

Treaties and Murders

THE hastily conceived treaties concluded with the Soviet Power, by R. MacDonald, have been promptly abandoned by the Baldwin Ministry," writes the Victoria "Colonist" (23/11/24). 'Tis surely humped like a camel. "The prompt action was the outcome of the new mandate from the British electorate." The Colonist is wise in the use of words. It says the British electorate, not the "people". And there is a world of difference between the electorate and the people. The difference between Democracy and the Capitalist sham "made safe by the war."

The "mandate" shows who is meant by the "people" of the "Colonist". The returns—presuming them votes, not altogether a safe guide, even in Canada—show the Conservative vote as (approx.) 7,855,000; Labor, 5½ million; Liberal 3 million (nearly). The seats held are Conservative 413; Labor 150; Liberal 42. The Conservative vote is 47%; Labor 33%; Liberal 18% of the total. But the seats held show quite other proportions: Conservatives 67%; Labor 25%; Liberal 8%. In the south counties—the real home of the "highs," the Conservative vote was (approx) 1½ million; seats obtained 84. The other parties with 1 million votes got one seat. The combined Conservative and Liberal majority over Labor in the House is, 74%. In the last Parliament the combined strength was 67%. Thus the Conservatives with considerably less than half of the poll obtained 67% of the seats. While Labor with one-third of the poll has one-quarter of the seats. In the last Parliament the Conservative strength was 41%. In the present election the Conservative vote increased by 2,400,000; the Labor vote by 1,200,000. So that with a vote increase of 14% the Conservatives secured—by electoral democracy—an increased strength of 26%. While Labor with a vote increase of 1¼ million declined from nearly one-third to less than one-quarter. Obviously, there are more than treaties "hastily concluded," and more than negotiations, "lamentably weak."

The "Colonist" is right,—the treaties "were never dictated by the good sense of the British people;" the loan would "never have been implemented" because, lacking safe-guards, "the money would not be subscribed." True. Because the only "people" in Britain with money to lend in such amounts are the oligarchs, the owners of capitalist property. And they would not risk their sweated gold with the Bolshevik—without safe guards. Nor to any one else. But with safeguards—"the owners of money for an adequate percentage will risk even the gallows." Nowadays, however—so low is the ethic of capital—that even that risk is proxy. So low that the "people" scorned a paltry loan of £30 million for the life and freedom of a nation, but could pour forth some £200 million to Wrangel and Denikin and Czecho-Slovaks to encompass the slavery of man. So low that its lickspittle press cannot even recognise its depravity. We hope that the "iniquity" of those expeditions may tangle the feet of their Capitalist sponsors in destruction, as Brest Litovsk tangled the Germans in ruin.

However, those "sensible people," having failed by force, offered to buy an entrance into Russia. All things have their prices, is their maxim. Through their vulgar mouthpiece Lloyd George Russia was offered a £20 million loan at Genoa. Safeguarded of course. But as the only possible safeguard was Russian resource, the pledging of Russian resource meant the slavery of the Russian people. For without the slavery of the nations, profit and interests and dividends cannot be obtained. Let that fact be emphasized. Without slavery, no profit. No where, no when. Russia, recognising the "lying spirit of God in the mouth of the prophet" rejected the offer. A thing which no Capitalist kingdom in the world would ever have the honor to do. For everywhere the "honor" of capital is but the slimy mask of exploitation. Yet even if that abstemious spawn of thrift had taken the risk of the Russian loan, they

did not stand any great risk of losing, even without safeguards. Because there are £15 million to Russian Government (Czarist) credit in London. And, 'tis said, a goodly sum in N. Y. The Russian loan was mooted as some £30 million, two-thirds of which was to be spent in Britain. There was therefor only £10 million risk—and even that would be, probably, reconstruction credit. Moreover, the unpaid interest on that £15 million for 7 years, at a paltry 5%—5¼ million. So that for a risk of £10 million Britain actually held a pledge of £20 million. And yet refused? No Wonder British Israel traces descent to the Hebrew. And prosperity to its god.

There is that "notorious Zimoviev letter"—the "sufficient indication to the British people that Moscow is not to be trusted." A statement which is also sufficient indication of the worthlessness of Capitalist evidence. Well, Moscow denies its authenticity—an argument valid only as it squares with other facts. It appears that Zimoviev was not even in Moscow on the date of the signature. We know it is neither the first nor the second time that chosen "people" have been found engaged in the gentle arts of forgery; that it is a regular arm of counter-revolution; and that, as alleged, there is a regular "forgery factory" in Poland. The authenticity of the letter is still in doubt, even by the Cabinet Committee; the original has never been produced or seen by any government department. MacDonald, in his anxiety to "run with the hares and hunt with the hounds," got "hot" only over a copy. It was not intercepted in the mails. It was said to be "received" by Communist headquarters. And there denied. It is also said to have been discovered by agents of the secret service, abroad (source unspecified). The contents of the letter "leaked out" to several sources, by unknown means. And a copy was, for an unknown time, in the hands of a paper hostile to the government before it was published by the Foreign Office. Such are the facts to date. In view of the conflicting evidence; of the undoubted forgeries of recent priority, and of the undoubted hostility against labor, generally and particularly, the balance of probability is rather against than in favor of authenticity. But the point in question is: the Colonist gave editorial prominence to the letter as a "resumption of Bolshevik propaganda." If the Colonist pronouncement is not to be interpreted as a continuance of capitalist propaganda, the current complementary facts of the letter claim an equal prominence. If, for no higher reason, than to justify the claim to be "clean."

