

WESTERN CLARION

A Journal of
CURRENT
EVENTS

Official Organ of
THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

HISTORY
ECONOMICS
PHILOSOPHY

No. 892.

NINETEENTH YEAR.

Twice a Month

VANCOUVER, B. C., JUNE 1, 1923.

FIVE CENTS

Petroleum and Coal in France

FOR France the petroleum question is and remains an industrial and political problem of great importance. In 1921 France consumed 778,000 tons of petroleum; of this 708,000 tons were imported, and only 70,000 were produced at home. This is a disagreeable position, and one that may become critical within a short time. How to satisfy such extensive requirements and to remove the almost complete dependence on foreign countries, is the economic task which may dominate the manoeuvres of the diplomatists in the near future, which may cement alliances and bring about international conflicts.

The Franco-Polish petroleum agreement, concluded after lengthy and difficult negotiations, signifies an important success for French capitalists, who have been long endeavoring to secure the maximum of independence and security for their sources of fuel supply. This agreement gives the French companies, which have received concessions from both governments, certain privileges for a period of 10 years, during which time they enjoy perfect liberty to supply themselves with the necessary material, to transport their products, to export them, and to develop industrially. At the same time they are favored by considerable taxation exemptions from export duties, capital levies, and compulsory loans. The "Moniteur des Interets Materiels," of March 26, expresses itself very clearly on the new situation created by the Franco-Polish agreement: "This treaty enables the French government to attain the three objects it was aiming at: to secure the future of the French companies, to obtain an important share of Polish petroleum, and to exercise control over the French company in Poland." Before the war three groups of French financiers were interested to the extent of a total of 154 million

francs in the exploitation of Polish petroleum. After the war the French capitalists appropriated the German and Austrian concessions, so that by 1920 the amount of French capital invested in the Polish petroleum industry had already reached a sum of 500 millions. The total capital of the companies controlled by French share-holders amounts to 900 millions.

But French policy is not only interested in appropriating foreign petroleum wells, but also in utilizing the so-called national possibilities of fuel production. But the constant efforts made to generate carbon by the aid of alcohol cannot solve the problem of the liquid fuel supply. Experts are devoting increasing attention to the manufacture of liquid carburated hydrogen by means of suitable chemical treatment of coal, asphalt, and lignite. Experiments, made by Metivier showed that the distillation of 20 million tons of coal would yield 85 tons of benzene, 230,000 tons of heavy oils, and 446,000 tons of pitch, paraffine, and tar. As France's yearly consumption of petroleum will soon reach one million tons, it would thus be necessary to distill more than 20 million tons of coal, and in the second place, the metal industry would have to be developed so that the enormous quantities of coke produced in this process could be used up. But where is this immense quantity of coal to be obtained, a quantity representing more than two-thirds of the total production of the French and Saar mines? The asphalt beds in France are but meagre; the production of asphalt does not amount to more than 120,000 tons annually; on the other hand, there is lignite almost everywhere, especially in mountainous districts. These undeniably rich stores have scarcely been exploited as yet, and could be made to yield large amounts of fuel, es-

pecially as the production of benzene and heavy oils by the distillation of lignite at low temperatures has made great advances of late. But despite this, the future lies neither in the generation of "national carbon" nor in the distillation of lignite, but in the utilization of a store of coal large enough to cover the shortage of petroleum.

It is still too early to estimate the result of the chemical process discovered by Metivier, Sabatier, Maille, Ipatief, and Bergius. In the opinion of Professor Connerad this process may solve the problem of liquid fuel for Europe. The coal beds of Central Europe would then to a great extent replace the oil-fields of America. Such a change as this would give France a leading position, with regard to coal and petroleum, equal to that which she will possess with regard to iron and steel should she succeed in keeping her hold on the collieries of the Saar and Ruhr.

The scientific solution of the petroleum problem will be one of the great events of our generation, and will cause a complete industrial and political revolution in the world. The dominance of the great petroleum trusts will cease to be, and the struggle for the possession of the coal-fields will become more acute. The victorious return of Coal, to replace Petroleum which had already dethroned it, will rob the great Anglo-Saxon empires, now lords of fuel and ocean traffic, of their predominance. France, on the other hand, will gain all the possibilities of industrial and commercial expansion implied by ascendancy in the fuel question. It is thus easily comprehensible that the Ruhr area has become an even more valuable spoil than the oil-fields of Mosul and Mexico, and is the stake for which hostile imperialisms are prepared to embroil nations in the most frightful butcheries.—"Inprecorr"

Inevitable Change

DAVID Lloyd George now sees the handwriting on the wall and issues a warning to the British public. Thousands of the well-to-do people, he says, have considered the Socialist doctrine crazy and impossible, but now that the I. L. P. land programme is presented to the British House of Commons it must be taken more seriously. The Socialist agitator has had a long and painful path to travel and his method of administering the drastic dose to arouse the workers from their apathy has never been to the liking of the resentful. The more advanced types of units of past forms of society have suffered for their pains in striving to benefit mankind and in many cases with their life. Karl Marx, the founder of Socialism based his conclusions on the rock of observation and sound reasoning, and even today broadminded men recognize him, although sometimes with reluctance. Every stage in the development of the capitalist system from the time that the handcraftsman's tools were thrust into the arms of a big machine requiring great mechanical motive power to operate them; the bringing together of larger numbers of workers un-

der one roof, widening the division of labor, producing greater economy and cheapening commodities; trusts and big combines, eliminating small concerns and driving their operators into the ranks of the wage workers, have come just as outlined by Marx in 1848.

Lloyd George says that the larger portion of the British voting public have no property to seize, and is quite alarmed at the huge industrial population over the agricultural. Only 10 per cent of the British workers are engaged in cultivating the soil. The inculcation of the Socialist germ developed very rapidly in the minds of men and women engaged in factories, and workshop. The storm that now hovers over England may develop into a hurricane and unless something is done to avert the calamity Capitalism is doomed. Again, to use Lloyd George's words, "the greater the resistance the greater the rebound." This has been propounded by Socialists that to stem the tide of human progress could only end in disaster. The Feudal Lords blindly resisted the march of the rising capitalist, and even the Capitalists themselves were ignorant of the law that all

mankind must obey. Economic law in human society is a dynamic agent that explains the active lever of social change. A knowledge of this force provides the workers with the weapon that neither Lloyd George nor any scheme formulated can avert working class control of the means of production and distribution. A warning to the capitalist world only means a message to resist, and the greater the resistance the fiercer the hurricane. Capitalism came into the world dripping from head to foot with blood and dirt and it may be the blind resistance that will clothe it with the same garment in which it was born.

Lloyd George speaks of the shrewdness of the Socialists in the winning of the ex-service men's support by bringing their grievances before the House of Commons, knowing well the cause of the overthrow of their Italian brethren. Karl Marx says no new order can appear until conditions have developed within the womb of the old order. There was room within the womb of Italy for the Fascisti, but now that the elements composing Fascism are becom-

(Continued on page 8)

By the Way

TO a great degree, I attribute the demoralization within the working class movement, so far as the personal aspect of causation is concerned, to the presence of an uncritical romanticism in our theorizing on the problem of social change and to the destructive activities of undisciplined impulse. Partly, the romantic character of the theorizing may be traced to a faith in instinct (give them slogans) and to the vestigial remains in our materialist philosophy of an out-of-date Hegelianism which, in its day, imputed a spiritual quality to what modern science sees as merely the play of mechanical forces. These romantic elements of our thinking along with the frequent exhibitions of undisciplined impulse, I take to be signs of our immaturity. Now a mark of maturity in mental life is the habit of rigorous introspection and self-criticism. As we take on that habit, we shall have fewer illusions and more self-discipline; and although we can never avoid the shocks of experience, we shall meet them more steadily and without loss of morale. As we mature, we shall not be tardy in acknowledging mistakes but be eager to do so for the good of the movement.

* * * * *

It is easy to criticize, especially when faults are so glaring; though it is also a graceless task when they are so very human and therefore very common, so common that the critic must have the hardihood to say, "do as I say not as I practice." Criticism, then, is only justified as it is intended to enter into our lives as a factor of the environment influencing us for the better. It serves best when it is not only destructive but also suggests better standards of thought and conduct. The working class movement needs a better philosophy to rescue it from what is nothing less than demoralization. The reign of reason should be established as a restraining influence, as a moral discipline over the vagaries of irrational impulse so destructive of solidarity and productive of apathy. The active interest of the producing masses will be aroused, solidarity be achieved and control over circumstances established in degree as hard thinking on the social problem assisted by positive science disciplines us into a more single-minded interest in the good of the movement.

