no sinister threats of social upheaval; no barren appeal to fugitive enthusiasms, forlorn because divided with its vain imaginings; and no phantasies of economic necessity, red with the terror of unexploded fallacies. Its tactics must be the awakening of class conscious perception. Grown from and changing with the necessities of developing capital tactics must consistently seek the explanations of capitalist reality, paying but scant heed to the proletarian temporizations for immediate relief, and concentrate on the struggle for political power. In the deepening miseries of a society becoming more and more a proletarian unity,

tactics will point the failure of capital to fulfil its social obligations—and the reason why; will be alert for every opportunity of enlightenment, critical of practical politics and its reasons, driving home its lessons from the rude shocks of daily experience, keeping steadfastly to its own living issue—proletarian unity through the precepts of social understanding. It will hold the mirror of truth to the groping mind of discontent, thereby consciously arousing its rising hosts with the weapons which, unconsciously, historic development has prepared for use, working hand in hand with the forces of progress, knowing that in the harsh disillusionments of disintegrating society, in the fevered struggle, fruitless toil and wasted effort of proletarian existence, in its great throbbing heart of hope, and courage, and indomitability, there will be born the sure conviction that no political contrivance whatsoever can either mitigate or vanquish its frothing miseries. That is the real pathway of revolution, the tactics that draws strength from pregnant condition, and encouragement from unfolding reality, armed at once for attack and defense, and impregnable with the passion of its truth. R.

Literature Price List

	Cloth Bound	Per Copy
A. B. C. of Evolution (McCabe)	.....	\$1.15
Economic Determinism	.....	\$1.65
Evolution of the Idea of God (Grant Allen)	.....	\$1.15
Evolution of Property (Lafargue)	.....	\$1.15
Critique of Political Economy	.....	\$1.65
Revolution and Counter Revolution (Marx)	.....	\$1.15
History of Paris Commune (Lissagaray)	.....	\$1.50
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
Capitalist Production (First Nine and 32nd Chapters "Capital," vol. 1, (Marx)	.....	\$1.99
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
Gems of Mind in Plants	.....	80c
The Triumph of Life	.....	80c
Anarchism and Socialism	.....	80c
Feuerback	.....	80c
Socialism Positive and Negative	.....	80c
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. Bongor)	.....	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)	.....	35c
Civil War in France (Marx)	.....	35c
Eighteenth Brumaire (Marx)	.....	35c
Christianism and Communism (Bishop W. M. Brown)	.....	25c
Psychology of Marxian Socialism	.....	30c
W. A. Pritchard's Address to the Jury, (State Trials, Winnipeg, Man., Fall Assizes 1919-20)	.....	25c
Quantity Rates on Paper Covered Pamphlets.		
Two Essays on History	.....25 copies	75c
Communist Manifesto	.....25 copies	\$2.00
Wage-Labor and Capital	.....25 copies	\$2.00
Present Economic System	.....25 copies	\$1.50
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific	.....25 copies	\$3.25
Slave of the Farm	.....25 copies	\$1.50
Manifesto of S. P. of C.	.....25 copies	\$2.00
Evolution of Man	.....25 copies	\$3.75
Causes of Belief in God	.....25 copies	\$2.00
Value, Price and Profit	.....25 copies	\$3.25
Economic Causes of War	.....10 copies	\$2.00
Christianism and Communism	.....6 copies	\$1.00
Psychology of Marxian Socialism	.....10 copies	\$2.50
W. A. Pritchard's Address to the Jury (State Trials, Winnipeg, Man., Fall Assizes 1919-20)	.....10 copies	\$2.00

All prices include Postage.

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