

Recognition

SINCE it set up as a Socialist Republic, the activities of Soviet Russia have centred around the question of recognition. At first, from the various outside capitalist-backed white armies, Russia got the kind of "recognition" it didn't want—in the neck! Then, having managed to survive that treatment usually accorded to doomed chickens, it continued to gain, one after the other, with increasing success, the sort of recognition it really needs; until there are now few important countries that refuse its propositions.

Russia's experience, in this respect, is neither new nor extraordinary, the only novel feature being the fact that it, a modern Revolutionary Communist society which, upon one of the largest of national and international scales, is seeking recognition from many of its deadly and avowed enemies: for the same struggle, but played upon smaller national stages, has always accompanied the class-war-provoking conditions of every master and subject class society.

The latest instance of the kind took place last month in connection with a Winnipeg branch of the Canadian National Railways One Big Union. Two members of the O. B. U. having been discharged from the Transcona shops, the Union officials endeavored to get a board of conciliation appointed to settle the dispute favorably to both the Union and the men, upon whom sentence of death by starvation (through loss of employment) had been passed. The Hon. James Murdock, "Minister of Labor" has further informed the O.B.U. that they will not be recognized, either by the C. N. Ry., or the Government, as a true labor union, and laughs at their threat of retaliatory action; and should such threats materialise, promises the dismissal of all individuals concerned. Under the decision of the Department of Labor, the only recognised union in the Transcona shops, is Div. No. 4 of the American Federation of Labor.

No other master-class attitude than the above, could or should have been expected; as supposedly class-conscious union men ought to have been aware of and fully prepared for. As well might the lamb in the fable have looked for reason and mercy in the wolf, as a minority class-conscious Socialist organization expect favors from a master-class secure in the knowledge that servility and disunion prevailed in the ranks of the opposing labor armies. To the dominant class, the workers are always a nuisance, a necessary evil, which they unhesitatingly get rid of whenever machines—those other means of wealth production—can more profitably take the place of the living creature.

But to appreciate the true inwardness of the gentle master-class heart and spirit, the pages of history must be referred to, at the time when, subsequent to 1785, the invention of steam, introduced into British factories, made full-blown Capitalism possible. The result of this economic revolution was that a number of dirty, smoke-begrimed factory towns arose, whose machine-made commodities caused the decay of the rural iron trade, cloth trade and other village industries. Therefore, in 1795, many food riots took place and in the same year the country landlords of Speenhamland in the south of England, thought up or, rather, developed—for it was not entirely original—an elegant scheme to help themselves out at the expense of the workers and other sections of the community. The great idea was to grant relief from the poor rates to married laborers whose wages were not enough to support them, their wives and families; and this policy was adopted from end to end of the land. Thus, the masters profited by the low price of labor-power by shifting the burden of the subsistence wage onto the shoulders of other people.

The result was to pauperise the workers. In one parish three-quarters of the inhabitants were receiving relief. "The meshes of the Poor Law," writes Mr. and Mrs. Hammond, "were spread over

the entire labor system. The laborers, stripped of their ancient rights and their ancient possessions, refused a minimum wage and allotments, were given instead a universal system of pauperism. This was the basis on which the governing class rebuilt the English village."

In 1812, the scale of allowances from the rates began to be reduced and therefore the position of the laborer declined and poverty became more intense. In 1830, as a result, the English peasants broke out into open, threshing-machine and rick-burning revolts. But, so far as government relief to the laborers was concerned, the risings were an utter failure; some of the leaders were hanged and several hundred men and boys were transported overseas.

Three years later, in 1833, the first English Agricultural Laborers' Union was formed in Dorsetshire and though merely a friendly society, it was, in a few months, brutally suppressed by an alarmed government; although the laws against trade union combination had been repealed since 1824. But, further, as this harmless laborers' society had administered, in accordance with the then general trade union customs, an oath of secrecy to its members, a kind of oath which, by an out-of-date statute of George III. was held to be illegal, six members of the union were arrested, gaoled, sentenced to 7 years' transportation and then hurried out of the country to avoid public protests.

This protest came in due course in the shape of a petition signed by over 250,000 persons and organized by the whole trade union movement, and enormous processions and demonstrations took place in London. Still, three years passed before the government issued a free pardon to the victims; and they and their families could return to "their" native land; where a sum of money had been collected sufficient to settle them on farms of their own where that famous British love of fair-play, as exercised by the British master-class, couldn't get at them!