* * * * *

In these articles, according to my lights, I am trying to do my bit in bringing on the reign of reason in the movement, by continuing to suggest to the active elements that the social revolution is the task of the producing masses; that economic, political and educational activities are all necessary departmental activities; that the respective organizations should not be competing against each other for working class support, but should be looked upon as organs functioning in a mutual enterprise. Further, I am also suggesting that it is the beginning of wisdom to deal with that which confronts us in the present as our only means of control over the future. The future should not be looked upon as a distant goal but as something we are continually growing up into; and that, in dealing with the present, we should aim to establish changes that would become new cultural influences in the environment, creating and strengthening habits and mental dispositions which would in turn become levers for other changes in the environment—a process of interaction between man and his environment in which changes in both may be more continuous with each other than in the past. I am not such an optimist as to expect our various organizations to be so sensible as to issue proclamations and to reorganize to that effect. All I may hope to do is to throw a light on the movement from an angle which may help develop an appreciation of our respective functions and so lead to a better disposition, reducing the frictions amongst us.

* * * * *

On my way I shall now take a flying kick at the cataclysmic theory of social change, another of many socialist preconceptions needing one. The

theory pictures humanity in a state of inertia, existing so until, under an accumulation of social misery no longer bearable, a mass movement launches itself against the barriers to social betterment. The grounds of my animosity against this theory are several. Examining the concept, you will see that the thought of cataclysm involves also thinking of inertia—in nature, the rigid crust of earth; in society, the crust of custom. But we should never forget that written history is a description in dramatic form, unavoidably foreshortening to a few pages social changes that may have occurred over considerable time and of which the more catastrophic features have been more or less local. Then again, the magic of suggestion in words and phrases deceives. There is a large stock of terms and phrases evolved in war and military life and in describing the more impressive occurrences in nature which, when applied to the scene of political activity and social change, almost always, even with those conscious of the danger, retain a suggestiveness all their own, long recognized as the source of much error. If, then, we have to beware that our conception of a cataclysmic situation in society does not approximate too closely the sudden convulsive character of earth quakes, we have also to beware of society as existing in any such state as that of inertia.

It is true that established custom and institution may exist for long periods but that is because they are more or less flexible or adaptable. As changes in the material conditions of life bring on alterations in the standards of belief and knowledge, these in turn bring on changes in law and custom. Institutions may grow in strength and their influence extend, or their scope and influence may decline to the point of disuse; or, they may be thrown violently overboard, all as the changing needs of a community determine. Changes go on in law and custom and institution because man acts anyway, he can't help acting. Seen as a period in history, the movement in society may be one of conserving the present or of advancing or of going backward; and internal struggle more or less severe will accompany all of them, though the story of the struggle be lost to other generations. I think what we know of the ancient city civilizations of Asia proves that And if Carthage or Greece fell before a superior civilization in that of Rome it was because of Rome's superior capacity to organize human forces into a military imperialism. Rome finally fell after centuries of decline, weakened internally by social antagonisms and corruption and before the repeated assaults of the hosts of barbarism. Inertia anyway, never describes adequately the state of man.

* * * * *

To apply the term cataclysmic to the manner in which political and institutional changes have occurred in Europe since the fall of Rome, is to stretch the term beyond reasonableness, turbulent as has been European history. Most of this note I lift bodily from Beards "Economic Basis of Politics" and set it down here over against the theory of cataclysmic change:—

"Without any conscious design, but by the contribution of many forces and circumstances there evolved in the various states of Europe a representative system of 'estates' superseding the simple sword-won despotism of war leader, baron, prince or king. Sometimes it was the resistance of a particular economic group to royal despotism that won for it a recognised share in the government. An example of this is afforded by the contest which ended in the grant of Magna Charta. The barons wrote their interest in the public law of England, and secured it by obtaining the right of actual participation as a class in the control of Government. At other times kings, especially during wars of conquest, found themselves straitened for funds, and they called upon certain classes or groups to fill their treasury. Such, for instance, was the origin of the English House of Commons. To the continued financial necessity of the English kings, particularly during the long war with France, was due the extraordinary development of the English Parliament. Whatever the circumstances in each particular case, the strik-

ing fact is that we find all over Europe what Dr. Stubbs calls, 'National assemblies composed classes.'"

These classes were as follows, four in number: the clergy—(partly as a spiritual interest, in the main, as a body of landed proprietors) the baronage, the smaller landed gentry, and the burgesses of the towns. It is not, however, until our own days that all the commonalty of the realm find representation in the legislative chamber. Beard points out that,

"The term 'commons' does not derive its meaning as is often erroneously supposed from any connection with 'the common people.' On the contrary it comes from the vague word *communitas* which was used in the middle ages to describe a political organism such as a country or chartered town. The House of Commons therefore, was in reality the house of the *communitates*, composed of representatives of the gentry of the country and the burgeois of the towns considered as collective bodies within their respective geographical areas."

* * * * *

British political development has been far from cataclysmic. In the main it has been one of compromise, though carrying, as everywhere, whatever the method, much popular defeat. Violence from time to time, peasant revolts and a Cromwellian rebellion, but violence has not been universally the sole direct lever of change, nor as important a one as some believe. As to the future, he is a bold man who predicts. But it can be laid down that there is no particular outcome pre-ordained. In the Book of Fate the future is a blank page. I further suggest that the cataclysmic theory is nine-tenths psychological in those who hold it. It is not for nothing that it has in all ages been the pet theory of minorities. Witness the early Christians, submerged under the immovable bulk of Rome. The year 1000 was to see the end of that dispensation and the Son of God was to return in majesty to rule the world. In history the theory crops up again and again in many forms; it is, in fact, contemporaneous at all times with poor frustrated human nature. Like poetry is said to be, it is unrealized actuality realized in fancy.

The stressing of the part played by violence in history to the exclusion of other ways and means of change is a dangerous and irresponsible flattery of the bitter humour of those who feel their oppression strongly. By suggestion the problem of change is simplified for people who do not want to think, to the one method. It discourages the quest and trial of other ways and means; it discourages the effort to educate and create a massed public opinion; it discourages a day to day struggle and the study of immediate problems. Instinct is the thing, not Reason; and the ideal proletariat are sheep led by the "knowing" few—to be slaughtered by machine gun, bombing plane and poison gas. The days of the barricades are gone. Furthermore the ways and means, the technology of production and distribution of modern industrial and commercial communities is a delicately balanced, intricate mechanism of relation with all regions in the wide world, and the life of these communities has come to rest precariously but also absolutely on the maintenance of these relations. Therefore, so far the lessons of history fail because the technology of military power and the technology of economic processes in modern life are new and without example in previous history. So far, then, the present situation must be studied on its own merits because a collapse of economic life from whatever reasons would bring on turmoil and famine among millions, conditions least favorable for constructing a new order, and almost surely lead to generations of reaction. So far, then, in the face of the present situation as I can see it, the socialist, working for a better order, should not lay stress on the violence that has accompanied historical change to the exclusion of its other methods thus creating a disposition to look to violence. In fact, this social revolution, as others in the past have finally had to do however star-hitched their ideals, must make terms with the technological facts, the ways and means of productive life—now, or perhaps never. And to resign the cause to the one method of violence is to announce bankruptcy in morale and contriving intelligence.

The moral is, rest not your hopes in catastrophe and the reign of accident. At this day, look for other ways and means of change. "Man is a cultural being, culture breeds more culture; it invents the steam engine. The steam engine invents the steamboat and the steamboat invents the ocean liner. Arithmetic invents algebra and algebra invents the infinitesimals." We should "take the world as it is, including its capitalism, as a going concern and transform it, and in the transformation the new habits formed by the transformation itself have to be used as levers carrying through the further transformation." It is all in the attitude of mind. I look or try to look on politics as a branch of social engineering and the way of social change in the future as an engineering proposition.

