870—Peterson, J A
240 Hawks Ave

870
5.23
37

WESTERN CLARION

A Journal of CURRENT EVENTS

Official Organ of
THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

HISTORY
ECONOMICS
PHILOSOPHY

Number 833 Twice a Month — VANCOUVER, B. C., DECEMBER 16, 1920 — FIVE CENTS

The Coming War With America

I HAVE been asked if I can give any clue to a clash between Britain and the United States in the near future, by some of the "Clarion" readers. I may say John Maclean has issued a pamphlet under the above title, published by the British Socialist Party, price threepence. I will give some of the quotations from this pamphlet, and will add more information which probably Maclean had not obtained. He quotes Douglas Haig, at Glasgow, May, 1919, warning Britain not to rely on the "League of Nations," but to make adequate preparation, using the expression: "Only thus can the **terrible pressure of economic competition** be prevented from driving whole continents into war." Sir Douglas believes the danger can be averted by raising eastern civilization to the level of that prevailing in Europe, because of the danger of them flooding the world's markets with cheaper goods because of their lower standard of living.

Maclean says: "As Germans had as high a civilization as Britain, and both fought, we must disagree with Sir Douglas when he anticipates a yellow menace. We calculate that America holds the field. So popular is this view in political "high class" circles, that "John Bull" utters on a poster the pitiful cry: "Is America to Boss the World?" Some may protest that a war between English speaking people is impossible. Perhaps; but let these recollect that the bloodiest war of the last century was the American Civil War of 1861-65, over an economic question." Maclean points out an American who urges universal military training as being convinced that "as long as human passions remain unchanged, as long as lust for power, or love of land or greed for commercial expansion exists, so long will there be war."

"America's foreign trade has trebled during the war. She owns 6,000,000 tons of shipping, instead of 1,000,000 in 1914 whilst her 200 shipyards, with 1,000 slips, are now constructing over 4,000,000 tons instead of 140,000 in 1914. Britain's foreign trade is expanding and she has still over 15,000,000 ship tons; but her yards have only on stock a declared weight of 2,500,000 tons. No wonder the press had recently an inspired advertisement headed: "Shipping Supremacy—American Shipyard Competition." He shows how America is obtaining a grip of European markets and how Britain is counter-balancing the menace by loaning to European countries to capture their trade.

He deals with the trustification of industry, Harland and Wolff having absorbed Ingles' shipyard in So. Govan and Henderson's shipyard of Meadowside, Patrick.

The shale oil industry of Scotland has been absorbed in a £20,000,000 trust, dominated by the Persian Oil Company, which is **largely controlled by the British Government for commercial and political reasons in Persia.** The Federation of British Industries, representing a capital of £4,000,000,000 exists for foreign trade and class protection at home.

He points out that the big banks of New York are co-operating with the Meat Trusts of America to lend food supplies, and how America is using the differences between France and Britain over the peace terms and Syria, to win Francec to her side.

He deals with the British loans to the Baltic States and the sop thrown to Norway to rule Nova Zembla in the Arctic ocean. The visit of British journalists to Denmark he describes as being no accident when "we know America is flooding Denmark with motors and agricultural appliances. The power which can get a grip of Denmark has the key to the Baltic and the north."

He tells us: "Britain is encouraging Japan in North China against America, and in East Siberia, for the same reasons."

Maclean says: "America is exploiting Ireland's distress, and this explains the mighty reception given to De Valera, backed up by loans in due course. In case of war Ireland would be a fine naval and air base against Britain. Britain could be kept out of the Atlantic, and if cut off the continent by a ring of opposing powers her course as the mistress of the seas would be ruined. This explains Britain's madness in suppresing the Dail Eirrean (the Sinn Fein parliament) and Irish papers, and the imprisonment of Irish patriots. America is exploiting this all right. She is showing herself as the "righteous democracy," whilst at the same time she is absorbing her own little Ireland—Mexico to wit."

"The Consular system is being recast. Now Britain will have over 400 full-time Consuls over the world, instead of 200 on half-time as before. That means more trade and political spies—the prelude surely, to another war." Maclean then deals with the military and naval preparations of Britain and America, and the trans-Atlantic flying, pointing out that America's route was by Spain to France. He points out the probability of a clash over China, with Japan and Britain lined up against America and China. He gives quotations from various sources commenting on the merging of banks and industries to recover sufficiently to stand the commercial struggle, especially with America, also that Mr. Gary, chairman of the U. S. Steel Corporation, urged immediate resumption of trade with Germany, and finance less fortunate countries to revive production. Gary warned business men that they were facing the fiercest commercial struggle in the history of the world. He declared the American merchant marine equals the best.

Mr. McCurdy, Parliamentary Secretary to the Food Control, on October 31st, 1919, stated that as chairman of the committee on trusts it had been his business to investigate and protest the sinister influences on the world's meat markets of the American packers combine, and that the situation was "full of menace," as this group (the Big Five) "already controls a large part of the surplus meat of the world." Maclean appeals to labor on both sides of the Atlantic to save the world from a new and bloodier war five or six years hence, by taking full conquest of power, political and economic. To cut out this market rivalry and co-operate, which will lead to abundance and leisure for all.

For the details read this pamphlet

I will further illustrate the necessity of the wage slaves to waken up to their position if this struggle is to be avoided. The "Sunday Chronicle," 5/9/20, with a headline "Coming World Fight for Oil Wells."

"The American oil men see the danger ahead;—they are therefore, scouring the world for new oil-fields; only to find that British enterprise has nearly everywhere been ahead of them, and that the control of almost all the most promising properties is in British hands. The past of the oil industry belonged to America; its present is predominantly under her control; **but its future, if we play our cards well, should be, and will be, British**

"America is not going to see her old supremacy in the oil world pass without a struggle; that she will fight hard and long to prevent the British concessions in Mexico and Central and South America from remaining in our hands, and that this question of whether Britain or the United States is destined to dominate the future of oil, is going to **prove one of the most contentious that has ever arisen between the two countries."**

There is also a movement to bring the West Indies into a political union with the Dominion of Canada, with representation in the Federal House, and a Provincial House similar to the provinces.

Mr. Harry J. Crowe, of Toronto, wrote to the London (England) "Times," March, 1917, on this subject. The "Times" had an editorial applauding the project. Here are some of the outstanding features as expressed by Mr. Crowe:

"The value of these tropical possessions seems also to be exciting the cupidity of some of the statesmen on the other side of the border. You have, no doubt, read a recent despatch from Washington, containing a remarkable suggestion from William G. McAdoo, former secretary of the American Treasury, and son-in-law of President Wilson, namely, that the United States should take over the Bermudas, Bahamas, Barbados, and Jamaica, to reduce Great Britain's war indebtedness to our southern neighbor."

"The value of these tropical possessions in the Caribbean Sea has long been recognized by our neighbors to the south of us, and we should not be surprised at this when we realize that the United States has **more trade** with all the West Indies, than she has with South America or even with China, with her 400,000,000 consumers."

"The United States fully realize, as we should, that the world is more and more depending upon tropical products, **and that the great rivalry of the future will be for the control of the tropics."**

He deplores the fact that Canada has no tropical possessions, while South Africa, Australia and New Zealand have acquired tropical territory larger than the German Empire, from the enemy, while Canada has not added any territory, although she paid the biggest price of any child of the mother country. Mr. Crowe frets that Canada has no Florida or Louisiana, no Hawiian Islands, nor Cuba, nor Porto Rico like the United States. He says: "The lack of tropical territory is the one obstacle to our full development. Canada must have tropical provinces, producing raw material for our manufactures, and cheap fruit and other products . . . . . without tropical territory of our own, in my judgment, we will never be independent of the United States."

"The United States has been rapidly extending her political and commercial control over the West Indies, until she now embraces not only Cuba, Porto Rico, but has acquired the Danish West Indies, and I understand is now negotiating for the purchase of Dutch Guiana. The rich republic of Hayti and San Domingo with their 4,000,000 people will likely soon

(Continued on page 8)

A Controversy

EDITOR'S NOTE.—Both of the disputants are well known to "Clarion" readers and to the Socialist movement in this country. Both of them have come through the same "school of thought," and they are well grounded on the fundamental principles of Socialist education. Their contributions presented hereunder appear exactly as written. Any further contributions that may contain apparent personal references will suffer mutilation while in our care. There is room here for discussion and we see no reason why it should not result in a continued interest in the Russian situation, and a thorough understanding of the problems, past and present, of the Russian comrades.

A. McKENZIE CRITICIZES J. A. McD.'s ARTICLE "ON COPYING THE BOLSHEVIKI."

Comrade Editor,—

In the issue of November 15th of the "Western Clarion," appeared an article under the heading "On Copying the Bolsheviki," by J. A. McD.

Such an article coming from such a well known and voluminous writer, and accepted teacher of Marxism in our official organ, is to say the least, rather surprising to many of us, and demands some criticism.

