

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, unsanguine 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 "upsurges 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)