Here let me outline my attitude to reforms, leaning heavily for form of statement on G. D. H. Cole—As a revolutionary socialist, while recognizing that there is a class of reforms that only touch effects, I also recognize that the present economic system does not want mending but it wants ending and the only attack that is worth making by a socialist is a direct attack on the foundations of the system itself. At the same time I can not forget the working class is the instrument of its own and society's emancipation from the present system and that the degradation of the workers would more and more unfit it for the task. Hence I recognize the necessity of the immediate struggle on the political as well as on the economic field.

"One who sees in reform only reform," (says Cole), "is one who has no coherent social philosophy and directs his attention to particular abuses and not to any fundamental change. The constructive revolutionary is as eager for reforms and partial changes but he refers all such proposed changes to a standard which is present in his mind! he is a doctrinaire who sees life steadily and sees it whole. The difference then between the social reformers and the constructive social revolutionary is not that one possesses an immediate policy and the other does not; but that in the one case the immediate policy is opportunistic and fragmentary, whereas in the other it is coherent and conscious, directed to a known end. The revolutionary, unlike the reformer, has a test which he can apply to all suggestions for reform. Will the proposed change, he asks, help society along the road to the ideal which he has in mind or will it retard its progress? If the answer is that the particular reform in question will retard the general progress of society towards the given ideal, the revolutionary will reject the reform, even if its immediate effects are likely to be in some sense ameliorative. The reformer on the other hand will accept it quite unconscious of its underlying implications and more distant effects."

I would re-adopt an old standing rule of the Party governing members in the legislature to the following effect—that after the Party member has analyzed the reform and shown its shortcomings from the revolutionary standpoint, he is then to ask himself this question: Is or is not this measure in the interest of the working class or a section of the workers? If his answer is in the affirmative he it to vote for it; if in the negative he is to vote against it.

Now follow my conception of the function of the Socialist Party and its position in relation to the working class movement: I realize the need for a doctrinaire Socialist Party. (The term "doctrinaire" has become almost synonymous with sectarianism. Readers will see, that, in my conception of the former term, as covering a special function related to other functions in a common enterprise, there is no compatibility between the two.)

Experience shows that neither theory nor principles can be applied in purity to the intractable material of life, neither in blacksmithing nor much less in politics, but since theories and principles are indispensable guides to successful action, the study of phenomena and the forming of theories and principles and the expounding of them falls naturally into a special departmental activity. It is a subdivision of labors, through which activity becomes more efficient, that lies between the man of theory and the man of practice and not any fundamental antagonism. They are complementary to each other, even if they are not often complimentary.

A doctrinaire Socialist Party would then be the

expression in theory and principle of the social revolution, a guide to the working class in creating a new order. As an educational organization, it should bring to the workers the knowledge of science as well as a knowledge of the principles of revolutionary socialist thought. Let me point out that education is in its essence, functional. It is a case of the creation of a special environment under which, through better understanding, we can more efficiently change the conditions of social life.

Such a party on the political field should not advocate an immediate program. It should hold up the ultimate economic program of the revolution: Labor off the market and Social control over economic powers. Its function in the country should be that of its members in the legislature as I lay it down in the standing rule quoted,—to criticise all immediate reforms with the aim of forwarding the political intelligence of the masses.

Objections are being raised to these non-conformist notes, so I do not know whether these or any more will be published, but my next were to deal with the constitution of a Labor Party, representative of the broad masses, and with the State institution.

Lestor Explains

ASPECTOR has been haunting Vancouver, and the forces of capitalism have been shaken to their foundations. The phantom has now departed and the master class breathe more freely. It happened in this wise. I was holding forth at the corner of Carrall and Cordova, and in answer to a question re Soviet Russia I forgot to call upon the audience to cheer three times. I even neglected to cross myself twice. The Spector, however, appeared, and in awe inspiring tones demanded the box. He severely reprimanded me and told the crowd weird and wonderful things about the land of the Moscovite. Miracles that would cause Dr. Price to blush with envy and swallow his false teeth with vexation were happening there every day. He himself had seen them. The crowd refused to believe it and after yelling frantically for Soviet Russia and the Third International the phantom departed. The next night Underground Bill with the Ghost by his side appeared in the crowd and asked for the rostrum. He assumed the pose of Ajax defying the lightning, and in the thundering tones of a Soviet Ambassador delivered the following written challenge to me:

May 9th, 1923.

Dear Com. Lestor:

On behalf of the Vancouver Branch of the Workers' Party of Canada, Maurice Spector of Toronto, hereby challenges you to make good your opposition to the Third International and your attitude to Soviet Russia by upholding the negative in a debate on the following subject, to be held Sunday night at 8 p.m. in the Columbia Theatre.

"Resolved the aims and policies of the Communist International express the real needs and interests of the international working class."

Wm. BATES.

Vancouver English Branch Organizer.

We pointed out that on Sunday the S. P. of C. meeting would be held, and that we could not neglect our own little love feast for the benefit of the Wire Pullers. We asked them to confer with our seconds and arrange a gab fest in the usual way, but all to no purpose. The spook commanded me to appear and take the side of the debate he had chosen for me without any regard to our views on the matter. Next day after an altercation with the phantom I asked for a properly arranged affair, but no, I was commanded in the name of the Revolution to appear on their platform and listen forty minutes to a bawling out or be forever ostracised by the Distractors of the proletariat. I went to the Socialist headquarters and discovered the boys engaged in the revolutionary task of playing cards. I asked their advice. It was laconic: "Tell 'em to go to hell." The next day the putrid press of the W. P. discharged its filthy waters and I was assigned a position in the movement that no sane man would willingly occupy. I was called upon to defend this position. That

settled it. The fateful evening arrived. The ghostly hero was on the stage resplendent in Soviet glory, but the villain didn't appear. He was never expected. There wasn't even a chair for him on the platform. By all accounts vituperation and slander were poured in torrents on the villain's head and on the heads of his associates, and at the end of the farce the hoaxed audience was induced to vote for the following resolution, carefully prepared beforehand:

Resolved: "That this mass meeting of Vancouver workers at the Columbia Theatre, Sunday 13th May, 1923, taking cognisance of the fact that whereas Charles Lestor, of the S. P. of C., was duly challenged to debate to-night with M. Spector of the Workers' Party of Canada, on the aims and policies of the Third Communist International, and whereas Charles Lestor refused to meet the challenger, this meeting expresses its solidarity with the position of the Communist International as outlined by M. Spector, and condemns C. Lestor for his failure to appear to substantiate his propaganda, which is hostile to the Third International and detrimental to Soviet Russia and the Labor movement in general. And further resolves that a copy of this resolution be sent for publication to the B. C. Federationist, the "Worker," Toronto, and the "Western Clarion."

Carried with two dissenting voices.

JAS. HULLIDAY.

Carlyle said there were thirty millions in England, mostly fools. There are possibly twenty thousand proletarians in Vancouver, and those at the Arena listening to Dr. Price, and those at the Columbia Theatre on Sunday, May 13th, share the honor between them. The tactics of those who yell about the united front are like the tactics of Dr. Price, the advertising stunts of fakirs. He uses the cloak of religion to gull the public, and the wreckers party achieve the same end under the cloak of revolution.

The phantom has vanished.

I am still holding forth at the corner.

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.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

EVERY SUNDAY

STAR THEATRE, 300 Block, Main Street

JUNE 3rd.

Speaker: W. A. PRITCHARD

All meetings at 8 p.m.

Questions.

Discussion.

Western Clarion

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

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

Editor.....Ewen MacLeod

SUBSCRIPTION:

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

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

VANCOUVER, B. C., JUNE 1, 1923.

Clarion "Mail Bag"

THE Mail Bag opens this time at Nova Scotia, with some monetary encouragement and a word of appreciation from Charlie MacDonald. He asks "Why not make a drive for cash?" Wonder what we've been doing all this time anyway. If anybody should by chance read this we hope he will consider it a drive for cash, especially if he has any.

We have subs from N. B., points in Ontario and in Manitoba. Comrade Glendenning, of Winnipeg, increases the "Clarion" bundle order a little. Outdoor meetings have commenced for the summer season in Victoria Park.