In the said article there are really only two paragraphs that could be seriously objected to, namely, the first and eighteenth, but they so contradict the rest of the article as to misrepresent the true significance of the Russian Revolution.

I shall let the first paragraph go with a very brief statement, as the other one requires a much more comprehensive reply. Indeed the first paragraph, to do it justice, would require quite a discussion.

He says in the third sentence, first paragraph: "We understood, as we still understand, that **Bolshevism** is not **Socialism.**" Then what is it? And what is "Socialism?" Without going into the story of the origin of the name "Bolshevik," it will suffice here to state that before the Revolution (March) the Bolsheviki were the truly Marxist faction of the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party,—the other being the Mensheviki. After the November (Bolshevist) Revolution, when they had obtained a majority in the Soviets, they simply put the Marxian theory into practice, and have been doing so ever since. For, be it remembered, Marxism is no iron clad system to be imposed "ready made" so to speak, on society. But the great lesson to be learned from Marxism is its **method.** And, true to that method, the Soviet Government is building up a Socialist society. True, they are building it in the face of enormous difficulties, but they are accomplishing it well. And whoever expects to find an ideal system in a few years in the face of uninterrupted warfare, expects the impossible. But nevertheless it is Socialism in the making.

Here is what he says in the eighteenth paragraph: "They have Revolution in Russia, but at what a cost? Thousands wiped out of existence through the ignorance of their follow men. Were the majority of Russian workers solid for Socialist principles, no nation, nor group of nations, could thwart their efforts. They would not be compelled to accept as allies the factions opposed to them. They would not have to accept 'Tilsit Peaces,' or shake the bloody hand of Capitalist Europe. These are the defeats that we can learn from. These are the obstacles that we must shun."

The above is from the pen of a supposed Marxian Socialist. It is really vulgarized Marxism. The Marxism of Kautsky, the Socialist renegade. It is a gross misstatement of facts, and shows the inability of the writer to appreciate the solution of the many difficult problems in a practical manner which have confronted the Russian workers since they took the management of their affairs into their own hands. Not only the above, but in a previous sentence J. A. McD. states that "As many impartial persons and delegations have testified, it has had a detrimental effect, in many ways, on the Working Class Movement in other countries."

Let us deal with that paragraph piece by piece! He says: "They have Revolution in Russia, but at what a cost? Thousands wiped out of existence through the ignorance of their fellow men." As a matter of fact very little blood was shed in the Bolshevist (November) Revolution. More blood was shed in combatting the counter-revolution, aided by armed foreign intervention, and the cruel blockade. But it must be remembered that Russia lost more men in the Imperialist War than any other nation, and I am willing to wager that there have been less people killed from the beginning of the November Revolution up to date, less than 100 per cent than in the said war. And that mostly by foreign intervention.

Then he says: "Were the majority of Russian workers solid for Socialist principles, no nation, nor group of nations, could thwart their efforts." The majority of Russian workers were, and are, solid for Socialist principles, otherwise they would not be in power today. As far as other nations thwarting their efforts, that is only partially true, and besides, that is not the fault of the Russian workers, but of the bitter hostility of every capitalist power in the world, and of the general political backwardness of the working classes of those various powers, especially the Entente.

Further on he says: "They would not be compelled to accept as allies the factions opposed to them." What does he mean by that sentence? It must be the participation of the Social Revolutionaries of the Left, and maybe some of the Menshivik factions in the government who were at one time opposed to the Bolshevist programme, but who now, owing to the development of events, have seen their mistake and thrown in their lot with the Bolsheviki. Therefore they can hardly be said to oppose the Bolsheviki.

And again: "They would not have to accept 'Tilsit Peaces,' or shake the bloody hand of Capitalist Europe." I suppose "Tilsit Peaces" must be the Treaty of Brest Litovsk, with perhaps the separate treaties which the Soviet Government concluded with Esthonia, Latvia, Georgia, Lithunia, Finland, and Poland.

Anyone familiar with the events which led up to the Brest Litovsk Treaty, and the necessity to conclude such a treaty (space forbids me dwelling on it here), will understand that far from being a mistake it turned out to be the only way of avoiding the probability of being wiped out, and as a matter of fact, subsequent events proved it to be one of the greatest tractical moves of the Revolution.

The conclusion of the other treaties are also to be considered as great achievements of the peaceful policy of the Soviet Government to avoid unnecessary bloodshed.

As to "shaking the bloody hand of Capitalist Europe," he means the opening of trade with the capitalist powers, or rather the attempts to do so, by granting certain concessions, etc. Is this to be considered as a defeat or mistake? Let us see! Russia is backward industrially. It is a country of vast natural resources waiting to be developed. Its greatest immediate necessity is the rapid reconstruction of the transportation system. Before the war Russia imported nearly all her manufactured goods from western Europe or America. Since the Revolution, that has been cut off by the blockade, and the Russians have been compelled to depend on the meagre resources of their own industry to try and keep up with the enormous demand. But this is found to be very inadequate. So the Bolsheviki must seek trade with other countries who can supply them with such things so necessary to the feeding, clothing and sheltering of their people, which at the present stage Russia is incapable of supplying herself. If such a trade incidently gives profits to the capitalists of other countries, it solves a problem for Russia in a few years, which, if left to her own resources, would take centuries, besides strengthening the position of the workers' government by helping to build the Socialist society. Is that a defeat or mistake? No!

The paragraph mentioned above more or less contradicts the rest of J. A. McD.'s article It shows a lack of understanding of the Marxian method of thought, especially in regard to the Proletarian Revolution, in spite of the many assurances given in rhetorical phrases that he does so.

The leaders of the Russian Revolution of today gained this knowledge, not only by a persistent study of Marxism, but by taking part in the 1905 Revolution. Their mistakes have been very few. And whoever heard, or will ever hear, of a revolution without mistakes and temporary defeats, which but strengthen the revolution ultimately.

Far from being a detriment to the movement in other countries, the Russian Revolution is a glorious example to the enslaved of every land. It has demonstrated to many of us the true nature of Marxism as the philosophy of the militant workers.

No doubt there is a tendency on the part of some to "do something" now, tacticians without sufficient knowledge; but there are also lots of theorists with sufficient knowledge who lack the courage or initiative to impart it to others, or emasculate Marxism to suit the tastes of their own comfortable position.

Indeed the need for education is very great, but I think that we will have to devise other means, more vigorous means, and tactics also, to get our propaganda before the masses. Otherwise we shall have to give way to a more virile movement. That is the lesson of the Russian Revolution.

A. McKENZIE.

McDONALD'S REPLY.

Coming, as it does, from one whom I have known long and favorably in the Socialist movement and at the same time, involving a re-examination of a most popular subject, the criticism of Comrade McKenzie is, indeed, worthy of serious consideration. The rancor and irritability displayed by my critic, as well as the innuendoes avent traitorous action on my part, I can mercifully condone. These imputations have no bearing whatever on the subject, and could not be substantiated even if they did.

Twice, in the course of his article, my opponent asserts that two paragraphs in "On Copying the Bolsheviki" contradict the remainder of the contribution. No proof is offered on where these contradictions occur, and mere assertions can get us nowhere in a serious discussion.

The case, as outlined in the article under fire, in brief, is this: A Revolution has taken place in Russia. A resolute Marxian minority succeeded in overthrowing a weak bourgeois regime and inaugurated a system of proletarian dictatorship in its stead. While the new social form is not Socialism, but dictatorship of a minority, it warrants the support of all revolutionists, the world over, because of its opposition to international capitalism, and the avowed intention of its leaders to establish a social system in the interests of the producers alone. That the class-conscious proletariat of other countries, while sympathizing with, and lending support to, the Russian workers, should recognize the fact that conditions in Russia are quite different from what they are in the industrially developed countries of western Europe and America. That these conditions warrant a method of attack that, in all probability would not be successful in the highly developed capitalist nations. That our great weapon of emancipation lies in the dissemination of Socialist knowledge amongst our fellow workers, and not in recklessly indulging in the various forms of mob action that have been advanced by different parties during the past three years.

A review of the article in question will prove conclusively that this is a fair summary of the position laid down. Yet, where is the contradiction? There is none in reality. But, while I have not contradicted myself, still, for the sake of accuracy, I must contradict Comrade McKenzie.

What is **Socialism? What is Bolshevism?** Socialism is a philosophy, a propagandist movement, and a form of society. It is generally referred to in the latter sense—a form of society, **where social ownership and control of the means of production obtains.** Is this the condition of affairs in Russia today? If so, then the Bolshevik leaders are guilty of hiding the facts from the rest of the world. In his article on the "Economics of a Transition Period," in "Soviet Russia," July 31, 1920, Lenin, after explaining in detail how private property in land was abolished on the 1st day of the dictatorship, goes on to show that it was impossible to put social ownership into operation, and ends with the statement that "**small production for profit remains the form of rural economy.**"

In article No. II. of "Russia Under the Soviets," compiled by Pritchard, from a conversation he had with W. R. Humphries, and published in the "Red Flag," this keen observer, and clever student, more lengthily explains why the Bolshevists did not, and could not, carry their land programme to conclusion.

