

Considered in principle the problem is really absurdly simple. No blacksmith in the exercise of his art would be perplexed by it for one moment. Knowing that iron is amenable only to certain treatment he would, if he were compelled to use iron, work upon it in accordance with the treatment to which it would respond. He would not waste his time and effort treating iron as if it were brass. So with the problem of influencing the mind and conduct of the human animal. We must, if we would be successful, work upon him in accordance with the treatment to which he will most readily respond.

If this were a "stove-pipe" discussion I should undoubtedly be interrupted at this point by some such question as, "Do you mean that the Party should peddle Reform, Commodity Struggle, Sentiment and all that bunk?"

Well as a matter of fact I do not suggest that the Party should do any other than it desires to do. I hold that there is no duty incumbent upon the Party to be other than it desires to be. And here it occurs to me that all this may be, as Comrade Saklatvala would say, just so much tosh. I have been arguing from the assumption that the Party desires to actively influence the minds of the workers to the end that the Social Revolution be brought about sooner or easier or more surely than it might otherwise be. It may well be that this assumption is false. On the whole I would not be surprised if it were. It may be that the Party is really no more concerned about the Social Revolution than—I am, for instance.

There is a peculiarly keen satisfaction to individuals of a certain type in belonging to a more or less exclusive set, removed from the common herd. Would it be impertinent to ask how many members of the Party are attracted to it by some such consideration? How many of us regard it as an intellectual group in which one may find refuge from the banalities of the boobery? Indeed may it not be a pertinent question to ask in how large a part some such consideration contributes to the cohesion—such as it may be—of all Socialist parties? It is a commonplace to state that the more of an individualist one is the more one tends to withdraw from the main group and seek the more congenial atmosphere of some smaller group of like kind. How many Socialists are Socialists mainly because they are Individualists? Come, Comrades! Open confession is good for the—subconscious mind. I will race you all to the penitent bench. For what, indeed, could constitute a more effective barrier against the common herd than a doctrine sufficiently profound to be unintelligible to the majority, delivered in a manner sufficiently remote from the immediate realities of life to be uninteresting to all but the faithful few? And what could be more congenial to individuals of this particular type than the freedom, so characteristic of all socialist parties, to attack every other god but our own—and even, in moments of exhilaration, to doubt even Him? The idea intrigues me. Already I am half convinced that if the Party was not actually conceived in this image it has since, by force of selection as it were, evolved into it.

However that may be I must not appear to evade my hypothetical questioner. So I will say to him that this "bunk" appears to be in large part the stuff of which life is composed for the great majority. Again, it is a pity—perhaps. But there it is. I will say further, arguing always, of course, from my assumption, that it is necessary for the Party to critically review some of the things it appears hitherto to have accepted without question. And one of them is the notion that "Education" in the sense of the mere dissemination of certain alleged facts, which socialists believe to be true and which they are convinced have to do with the ultimate betterment of mankind, will have some particular efficacy in influencing current conduct—"Ye shall know the Truth and the Truth shall set ye free." We seem to have been taking man at his own valuation. We have been under the impression that he accepts or rejects statements of fact because they are true or false. The fact is he calls

them Truths when he has accepted them and lies because for some reason—not necessarily rational—he cannot accept them. And he is influenced in his beliefs by numerous and diverse factors of interest, emotion, custom, tradition, habit, instinct and what not. The important thing for us to discover is what are the factors which influence him to accept a doctrine with such fervour and enthusiasm that it shall manifest itself in his conduct. To this end I would recommend the study of Psychology—not that it may form the content of socialist propaganda but it may inform the propagandist.

I would argue further that if the Party really desires to influence the worker to a certain end it must needs go about it the only way in which experience has shown he can be influenced. It must coat its pill in sugar. It must present its plain unvarnished Truth in terms of sentiment and emotion. It must describe its distant paradise in terms of immediate needs. It must coax, persuade, cajole, lead, drive—whatever you will—the working class out of the pit of ignorance, stupidity, superstition and economic subjection, a step at a time since they cannot be induced to interest themselves in the ultimate objective. Further, since I am inclined to agree with "C" that revolution is probably only the effect in historical perspective of the totality of a number of smaller and seemingly insignificant reforms, I would say that the Party should modify its position with regards to reforms. For this last authority may be found in the writings of Marx—assuming he is still held to be an authority.

If, now, the Party cannot bring itself to consider seriously some such change of tactics as I have here attempted briefly to suggest then I would say that to me it would appear as evidence that the Party is not nearly so much concerned about getting its doctrine to the workers as a whole as it is in retaining its position as a somewhat unique and esoteric cult.

