

But in the interests of truth and of sound pacifism, it is important to realise that anthropology gives no support whatever to the assumption of man's primeval pacifism. The pre-historic records of primitive man show him well provided with weapons, and weapons of war at that. Even more clearly can we see unmistakable indications of an essential combative streak in man's original endowment, when we study the present-day savage as representative of primitive man. It is true that the lowest and least cultured of them have neither a sufficiently developed technique nor the necessary organization for fierce warfare on a large scale; but even the least advanced savages indulge from time to time in miniature warfare.

This conclusion is based on two sets of observations. First, the criminology, as it might be called, within the group, the quarrels, fights, murders, injuries and offences, prove beyond a doubt that man will not live in permanent peace even with his friends and relatives. Secondly, the treatment of strangers, the behaviour of two alien groups, when occasionally brought into contact, show that there is a streak of aggressiveness and cruelty among all primitive peoples. Thus Mr. Massingham's statement that "they live at peace, not only with neighbouring tribes but with one another," seems to me highly questionable of any savage people. While therefore the primitive conditions certainly cannot be described as a universal warfare of all against all, the other assumption of a naturally peaceful and non-combative disposition seems to be equally mistaken. "Gentlest and most uncivilised," in Mr. Massingham's phrase is therefore not a well-harnessed couple of adjectives. Meekness is not an index of descending, nor brutality of ascending civilisation.

When we pass from the lowest primitives to the higher stages of development, those known in anthropology as higher savagery and barbarism—such as the North American Indians, the big military tribes of Africa, the Indonesians and such-like—we find our convictions growing that the doctrine of primeval pacifism is mistaken. Wherever a higher technique supplies him with efficient weapons, wherever more developed social organisation allows him to operate in large bodies, we see man engaged in cruel and destructive wars. The universal occurrence of warfare, wherever it is technically possible, the great variety of its forms, the enormous passionate interest taken by all savages in their fighting, seem to show that war is a natural condition of lower civilisation, and that there must exist combative tendencies not so easily to be uprooted.

These are truths which a wise pacifist should readily and freely concede to his militarist opponent, for no argument is made better by blinking facts or garbling them. The militarist is correct in maintaining that war has always existed, and he is right to a certain extent when he points out that primitive warfare has fulfilled certain important functions in human development. The fallacy of the militarist begins when he fails to see or to admit that there is an absolute breach of continuity between the earlier forms and the modern.

What is the nature of Man's essential primitive combativeness? One of its roots goes deep into the instinctive nature of Man and forms part of the great system of innate tendencies usually called the "instinct of self-preservation." When the natural exercise of any appetite or desire is interfered with, man as well as the animal gets angry and ready to fight. Take an animal and tamper with its feeding, take a mother and try to interfere with her young, arouse sexual jealousy in beast or man, and the fighting instinct invariably flares up. This is a well known fact. It is also well known that such anger and such fighting impulses, due to interference with a deep attachment, a lofty sentiment or a sacred ideal, are the foundations of bravery in animals and of high heroism in man. But it is not understood and often wilfully misinterpreted by the modern militarist—when he makes appeal to this type of heroism to justify modern warfare—that the combative impulse is moral and natural only under these conditions: the hero must truly defend something dear to him, some of his real ideals and values must be interfered with; the initiative of his heroism must

lie within his own instinctive and emotional constitution; and he must be able to face personally the real foe.

The monstrous manufacture of fear and hate, used to engineer and sustain modern warfare, the artificial production of dummy foes, the unscrupulous and ruthless painting of the enemy black by means of deliberately constructed lies, do create a wave of enmity as powerful as that of natural aggressiveness, and capable of producing real heroism.