Again, in the front page article of "Soviet Russia," June 26th, 1920, Lenin tells us that during the past two years they had gained some knowledge of the foundation of Socialism, but that there were still many things lacking for the realization of such an aim.

The same thing is true in regard to the industries, as I can prove by numerous quotations from the Bolshevik leaders should such be demanded. Many factories are still owned by capitalists who exploit wage slaves in order to make profits. Of course, I am allowing for the possibility of Lenin not understanding the conditions in Russia so well as Comrade McKenzie, though I would require a little more proof from the latter concerning his qualifications.

But, does my critic himself honestly think that Socialism prevails in Russia? His first statement says it does not, but before he finishes the paragraph he modifies the assertion to: "But nevertheless it is Socialism in the making." What mode of reasoning is this? Right there we can find that **Bolshevism** and **Socialism** are not synonymous terms. Bolshevism, as a social system, is proletarian dictatorship, with the ultimate object of Social ownership and control. A bitter discussion is now being waged by the Kautskian and Leninian Schools as to the possibility of Bolshevism developing into Socialism. In my article I stated that time alone would solve this problem, and this statement still stands.

Next let us look at the quotation taken from my article: "As many impartial persons and delegations have testified, it has had a detrimental effect, in many ways, on the working class movement in other countries." A glance at the original suffices to show that this quotation has been torn from its context and made to mean something very different from what it says. My statement was that the persons and delegations testified to the beneficial effects of the Revolution on the Russian workers, and not to the detrimental effect it had on the workers elsewhere. The latter was my own comment.

On this conclusion my opponent emphatically disagrees. One has only to review the attempts to imitiate the Bolsheviki, made by various organizations in the United States and Europe to see that notwithstanding the fact that the Russian Revolution is an **inspiration to all workers in the** fight for freedom, the lack of knowledge concerning the situation, as exemplified in the case of my critic, has had an injurious effect on working class policy. Here in the U. S. we had numerous examples of the formation of "Soviets" and "Workmen and Soldiers' Councils" founded on enthusiasm alone, and advocating the suspension of education, and the taking of mass action against a ruling class strongly entrenched in the realms of power. This "spontaneous upsurge theory" with its down tools, and street demonstration policy, could have none other than a detrimental effect on the numbers who openly assailed the capitalist citadel with nothing but good intentions to warrant their actions.

In the "Revolutionary Age," May 24th, 1919, a Bolshevik writer—Mescheriakov—tells of how the English workers tried to copy the Bolsheviki by forming "Workmen's Councils." He says that they did not understand that councils "as organs of the revolutionary struggle, and proletarian dictatorship, **can work successfully only in the atmosphere of a proletarian revolution.**" The attempts in England had met with complete failure.

Comrade McKenzie's attack on the 18th paragraph of my article is weak and vaccillant. In most cases he has answered himself. One sentence particularly merits examination: "The majority of Russian workers were and are solid for Socialist principles." A review of Lenin's article on "The Work in the Villages," "Soviet Russia," February 7, 1920, is sufficient to brand this statement as entirely incorrect. He there shows that the reserve of science, knowledge, and culture, without which Communism cannot be built, is in the hands of bourgeois specialists who do not sympathize with the Soviets. That among the peasantry are extraordinary disaffections which reach the stage of the repudiation of the entire system of Soviet economics.

On the question of "Shaking the bloody hand of Capitalist Europe," "Tilsit Peaces," "Accepting their opponents as allies," "the cost of the Russian Revolution," etc., I can recommend (for space will not allow me to quote) a perusal of Lenin's pamphlets—"A Letter to American Working Men," "Lessons of the Revolution," and "Soviets at Work." This paragraph, however, was not an attack on the Bolsheviks for doing something that they should not do, but a plain statement of fact regarding the position they were placed in and unable to avoid. The moral, if such is necessary, is that we must study Socialism and know how to act when the opportunity presents itself. Comrade McKenzie winds up by stating that the need for education is very great. The more I see of his article the more I am inclined to agree. As for the "other, and more vigorous means" for spreading Socialism, a little further elaboration would be thankfully received.

Now, Alex., resume the attack as soon as convenient. But do see to it that you sprinkle sugar instead of vinegar on your mush before starting in. This is a big subject, and can be dealt with far better by avoiding groundless insinuations regarding your opponent. Let us examine the case on its merits, and through such means arrive at a satisfactory solution.

J. A. McD.

:o:

PLATFORM

Socialist Party of Canada

We, the Socialist Party of Canada, affirm our allegiance to, and support of, the principles and programme of the revolutionary working class.

Labor, applied to natural resources, produces all wealth The present economic system is based upon capitalist ownership of the means of production, consequently, all the products of labor belong to the capitalist class. The capitalist is, therefore, master; the worker a slave.

So long as the capitalist class remains in possession of the reins of government, all the powers of the State will be used to protect and defend its property rights in the means of wealth production and its control of the product of labor.

The capitalist system gives to the capitalist an ever-swelling stream of profits, and to the worker, an ever-increasing measure of misery and degradation.

The interest of the working class lies in setting itself free from capitalist exploitation by the abolition of the wage system, under which this exploitation, at the point of production, is cloaked. To accomplish this necessitates the transformation of capitalist property in the means of wealth production into socially controlled economic forces.

The irrepressible conflict of interest between the capitalist and the worker necessarily expresses itself as a strugvle for political supremacy. This is the Class Struggle.

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

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

Literature Price List

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

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

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

Capitalist Production. (First Nine and 32nd Chapters, "Capital," Vol. 1, Marx). Single copies (cloth bound), $1.00; 5 copies, $3.75.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ancient Society (Louis H Morgan), $2 15

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

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

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

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

Civil War in France (Marx) 35c

Life and Death (Dr. E. Teichmann) 90c

History of the Paris Commune (Lissagaray) $1.50

Class Struggle (Kautsky), cloth, 90 cents; paper, 35 cents.

Ethics and the Materialistic Conception of History, (Kautsky), cloth, 90 cents.

Puritanism (Meily), cloth, 90 cents.

Evolution of the Idea of God (Grant Allen), paper, 55 cents; cloth, $1.

Origin of Species (Darwin), cloth, $1.

Information Respecting the Russian Soviet System and its **alleged** Propaganda in North America (Martens), per copy, 10 cents.

The Protection of Labor in Soviet Russia (Kaplun), per copy, 15 cents.

Savage Survivals (Moore), cloth, $1.

Law of Biogenesis (Moore), cloth, 90 cents.

Social Studies (Lafargue), 90 cents.

Germs of Mind in Plants (R. H. France) 90c

Economic Causes of War (Leckie), single copies, 25c; 10 copies or more, 20c each.

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

(All above post free).

All above literature can be obtained at the same prices, post paid, from—J. Sanderson, Box 1762, Winnipeg, Man.

:o:

SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

LOCAL (VANCOUVER) No. 1

EDUCATIONAL CLASSES

POLITICAL ECONOMY: Every Sunday afternoon, from 3 to 5.

HISTORY: Every Thursday evening, from 8 to 10.

Classes meet at 401 Pender Street East. No fees are asked and no collection is made. All that is required is an earnest interest in the subject taken up. All points raised and all questions asked are fully discussed. Membership in the Socialist Party of Canada is not a condition of membership of these classes.

You are earnestly invited to attend.

:o:

LOCAL (WINNIPEG) No. 3—EDUCATIONAL CLASSES.

ECONOMIC CLASS: Every Friday at 8 p.m.

SPEAKERS' CLASS: Every Sunday at 11 a.m.

HISTORY CLASS: Monday Evening, 8 o'clock. Friday Afternoon, 3 o'clock.

These classes are already well attended, and the number of members is increasing. The classes meet at 530 Main Street, Winnipeg, and all workers are requested to attend.

Western Clarion

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

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

Editor ..... Ewen MacLeod

Subscription:

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

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

VANCOUVER, B. C., DECEMBER 16, 1920

EDITORIAL

H. G. WELLS.

THE latest publicist to visit Russia is H. G. Wells. Mr. Wells is a noted novelist. He is also a master of arts, and a bachelor of science. His fanciful imagination, however, is more useful to him in gaining a livelihood than these last mentioned attainments. He was at one time (and may now be) a member of the Fabian Society.

Mr. Wells spent fourteen days in Russia. A previous visitor from England, Bertrand Russell, spent a month or more there. Mr. Russell had never been in Russia before, which was quite evident from the articles he wrote on his return, and the apparent difficulties he was under in making comparisons as between conditions past and present. While there Mr. Russell compared Russian conditions under Soviet administration with his own theories and preconceptions, and of course his theories were much nicer than conditions as he saw them in Russia. Compared with him Mr. Wells appears to be a better observer, although he does not appear to be quite as well acquainted with Marxian literature. In fact, all, in the same breath, Mr. Wells condemns the conclusion arrived at by Marx in "Capital" and proclaims that he has not studied that work. This being the case, Mr. Wells' criticism of the Marxian whiskers may be allowed to be quite in order. As we have said, he is a good observer. He has seen Marx's picture and that is all he knows about him. Not even our fanciful novelist, however, would have us condemn the theory of surplus value, the materialistic conception of history and the class struggle pronouncement because Marx chose to wear well ordered whiskers. Being a man enthusiastic about art in all its manifestations, we grant him his place as a critic in that department of human endeavour. His limitations as a critic of what is known as the Marxist position are self confessed. He has not studied that position.

