

# WESTERN CLARION

A Journal of  
CURRENT  
EVENTS

Official Organ of  
THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

HISTORY  
ECONOMICS  
PHILOSOPHY

No. 882.

NINETEENTH YEAR.

Twice a Month

VANCOUVER, B. C., JANUARY 2, 1923.

FIVE CENTS

## A Rough Review of British Politics

BY WILL BAYLISS.

DAVID L. George has apparently been suddenly fired; and Bonar Law politely asked to take his place, and form a "new cabinet" out of old stuff. This upheaval in a tea-cup necessitated an untimely election. There were no startling platform phrases to catch the voter; but there was a phrase used by every brand and shade of parties which appealed to the "sober minded" voter. The phrase is "stability." The Coalition was an ideal management in war time, but for peace (?) time they need an executive with minds governed by the "Prince of peace." That is, in reality, a mind governed by interests needing peace and stability in order to develop the trade peculiar to the "after the war" period. D. L. George & Crew, Bonar Law & Co. and Labour Ltd., all seek stability in order to put capital, and incidentally, labor, on its feet. To place capital and labor on its feet it is absolutely necessary to check, and if possible, throttle the Bolsheviki movement. Mr. McKenna does not fear labor. No statesman of brains fears labor, but it is the Socialist element within the rank and file which bothers D. L. George, Bonar Law, Asquith, Churchill, Birkenhead and many others too numerous to mention.

The election aims of all parties, besides the socialist party are very similar. This admittance has appeared in the public press. It is questionable, however, whether the mass of workers will observe and digest so important an admission. If they do, it is all up with capitalism. The Marxist has known this for 70 years or more. But the great mass do not study economies relative to the basis of society and the aims arising therefrom. Whether the executive of the capitalist class is called Conservative, Liberal, Unionist, Labor or Coalition, make no difference so long as the executive efficiently carries on the business of their masters. To accomplish this, any executive has to declare upon oath in favour of private ownership of property. That property is sacred. That they will protect it at all costs to the advantage of the private owners. That property held as a means of exploitation is within the law.

Seeing that most statesmen have come to realise that Labor as well as capital is necessary to produce commodities, these same gentlemen have become piously interested in a scheme of co-operation of masters and slave. As if the co-operation has not existed before. It has existed in all slave societies, but the tendency to separate shows itself, and an anxiety arises from that condition which forces the master's mouthpiece to propagate this apparently new doctrine. The relationship, however, must ever widen, even though the workers consciously cooperate with the owners and produce for them more efficiently. In fact, the more efficiently the producers work, the quicker the severance of the relationship between them and the owners will occur. The more staple or peaceful the capitalist world becomes, the greater will the crises be.

Seeing that all the British political parties, excepting the Socialist party, are out for one objective: stability in order to develop trade equal to exploitation and profit, or the maintenance of a society consisting of masters and slaves, seeing this, why an election? Is there any danger of the fall of capitalism? Is the danger within the British Isles? Or,

is it an international danger? If so, what kind of danger is it?

To stabilise trade is to save society; so Bonar Law and his supporters say. In order to accomplish this it is necessary to remove Lloyd George and his gang of war lords. Peace, profit, and prosperity require parliamentarians of a different temperament than times of war, waste and wrangling; even though profit and prosperity follow the bellowing of guns and the groans of dying slave soldiers.

The stability referred to requires both a national and an international character. Contented slaves at home and a stabilised market abroad are the two essential characteristics necessary to peace and profit commonly called stability. The Coalition has made blunders in diplomatic circles. It has made enemies where friends should be made. It has widened the breaches where they should be cemented. So great has the bungle become that the greatest treaty ever conceived of has failed. The League of Nations has become a farce during the reign of Coalition. The seekers for power today blame the Coalition, but Lloyd George rightly blames conditions.

A Conservative government cannot mend matters, try as they will. Present day society, because of its basis, cannot again satisfy its human needs. Whatever is done will react adversely. Steady employment will soon result in unemployment.

Markets of fifty years ago are today themselves seeking markets. The new markets are situated in a dangerous zone, and found in a dangerous time. International capital is complicatedly interested. The Allies in War are enemies in the peaceful pursuits of producing oil. Oil is a commodity of great value when applied to the machinery used in producing other commodities. Some of the British Allies have common interests with war-time enemies. So there is a general mix-up over the oil fields of the Near East. To allow Turkey even the success she has gained, was, in the eyes of British capitalists, a big mistake. It has, in reality made France, by reason of its relations to Turkey, an enemy. In the meantime France is pacified; but the burst will come sooner or later, and a war between two sides must take place over oil. It may not be a military war; but it will be a war of some sort. It seems to me that England and Germany will join hands in this commercial struggle. The Conservatives think they can steer the international canoe safely through the rapids of "after the war" waters and find a peaceful Mediterranean.

Assuming the oil controversy were settled peacefully and oil was being produced in ever increasing volumes; that Mesopotamia was booming; that the Near East had become an Eldorado to capitalists and that the country had become dotted with towns. What effect would this have upon England? They would suffer in the coal industry because oil displaces it as a fuel. Coaling vessels would be no more, and thousands at British ports would be idle. British farm produce would not be wanted in the East because it can be produced there. Oil would revolutionise production, and cause greater instability than did steam. To adjust the social change would also be a greater problem than when steam took the place of water and hand. Oil will run to

where it is required, and few hands are required to attend to it. Instead of stability, the future stores up stability. That is, if the future is controlled by the present mode of production. Stability can come only by changing the mode from production for profit to production for use.

Is the danger within the British Isles? It is partly, but not wholly. The working class are becoming educated and restless. The educated element composes the Labor Party and officials of labor movements. There is no danger to Capitalism from these, in fact, they are somewhat like the early Liberals were, but the restless ones are the rank and file. Few there be who are educated in the bourgeois sense. Here lies the danger. These, along with the class conscious European workers, are forcing the hand of "dignified labor." Respectable labor must gain parliamentary power. They must, like their fore-runners the Liberals, etc, fail to satisfy those they are supposed to represent, i.e., chiefly the working class. The final lesson will be learned by the workers during the reign of Labor. Emancipation cannot be passed by an executive representing the interests of capitalism. That is, a capitalist institution is too partial to its own interests to destroy the very foundation upon which it rests.

The Co-operative candidates in the British squabble for power say they approve of the Versailles Treaty, limited reparations and the League of Nations. At the same time they say they want a "new social order." This institution is not only utopian but reactionary as well. The Versailles Treaty is nothing else than an agreement between international capitalists for extracting swag by the modern method of exploitation. It is an international guarantee to national capitalists. In short it is the highest expression yet of the identical interests of capitalists world wide in relation to the peaceful exploitation of the slaves living by their permission. In conjunction with this treaty we must consider the League of Nations and reparations. They are inseparable.

The machinery of production calls for social effort; not only social in a national sense, but international. Capital is social. Labor is social. The product is social. Everything is socialised excepting the idea of ownership. Ownership in the broad sense is partly socialized and partly individual. Individual owners are not very powerful. The only part of capitalism which retains its individualistic character is the sharing of the swag, i.e., profit. Now, seeing production is socialised, and boundary lines in reality are wiped out, why is it that capitalism demands the protection of small nations? That definite boundaries be drawn here and there? That some countries be split and new countries made? These are the contradictions of the Versailles Treaty which the League of Nations is supposed to carry out. The economic reason is clear and plain. Small nations must keep the peace. Some must act as buffer states between more powerful competitors. Strong countries, such as the German Empire must be broken up, its grinding teeth extracted if possible. Capital, being social and international, places the small countries under ob-

(Continued on page 7)