But with all this the modern spirit of hatred and the artificial combativeness stand to the natural one in the same relation as a monstrous sexual perversion would stand to the pure and healthy instinct of sex. The modern press-made collective hatred is a perversion, for it lacks its real object, for which an artificially made "devilish German" or "barbarous Russian" or "perfidious Englishman" has to be substituted. Again, instead of fighting man to man the enemy whom you know has injured you, the dreadful doctrine of collective responsibility makes you kill a man who may feel and think exactly as you do, or injure indirectly thousands of women and children. So that modern "righteous anger," due to the type of prophets such as Bottomley, Northcliffe, Kothermere and their compeers in France and Germany, while it kindles here and there sparks of misguided heroism, starts a conflagration of all modern values to smoulder and poison the atmosphere for decades.

There is another root of the combative tendency, the one coming not from the relation between individuals but between groups. As soon as social cohesion develops a type of collective ambition and the idea of tribal honour, there comes into being social rivalry and intertribal warfare. Here an important distinction must be made, not sufficiently allowed for by anthropologists. There is one type of primitive warfare among the higher savages in which they fight with each other communities alike in culture and language which, besides their relation in war, entertain also relations in peace.

Such warfare, of which a very interesting type is found among certain Melanesian communities (described by the present writer in *Man*, 1918), seems to exist among all the higher savages. It is really a form of sport, only a little less dangerous than baseball or Rugby, and an excellent tonic of social life. It deserves the development of physique, the prizing of courage, heroism and the tougher qualities of manhood, and it obviously has nothing to do with modern warfare, for it selects and develops the fittest, of whom it kills out only an infinitesimal percentage. The suppression of this warfare, done by missionaries who pray for victory over Germany and Government officials who hope for the speedy extermination of the Hun, is one of the greatest blunders and crimes of so-called civilisation against so-called savagery, for it contributes largely to the dying out of the native races.

There is, however, another type of primitive warfare: murderous expeditions against strange and distant communities associated with cruel and barbarous customs such as cannibalism, head-hunting, slave raiding, extermination of women and children. It is no good for a pacifist to blink these facts and to deny that, where no restraints, no moral forces and no influences of reason bind man to certain ideals, he can become cruel and a beast of prey. What biological value have such predatory wars between entirely unconnected savage communities? Perhaps they lead to the survival of the fittest groups; perhaps human nature has to be coarsened and strengthened first before it can pass into higher stages of civilisation.

But the argument of the militarist becomes childishly nonsensical when he begins to use the darkest and most barbarous lapses of savagery as reasons for justifying a modern civilised institution. Does the wide prevalence among savages of slavery, wife lending, cannibalism, human sacrifice, religious prostitution, each partly rooted in instinct though it be, suffice to advocate the value of similar only more thorough-going and baleful customs among us today? The militarist forgets that modern warfare is infinitely worse, more destructive and more highly immoral than the worst massacres of savages. Just

because modern humanity is not a congeries of independent tribes but one big society; just because in destroying our neighbours, far from leaving our own tribe intact, we mutilate it severely; just because we can look upon the foreigner as fair game for worse atrocities only by deliberately swallowing the most pernicious and absurd lies; just because of all this, modern war must be ranked morally, biologically, and sociologically far below the most destructive combats of the most brutal savages.

Thus we cannot build on man's primeval pacifism. On the contrary, we must recognise that war is caused by and satisfies certain natural impulses—on the whole, however, among the worst and lowest of human nature. Pacifism, indispensable to the continued existence of higher civilisation, is not a state of nature to return to, but a highly complex and difficult condition of public opinion and social organisation.

The New Leader (London, Eng.)

HERE AND NOW.

WE are not able to present our cash returns Here and Now since last issue. At the moment of going to press we are personally bewildered by the necessity of being in several places at one time and of performing several tasks at once. This in connection with the election in B. C. to be held June 20th. In chasing socialist signatures for nomination papers we stumble upon a new definition of a socialist; who appears to be "one whose name is not on the voters' list."

However, we suppose that with enough concentrated worry the troubles incidental to election preparations will be overcome. Meanwhile we release for the press the Clarion "clipped," un-proofed, neglected and on the whole without editorial care. Hence these prosy explanations.

So that, in case anyone should manifest impatience concerning our subscription totals, we have to say we only know they're at low ebb as usual. Your impatience and anxiety may be allayed by the knowledge that you're not missing much.

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.