But in visiting Russia he was saddled with fewer preconceptions than Bertrand Russell. He had been there in the early part of 1914, and in his recent brief visit he was able to make some personal comparisons. In industrial life, in work shops and factories, he found activity curtailed, mostly on account of the mobilization of men for defensive purposes on the various fronts. The transportation system, a basic field of operation in any country of large area, he found to be seriously out of order and in a state of disrepair. The food supply and system of rationing he found to be even worse than that obtaining in the England he knew during the time of war. The education system he found to be constructive and admirable. The communal schools were the subject of his warm admiration. In them, in their educational system and in the food administration within them he found that the system built up by Lunacharsky and his educational staff had surpassed his expectations of what was possible. Disaffection and at the same time contentment with the Soviet regime he found among the peasants. He had all the freedom of observation he required. He was sensible enough to expect that if he were taken on an official tour inspecting schools, prisons, etc., he would be shewn these institutions under the most favorable circumstances. The same is done everywhere. But he anticipated this by sometimes cancelling his official engagements so that he might make surprise visits. The result of these surprise visits was good. His conclusions on the Soviet administration are warm in praise. No other group or party in Russia is possible in control. To abandon Bolshevism means murder, chaos, starvation and wholesale disintegration now. The Soviet chiefs of Departments he found to be able men and earnest workers. In administration of Russian affairs they had steered a straight course and had achieved what was impossible for any other group or party. From the ruins of Czardom they had inherited nothing but hunger and want, a broken-down transportation system and an industrial and agricultural collapse in production. They had estaablished Dictatorship, and Dictatorship, instead of weakening, had necessarily strengthened itself in three years. Without it, any semblance of order was impossible in Russia.

With the Soviet theories and ideas of social life Mr. Wells found himself in disagreement. Of their administrative work, he has nothing to say but to praise it. In spite of the many delays in transportation and communication which, incidentally, he makes responsible for his failure to meet Lunacharsky, he thinks it astonishing that there eists any at all. There is really little in Mr. Wells' account of life today in Russia that is not published week after week in articles written by the Soviet chiefs themselves. As for instance in "Soviet Russia," the organ of the Russian Bureau of Information in New York. We have seen in the past year or two the efforts of these Russian writers to acquaint the workers of the world with Russia's condition and her needs. Their progress in construction work from period to period, their statistics of output, their laws, present plans and achievements generally, have been given publicity. Mr. Wells no doubt is fairly familiar with these or similar documents. He went to see for himself, that is all, and being a well known figure in English journalism he is able to gain the attention of all who will read and pay attention—even to a newspaper. He charges the miseries of present day Russian life to the wreckage inherited from Czardom; to six years' war and to the blockade. Anyone who expects to find uninterrupted harmony in social life and free institutions of administration—let us say democracy—in a country that has had Russia's experiences of the last six years, is blind to perception or otherwise dull. Six years of incessant warfare and three years' blocade! Any administration that could maintain existence during the last three years in Russia, even if it has not the fully comprehensive understanding of its entire population (as the theoretically pure would have it) has surely judged needs and conditions rightly as it met them.

Concerning the blocade and its effects, Mr. Wells' account of hospital equipment and surgical supplies urgently required is worthy of note. Think of a condition wherein, in a hospital, in the matter of operations, cases have to be held until the "operating day" once a week come round. This in order to conserve available supplies and prevent disastrous waste. That the Soviet medical authorities have been able to check the spread of disease is due to organized effort in the face of the utmost difficulties.

Strangely enough, from an industrial worker's point of view, the aspect of life in Russia that most arouses the interest of visitors like Russell and Wells is the cultural aspect—art, music, literature. It is strange that a man like Wells, who was prepared to see worse conditions in Russia than he found there, and who appreciated the efforts made by the Soviets to establish and maintain order amid chaos and the pressing problems that necessarily arose, should be surprised to find the healthy development and promotion of art endeavour in its various branches to be a consideration secondary to the work-a-day problems of life. In this he shows his lack of understanding of the paths of human evolution and social growth.

In all his activities man first attends to his requirements in food, clothing and shelter, and upon these, when he finds time, he builds his art. Art without this basis is useless to any society and shorn of appreciation. In the various stages of his development, the measure of man's artistic effort has corresponded to the leisure time his method of acquiring a means of livelihood afforded him. He first built his house and in his after-moments he decorated and adorned it. He first clothed himself and afterwards, in course of time, he was able to produce a coat of many colors. He was hungry and he ate what he could obtain. Primitive man knew no sauce. In supplying his meals he first met the demands of bare nature. When he has erected for himself an inhabitable house he is then able to consider decorating its walls. Use before beauty, however offensive to the artistic soul of H. G. Wells it may be, will prove a handy reference if circumstances ever overtake him and find him hungry.

And so with Russia. In a land where constructive work is in progress towards the provision of its people's needs, the first consideration lies in directing energy toward the finding of food, clothing and shelter, and making secure the certainty of continuous supply. These are the essentials. Art without these is useless, because it cannot then be appreciated. The follower of culture will attune himself in such a period to the actual requirements of the day. The requirements of the day, being met, will promote in art its impulse.

If Mr. Wells were now to devote himself seriously to a study of Marxism he might understand what he has observed. He makes some attempt at theorising and tells us the class struggle is not a fact of life. He cannot see the dividing line between bourgeois and proletarian. Marxism asserts that there is an unbridged gulf between these two classes and that they have nothing in common. In this matter we have little regard for Mr. Wells' opinions. The confusion of his mind on such a subject as this is not due to dullness but to lack of application in its study. We are familiar with those arguments from the polished and artistic lights of literature. Mr. Wells sees two hundred classes instead of two. He would argue like others of his kind that the workman who has a dollar or two to his credit in the bank is in the exploiting class as drawing interest. The day is past when we have to prove the nonsense of such hapless twitterings. The wage worker whose stomach has missed a dollar or two's worth of filling represented in a banker's meagre accounting of his savings, is but a day or two further removed from starvation than his fellows in time of stress. He maintains life, not on his savings but on the proceeds of the sale of his labor power day by day. This is the real division of classes that Mr. Wells is looking for, wage workers who sell labor power and capitalists who buy it. Labor in production and capital in appropriation; a class of producers and a class of owners; a subordinate class and a ruling class; exploited and exploiter; propertyless and property owning; proletarian and bourgeoisie.

IN DEFENCE OF CHARLIE O'BRIEN

Some time ago an appeal for funds was sent to us by the O'Brien Defence Committe, Rochester, N. Y. The appeal stated that funds were required to obtain a writ of habeas corpus for Comrade C. M. O'Brien, who was ordered deported from the United States. We thereupon decided to open an O'Brien Defence Fund in these columns, but, since later advices informed us that O'Brien had obtained the writ, and had succeeded in nullifying the deportation warrant, we waited for further information.

Our readers have been informed that Comrade O'Brien was arrested in December, 1919, under the Criminal Anarchy Law of the U. S., and that he has been on bail under the charge of having sold a copy of the Manifesto of the Communist Labor Party to a police informer. Under this law the penalty stated is 10 years in jail or $5,000 fine, or both. O'Brien's lawyer has been promised that the case

obtain hearing before the Lusk Committee some during this month, and moneys are required to expenses.

e do not feel that we are required to elaborate 'Brien's qualities as a man devoted to the cause orking class emancipation. Whoever is acnted with the history of the early day efforts rds education to this end in Canada is acnted with the story of the pioneer work of lie O'Brien. Some criticism is necessary how, on the attitude of those who hold that the legal t is necessarily a losing fight for the worker, is therefore a waste of time ,effort and money. constantly teach that the political, legal, moral religious relationships of mankind change cordingly with their underlying economic basis, that, maintaining a relationship, each with the r, and all with the base, they each play a part oulding the affairs of men, races, classes, etc., the course of time.

our own case, that is, in the case of those who devoted to the education of our class, we comly come into contact with the law. Under cer circumstances we may be disfranchised, thus ng our privilege in so far as it affects the pol al structure; in other circumstances we may be acised in social life or excommunicated in the gious world, and while we may not experience h grief over these happenings, contact with the l institutions of any country is a grave matter us. In the case of contact with the Criminal e, the personal liberty of civil life that we en, even in these days, is threatened. If we end no dispute or protest on any charges, on unds real or imagined, that the minions of the chose at any time to lay against us, we would ve to be easy victims under our masters' rule. l building would have boom times. In entering pute and argument on the charges laid against we enlist the support and interest of our fellows. d when we come to the point of presenting the ument in the case, directly or indirectly, we are need of the training that department of man's -divided activities that a lawyer has, to argue case where it necessarily comes to be decided the courts. In O'Brien's case the following neys have been received here. Further donations be sent to Louis Stark, 580 St. Paul St., chester, N.Y., or to E. MacLeod, 401 Pender eet East, Vancouver ,B. C. Further donations l be acknowledged. W. McQuoid, $1; E. Macod, $1; H. Williams, $1; Blampin, $1; H. Howd, $1; J. Johnson, $1; Hanson, $1; Mrs. Streeter, A. Sabanski, $1; Leurin, 50c.; J. Dekowsky, $1; Saary, 50c.; Gbrosetti, $1; J. Shepherd, $1; F. rson, $1; Johnson, $; Managos, $1; McPrice, 50c; arlie, 50c; Smith, $1; Ananymous, 10c; Brown, c; Lamont, 25c; Lahorre, $1; Reorsa, 10c; E. A. bbs, $1; Local Vancouver, No. 1, $25; A. Slave, —Total, $46.70. (This is up to Dec. 10th.)