"While the present government holds power, it is safe to assume there will be no overtures from London to Moscow." If the assumption is correct, then the Baldwin government will become an efficacious means for the "spread of the pernicious doctrines of Soviet aspirations." For the isolation of Russia from the world market entails the isolation of capitalist Britain from due prosperity; the lowering of living standards; and the consequent tightening of the yoke on the necks of the slaves. By implication therefore, the "overtures" will go by the covert channels of diplomacy. And Moscow will triumph—has triumphed. For Moscow has proved itself to mean the life and freedom of man. While London—with all its golden horde of vilification—has proved itself the Philistine of privilege. Moscow to lay, after seven long years of persistent and implacable capitalist intrusions and mendacity, stands beyond challenge. While London, after the same seven years, with unlimited material and unlimited opportunity for human elevation, is confronted with revolution. Apparently invincible, with its "cohorts waving in purple and gold," proud with the prestige of exploitation, yet, like the pride of old Spain; like the armies of Hindenburg, like the political barrage of France, it will crumble like a child's sand castle before the advancing tides of the new world. Not because of Bolshevik propaganda, nor for the anguish of its slaveries. But because it has tram-

pled the aspirations of social man in the dust; because it has continually violated the founded integrity of society; because it has sapped the morale of progress and turned the moving issues of social coherency into the issues of dominion—in brief, because it has bartered the glory of life for the law of class.

"Teaching Bolshevism to mind its own business, and leave others to mind theirs," sounds very noble. But 'tis only sound. Like the forcing of the doors of Japan and China; like the forced trafficking in opium (and its diplomatic shuffling right down to date); like the Balkan treacheries; and the status quo that permitted and maintained the slaughtering of Armenians; and like forcing democracy (!) upon the "Hun." Capitalist notions of "teaching, etc.," are written over the face of the world in fire and fury. America showed Mexico and Cuba; the Phillipines and Spain, its significance. Japan carried the message to Korea and China; France and Germany propagated it in various parts of the world. "Heroic little Belgium" bore the ark of the covenant into the Congo. And Britain practices it now in India, Africa, Europe and the isles of the Pacific. And just as in the old days of chattel slavery, the Tory press and the Tory pulpit fulminated against emancipation, or ignored the festering earth; so today, like sycophants, foam in the sweat of a like greed, against the emancipation of wage slavery, or keep discreet silence in the presence of degradation unequalled; or worse still, preach homilies on the excellence of exploitation. A prostitute press and a prostitute pulpit, how fitly are they adapted to their environment of capital.

In those eventful years, when the world was being prepared for "democracy," when the Allies were struggling almost to exhaustion to safeguard the weak—all unbeknown to the "immortelles," destined for carrion, plans of reconstruction were preparing. France was ordered in universal centralization—in virtue of the service of man. Industry concentrated in higher technique—so that the leisure of the heroes might not be intruded upon. The melon cutters, scenting the piping days of peace, "engineered" the "irrigating plant." So that honest Britain, with the commendable foresight of thrift, and the usual craftsmanship of diplomacy, emerged from the war with her rivals crushed; with future oil secure; and the possible marts of the world to her hand. But alas, the "negotiations" ruptured the "eternal friendship" of the past. The ruddy soil of conquest nourished unexpected poppies for the tables of privilege. Fear cast her deepening shadows over the world market, and in its darkness died the dreams of the heroes. But not the ambitions of pestilent Imperialism. Clothed in the Prussianism it fought not to stay, but to camouflage; it storms, like Dion, across a stricken world. Mouthing the phrases of democracy, it immolates humanity in the furnace of its greed. On the bleaching bones of the last war it bids us arm for the murder-fest of tomorrow. For the perpetuity of slavery, it urges society to the verges of class war. And for the peace of its property right, it drives civilization almost to extinction. Is it the ignorance of convention, or the mumming of the Pharisee?

"It is well those treaties should be forgotten. They were conceived in iniquity, because there is always iniquity in shaking hands with guards." I wonder what the wisard and other super persons think of the classification. The generalisation covers a wide field. And perhaps enough. History is reported correctly—the field avouder the British. For instance, would it be shaking hands with murder to consort with Lord Reading and General Dyer? Yet there is the railroad death car; American swarms suppression, and emergency laws. Why? Would it be safe to "shake" with the power that hated to the "people" of Johannesburg in their affliction? Would the government of the Black and Tan leave a

(Continued on page 6)