Brief notes from Saskatchewan, various places. Likewise places all over Alberta: Vulcan, Travers, Nordegg, Castor, Tofield, Calgary, Wimborne, Seven Persons, Stanmore, Markerville, Botha, Meeting Creek, and Edmonton. Concerning the interest of women readers recently displayed in the "Clarion" Comrade Mrs. Hollingshead writes to say she will forward the record of an address she made in Calgary touching on the woman's viewpoint, which should interest "Clarion" readers. From Stanmore, S. V. Valisco informs us that some time in June the comrades in and around that neighborhood will hold a picnic, with all the Reds on earth welcome. There will be sports held, Socialist literature being given as prizes, refreshments will be on hand, speeches will not be forbidden and general enjoyment is the general expectation. The exact date is not yet decided upon but the assembly place will be Westover School, officially and properly described as Sec. 27, T.31, R. 11, W4th M. 7m. north town of Stanmore. Farmers and others in the surrounding district are charged with the ability to find their way there; all that is missing now is the date of the picnic. Write S. V. Valisco, P. O., Stanmore, Alberta.

Comrade John Beckman of Meeting Creek, writes facetiously of the influence of the weather on Mr. Farmer's mind. He says "C" would be put to it to find an even current of philosophy in rural life governed by credit finance, Jack Frost and associates, and passes some scathing strictures on philosophers in general. Worst of it is, the philosophers don't mind a bit—they keep on perpetrating the offences, and they are able to endure abuse almost as well as they deserve it.

A lengthy letter from Edmonton arrives minus a signature. Letters are better looking with a signature. We like to know who it is thinks so well of us. Write again.

Letters and notes from points in B. C.,—Port Haney, Shames, G. T. P., Lund, Graham Island, Jackson Bay, Cumberland, Prince Rupert, Kamloops, Sandon, Quesnel and Queensborough.

Many letters from points outside Canada. Subs.

from John A. McDonald, Frisco; L. Schlemmer, Rochester; A. R. Pearson, N. Y., E. Burke, Oakland, F. Shaw, Los Angeles; C. Killeen, New Zealand; R. Corbett, New Zealand; D. Aloise, Butte, Montana; P. Wall, Chicago; N. MacAulay, Frisco. Comrade Alex. Shepherd writes from somewhere in the U. S., in search of a job. We thought you had gone on the wander six weeks ago Alex., but we'll expect a note of your address as soon as you get one, likewise "Sandy."

Winnipeg old-timers will be sorry to learn of the death of Comrade Robert A. Walker, who died in Ruskin, Florida, March 2nd. Mrs. Walker asks that the Winnipeg comrades be informed of her husband's death.

From Seattle we learn that the S. L. P. there have about 30 members, but hold no meetings other than business meetings. The S. P. of A. have about 25 members. They hire a room once a month for business meeting purposes. No other meetings held. The Workers' Party have about 40 members. They hold no propaganda meetings. The most active organization industrially or politically among workers is the I. W. W. So apparently the prevailing apathy has not escaped. Seattle.

This is a brief survey of the "Mail Bag" up to 29th May.

Looking Backward

KARL RADEK in the "Communist Review" produces an excerpt from Lloyd George's secret memorandum to the Big Four of the Versailles Conference, March 1919. We reproduce the excerpt here as of interest, showing how the temper of the masses was judged by the rulers of society at that time:—

"Europe is full of revolutionary thought. A deep feeling, not of ill-humour, but of fury and rebelliousness, lives in the breast of the working class against the conditions of life brought by the war. All the present-day arrangements, political, economic and social, are looked at askance by the people in Europe. In some countries, as in Russia, this unrest is pressing forward to open revolt; and in other countries, in France, England and Italy, this feeling makes itself felt in strikes and in a certain unwillingness to work; all signs are that they are as much concerned about political and social changes as about increases in wages.

A good part of this unrest is to be gladly welcomed; we shall never attain an enduring peace if we have as our goal the creating of the same conditions of life as those that existed in 1914. By doing that we only run the danger of driving the mass of the European population into the arms of the extremists, whose sole idea, with regard to a rebirth of humanity, consists in their desire to see the exploiting social order permanently destroyed. In Russia these people have gained the upper hand. But the price for this victory was terrible. Hundreds of thousands of its inhabitants no longer exist. Railways, cities, the entire State structure of Russia is almost completely destroyed; however, in many respects they succeeded in keeping the mass of the Russian people in hand, and, which is still more significant, they have succeeded in organising a great army which is apparently well led, and held in good discipline and which, for the most part, is ready to sacrifice its life for its ideals. If we allow a year to go by, Russia, imbued with a new spirit, will have forgotten its need for peace, because it has at its disposal the only army having confidence in the ideals for which it will fight.

The danger I perceive in the present situation lies in the fact that Germany would be able to place her fate in the hands of the Bolsheviks, to place her

riches and wealth, her spirit, her marvellous powers of organisation at the disposal of these revolutionary fanatics who dream of conquering the world for Bolshevism, and this, be it added, by the means of armed forces. This danger is no empty phantom. The present German Government is weak; it commands no respect; its departure means the calling forth of Spartacism, for which Germany is not yet ripe. But the argument which the Spartacists know how to employ, and which never fails to succeed, is the argument that they alone are capable of freeing Germany from the insupportable condition forced upon her by the war. They want to free Germany from all her obligations to the Allies, from all her obligations to her own wealthy classes. They offer the Germans permanent control of their own affair, they open up to them the prospect of paradise, of a better world. Of course, the price would be high. For two or three years chaos, perhaps bloodshed, would be the order of the day, but at the end the land would have been retained, its man power, the majority of the houses, the factories, railways; and Germany, freed of her oppressors would be able to go forward to a new era.

If Germany should yield to Spartacism, there is no preventing her closely uniting her fate with that of the Russian Bolsheviks. If this were to happen, the whole of East Europe would be thrown into the whirlpool of the Bolshevik revolution, and in the course of a year we would find ourselves facing over three hundred million human beings who would be schooled and drilled into a gigantic Red Army by German generals, by German instructors, equipped with German artillery, with German machine-guns, ready at any moment to renew the attack upon West Europe. No one can look forward to this prospect with indifference. The news received from Hungary only yesterday proves plainly enough that this danger is no mere phantasy of the imagination. What are the reasons for this great decision? Fear it was, stark fear that a great part of Hungary would be placed under foreign rule. If we were clever we would offer Germany a peace which, because of its justness, would draw away all rational men from Bolshevism.

HERE AND NOW.

IT begins to dawn upon us that "Clarion" readers are all broke, together with all their acquaintances. We are asked by one bright youth who has been reading the Family Journal some fifteen years why we don't make a drive for cash.

How is it done? We need cash. The problem is, how to get it. A "drive" is suggested. We thought we had been "driving." Apparently not (which is good news, and encourages further hope). So we are to find out how to "drive." Suggestions, advices, instructions, pointers, etc., are all in order and will be welcomed as per results. Almost any result could wash out the figures below:—

Following, \$1 each—Walter Wilson, Robt Gill, C. A. Smith, C. F. Orchard, C. L. Sallstrom, Wm. Braes, A. E. Cotton, A. B. Chambers, J. T. Sinceton, R. Marshall, D. O'Dwyer, F. C., R. Dickinson, J. Lavery, J. H. Reed, D. MacPherson, Norman MacAulay, J. F. K., W. T. Moore, B. D. Huntly, A. R. Snowball.

Following, \$2 each—A. McLennan, J. Harrington, S. Rose, Sid Earp, John Nelson, J. A. Beckman, Wm. Seyer, R. Sinclair, J. A. McDonald.

R. Schlemmer, \$1.50; H. Webster, \$1.50; J. Pollock, \$3; R. Corbett, \$3; Chas. MacDonald, \$3; C. Killeen, \$4.05; J. E. Lindberg, \$4.

Above, Clarion subscriptions from 11th to 29th inclusive—total, \$59.05.

CLARION MAINTENANCE FUND

Following \$1 each—Wm. Braes, Wellwisher, A. J. Beeny, S. Rose, John Nelson, Harry Grand, B. D. Huntly.

F. Shaw, \$2; J. Stephenson, \$2; Patrick Wall, \$2; J. E. Lindberg, \$6.

Above, C. M. F. receipts from 11th to 29th May, inclusive—total, \$19.

Concerning the United Front

IN a perfectly logical way, the writer in the leading article of the "Clarion" for May 1st, concerning the theory of "The United Front" advocated in labor circles, sums up his argument as follows:

"Thus the appeal of the United Front loses potency as a material reality.