———:o:———

HE "WESTERN CLARION" IS ON SALE AT:

ALGARY, ALTA.—Alexander News Stand, 204 Eighth Avenue West.
Labor News Stand, 814a—2nd Street East.

ONTREAL—S. Feigelman, 421 St. Lawrence Boulevard
Frierman and Baranowski, 12 Ontario Street East.
Popular Book and Stationery Store, 16 St. Catherines Street West.

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

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

ORT ARTHUR—Viking Book Store, 264 Bay Street

ORONTO—D. Goodman, Blind News Agent, corner Queen and Chestnut Streets.
The American News Agency, 81 Queen St. West.
The Theatrical Book Store, corner Bay & Queen, West
The Leader Lane Book Store, Leader Lane and King St. East (near King Edward Hotel).

ANCOUVER — Columbia News Stand, corner Hastings and Columbia Streets.
John Green, Carrall Street
W Love, Hastings Street East.

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

HICAGO—Walden Book Shop, 307 Plymouth Court.
The Clarion, 204 N. Clark St.

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

ACOMA—Raymer's Old Book Store, 1317 Pacific Avenue
P. R. Haffer, 1151½ Broadway.

ETROIT SOCIALIST EDUCATIONAL SOCIETY.—25 Adelaide St. East, Detroit, Mich.

———:o:———

Things As They Are

THE happiness of the world, and the true prosperity of man in society, therefore the real happiness of that society, lies in the complete realization of Socialist philosophy. Whoever regards existing conditions of life, and has a glimmer of the nature and objective of political society—and the numbers that are being compelled, through bitter experience, to examine those conditions are being constantly increased by the inevitable contractions of capitalist maturity — knows that in this society there is no possibility of prosperity to any but the owning class, and but scant happiness to any others. Human society has grown into, and developed through, ever changing forms of slavery, perceiving neither their identity of principle, nor their material necessity of form and function. Hence, although crucified on this necessity, and dimly conscious of his degradation, man has expended his efforts for his real welfare, vainly against one or other detail,—always stubborn to alter, and valuless when achieved.

But out of the determinism of the world process has come a consciousness of this principle, a consciousness clarified with development, kinetic with necessity, as a climax of which the body politic will lose its polity of class rule. This class rule, although in appearance different is, nevertheless, functionally the same as all ancient political societies, holding a subjugated class in bondage by precisely the same methods,government—for the same reason,—the exaction of tribute—based on the same economic foundation—ownership of the means of life—the one and only way man can be enslaved.

This "political" means of obtaining a livelihood is the key to our exploitation. A ruling class in society, of necessity owning the materials of production, is master in, and of, that society, since a master class predicates a subject class. That is the meaning of capital. That is capital. But a master class, owning the material of production, by exactly the same right of property controls the entire product of the productive machine. Hence automatically, a steadily accumulating stream of wealth flows to the master, a weightier burden of degradation to the subjugated.

The commodity nature of capitalist production,—production for sale—ultimately means the stifling of all industry. Because, by the invention of mechanical appliances, and the involved displacement of labor, there is an ever-increasing surplus to dispose of, on a steadily diminishing market. Free competition between buyers and sellers eliminated all unnecessary material from production, necessitating commodities exchanging at value, value being the socially necessary labor embodied in their production. Machine production therefore, by progressively augmenting the producing capacity of labor, progressively decreases its purchasing power. No purchasing power, no market; no market, no profit; no profit, no production, since, as stated, production is entirely and absolutely for profit. With this stoppage of industry, we disport ourselves in the manifest delights of "financial panics," while our masters diligently seek for an outlet for **their** goods, which **our activity** produced. That is the owning class end of the business.

But we, too, alternatively, intelligent voters and recalcitrant workers, have a commodity to sell. And in selling our commodity we have the same "freedom" as our masters: viz., freedom of competition. Our commodity is labor power, subject to the same law of value, determined in the same manner, as any other commodity — the socially necessary labor involved in its production. Or in common or garden English, the amount of food, clothing and shelter requisite to maintain itself in the realm of production. And just as the competition of the capitalists among themselves for profits compels them to exchange—sell—their merchandise at value, so the competition of the workers, for jobs, compels them to offer their one commody at its value. But the perfection of the tools of production so enhanced the productive capacity of the worker that, while he receives the full market value of his labor power (wages, to buy necessities wherewith to restore the energy consumed in the day's work) he does not receive the full value of his productive power (surplus, which is exported). This immense surplus which labor creates, through the medium of machinery, belongs by right of property to the owner of that machinery. This is where we are exploited. Here is the fountain spring of master class profits; the yawning gulf of slave class poverty. Here, we discover the mysterious and variegated tree of opportunity, whence Sir William gathereth figs, and Henry, thistles. And both are blindfolded.

Before the master can realize the profit contained in this abundance of creative toil, he must exchange it on the world market. But here the law of value reacts, exactly limiting the purchasing power of that market to its capacity. Consequently surplus increases until, at last, the glutted market compels the production machine to halt; and the indigent feverishness of stagnation reigneth instead of the indigent feverishness of industry. Furthermore, to the greater misery of the slave, to his infinitely greater humiliation—here is the founded cause of war. Capitalist government meets capitalist government on the commercial field, competitively for "place," "privilege," "concession," "rights," "tariff favor," "spheres of interest," one and all squarely based on the economic necessity of markets, obtainable by "diplomacy," "tact," or "peaceful penetration" if possible; by the weightier penetration of Krupps and Vickers', if not.

Since the hope of capitalism is profit, and since profit is only obtainable through exploitation, obviously all endeavor to exalt human society, that does not abolish this exploitation, is futile. Classless society is the hope of the world, yet we must possess our souls in patience, until the mills of the world process grind out the conditions of its advent. We cannot thrust our ideal on the psychiatry of wealth accumulation; nor force dialectics on the illusory ideation of interest. We can only preach to whosoever will listen; and only those are disposed to listen who suffer from the necessities of the omnipotent machine.

The one great fundamental of capitalist society is class ownership of the means of life. When the growth of the system, which consecrates this ideal of property has, by its inevitable expansion consummated its own dispossession, the truths that now clamor for acceptance will find a fertile soil in the great body of dispossessed, thrust out of the ruts of custom; expelled from the havens of individualist opportunity; fated to see their all swallowed up by the sateless Moloch of monopoly.

It is for this reason there is no short cut to the "golden age." The precessional of the system itself must vanquish the confusions, hoary and hallowed, draping the ideal of property right in life's requirements. That accomplished, the inexorable facts of economic law will stand out, clear as the summer sun. We, the workers, suffer from the spoilation of capital. Obviously, therefore, we must be the instrument, in the logic of time, for its overthrow. But to abolish requires wisdom; to act knowledge. That is our part in the substantial of evolution. While we are passionate with hope, vibrant with enthusiasm, eager with the heroism of an ideal, we must also be girt with understanding staged on the invincible rock of material fact. There can be no compromise with political parties, no dalliance with the reforms of the declassed, or the opportunist. The ghosts flitting among the crumbling ruins of revisionist utopias are arguments, eloquent "as the tongues of angels," and it is for us to benefit from the tear-misted failures of the disappointing past.

History speaks with unwavering voice, and the lessons of the times have shown the unflinching necessity of loyalty to our ideal—the civilized commune —unyielding adherence to our basic principle—the abolition of wages,—and witnesses with the fervor of inspired truth, that whoever walks in the narrow and precipitous way of historic materialism, must be freed from all expediency, absolved from all prejudice, and speak with clear utterance from the calm summits of unclouded reason.

R.

Just a Few Definitions.