Frankly I do not suppose the Party will consider any change whatever in its position or tactics. Nor for my part would I have it do so. The Party suits me very well as it is. It provides an atmosphere of pseudo intellectuality that at times I find very refreshing. A party actively interested in endeavoring to influence the working class to move consciously toward the Social Revolution would of necessity be compelled to deal in sentimental and opportunistic flub-dud such as would bore me to distraction—as it probably would most of the present members. Nor would such a party tolerate upon its premises one such as myself.

As it is the Party has a "stove-pipe" circle which is unique. Therein one may discuss with a straight face questions such as—What is Capital? Was Marx a Reformer? What is the Class Struggle? What is the M. C. H.? And so on—questions which provide inexhaustible material for entertaining discussions which have the added merit of committing one to nothing very serious.

All of which is quite alright with me. I like it. But, frankly, are we really a Revolutionary Party?
C. K.

ORGANISERS.

WHO knows the duties of an organizer? I hear you say every one can answer that question; all he has to do is to go from place to place addressing meetings, visiting locals and trying to form new ones; he must be well read in all the activities of the movement and keep himself informed regarding past history and current events. One would think this is all that is essential to make a successful organizer. For the cities no doubt this will suffice, but will it fill the bill in the country districts? Try it and see, or if you have not the necessary qualifications, nor the aptitude for speaking, listen to the comrades and you will soon discover that an organizer has to be a man of many parts. I have heard of young men who are so intellectual that while on the circuit they spent their spare time reading, leaving the ashes to pile up in their rooms. True they were orators, well-informed and witty, but these accomplishments did not leave such a lasting impression on their hostesses as the

circumstance of the ashes piling up. I have heard of others who made quite a hit throughout the provinces because they were good dish washers, they could chop wood, clean the stove and pump water, they could hold the baby and help the school children with their lessons. Nor is this adaptability all that is expected from an organizer. In order to be truly popular with the young as well as the elderly he must know how to conduct himself socially so that he may be kept in remembrance, not so much for his instructive speeches but because he is a first rate dancer. Such visitors are held in high esteem on the prairie. We will do well to bear in mind that such a varied programme requires a man of iron constitution. Travelling on the prairie is no holiday, even in the best of weather. In the light of such reports we need not wonder when we hear of some speakers who have toured the prairies with a repertoire of but one speech. That was a matter of necessity, they had not the opportunity while on the circuit to prepare or to rehearse another. We cannot advance the claim that these domestic and social attainments do not concern the movement, since we are told that our movement embraces every phase of human activity. So then, organisers, when you leave Vancouver with the blessing of the Harrington Academy, and peradventure \$5.00 for travelling and other expenses, it will be well to see that you have qualified yourself for the pioneer life of the mountains and plains.

A. H.

Knowledge Comes First

BY R. SINCLAIR.

BURNS did truly say "The best laid schemes of mice and men gang aft agley." Since the Russian revolution and up till the present moment there is a note of dissatisfaction among a section of the militant proletariat. The main reason behind this discontent of theirs is the apparent weakness of the various movements throughout the country. Our minds have been keyed up to the highest pitch by great historical events such as the overthrow of the monarchy in Russia and the substitution of a form of government which measures higher and is more in harmony with working class ideals than any other change recorded in past history. And there was the ending of a great war which for brutality of purpose and loss of life has been unequalled in the annals of world events. Crowned heads have taken the route which society saw fit. The right of God was rejected for the power of man. Uprisings of the workers have taken place all over the world. And they stood out more prominently in Finland, Poland, Austria and Germany. Governments changed over night and some of the changes were not for the benefit of the workers either; the time is too short to forget the white terror and its stern methods of suppression. Strikes took place of such magnitude as to strike fear and consternation into the hearts of the bourgeoisie. Arrests and deportations were the order of the day for hundreds of workers, and jail sentences were imposed on as many more who are still in the jails for that heinous offence, Les Majesty.

It is not to be wondered at when the excitement has subsided and a general survey taken that we find many whose hopes and dreams were rudely shattered by the lull that now exists all over. They had idolised Russia as the foundation of all liberty; all their appeals have been based on its behalf. As a rallying cry Russia has electrified their minds and dulled their masters on more than one occasion. The ultimatum from the British workers was a case in point, "Hands off Russia." But now the glamor is gone. They are working out their own salvation in Russia as will have to be done elsewhere. We do not lack any admiration for what happened in that country, but admiration for others doesn't solve our problem; Neither does it solve theirs, and the increased number which was thought

(Continued on page 7)