We cannot force diverse purpose into the firm unity of common aim; we must first 'want' the object of our activities."

Precisely so.

No fact was ever more patent; and I venture to add the paradoxical truth, that never in the history of the world was the whole human race potentially so close to a realization of this ideal—that is, to a "common objective in the struggle for existence."

True, the world is divided to-day into factors representing every shade of political and economical thought—the supposed preludes to panaceal legislation from a proletarian viewpoint, we find that the originated; nevertheless, on looking over the situation from a proletarian viewpoint, we find that the circumstances surrounding the political life of this planet, were never before so auspicious.

There is, of course, no certainty as to how events may shape themselves in the future; but we may well ask what would happen if the colossal experiment in government peculiar to the "Soviet-World Republic," as she was pleased to call herself in New Year's Day last, should prove a success? What would happen in case Russia came out victorious from her gloriously epoch-making ordeal?

Suppose she succeeded in demonstrating that "Production for Use" offers the only basis for a rational disposition of our manufactured goods—Suppose in ten years from now, she stood before the eyes of the world as a nation of superior men and women.

Does anyone doubt that the great object of the desire of the peoples of the world, would then be to achieve like results at the earliest possible date?

The race would then be in a position, as "R" expresses it "to force diverse purpose into the firm unity of a common aim." It would "want," that is "desire to have" the object of its activities.

The "Russian World Republic" has so far, proved invincible.

Is it not quite possible for her to continue so, until her people acquire the culture that will give permanence to their condition?

She is not likely to be defeated from the outside, since ethically considered, she stands beyond comparison, above all the nations of the earth: moreover her large battalions, are made up of men, strong with faith in their purpose.

"Right gives way to Might" they say; but here Might and Right are inextricably woven together.

Nevertheless there still remains the terrible danger (not only for Russia, but for the whole world) of destruction from within.

It is here that comrade "R's" logic may well be applied as a criterion.

Will the Russian, under all circumstances, continue to "want" the object of their activities?

Their fervent desire to develop, and bring into being the justest government the world has ever known, is founded on faith in the ability of the greatest tacticians known to history, to bring about the materialization of the great ideal of Socialism.

Let us consider, for a moment, the possibilities of the situation.

If, for instance, they should succeed in establishing the ideals embodied in the principles of:

Equality of Opportunity.

Democratic Administration in Government, and

Real Liberty in Thought and Action.

If they could maintain these, by means of what then would be, the strongest government on earth—supported as it would be by "Free strong minds, and hearts of health."

If such an international protagonist should stand on guard over the blazing torch of truth that shone, meteor-like, across the firmament.

If the time should arrive when these ideals were accomplished facts—and it is quite within the range of possibility that it will,—It would then be hard to imagine that "There breathed a man, with soul so dead. Whose spirit to himself hath (NOT) said" This surely must be the model after which I shall fashion the institutions of my beloved Fatherland.

Too long has it:

"Languished in subjection.

Equality has other laws

'No rights' says she without their duties

No claim on equals without cause."

Could men, once having seen an object lesson in methods of government, founded on freedom and its incidentals, ever relapse into the Feudal restrictions of the middle ages?

It would not be a very far-fetched surmise to say that this could hardly be possible, and that the whole world would actually "want" the object of its political activities or as Sir Walter Scott might have expressed it—The World would not be any longer content with "glozing" words.

And, in the meantime, is the "United Front" advocated so fervently by enthusiastic labourites, to be despised?

On the contrary, in view of the possibilities of the future, it would appear to be an urgent necessity.

There could be no single circumstance more profoundly important to Humanity than that provisions were made for the reception, at the proper time, of the message handed down by the Great Soviet World Republic, giving details of the mechanism of a government for the people, and by the people—a government unshackled by the rivalries that nurture the germs of disastrous war, and one that embodies in its materialization, a promise identical with that laid down in the "Good Book".

"The sword shall be turned into a pruning-hook, and the lion shall lie down with the lamb."

It is only, by means of a united front that the opportunity can be grasped at the psychological moment.

"Time and tide wait for no man," and in its onward course, the development of industry is equally inexorable.

F. W. MOORE.

AS TO THE U. F.

THERE is one paragraph in Com. Moore's criticism with which we agree—the last. The rest of it is dubiously mixed. In its final conclusions it appears in disagreement with the attitude of the article it criticises. It is, however, in agreement on the presentation of the actual facts of today. That admitted—and if it be true—it goes far to weaken his conclusion. For if unity is a product of a better social understanding, the attempt to organize the misunderstanding present, to meet either the "urgent necessities" of the hour or the uncertainties of a vague future, is a vain effort. And it puts the substance of the matter in reverse.

We do not propose to follow its apostrophes of supposition. The kindly light of one step is enough for one day. We do not know what the detailed conformations of future society may be; nor their particular effects on the human race; nor the possibly startling surprises of their reactions. In the darkness of the present, the struggles of the present is problem enough. The future is but a vast space, peopled with the more or less shadowy figures of our optimism—or our forebodings. And at that we leave it.

It may be that society stands close to a common objective. But, we are loath to say we do not see it, and but little evidence to support it. True, the divisions and confusions of modern thought and

activity predicate a dying society. They are the baffled efforts no longer in tune with the class hardened institutions through which and with which they must achieve satisfaction. They presage the birth of a new order of society yet formless in the darkness of necessary development. But they also presage—and perhaps of necessity—a grim struggle for the triumph of the one sovereignty that is to forge their diversity into social unity; that is to break up the distorted interests of individual endeavor and remold them on the new foundation of economic freedom. They are the evidences of a society "battered by the shocks of doom," battling amidst a multiplicity of unformed aspirations, un sanguine hopes, and aborted toil; half or wholly unconscious of their significance and bewildered in the wonderment of their "mysterious" complexities, to reclothe the halted forces of progress with the new concepts and idealisms of unfolding reality. Those forces, like the frosts of winter, by their own expansion will crack and shatter their confining restraints, and urge on, in new channels and spheres the undying motive of progress and achievement. But their incarnation, through whatever agencies of consummation, are dependent, both in form and time, not merely on local and exotic "up surges of revolution" but on the dynamic circumstances of variable development, and the indigenous constitution of historic totality. It is not one nation, or one factor, one policy or one aim, one culture or one ideal. It is the revolution of reality comprising all, and requiring all for its purpose. It is an entirely new society, and demands the effort of all society. It is the necessity of an international society, cast in the bondage of political capital, reduced, in all its major and important realities to the lowly status of an international proletariat.

The struggles we see going on around us are but the incipient efforts of the struggle for dominion. For dominion over the social means of life. They are the opening "exchange of courtesies," not by any means the closing stages. Revolution is not quite so uneventful as that, nor the reality of life so irresponsible. Expectantly to watch the struggle in Russia is not revolution. To cry spectacularly "to horse," is not revolution. The first is but temporising with time; the second with folly. And the fact that society in general, and masses of the proletariat in particular repudiate its principles (of extremism) and discount its objective (of communism) is argument, bristling with the spears of fact, that the social conditions are not nearly ripe enough to organize a revolutionary change. And it shows incidentally, how little can be expected from any example of objectivity so long as society is choliformed with class ethic, breathes the thin air of possession and is sublimely unconscious of its slavery.

Soviet Russia can neither bring us revolution nor socialism. Nor bring us to them. And if it could we would probably cart them away—being ignorant of their value. Russia is but an episode in the revolution. If we want revolution we must pursue it for ourselves. If we want socialism we must achieve it for ourselves. And we must know how. We must actively participate in movements; but participate conscious of its objective, cognisant of our social status, understanding the nature and function of the state; knowing we have nothing to lose but our chains. We must not only just want the object of our activities; we must want it with the keen vim of wakerife necessity. Else we are apt to be turned away by the gaudy wares at the political bargain counter.

It may be very inspiring to hail Russia as the "Soviet World Republic." And pleasing to the rugged heart of poverty to think of it in success. But—O but—although Russia is a Soviet Republic, she is not a Soviet World Republic. Nor will she be—nor can she be—until the proletariat of the industrially developed nations of the West perceive

(Continued on page 6)

CONCERNING THE "UNITED FRONT."

(Continued from page 5)

the thimble rigging of capitalist democracy and join issue directly with their masters for the control of the means of life.