EDITOR'S NOTE—In a letter accompanying the following article under the above title, Comrade McNey, who is well known to our readers, expresses himself (in part) thus:

"About a year and a half ago, at the time when the "Clarion" was under the ban, I wrote a short article of about six hundred words, that contained part of what is in the present article ,only much milder in tone, and sent it to "The World," Oakland, Calif. (a near-Socialist paper, at that time controlled by a group who afterwards became part of the Communist Labor Party), with the request that it be published and that some comment be made on it or discussion asked for. There was no response; the article was not published. Evidently my literary style was at fault; or it was thought better not to have any discussion on such a subject. I then wrote out another copy and sent it to "The Proletarian," Detroit, with the same request but I left town soon after, and missed two or three copies, so I do not know whether they published it or not.

"It is difficult to educate the workers to understand their class position or anything else, so long as the country is full of radical papers, edited by fools, freaks, humbugs and hypocrites writing volumes and saying nothing.

"The enclosed article is something in the nature of a challenge to those freaks and humbugs to get down to bed rock, and explain what they mean, and the circulation and influence of the "Clarion" is wide enough so that they cannot all very well ignore it. Most of them will, of course, but there may be a few who, due to ignorance, or a sincere desire to get to the bottom of the subject, may undertake to discuss it. Let us hope so. I am also aware that some of the conclusions arrived at may not meet with the approval of some scientific Socialists. Very good; they have as much right to their opinion as I have."

It will be noted that in the article itself Comrade McNey requests other "Clarion" writers to express themselves on his conclusions. We have no objection to that (provided they don't all do it at once). In our opinion definitions, as such, are the stated meanings of terms which stand to be accepted or refused. Acceptance means that thereupon the properties (so to speak) of the term commonly accepted as defined may come under discussion. Refusal means that these properties cannot be discussed until they are recognized under a commonly accepted definition. We are more interested in the thing itself than in the definition of it. At the same time it can do no harm to have the terms commonly used defined and traced, for the purposes of common understanding. Comrade McNey's classification of certain working class symptoms incidental to strike conditions as recreative and sportive are not quite in keeping with the otherwise seriously expressed context of his article. We publish this article in the hope that its various fundamental statements may be examined by our readers to the end that the many elusive phrases commonly seen in Socialist and Labor papers relative to "action" of one sort and another may be discussed and that thereupon political action may be understood. Since we are on definitions it will not be amiss to direct attention to the usefulness of any word or phrase in tracing its history or, more correctly, etymology, as for instance the word economics. A study of the roots and origin of words lends stimulus to the appreciation of their present reference, and while we are not anxious that any discussion that may follow from this article should exclusively follow that course, we would like to see avoidance of arbitrary standards. There is room for considerable discussion here, and very likely, as it arises, we shall have a word to say ourselves.

FOR some years past, it has been the privilege of the workers of the world, from time to time, to be invited to apply their economic power, to use economic action, direct action, mass action, etc., in their efforts to emancipate themselves from wage slavery. We have also been warned against having anything to do with political action, parliamentary action, etc., and have been advised to strike at the ballot box with an axe. Those invitations have been issued by all manner of persons calling themselves revolutionists, and ranging all the way from stool pigeons up to university professors. On the other hand, the more conservative and law-abiding radicals and labor leaders, warn us to have nothing to do with direct action, and advise us to be content with parliamentary acton, and constitutional methods. Again, there are those who tell us that political and economic action, used together at the same time, is the only solution of the problem, these being the two wings of the same bird, and whereas if we use only one at a time we will wobble around in a circle and get nowhere, if we use both together we will be able to fly along gracefully, and peacefully, to the land of milk and honey. All of which advice may be very good as far as it goes, but when we consider that not one of those wind-jammers has ever seen fit to give a logical definition of the terms they use, nor have made any attempt to classify the subject discussed, it is all more or less confusing. Consequently we have decided to offer a few definitions for what they are worth, and judging by the general intelligence displayed by most of the disputants, we feel perfectly qualified to deal with the subject, there is always room for one more fool in any discussion, and one more fool should always be welcome in a fool's paradise, this is our main excuse for "horning in."

We will commence with a few dictionary definitions, and finish up with a few definitions of our own.

Power—"Ability, capacity strength, energy, faculty or energy of mind, rule or authority; capacity for action."

Action—"The function or operation of that which acts; the doing of something. State of motion, activity. Force exerted by one body on another."

Economics—"The science that investigates the conditions and laws affecting the production distribution, and consumption of wealth, or the material means of satisfying human desires."

Politics—"The science and art of government."

Government—"Act or pact of governing; exercise of authority in regulating the action of something; control; direction; rule."

Strike—This word, like many other English words, has several meanings, we are concerned here with only one.

"A strike, in the labor sense, is a stoppage of work by common agreement on the part of a body of work-people for the purpose of obtaining or resisting a change in the conditions of employment."

It will be granted that these definitions from an ordinary dictionary are fairly correct, although we might elaborate on some of them a little from a Socialist point of view. Therefore, we shall proceed with our definition of terms.

Economic power, is the power of man over nature. The power of man to force from nature in ever-increasing quantity, all things necessary to his existence. In other words labor power.

Economic action, is economic power applied to the natural resources for the purpose of producing wealth.

A strike is not an application of economic power. A strike is a refusal to act. Theoretically speaking, when a group of workers are on strike, they stand motionless with their arms folded, until their demands are granted, or until starvation and the political power of the State drives them back to work. It is true, that in reality we do perform certain acts when we are on strike, such as eating our meals when we have anything to eat, or throwing a brick at a scab occasionally, and other playful little acts of similar nature, but such acts cannot properly be classified under the heading of either economic or political action, they can more correctly be classified under the heading of sport and recreation. And as such have very little to do with either economics or politics. And furthermore, the fact that this refusal to act(this stoppage of the production of profits, temporarily), occasionally brings results, in the shape of a few reforms, is no excuse for calling it action.

Political power is the power of man over man, the power of government, coercion. The power used by a class of parasites, to force a class of slaves to produce wealth, and yield it all up to their masters. Power used for the purpose of robbery and exploitation. Consequently, the class that holds the political power, also controls all economic power and action.

Political action, on the part of the capitalists, is any action they consider necessary to maintain their position as a ruling and exploiting class.

Political action, on the part of the workers, is any action they may find necessary to overthrow the political power of the capitalist class. To establish a proletarian dictatorship, and maintain it, until all danger of counter-revolution is past, and until all the means of wealth production, now the property of the capitalist class, have been transformed into the common property of society, to be operated in the interest of the whole people. For it must be remembered, that the capture of political power by the workers, no matter whether by a majority, or a minority, does not imply the instantaneous abolition of classes. Not by any means. We may make it compulsory for all to do their share of the work, but we must be in a position to see that they continue to do it. For the class psychology, and the desire to become masters once more, will persist for a long time in the minds of the conquered parasites. Economic classes, can only be eliminated by a gradual process of assimilation and education. This may take a generation or two, and can only be accomplished under a proletarian dictatorship.

Direct Action—If this term means anything at all it means efficient action. The easiest, quickest, the most efficient, or the only way to accomplish any purpose, no matter what that purpose may be. This applies to both political and economic action. The most efficient, or the only possible, economic action, is direct action, even though indirect methods must be used. Likewise, the most efficient, or the only possible, political action, is also direct action, even though indirect methods must be used. When this is understood, the term direct action, taken by itself, has little or no meaning, it is superfluous, a confusing and unnecessary term. The kind of action very often advocated by the exponents of direct action, when it is action at all, is generally idiotic action, not direct action, and equally ridiculous is the position of those law-abiding freaks who declare themselves opposed to direct action, as defined above, for such a declaration is equal to declaring themselves opposed to all action.

While we are on the question of power and action, we might mention that economic power, is sometimes defined as "the power arising from the ownership of economic wealth," by persons who do not investigate the subject very thoroughly. This theory is a fallacy. Ownership is merely a legalized claim, and the only power connected with it is the political power that sustains it. It is true, that the ownership of economic wealth, the rights of property, give the owners, or capitalists, an economic advantage over those who do not own, the workers, just so long as the workers, the vast majority of the people, recognize and respect those claims and title deeds, or so long as the capitalists hold the political power to sustain and legalize their ownership, which amounts to the same thing, because if the majority of the workers did not recognize and respect those claims and rights of property, the capitalists would not hold the political power very long. In this connection, we would ask if there is any real power in ownership, why was it, that the Czar, the landowners, and the capitalists, did not use it to maintain their position as the rulers of Russia? They owned everything in sight, while the working class owned nothing. Other instances might be cited, but this is enough for the present.

Now we realize that this article is what its title implies, and that the last word has not been said on the subject by any means, there is enough left to make a good general discussion, or several discussions, in any economic class. We would also like to have the opinion of other "Clarion" writers on the subject. In the meantime, we are waiting.

Waiting for someone to show that economic power and action, is anything other than labor-power applied to the natural resources, for the purpose of producing wealth.

Waiting for someone to show that political power and action is anything other than the "big stick" in all its various forms and manifestations. The power used by a class of parasites to rob a class of slaves, of the fruits of their toil.

(Continued on page 8)

Materialist Conception of History

FOR BEGINNERS

LESSON No. VI.