The moral of it all is, that when masters or workers really ACT in harmony with their true and undisguised economic interests, mutual recognition is utterly impossible by either party to the transaction. It is only when the actions of both classes, through fear or policy, fail to openly realise, that a sort of hypocritical and ironical truce can be maintained.

"Government," we are told, like the poor, we always shall have with us. That is a vulgar mistake, for government is a late arrival on the human scene. The first thing mankind realised was that co-operation was a prime necessity and benefit, and therefore strictly and universally practised it. Although the average white man on this continent considered the Redskins mere "varmints," it is to Morgan, the American student of Red Indian communities that we are indebted for an insight into these tribal societies, as the type of the entire social system of primitive man.

These Indians lived under a condition of Communism, wherein they co-operated to their mutual advantage. For all that, they, too, had their "rulers" consisting of a Central Directing Authority—the "Sachems." As the common property basis of their society meant the absence of rival economic classes, the Sachems' work was necessarily confined to sharing in and managing the collective efforts and welfare of the whole community of which they were members. They were not, like the Capitalist State Executives, an oppressive and repressive institution directed against some under and economically weaker class.

A Central Directing Authority is essential to any society or social project which intends to produce definite results; as Marx points out with his illustration of the need an orchestra has for a leader, as compared with the superfluity of such a functionary in the case of a solitary musician.

The Capitalist system of production, with all its

faults is in its way, like an orchestra, although it tries all it can to be independent of everyone. Hence even it needs its leader, its Central Directing Authority. The trouble is, however, that the general competitive profit-seeking and class antagonistic character of its make-up, breeds anarchy; and therefore, tyranny, the companion of anarchy, is bound to rear his ugly head.

Is it strange, then, that wherever, under Capitalism, the functions of rulership must be exercised, whether in the factory, the shop of the State; these functions are constantly and inseparably linked up with and adulterated by the evils of injustice and tyranny?

But modern Socialism, like the Primitive Communism of the Red Man, implies the common ownership of the means of living, which involves organization and that spells a directing authority. Having no dispossessed under dogs and classes to dominate and bully, such Central Directing Authority must perforce work off its steam and operate solely with Industrial Processes. Hence, Communist authorities will be simply committees of industrial and economic experts—not C. N. R. nor any other kind of financial magnates or Hon. Ministers of Labor.

Under such conditions, the more brains and efficiency we can command and set in motion in our managers, the better and merrier for all of us; and internal labor wars and Capitalist feuds, as well as other forms of competitive, anti-social jealousy, would, like the "State" die a natural death.

Armed and imbued with this knowledge, it is a gross and glaring absurdity to expect any worker or other intelligent person, to respect and "recognise" him or them who profess to do the work and carry the ideology of private property or private Reform Government, owned and operated Capitalism, which belongs to the dying past, from which, as the last bondage of the Kingdom of the Brute Socialism is destined to free the Human Race.

Anarchical Capitalism and its human instruments will never give rose water treatment to those who, unlike the A. F. of Labor, dare to criticise and challenge its waning and discredited authorityship.

So, when we say, give us Socialism; that means give us genuinely helpful men and women whom we can and will respect and recognise; for the former implies and creates the latter, and the latter—if they are justifiably included in the foregoing classification—will surely not be long in granting themselves, the former.

PROGRESS.

HERE AND NOW

IT is a tremendous pleasure Here and Now to record an advance in the financial returns and to express appreciation of the efforts of those excellent and industrious ones who have made that possible. On the other hand it is necessary that while broadcasting our joyfulness we be not altogether ebullient, because thus there may be others who will consider us content. And so we approach the condition of Gilbert's character who, through character complexities, became "a living ganglion of irreconcilable antagonisms."

Therefore we fall back upon the condition of Oliver Twist: Encouraged by what we've had we ask for more. Here follows what we've had:—

Following \$1 each: J. Aconite; A. Solis; H. W. Speed; R. Temple; "Progress"; W. J. Sim; Sam Guthrie; G. H. Powell; M. Farrell; G. Lester; R. Antijuntti; Wm. Morrison; S. G. Evans; P. Neale; H. Asson; A. E. Faulkner; L. T. Morgan.

Following \$2 each: George White; G. Alley; Oscar Motter; T. Twelvtree.

Robt. Inglis \$3; J. Pettie \$2.50. Above, Clarion subscriptions received from 29th August to 11th September, inclusive, total \$30.50.

CLARION MAINTENANCE FUND

R. Temple \$1; Robt. Inglis \$2; Local Nansimo No. 111 (per Arthur Jordan) \$50.

Above, C.M.F. receipts from 29th August to 11th September, inclusive, total \$53.