Whether the Soviet Republic will remain as it is now is for the future to decide. In Soviet circles it is maintained that it will; that its present position is equal to meet the aggressions of capital. And certainly all but its capitalist enemies hope for its success and final triumph. Still that is but hope; and it calls for more than hope to foil the deadly duplicity of counter revolution. We know that the Soviet Government was not able to retain its original likeness and intention—for very obvious reasons—now—; and if what our comrade says is true, that it is founded on the idea of the justest government and faith in the ability of its tacticians to bring about Socialism, then, not only is the Soviet World Republic a phantasy, but the Soviet Government itself maintains but a precarious existence. Faith will never put vertebrae into the back of slavery; nor will justice ever vanquish the human nature of capitalist society. Knowledge and understanding can alone beget its progeny of freedom and culture. Knowledge of the facts of social life, knowledge of the associations that compel its answering movement; knowledge of the cause of its inexorable necessities, derived from the tragedies of daily experience and demonstrated in the deepening chaos of failure. That is what brought the Soviet into being and invested it with power; that is what held it staunch and firm against the assaults of ravening capital; and that is what constitutes its security in the future stress of developing revolution.

On the matter of "production for use" Russia never did—and does not now stand on such a basis. Nor is likely to for a considerable time. In the organised commercialism of international capital, Russia, like other nations, produces of necessity under the conditions of the social organisation. Not under her own special organisation. In an international world she cannot live and flourish alone. Nor would she be allowed to. The capitalist world has need of her people, her energy, her resources; and to match and over-match the encroachments and policies of capitalist necessity she must fight with the weapons of Capital—choosing however, to a certain extent, her own ground; and wary but confident, with complete comprehension of the game that is being played. She is—and that is why she is—seeking trade, permitting profit, granting concessions, making contracts, feigning alliances and compromising with conciliation. All for the development of her vast resources and in order to hold and maintain and further the dominance of the Soviet Government. She must trade with Capitalist nations, and compute in terms of Capitalist majorities, and acquire technology by more or less wide latitudes of communist principle. The cumulate effect of those conditions produced the N. E. P. and the N. E. P. anchors the Soviet in the shallow waters of its communist objective. And being limited by this necessity and partly languishing in its petty, niggard, and uninspiring quota of material, the flourishing growth and development of superior culture and attainments, if not actually thwarted and denied is checked and restricted in the weariness of circumstantial impositions.

Finally, we don't despise the U. F. We would—we would with all the fervor of long anticipation—that it were here, that it could be devised. But we say that it is not to be fabricated, that it is not the product of rational argument or logical (ratio cinative) deduction. That it will not be accepted until developing conditions, weakening and destroying our ameliorative organisations or making them inoperative in the advancement of machine production and Imperialist amalgamations, and breaking up our illusive hopes, pinned on chameleon side issues and nurtured on the manna of idealist coalitions (political and non-political); until the fateful conditions of contemporary experience, through the failure and disappointments and suppressions and prohibitions of its political forms and institu-

tions, to satisfy social necessity, have been unmistakably demonstrated in their own absurdities and antagonisms, and forced home on a social intelligence, ruddy ripe for its reception and fanned by the white fires of conviction; conscious in the failure of disunited efforts, of the necessity of unity, and wifful of its significance. Not, we say, until then can unity be a living reality.

Society is never "in a position" to force diverse purpose into firm unity. It can but express the red wine of material conditions; and express it in terms and circumstances of contemporary development. It can neither revive the spirit of the past, nor anticipate the formularies of the future. Its debt to the past is to understand it; its service to the future is to understand itself. Ultimately, it must. And it is the way of the "must," foredoomed in cosmic necessity, but unknown, in human exigency, which alone concerns us.

The various conditions and changing interests of life, in its composite entirety, produce concepts, ideas and activities, charged with the heritage of their causes. In capitalist society, all of those interests (and their appendages) struggle individualistically, struggle for their own specific advantage. Capitalist society is an unsocial society, a society for private benefit. Consequently, like all political societies it is fundamentally inimical and finally disruptive of the society of humanity; the society, i.e., for social preservation and progress. Yet as political society, in its inception and early growth, favored the development of social preservation and progress, it came to power and dominion; and now in its developed cycle of maturity it holds that power not by the mere assemblage of force and repression, but by the spirit and substance of the reality which that force represents,—traditions of new discoveries and inventions, of their newly found freedom and opportunities, the ideological inheritance of their passion, the developed ethic of class culture camouflaged by the virtues of necessity, the stringencies of need, schooled in the initiative of individualism, by the panoramic influences of its ever changing economic constitution—or its functioning.

Those influences and interests, "good" in the sight of their original generations, become "bad" in the sight of the developed creations of progress. "Good" in the first case because they served the fluxing needs of an economically freer and more independent society; "bad" in the second case because they have finally unfolded their inherent antagonisms and basic contradictions, and serve—the mead of their intention—a class or a corporation. But their ideological contents and their old political forms and associations linger on, mingling inextricably with the new concepts of modern practice, and confusing the collectively simple, unphilosophic, and conservative mind of society by their bewildering appeal, in the strange terminology of unfamiliar conventions, to unknown gods.

It is the weighty inertia of all those forces and influences which stay and hinder the concept of revolution in the minds of the mass, while at the same time, economic development, gaining momentum by its own progress far outstrips its old political company and builds up its own vastly different cultural appreciations. Thus it is that, although the economic process ravages the life of society and devours its substance, driving it, with the whip of want through the dire waters of despair, society, its yet untutored mind, slow to innovation, reacts to the forward pressure of economic development by a backward appeal to the congenial days of its social youth. That is why on the one hand there is a gathering insistence for reform and redress, and "policies of independence," on the other a steady push for revolutionary ideals. That is why the former, misinterpreting the signs of the times, is impatient for the last issue, and why the latter, knowing, patiently abides the shock,—and works for the enlightenment of—discovered necessity. That is why we must wait the destruction of old illusions by the conflicting forces of society, as the prelude to the advent of unity. That is why there is—and can be—no scheme of social practice. Because there is no definite knowledge and data of the material conditions obtaining in the days when society discovers

reality. And that is why, the most profoundly important provision to humanity, is the clear and indubitable understanding of social organization and its inevitable consorts of class status and disabilities. For knowing the reality of that organisation and its developed implications, society will be equipped, with the modern armory of preparedness, to cope with whatever situations may arise in the great epic of emancipation. R.

That "Slap at DeLeon"

AN editorial reply to a San Francisco correspondent appears in the N. Y. "Weekly People" of April 7th, with reference to the recent remarks in our Clarion about DeLeon and Money. The editor states that DeLeon did not totally deny that money is a commodity, but only denied a commodity character to money as means of payment—"legal tender" and "fiat money" of less than its government-stamped face value—and that, viewed from a gold standpoint and as medium of exchange, money is a commodity. That is perfectly true. But as the criticism arose from a statement by the author of "Banks and Banking" that "money cannot be loaned nor wheat sold profitably below cost" our remarks, which did not trouble to particularise, had reference to this special (banker's) use of money, mainly provided as a means of payment. The classifying of loaned money with the true commodity wheat, by a practical banker, proved it to have been wrong on DeLeon's part, to sweepingly deny to the former, a commodity character.

A further quotation from the booklet again condemns DeLeon's attitude:—"Why, it may be asked, can the wholesale merchant in the large cities in all the provinces get money from the banks at 6 per cent while the farmer borrowing from a bank in a western country village has to pay 8 per cent? The answer is that on a large turnover, costs of operations are relatively lower. The unavoidable overhead expenses of a branch bank in a sparsely settled area are very heavy in proportion to the volume of business that the community affords." In the town where the undersigned lives, there were five branch competing banks; but one of them recently, owing to lack of demand for its "commodities," and just like any store, was compelled to close down.

Long before Dietzgen or McMillan ever wrote against such De Leonistic absolutism, it was being taught in logic text books that "of contrary propositions, both cannot be true; and **both may be false.**" That means that if someone says, "All men are liars" and his opponent retorts, "No men are liars," both statements cannot be correct; and yet **neither of them** may be right. The truth will probably lie in a middle position; such as we find in thousands of similar cases, including many biological and economic examples.