WHEN the Matriarchal institutions prevailed, women's economic status was supreme, and descent was in the female line. riculture, which was developed by the women the tribe cultivating the land surrounding the mps, while the men were hunting or herding, was basis upon which slavery was built up.

The first signs of a settled life appeared in the ricultural stage. The women left behind, in need food, learned how to plant roots, and agriculture s at first a female occupation.

As long as tribes wandered about, agriculture s a secondary pursuit. When the tribe got mmed, in a fertile plain, agriculture became the incipal occupation. Up to this time private pro rty consisted of the simple personal belongings, hich were buried with the person at death. The a not only of private property but public pro rty did not exist before the agricultural stage. e first landownership was held in common.

As long as women folks remained behind and ltivated the soil, the manufacture of household ensils was exclusively done by the women. Wher er the women materially assisted in the production the necessaries of life, as in the Marian Island, ey were well treated and enjoyed a superior pos ion to the women in other parts where women did t contribute to the production of the material cessities of life. Morgan points out that the In ans cultivated maize and potatoes. They dug e earth with a crude stick, or spades and hoes ade of bones and shells attached to a stick. The ost of the cultivation was done by the women hile the men went hunting, and as the use of a ing constitutes ownership in primitive society, ivate property was owned by the women, there re under these conditions women were equal, if t superior in the tribe, with female descent.

We hear much about democracy today, yet a reater form of democracy prevailed in primitive mes when women took equal part in the councils the tribe. The female portion ruled the com unal houses. Morgan says: "A man who was o shiftless to do his portion of providing subsist nce, no matter how many children or goods he had, ight be ordered to pick up and get out."

This condition exists in the Marian Island in the orth Pacific, which Germany bought from France 1894.

A man can kill another man whom he finds with is wife, but dare not do her any ill, while the woman an condemn him to any punishment for a similar ffence. She assembles all the women in the neigh orhood who, armed with lances get after the cul rit. In Formosa Island, which China ceded to apan in 1897, a daughter is regarded more highly han a son, because when married she brings her usband home, who becomes one of the family and elps to support the family.

The pairing family became the standard of mor lity because the institution of private property xerted an important influence on the constitution f the family. The complicated system of relation hips growing out of the maternal family which athered so large a number of individuals under a ommon head, could only prevail previous to pri ate property. As soon as the idea of private pro erty arose, the bond of relationship ceased to be represented by a community of sentiment, and be ame embodied in the economic relation of hered tary relationship or succession. Thus, when this nstitution was firmly established, the maternal fam ly with its numerous hosts of relations became in olerable, since it necessitates the division of the eritage among an enormous number of relations. Therefore private property consequently removed the multiple ramifications of relationships growing out of collective property, and replaced them with a simpler system and a more restricted form of the family.

McLellan, who devoted his whole life to the question ("Studies in Ancient Society") did not hesitate to declare: "Every stage in the evolution of the family is determined by considerations of property." Property is an expression of economic conditions. Polygamy was permitted under this pairing family. A man could have several wives but a woman could only have one man. Thus the double standard of morality was established which exists in society today. Previously the sex relation had never been considered vicious, but from this time it became vicious because of the confusion it might cause in the paternity of the offspring.

In the history of American tribal government before this, no death penalty was found to any crime, but after the change of the line of descent from the female to the male, at least one tribe inflicted the death penalty on any woman who contracted a sex relation outside her marriage.

Rev. Samuel Gorman, a missionary among the Pueblo Indians, says: "The lands were held in common and the right of property belongs to the female part of the family and descends to the daughter."

As long as the pastoral stage lasted, women were in an equal position because of their economic activities, cultivating fruits and roots around the the camping grounds, although the movable property of the pastoral stage, being in the hands of men who attended to the domesticated animals, is believed to be the first influence to transfer the economic supremacy of the women to the men.

The scarcity of the game in the hunt in the western hemisphere and the need of cultivation as a means of subsistence for the domesticated animals, in the eastern hemisphere, through the scarcity of nature's growth in dry seasons, force upon the human race a more regular employment on planting, and agriculture became the principal occupation. It was Communism in land first, but with the immense benefits derived from the land the change of obtaining a living by agriculture marked an increase in the density of population, and the introduction of private ownership in land. This ownership of property gave man an influence and power, and the product of his own labor, being not enough to satisfy his ambitions, captives in tribal wars became slaves, being more profitable cultivating the soil than using them as food. Cannibalism became immoral, man even enslaved his own wife and family. Land being the source of wealth by the application of slave labor, we can readily see why land passed from being owned in common, to private ownership of the strongest men of the tribe.

Since the inauguration of private property history became a history of class struggles. The class struggle is not an invention of the Socialist. It is a fact which they discovered by a scientific analysis of human history. The class struggle has been raging in human society thousands of years before the Socialists discovered its historical function and pointed it out. So did the struggle for existence between the various organic creatures before Darwin formulated his definition of it. The first enunciation of the class struggle was no more a gospel of hatred than was the assertion of the struggle for existence by Darwin. It was simply the statement of a scientific fact in plain scientific terms. The first Socialists to point out the class struggle did so, only to show its historical function in human development and declare their aim, as the abolition of the class struggle.

The pastoral stage is believed to have developed as a result of the domestication of the animals. Domestication originated from the hunter killing a female and its young following the hunters to their camp grounds, where they were brought up and domesticated for meat and milk. There were no slaves in the pastoral stage. Slaves would have been detrimental to hunters and herdmen, therefore, captives being no advantage, they were killed.

The pastoral stage has been traced in different parts of the globe. The bible shows the pastoral stage of the Jews, where wealth is measured by the head of cattle a man owns. In Genesis, Abram was very rich in cattle. Lot also had flocks and herds. Abram said to Lot: "Let no strife be between thee and me; my herdsmen and thine herdsmen, for we be brethren." When Caesar landed in Britain he found the inhabitants in the pastoral stage, living on milk and meats and dressed in skins. They had wives in common, as many as 10 and 12, including fathers, brothers and sons. Pastoral wealth had the advantage over agricultural wealth that it could be removed when a weak tribe was attacked by a strong tribe. They could fold up their tents and drive the sheep and cattle out of harm's way. When the agricultural stage is reached, property or wealth could not be so disposed, because you could not remove growing crops or stored up grain. Man began building permanent homes under the settled state of agriculture. It became more tempting for neighboring tribes to war with their neighbors and rob them of their agricultural wealth, yet on the other hand it had the tendency of keeping the tribes at home in peaceful occupation. Therefore the growth of property and transference to men's children was the moving power for monogamy in marriage, to limit their numbers to actual progeny of the married pair.

I have pointed out that slaves were detrimental to a pastoral people who killed their captives. A. J. Butler, in 1896, said: "The Masi in East Arfica, a shepherd tribe who subsist on herds of a fixed number, kill all thier prisoners, but a neighboring tribe (Wakamba) which follow agriculture, being able to find use for slaves, do not kill them." Therefore morals are a reflection of the economic structure of society.

The medium of exchange under pastoral society was cattle, under agriculture it was various grains and tobacco. So that we have another instance of the economic condition reflecting itself in expressing the wealth of society and individuals. The bible shows the agricultural stage in Samuel's time: "And he will appoint them caption of thousands and will set them to ear the ground and reap his harvest, and he will take your fields and give them to his servants."—Samuel viii., 12, 14.

"Thou shalt not remove thy neighbor's landmark."—Deut. xix., 14.

Job numbers among the wickedest of men, he who removes the landmark: "Cursed be he who removes his neighbor's landmark."

The agricultural period was reached in Britain by the time of William of Normandy. In fact it was during the three and a half centuries of Roman rule that England became agricultural. Agriculture and private ownership of land was the beginning, leadig up to geographical divisions of people and the carrying on of barter between tribes on neutral land between their boundaries. Therefore the first land ownership was held in common (although capitalist apologists try to dispute it, which I will deal with in our next lesson) developing to private ownership and slavery. I have endeavored to trace human society and its development through the changed methods of procuring a living, showing the status of women on an equal footing in early human development. Here women performed the most important labor in early agriculture and acquired superior power in the councils of the tribe. With the growth of productive labor through higher developed tools, man performed the task alone, and a further extension of man's productivity enabled the conquerors of other tribes to institute slavery.

Woman's position became that of man's inferior, economically depending on the support of man; she lost all say in the councils of the new society. Engels says in "Landmarks of Scientific Socialism": "In spite of all the contradictions and accusations of heresy, the introduction of slavery at that time was a great step forward. Instead of being mur-

(Continued on page 8.)

THE COMING WAR WITH AMERICA

(Continued from page 1)

fall into the hands of the United States, as that country now collects the custom revenue, and has an armed force on the island."