Equally mistaken is the "People" editor in affirming that our side-step "slap at DeLeon" was intended to discourage our readers from consulting his works. The writer is still, and has been for twenty years, a subscriber to the "People" and yields to none in his high estimation of DeLeon. But our friends in the "land of the free" to the south of us, are somewhat inclined to exaggerated hero and heroine worship; a la Christian Scientists towards their Mary Baker Eddy. So "Progress" merely felt it his duty to put a wee spoke in a big, big wheel, so as to give the unwary a fair chance to clear out of the way before it ran over—their little toe!

"PROGRESS"

Revolutions: Political and Social

BY J. HARRINGTON

Article 6.

GERMANY was not a hermit empire such as Austria was in 1848. Already she had taken her place in the front of the intellectual trek which marked this period in Western Europe. Von Baer had published his work on embryology; Rathke and Bischoff had followed his lead, while chemistry and botany were also being wrought into a scientific system, from which the rest of the world was soon to seek assistance.

The Paris revolution had, therefore, as Marx points out, a different effect on Germany than on Austria. In the first place it supplanted the very form of government which the German bourgeoisie aspired to. In the second, its full significance was realized from the first,—the voice of the masses was heard at first hand, and not relayed by a notorious liar. Already the King had made several concessions in regard to press and speech before the Vienna revolution, and organizations for the relief of the needy were active, so that the intense misery prevalent in Vienna was not evident in Berlin.

In Vienna the revolution had appeared with the students movement. In Germany the working masses took the initiative. And in order that this movement might be kept in hand, the bourgeois assemblies undertook to present the various petitions which were constantly being drawn up. These petitions had more vigor and independence than the Austrian, but they too were merely seeking very simple remedies and did not betray any revolutionary spirit.

The day on which Metternich was smuggled out of Vienna in a basket of dirty linen, the King of Prussia rejected one of these humble demands. And the crowd which gathered to hear the news was fired upon; barricades were immediately thrown up and manned by the workers, on the next day, March 14, came news of the Vienna success, and simultaneously the uprising of the eastern provinces. The King now consented to the demands lately made, but revolutionary appetites increase with success, and what might satisfy one day merely aggravates the next. New petitions were presented to the King on the 18th, and he requested the deputies to return to their homes. An account of the many concessions which had already been made was being read to the crowd, when, without warning, they were fired on again. So that at the very moment the bourgeoisie were congratulating the King and themselves upon the happy conclusion of a five days riot, the very thing they dreaded and sought by all means to avoid, happened. After the first shots the crowd dispersed, but at once commenced to erect the well-known barricades; the countryside sent reinforcements and on the 19th the masses were ready for battle, when again the issue was settled by a regiment which had been brought in over night refusing to fire on the people.

The King surrendered, dismissed the ministry, conceded everything, stood abject and bareheaded while the funeral of the barricade dead passed, and otherwise acted like a powerful potentate must act when his power is gone. Meanwhile, outside the great centre the revolution continued; the Rhine provinces, Bohemia, Bavaria, Saxony, all had maintained a vigorous agitation for reforms, and the Paris revolution, followed quickly by Vienna and Berlin, carried them far beyond even their wildest demands, which were largely for a united Germany. In Saxony the Paris affair called forth immediate action. As soon as the news arrived at Liepzig the Town Council was called, to anticipate the "anarchist element" of course, and the usual petition was drawn up: Freedom of speech and press, and a German Elective Assembly. This was dispatched to Dresden on March 1st, three days after Louis Philippe arrived in England; proclamations called the

citizens to assemble on the 3rd to hear the deputies' report.

Robert Blum, a Liepzig bookseller, who had taken a prominent part in the agitation which had arisen over the Jesuits, the censorship, and the dismissal of some university professors and some priests a few years previous, and who had suffered imprisonment at that time, now became the leader of the Saxony movement. The deputies commenced their report by describing the kindly attitude of the King, when the crowd which had collected in the narrow streets clamored for Blum. Upon his appearance the crowd became more orderly; he was just as unwilling as the other speakers to inform them bluntly of the failure they had to report. The uproar broke out once more and high above all other cries, ultimately drowning out all others arose the cry: "The answer!" By this time, however, the answer was well understood, and Blum succeeded in turning the anger of the crowd into enthusiasm, which determined to press the demands still further. The immediate dismissal of the ministry, the immediate calling together of the German Assembly. Could an enraged people possibly ask less?

The pressure being maintained, the King finally appeared to yield, when on March 11th a strong force of soldiery appeared in Liepzig, to maintain order. Blum replied to the demands made upon the Town Council that bullets could kill men but were powerless against ideas, which really ruled the world.

But events were travelling fast, and on the fatal 13th the King thought enough evil was abroad and granted all Saxony had demanded. Everyone awaited the inevitable reaction, when the events in Vienna and Berlin carried these results into safe channels and urged their authors to still more daring demands.

Let us return then, to the revolution at large, leaving the other small centres for a brief mention in the general reaction.

The nice quiet little revolution which the bourgeoisie had planned, wherein the King was to be taken to the edge of the abyss, and they were to request him to fall down and worship them, got out of hand, and they found themselves face to face with the armed masses. So Marx tells us that "The king chapfallen in the highest degree after the revolution of the 18th March very soon found out that he was quite as necessary to these 'liberal' ministers as they were to him." The dread of the armed masses therefor threw all classes above the workers into one camp. The workers on the other hand had not yet matured that distinct class concept which would enable them to press further demands than those which would give them scope and freedom to move. Under the restriction of the pre-revolutionary days they found every desire and demand cribbed by the governmental forms. The organizations they belonged to were forbidden to carry on projects which promised betterment of their condition; sentiments expressed by tongue or pen arising from the irritations caused by their condition in life were promptly visited by prosecution and imprisonment; laws were made and enforced contrary to what they had been taught to expect, and they naturally conceived the idea that if all these things were changed they would experience joys not promised at their birth.

Under these circumstances compromise became easy, when this tremendous revolutionary movement, which involved every country in Europe except Britain and Russia, had now to put into actual practice the precepts of their faith.

We have not thought it necessary to include movements of subjected nationalities such as Bohemia and Italy, or those which merely ended in riots such as England, but these were to play an important part as we suggested above in the reaction

which followed. The Feudal tenure was at an end, and they were now called upon to institute a new method wherein their material needs could be advanced. Having won in the last court of appeal the right to order any form of government they desired, it would appear a simple matter to proceed to that end. Such a belief is still prevalent in spite of history, and we confess to the weakness ourselves until Russia once more emphasized it so emphatically; the fact is that during revolutionary periods the overthrow of an old form of government is a simple matter compared to the establishing of a new one.

When the Frankfort Assembly met on March 31st, we see an apparently solid mass. Flags flying, bands playing, crowds applauding. But immediately the deliberations commenced, the fur commenced to fly. They were united in the determination that the old order had to go. They were just as divided on what the new order had to be. The representatives chosen to attend this assembly were not the people who had conquered the right to have an Assembly. They were, moreover, haunted by the fear that an armed force might appear at any time and put an end to their deliberations. They did not have the courage or energy to provide an armed force for their own defence, a matter under the circumstances requiring little of either, except, as Marx points out, "This assembly of old women, was, from the first day of its existence more frightened of the least popular movement than of all the reactionary plots of all the German Governments put together."

They were damned if they did:

They were damned if they didn't.

But we had better leave that till another time.

PLATFORM

Socialist Party of Canada

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

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

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

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

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

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

Therefore we call upon all workers to 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.

Woman's Part

BY KATHERINE SMITH.

PROBABLY the greatest need of working women today is to learn to reason from the particular to the general. To learn to co-ordinate the tasks in which she is engaged with the tasks which confront society as a whole.

Primitive women contributed their full quota to the needs of the society in which they lived. It was she who varied the meat diet of hunter's game with contributions of mild fruits, nuts and cereals and by so doing discovered the possibilities of the cultivation of the soil and the preservation of seed for a new harvest. It was she who tended and reared the young animals brought in from the chase which made possible the development of the herd, thereby ushering in the herding industry. It was she who ushered in primitive handicrafts in her efforts to furnish clothes and necessary household utensils for the use of the tribe. It was she who, through her maternal function, kept the tribe together and it was through her that heritage in the tribe was traced. Her position was so important that it was reflected in the religion of the times, in the dominance of goddesses over mere male gods.

Unhappily the very service which she rendered to society became the means of her own economic slavery. Handicapped with her biological position as the mother of the human race she was unable to follow far afield the avocations which she originated, and herding and agriculture gradually gravitated into the hands of the man who became the dominant economic factor. Woman sank into the slave position which she has occupied with some slight variations until modern times.

As herding and agriculture had their inception in the hands of women, machinery on the contrary had its inception and earliest development in the hands of men, and women have until recently been excluded from a share in its development. The accusation that women do not invent the mechanical contrivances, even in her own household, is true for that reason. But the process is now being reversed. Machinery is becoming practically automatic and is gravitating into the hands of the women. She is supplanting men in the industries. The price of her labor-power does not include the raising of a family and can therefore be purchased cheaper. She is now by way of gaining her freedom from one form of slavery, i.e., of woman to man, as man, though not from the wage-slave system.

That she is simply changing from chattel slavery to that of wage-slavery does not deter her from rejoicing. She is celebrating what she deems her victory pretty much as the negro who observes Emancipation Day, and she is doing as many silly things as the men who celebrate what they think is their victory on election night. This resurgence of the women is viewed with alarm by the conservative element, who ascribe it to everything but the real cause, from too much jazz to too little Jesus.

Women's part in production has not, heretofore, been recognized as having an economic value because her produce has not met in exchange on the market. It has been largely for use and appropriated by the male to his own material advantage.

Now women's vision is beginning to broaden out but she has not yet learned that the task of providing for her own needs and those of her family are the same, on a small scale, as that in which society as a whole is engaged. That it is this need which brings into existence the different methods of production, any one of which lasts only as long as it can function adequately for the needs of society and when it can no longer do so it is forced to give way to another more capable of so doing.

The final transition from one form of production to another has always been a period of great distress for the workers. Evolution takes on the form of revolution with its accompaniment of counter-revolution and bloodshed.

The woman question has ceased to exist in highly developed countries, but capitalist society has seized upon women's awakening and are converting it to their own interest. Everything womanly is being lauded to the skies. "Mothers' Day" has arrived.

Women's part henceforth is to fight shoulder to shoulder with the men of their class, not independently but together, to rid their class of the psychology that is being instilled into their minds by the present ruling class who control all the authorized avenues of education. To prepare their class to direct the revolution into safe channels and assure it a final victory over the present wage system.

War?

AS we go to press it is not yet certain whether the British imperialists were serious in their attempts to start a new drive against Soviet Russia, or whether Curzon merely hoped to humiliate the Workers' Republic for reasons of internal party politics. The Government of Bonar Law has been repeatedly humiliated recently by France in the matter of the Ruhr, by America in the matter of the Chester grant. As neither of these powers is much afraid of the bully of Downing Street, "national honor," Mr. Curzon may have thought, was to be saved by an impudent note to Russia which has fewer warships than America and fewer aeroplanes than France.

Russia has made a dignified answer, refuting all the charges, reminding Britain that the trade agreement was just as much in the interest of the British people as of Russia; that Russia is not a semi-independent country like Germany, Austria or China and is fully determined to follow a policy of her own, that England with its intrigues in the Caucasus, in Turkestan and in Vladivostok should be the last to complain about Russian propaganda in the East, that the width of territorial waters is a matter for international negotiations which cannot be determined arbitrarily by England. Russia further asserts that at a time when England was invading Russian territory and killing Russian citizens, the Russian Government could not grant British spies the right of undisturbed pursuance of their honorable business. The gist of the situation is that Soviet Russia is ready to settle matters of litigation by negotiations but it will not be browbeaten by ultimata.—"Soviet Russia," N. Y.

"WHY WOMEN DON'T WRITE"

Another Letter

Editor, "Clarion"—

Regarding your note on a woman's letter, I should say that the reason women do not write is because they cannot, and they cannot because they are not widely read, and therefore cannot analyze situations connecting up the happenings of today with those of the past, and from that form a mind picture of what might be likely to happen in the future.

Potentially, woman's brain is equal to man's. Her environment in the past was one which did not develop her mentality.

The advent of machinery, forced woman outside of the home, to compete with man in the labor market, and since then her mental growth has steadily gone on. Women have had to fight down prejudice and some of the bitterest prejudice came from the side of men; they had been used to the meek, clinging vine woman, and this new creature, who demanded to know the things he knew, and challenged his sacred opinions, was not to be tolerated.

However, women have gone bravely on, and just at present, we have come to the point where we think the average man very stupid. M.B.

INEVITABLE CHANGE.

(Continued from page 1)

ing restless a reaction is expected in favour of the class that it was organized to overthrow. Italy, like Britain, is suffering to give birth to a new order of things.

Lloyd George contemplates visiting Canada, the working man's paradise! Men learn from their failures and an advice to the American rulers to hold on to that 60 per cent. population tilling the soil may mean an extension of the reign of Capitalism. Farmers are isolated, and not so susceptible to the Socialist doctrine, but Britain has supplied a large portion of artisans coming from the hotbeds of industry and settling on the land, fully inoculated with the hope of getting rich quick. Failure to even get a decent living, and no hope of anything but drudgery, those artisans are good revolutionary material, and a visit of an advocate that may sail in the same ship as new capital seeking investment in British colonies may meet with a storm both on land and sea.

GEORGE PATON.

Literature Price List

	Cloth Bound	Per Copy
A. B. C. of Evolution (McCabe)	\$1.15
Economic Determinism	\$1.65
Evolution of the Idea of God (Grant Allen)	\$1.15
Evolution of Property (Lafargue)	\$1.15
Critique of Political Economy	\$1.65
Revolution and Counter Revolution (Marx)	\$1.15
History of Paris Commune (Lissagaray)	\$1.50
Ancient Society	\$1.85
Philosophical Essays	\$1.65
Theoretical System of Karl Marx	\$1.65
Landmarks of Scientific Socialism	\$1.65
Socialism and Philosophy	\$1.65
Capitalist Production (First Nine and 32nd Chapters		
"Capital," vol. 1, (Marx)	\$1.00
Vital Problems in Social Evolution	80c
Science and Revolution	80c
The Militant Proletariat	80c
Evolution Social and Organic	80c
Puritanism	80c
Ethics and History	80c
Germes of Mind in Plants	80c
The Triumph of Life	80c
Anarchism and Socialism	80c
Feuerback	80c
Socialism Positive and Negative	80c
Eighteenth Brumaire	80c
The End of the World	80c
Science and Superstition	80c
	Paper Covers	Per Copy
Two Essays on History (C. Stephenson and G. Deville)	5c
Independent Working Class Education	10c
Communist Manifesto	10c
Wage-Labor and Capital	10c
The Present Economic System (Prof. W. A. Bonger)	10c
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific	15c
Slave of the Farm	10c
Manifesto, S. P. of C.	10c
Evolution of Man (Prof. Bolsche)	20c
Causes of Belief in God (Lafargue)	10c
Shop Talks on Economics (Marcy)	15c
The State and Revolution (Lenin)	25c
Value, Price and Profit (Marx)	15c
Economic Causes of War (Leckie)	25c
Civil War in France (Marx)	35c
Eighteenth Brumaire (Marx)	35c
Christianism and Communism (Bishop W. M. Brown)	35c
Psychology of Marxian Socialism	30c
W. A. Pritchard's Address to the Jury, (State Trials, Winnipeg, Man., Fall Assizes 1919-20)	25c
	Quantity Rates on Paper Covered Pamphlets.	
Two Essays on History25 copies	75c
Communist Manifesto25 copies	\$2.00
Wage-Labor and Capital25 copies	\$2.00
Present Economic System25 copies	\$1.50
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific25 copies	\$3.25
Slave of the Farm25 copies	\$1.50
Manifesto of S. P. of C.25 copies	\$2.00
Evolution of Man25 copies	\$2.75
Causes of Belief in God25 copies	\$2.00
Value, Price and Profit25 copies	\$3.25
Economic Causes of War10 copies	\$2.00
Christianism and Communism6 copies	\$1.00
Psychology of Marxian Socialism10 copies	\$2.50
W. A. Pritchard's Address to the Jury (State Trials, Winnipeg, Man., Fall Assizes 1919-20)10 copies	\$2.00

All prices include Postage.

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