Mr. Crowe points out the far-seeing statesmanship upon the part of the United States, is not satisfied with the control of the countries he has referred to, but they are carrying on a most persistent peaceful penetration into the very heart of the British West Indies, until today they have a **stronger grip of the commerce of these British possessions than Great Britain or Canada.** He points out Jamaica has a population about equal to the population of all the other islands, receiving 70 per cent. of all her requirements from the United States, and her principal exports practically controlled by the States. "The mighty octopus," the United Fruit Company, has a firmer hold on the island than ever, and a gentleman wrote to Mr. Crowe that they were binding the growers up to contracts in such a way that it will take some time for them to free themselves, adding: "Before things go worse, something from without Jamaica should be done. Nor is it too late, by any means, to right things."

"To bring about closer relations between Canada and the British West Indies, through commercial treaties, is a political phrase threadbare of results. If Canada does not take in the British West Indies, if she does not absorb them into the Dominion, the United States will eventually do so."

Crowe urges the need of this political union because "We are **seeking markets for our surplus products** in Roumania Belgium, and other European countries, **facing keen competition, while we pass by almost at our door, a market of 200,000 British consumers.**"

"While we are holding aloof, the United States are carrying on their propaganda, and **their Trusts are doing their utmost to create a prejudice against Canada and Canadians,** especially in Jamaica."

He also says: "**Commerce is not the only advantageous consideration in connection with a Canadian—West Indian Union. The strategic position of these rich tropical possessions** in the Carribean Sea may be of the **utmost importance to Canada and the Empire. They lie in the pathway of our trade routes to South America,** and between the Panama and Europe. Jamaica **may become a Western Gibraltar,** lying as it does, practically at the entrance to the Panama Canal, the water borne highway to British Columbia and the Orient."

When dealing with the suggestion of transfer to the United States by Lord Rothermere, Rowe says: "It occurred to me that if such an unfortunate transfer should take place, Jamaica might become another Heligoland."

The London "Times" dealing with this question points out the advantages to be derived from the Panama Canal, and says: "The opening of the Panama Canal has broken across the Isthmus, a new highway for sea borne traffic. Its effects have been, so far, obscured by the war. They are certain nevertheless to be profound and lasting. The most obvious of them, is the new importance which they involve for the islands that lie in the gulf over against the Eastern outlet of the canal. Our correspondent does not fail to make this point, and shows that Germany had seen it, and had tried to insure against it by securing the Danish West Indies. The loss of this outpost facing the new highway between the Atlantic and the Pacific is not the smallest part of the price which Germany has paid for the ambitions that plunged the world into war. Her chance of raising a Gibraltar that would frown with its battlements and its guns upon the eastern outlet of the Panama Canal, has gone for ever. The United States has bought the Danish West Indies, a transaction little regarded in this country,—such was the pre-occupation of our people at the moment when it was concluded, but likely to have the most important influence upon the **international relations and commercial developmets** of the future."

"The proposal, in fact, has much to commend it from the political and **strategic** as well as from the commercial point of view."

This is the position of the commercial world today after the great war for democracy, self-determination and war to end war, but let me remind my fellow-workers what Homer Lee says in his book, "The Day of the Saxon," p. 23: "There can be no retention of the British sovereignity, without the repression of the territorial expansion of other nations, a condition that must culminate in a war—**one war if the Empire is destroyed—a series if it is victorious.**"

This is the position, fellow workers. You must either take over the means of production and produce for use, or face another bloody conflict with your fellow workers of another country to create a market for the disposal of the surplus wealth exploited from your own hide.

"Workers of the world unite, you have nothing to lose but your chains; you have a world to gain."—(Marx).

If it would interest the "Clarion" readers, I may tell you of the purchase of the Danish West Indies by the United States when the European nations were too busy slaughtering one another to take notice.

Just as I was going to mail this article, I lifted the "Literary Digest" of 13th November, and find an article "Is the Entente 'Cracking'," and it starts out: "In name only the Entente still exists." There are quotations from the French papers because Britain renounces some rights of the treaty, an action which creates a privilege for Britain to the detriment of her Allies in her commence with Germany. To give you the gist of the question discussed, I only need quote the press despatch of October 27th: "The British Cabinet waives its right, under the Versailles Treaty, to confiscate goods sent by German traders to England. This action was taken, it is said, in order to facilitate British trading with Germany."

It will be no surprise to me if the struggle with America should arise, in which case France, according to my judgment, will be lined up on the side of America.

P. T. L.

:o:

JUST A FEW DEFINITIONS

(Continued from page 6)

Waiting for someone to show that a strike, a group of workers standing motionless, with their arms folded, is action of any kind.

Waiting for someone to show that direct action, is anything other than the most efficient, or the only possible way, to accomplish any purpose, no matter whether economic or political.

Waiting for someone to show that there is any power in ownership. That the title deeds to property, stocks, bonds, etc., are anything more than "scraps of paper," unless they are legalized, and sustained, by the political power of the State.

Now it is up to some of those hot air dispensers to come forward and show that the definitions given here are not correct, and give definitions of their own that are correct. If they fail to do so, they stand exposed in all their nakedness, as the four-flushers, and humbugs that they are.

F. J. McNEY.

:o:

MATERIALIST CONCEPTION OF HISTORY

(Continued from page 7)

dered when taken prisoner as in the Greek world, or instead of being eaten as they would have been at a still earlier period."

The fact that property consisted of land and slaves, led to the wars of conquest. After the fall of Rome, and the rise of German power, land being the principal means to exploit labor; feudalism and serfdom appeared. Neither the production of slaves or serfs gave women a chance to become an economic factor, and her social status remained low.

As trade and commerce gradually expanded with machine production, and the factory system drawing the women into the whirl of economic affairs, she has become an economic factor again. Her social status has improved and the law has granted her rights she had not before, and the movement for the emancipation of women entered upon the stage. Therefore it appears, if evolution is a series of circles rising higher in a spiral form, where human society through several systems of production, starting with a perfectly democratic organization based on communism of poverty in obtaining sustence, through a system of slavery with priv ownership of land with a State based on territo and property culminating in despotism, passing to a system of serfdom in agriculture and its sy tems of guilds in industry, with a correspondi feudalistic government, aristrcratic and autocrat to the presant time of free competition, and other capitalistic features, with extended rights suffrage in republics and limited monarchies, ing on to complete the circle higher up in spi forms, we shall have a more perfect dem cratic organization than the first, which instead being based on poverty will be based on wealth duction. Instead of an executive of a ruling governing people we will have an administration things, attending to the production of wealth use instead of profit. This is the historical mis of the workers.

P. T.

Next article: Proof of the common ownership land, and the morals and laws arising out of diff ent property relations.

:o:

MANIFESTO

— of the —

SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

(Fifth Edition)

Per copy ..... 10 cents

Per 25 copies $2

Post Paid

ECONOMIC CAUSES OF WAR

By PETER T. LECKIE

NOW READY

Preface by the author.

132 PAGES.

Per Copy, 25 Cents.

Ten copies up, 20 cents each.

Post Paid.

CLARION MAINTENANCE FUND

Alex. Taylor, $1; W. Donaldson, $2; Local Wimborne, Hugh Wilkie, $2; E. Erwin, $1; W. Scitt, $4; J. Leslie, T. Hanwell, $1; E. Falk, $2; B. R. Wilson, $2; G. Ia $1.

Total, 25th November to 10th December, inclusive $2

HERE AND NOW.

Following One Dollar cauh: W. G. Lindsay, F. Donal Mrs. S. B. Wood, E. Hallsor, J. J. Zender, H. Wilson W. Springford, B. Gill, J. Sanderson, S. Rose, S. Be W. Fleming, G. Darts, D. Stewart, W. R. Miller, J. Albers, D. Galloway, W. H. Snell, W. Donaldson, S. Sa W. Saunders, Wm. Scott, R. G. Williams, W. Erwin Lee, Martin Ophus, J. Leslie, A. Anderson, Slim Kemp M. Carpendale, J. F. Woloshyn, O. B. U. Victoria, J. J kins, H. Howard, J. Wright, J. S. Mason, T. Hanwell, C. Mutuh, A. J. Bell, E. Falk, J. Millard.

Following Two Dollars each: R. A. Fillmore, L. Jo stone, P. Rafferty, A. M. Davis, C. Johnson, J. Fisher *wald, A. H. Russell, O. Rusrhkowski, R. A. Walker, Sorlie.

Following Three Dollars each: C. M. O'Brien, A. Sh herd, Parry and Sim, J. H. Wilson, H. Roberts.

Ed. Fiala, $13; L. N. Olsin, $4; M. Goudie, $11; Fr Cassidy, $14; Sid Earp, $6.50.

Above, subscriptions to the "Clarion," received from November to 10th December, inclusive—total, $126.50.

:o:

Some records for fasting stand at present as follows:—

Jesus Christ	40 days
Dr. A. Hoffman	62 days
Dr. Tanner	40 days
Dr. Sriscom	31 days
Signor Succi	45 days
Alexander Jaques	30 days
Signor Merlate	50 days
Auguste Christensen	35 days
Mayor MacSwiney	73 days

All except the first on the list fasted under observation "The Freethinker," November 21, 1920.

:o: