

OUR "HOLY FAMILY"

(Continued from page 1)

fact, like a "God's plan of the ages" to a Russellite, to whom, the Almighty scorns the hit or miss method of purblind, finite man. "Marx said it, therefore it must be true"—even before it is a factual thing. The study of Marxism, as a science to guide us in a study of the book of life, becomes the mental degradation of a study of a book of revelations. As to what of our own intelligence and of modern science? or, as to what of unknown facts and factors, of unappreciated facts and factors, therefore of unforeseen and unforeseeable contingencies? As of yore the answer is, Pshaw, thus and this and that spake the Lord. "There is no ambiguity in that exposition," says F. C. emphatically, referring to his quotation of a prognostication of the future by Marx, "Socialism must come." "The transition from Capitalism to Socialism occurs with the inexorability of cosmic law." "Neither fortuitous circumstances nor purposeful men" have any effect whatever "to alter the course of its irresistible and timeless process." If that is not belief in magic, what unconscious fakery of word-mongery or other does it signify? The Darwinian evolutionist would be impelled to consider the possibilities of change in any direction, even retrograde ones. But no, he is ruled out of court in this evolutionary science of a self-realizing, inevitable advance to a goal. The cosmic law is right, and the Cosmos awful kind. For what the hell does F. C. mean except that there is a cherub sitting up aloft taking care of the affairs of poor proletarian Jack here below? Apparently, it is not of ourselves, but of our stars that we are to be free. Thus, a cosmology older than most of the hills. And what is the effect of that cosmology on those who yield to it? Just like regular remittances from home to the remittance man! Why, think, study, work, scheme, educate, organize, etc.? We should worry! And yet this same F. C., so soon as he makes that declaration of a faith in magic powers, uses it as a starting point to attack me for mysticism in saying that "man is the only purposeful factor in the process." But by the powers, the irony of it, unconscious that he has himself declared for a mystical interpretation of history and thinking himself a good materialist still, he sets out to fasten on me the charge of mystic by quoting MacDougall because he also uses the word "purpose," the, in fact, only similarity between us. MacDougall is talking, however, of a purpose of a super-human kind, while I referred to human purpose, whatever its limits, the only purpose that science in its work can take account of. It is F. C. himself who is self-confessed blood-brother in mysticism to Mac Dougall, only the latter perhaps is a conscious Bergsonian, while F. C. is just mainly out-of-his-depth in Hegelian phraseology—in word magic. His aim was to discredit me in materialist circles. But I have traversed the bounds too much and often to stray into the domains of mysticism unconsciously, even in the use of figurative language, as he has done.

And Lestor, who should know better, born and raised in England, the cradle of modern materialism and the scrupulous sceptic spirit. His use of analogies reeks of word magic inducing the crudest transference of ideas. Hey, Presto! a suddenly appearing new chicken, new baby, new earthquake; therefore, Hey, Presto! a suddenly appearing new society. One is tempted to ask, why not a suddenly appearing new geological strata also, if it would not spoil sport? And brevity of statement also is to him the soul of "suddenness"—a paragraph of Marx is briefly descriptive of a sequence of changes of an epochal kind, therefore, somehow, we are to believe that socialism is just around the corner, the system may go any minute. He sees "the whole of society being sprung in the air" literally. To him, speed is also the essence of that badly quoted phrase from the Communist Manifesto. Truly, words have magic properties and a life apart from things.

In the same spirit, when I challenge the Hegel-

ian elements in Marxism, my critics reply by quoting more of it and more of it and more of it, seemingly unconscious that they are thus merely begging the question I raise, and as though they thought mere repetition would work a charm. As a matter of fact, I am not sure how conscious they are of the meaning of the quotations they make and the phrases they use. This I am sure of, however, that a charge of infidelity is really what my critics are hissing at me through their articles. I feel they expect me to feel as must that impious wretch in the story of old, at whose dread act contending armies stayed bloody strife to gaze in horror upon him. It was at the flower of that naive and happy "golden age" in the youth of the world, when the sons of the gods were kings of men and 'twas at peril of the anger of heaven for anything less than a king to engage a king in combat. Accidents were liable to happen. The story reads, that "a bowman drew his bow at a venture, and the arrow, piercing a joint in his armour—killed a king." Yes that is it, I am irreligious.

I am held to be irreligious. That is the substantial core of inspiration in the arguments of my critics. I am held infidel by them because, forsooth, I attack the ideological hangovers from an archaic science and point of view to which they are predisposed by habit of mind, and challenge the Party positions to which they have become habituated. I know, "R," because, F. C., your habits were my habits, once upon a time.

Great . . . old . . . fossils!

How we Socialists slam one another, everywhere! Is it the movement criticising itself? If so, good and excellent discipline! But there are the dangers of egoism, as Lestor says. Let us help or force one another to take high ground on the merits of disputed issues.

I ask the Editor to reprint some matter from the "Plebs" of the British Plebs League, a Marxian educational organization, which seems to indicate a similar self-criticism is going on over there. The reprint, I think, has value for its constructive defining of what socialism needs, to cope with the practicalities in present day political situations.

C.

INTROSPECTIVE

In this rallying of the workers on definite class issues our function, of course, is not to supply the actual-political slogans of the struggle or to make pronouncements as to the actual forms which the struggle from time to time must take. Our work is to supply a knowledge of the relevant facts of the situation—facts of the past and of the present—so as to demonstrate what the true issues are. Coupled with this is our work of providing the means of interpreting these facts, and this requires us to develop among all the active workers in the movement the capacity for clear dispassionate thinking—a subtly wrought tool of the mind which the working class needs for the problems which confront it more than any other class has needed it in times of stress before.

We are, therefore, faced with a double task, to which it is imperative that all Plebeians should bend their backs in the coming winter. First is the need to relate our teaching more closely to the actual struggle, so that we may quickly sense the changing needs of the struggle which our teaching must serve. Second, we must raise the quality and standard of our education above its present level. We shall only persuade trade unions to entrust their education to us, if we can prove, not only that our aims and intentions are better than anybody else, but that our execution is also superior in quality.

The first need means that we must probably have less of theory and abstract phrases and more attention to present day facts than has been customary in the past. At any rate, our education must have a greater elasticity, so as continually to adapt teaching to meet the ever-changing needs of the moment. We must not be content to prove that economic conditions produce class struggle, and then to imply a priori that Socialism follows as an "inevitable" "effect." We must stress the need for conscious,

active struggle—and must apply our education to an examination of the forms which that struggle takes, and to a careful dissection of the detailed problems to which that struggle gives rise.

At the same time our second task requires us to caution ourselves against a pressing danger. We must not confuse our educational work with the distinct task of the propagandist agitator, whose aim is to stimulate the emotions of his audience by the use of words, as does the musician with sounds and rhythm and the artist with colour and design. The agitator plays the important role of rousing men to take specific action. Our task is to provide the mental tools by which a wise choice of action may be made. For the agitator words perform the part that the red flag to the bull plays for the toreador. For us words must be what lines are for the draughtsman or the map-maker—shorthand symbols for complex facts. A principal part of our education, in fact, consists in disentangling words from their emotional colour and associations and in teaching their use in strict relation to actual fact. For words are the vehicles of thought, and only in the degree that we can separate them from our emotions and use them as strict representatives of things will our thinking be realistic, scientific and practical, in contrast with the emotion-tinged dreaming of the mystic and the utopian. It is probably in improvement in this direction that much of the second part of our task lies. The duty of the teacher is not to overlay the mind with a new set of prejudices or to induce transitory moods of anger and resentment against a monster labelled "capitalism." On the contrary, it is to clear the mind and to give to students that apprehension of facts and power of realistic analysis of them which has made the teacher himself a fighter in the class struggle. And let us remember that vague abstract terms are much more likely to be suffused with emotional colour, and so to be a cloak instead of an instrument of thought, than are concrete words which can be easily related to something in our experience which they represent. In this fact lies the heart of the problem of simplification!

The Plebs (London)

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.

Red or Yellow?

BY J. A. McDONALD.

THE question of whether a revolutionary or reform attitude should be adopted by working class organisations in their political struggles appears to be a live one at present. Even parties that have hewn to the revolutionary line since their inception are now flopping over to the more popular advocacy of remedial legislation. To substantiate their new position every known form of reasoning is being called into action.

From an editorial in a recent issue of the Western Clarion (No. 925) I am extracting the following gem: "Agreement with the doctrine of the class struggle does not necessarily imply exclusive devotion to policies of immediate revolution." This conclusion is reached after a quotation from Brailsford: New Leader, September 19th, 1924, is produced. The editorial contention seems to be that there is a close relationship existing between the I. L. P. and the Socialist movement and that the theory of the class struggle is common to both.

The publication of the full article from which the Brailsford quotation was taken would portray a condition not quite so satisfactory for illustrating the revolutionary relationship as the editorial in question implies. (*) Then, the veteran editor—Brailsford—reminds us that once in his youth while addressing an I. L. P. audience he over-reached himself to the extent of stressing the class struggle. He was promptly taken to task by one of the old leaders who kindly explained that "we never speak of the class struggle in the I. L. P." A glance at the report of the last I. L. P. Conference suffices to show that less emphasis is placed on the class struggle now than ever before.

But this matter of "agreement" with the doctrine is worthy of some attention. The easiest way of disposing of an issue is to agree with it and then bury it. Even the defunct Second International agreed that there was a class struggle. But this agreement did not prevent them, when the opportunity arrived, displaying that they had not the slightest idea of what the class struggle meant. It was a matter of expediency to endorse it and more expediency to forget it. So with the I. L. P.

We do not have to cross the pond in order to demonstrate the futility of making room for a reference to the struggle of classes in a party platform and, then, conveniently ignoring it so that a far distant revolution should be the objective rather than an immediate one.

Here in the U. S. A. the Socialist Party has amply supplied the necessary material. For more than twenty years their lengthy reform platform has always managed to embrace some kind of a reference to the class struggle. There was a tradition in

the movement that whatever was omitted the class struggle must be mentioned. During some election campaigns it would appear about the beginning of the platform, while on other occasions it found its way to the end, but it was always fortunate enough to be included.

The numerous immediate demands in the same program received the attention of every party speaker. They wanted the abolition of child labor, government ownership of the railways, or a reduction in the cost of living but no one had time to explain the significance of the class struggle. In their greed for petty reforms, that practically every other party was espousing, they could not exclusively devote themselves to policies of immediate revolution. When all the reforms were introduced and applied the revolution would be here and of course the class struggle would take care of itself.

The logical outcome of this situation was that the class struggle became so worn out and feeble that it couldn't stand up. It became obsolete. In the recent presidential campaign the Socialist Party gave up the ghost and joined the LaFollette parade. They willingly accepted the platform of the new party. Here there is no mention of the class struggle at all. The old immediate demands are all present. They appear just as healthy and vigorous as when they made their home in the Socialist program.

La Follette and his gang are not clamoring for an immediate revolution. They do not even anticipate a remote one. Capitalism must be saved and a reform program alone can save it. So we have the spectacle of Debs, Berger, and Hillquit lining up with the old party leaders to save the nation and the constitution. As Rudolph Spreckels, one of the Third Party millionaires, so well stated: "We've got to vote the Socialist ticket to save capitalism."

The Socialist Party of Canada is now adopting a policy that, ultimately, can only land it where the S. P. of A. is today. The sympathetic attitude taken towards all other groups in the labor movement, together with its flirtatious disposition anent reforms are the primary essentials for a revolutionary funeral. The claim that the leaders of the S. P. of C. are better equipped with class knowledge than those of the S. P. of A. and consequently, will be able to stem the tide of dissolution is not substantiated by the facts.

There has been a number of capable economists and historians in the S. P. of A. Untermann, Boudin, Lewis, and others have produced much in the various departments of social science. Regardless of the fact that exception must be taken to some of their conclusions we must admit that they have contributed greatly to a popularisation of Marxism. This did not suffice to preserve them from anti-socialist action.

While in theory we were supplied with profound treatises on value, surplus value, ground rent, and wages the application of such knowledge was thwarted by their misconception, and consequent belittlement, of the class struggle. At the national S. P. of A. convention in 1916 Untermann, in supporting the ban on Oriental immigration, stated that "when Marx said 'workers of the world unite' he did not mean for them to come to the United States to unite."

In Canada the Canadian Labor Party appears to possess all the earmarks of the S. P. of A. and is undoubtedly heading in the same general direction. A reference to the class struggle is likely contained in its platform to provide something in the way of a revolutionary atmosphere but this can be discarded with impunity when occasion demands.

The opinion has been expressed that the S. P. of C. cannot longer function in its present condition. Audiences are small, interest is waning, and finances are practically non-existent. So something must

be done in the will to live and this something resolves itself into an alignment with a larger and more influential group. It appears to me that much of the lethargy prevailing in the S. P. of C. is due to the obsolete methods of carrying on propaganda work still in vogue.

Take the Clarion for example. The front page which should always be devoted to some live current event, analysed in the light of Marxism, is generally reserved for lengthy quotations from Veblen, Beer, Hegel, or some other ponderous authority and consequently makes an uninviting appeal to the average reader.

Then, again, the articles are too long. Even if sound, they absorb too much space in proportion to the size of the paper. They would be well suited to the semi-feudal conditions obtaining in the land of "three mile prayers and half-mile graces" but in this age of Capitalism, in a rapidly developing land, the worker, looks for shorter, simpler, more direct analysis of his social problems. This can easily be supplied without sacrificing anything useful.

Again the apparent effort to produce style at the expense of clarity is harmful to a propagandist paper. In recent times the Clarion has been an innovator of cubist phraseology. When one wanders through an article of six or seven columns he still remains in doubt of the writer's meaning. This is not as it should be. Scientific explanations from the old masters should be made assimilable for the common worker who is not a profound dialectician and who must have his education presented in a way he can understand it.

"THE PARADISE OF THE POOR"

IT may be said that these two fundamental instincts of life—bread and love—by their functioning maintain a social equilibrium in the life of animals and especially in Man.

It is love which causes, in the great majority of men, the principal physiological and psychological expenditure of the forces accumulated in larger or smaller quantities by the consumption of daily bread, and which the daily labor has not absorbed or which parasitic inaction has left intact.

Even more—love is the only pleasure which truly has an universal and equalitarian character. The people have named it "the paradise of the poor," and religions have always bidden them to enjoy it without limits—"be fruitful and multiply"—because the erotic exhaustion which results from it, especially in males, diminishes or hides beneath the pall of forgetfulness the tortures of hunger and servile labor, and permanently enervates the energy of the individual; and to this extent it performs a function useful to the ruling class.

But indissolubly linked to this effect of the sexual instinct there is another, the increase of the population. Hence it happens that the desire to eternalize a given social order is thwarted and defeated by the pressure of this population which in our epoch assumes the characteristic form of the proletariat—and the social evolution continues its inexorable and inevitable forward march."

E. Ferri: "Socialism and Mod. Science."

Are not Ferri's conclusions now obsolete, due to the dissemination of birth control methods amongst the people who dwell in "the paradise of the poor"?

Is not the normal pain-cost (large families) of obeying the Biblical injunction, over-balanced by the pleasure-gain as the result of the intervention of Margaret Sangster and the birth-control leagues?

Modern science in the realm of love and war where the proletariat meet on an universal and equalitarian basis—presents itself as a wonderful and fearsome weapon of emancipation—by extinction!

F. C.

(*) Editor's Note: Fair criticism is as valuable as it is rare.

Here's what we actually did say:

"A statement like this (Brailsford: New Leader, September 19, 1924) is never to be found in labor party or I. L. P. electioneering literature: "The class struggle is a raw fact, which no gentle idealism can disguise. It is the motive force without which history is unintelligible: it is the plain name for most of the processes which make up the practical life of every day. So long as a small minority in every nation owns the land, the machines and the banks, so long as this minority can levy a toll before the rest of us may work, so long as its uncontrolled power over machinery, raw materials and credit governs us in every detail of our daily lives, so long must we choose between slavery and struggle." By which it may be seen, incidentally, that agreement with the doctrine of the class struggle (since Brailsford is a reformer) does not necessarily imply exclusive devotion to policies of immediate revolution."

There is no further need to show that Comrade McDonald imposes a viewpoint upon us which we did not present. We have set some lines in bold face type so that they may not escape his attention this time. We did not say the I. L. P. or the labor party were in agreement with the doctrine of the class struggle, but we did say that Brailsford was, and he is a reformer, and he is not devoted to policies of immediate revolution.

Western Clarion

A Journal of History, Economics, Philosophy,
and Current Events.
Published twice a month by the Socialist Party of
Canada, P. O. Box 710, Vancouver, B. C.
Entered at G. P. O. as a newspaper.

Editor: Ewen MacLeod

SUBSCRIPTION:

Canada, 20 issues \$1.00
Foreign, 16 issues \$1.00

929 If this number is on your address label your
subscription expires with next issue.
Renew promptly.

VANCOUVER, B. C., DECEMBER 1, 1924.

THE FELLAHIN.

IF the king of Egypt, Ahmed Fuad Pasha, has inherited little of the renown and dignity of the Egyptian kings of the ancient dynasties, his people are having it brought home to them again that the land of their sojourning, with themselves crowding the fertile valley of the Nile, is again coveted by the invader. In the ancient days the people in occupation developed irrigation projects of their own, in the cultivation of corn; now the invader would, in modern fashion, develop irrigation in the cultivation of cotton. Since the fourth century B. C., Egypt has ceased to be an independent sovereign state, and she enjoyed that state previous to that period only in lapses. And the protecting influence of the desert, subject to penetration as it was then is more so now. An added chapter of "The Book of the Dead," their great literary epic, must include the modern civilizing influences of the long staple cotton plantation and the mill of capital which from that weaves the fine thread of artificial silk, bogus silk which, in these days of poor marketing, is doing its best to drive good silk grades out.

The modern "Egypt for the Egyptians" campaign began in the early 80's and ended then too, and from that time until 1922 Britain imposed a "temporary" occupation upon Egypt. In 1922 the British military occupation ceased—otherwise than that she insisted on maintaining the safety of British Empire communications, defence of Egypt against foreign aggression, governorship (protection) of foreign interests in Egypt and guarantees for British interests in the Sudan. In securing these objectives, British troops have been maintained along the Suez Canal and the Nile Valley.

While Egypt has gained this sort of national status she appears to have actually lost Sudan, hitherto jointly administered by Britain and Egypt. In 1870 it was annexed and declared to be Egyptian territory. In 1885 the Arabs captured Khartoum and killed General Gordon. They held the territory until the troops under Kitchener drove them out in 1898. Then followed the Anglo-Egyptian Sovereignty. In the present dispute in which political assassinations have been the feature for two or three years, the desideratum of the Egyptian nationalists is sole sovereignty of the Sudan. But Lord Cromer called the Sudan a "priceless possession." The Cape to Cairo railway runs through it; it contains some of the most fertile land in Africa; already immense irrigation works are projected which will establish control of the waters of the Nile. Last June Lord Parmoor (for the Labor Government) stated in the House of Lords that under no circumstances would the British Government abandon the Sudan. This was confirmed by Premier MacDonald, and now appears to be proven by Premier Baldwin's government. Attempted assassinations, by the way, have not all been one sided in Egypt. Last July Zaghlul, Premier of Egypt, was shot at and it appears to be agreed the effort, unsuccessful, was made from political motives.

Here lies a problem, for those who are interested in such, of the fates of small nationalities. The Arab Mahdi ruled the Sudan for upwards of fifteen years

before Kitchener established British control. If the fellahin is in bad shape now, and if in considerable number he is destined to shoulder the status of wage worker for British capitalist interests, it appeared that his former status was deplorable. Egyptian nationalist bourgeoisdom would willingly substitute for British in the exploitation process. Can the fellahin escape? Rightly or wrongly, the British Labor Party, or an influential section of it, appears to think they are not to be "given up." That fellahin, like those lower down in Uganda, in Kenya Colony, in Congo, in Iraq and other areas has a mission in life, apparently, and that is to enable his civilizers to substitute manufactured long staple cotton as silk for the silk now on the market, and the process, it would appear, has had some success already.

Now that an important British official has been killed we are likely to see British Imperialism settle itself definitely in the Sudan. That is, if France and America don't once more become indignant over the fate of small peoples who are unable to develop, by themselves, oil, potential silk, coal lands—or whatever it is—or to howl imperially, and who must therefore suffer the grace of God and the tortures of civilization.

HERE AND NOW.

Here and Now we haven't much to say, for the reason that we have but little to talk about. Inspiration, Here and Now, comes usually from inspiring cash totals and these, this time, are so negligible as to be hardly worth talking about. Our scheme is to let them run until next issue, present them all at once, and then make-believe that the cash is worth counting.

FASHIONS.

Fashions are exhibitions of the imitative instinct. Women are much more inclined to imitate each other than men are, because they have, on the whole, more of the characteristics of the child psychology.

There are fashions in ideas just as there are fashions in dress. If nearly everybody in a community believes in a certain way, it is almost as hard for any one of us to think differently from what the rest do as it is for a bird not to fly up when the rest do.

Independence, self-reliance, and originality are opposed to the imitative instinct and tend to weaken and displace it. These qualities indicate strength and maturity, just as the tendency to imitate others indicates weakness and inferiority. "The eccentricity of genius" is a common expression of the fact that persons of extraordinary originality are disposed to act in ways that are unlike those of ordinary people. I remember once hearing Prof. Lester F. Ward, of Brown University, say that he was very nearly mobbed one warm day in September when he walked down Pennsylvania Avenue, Washington, D. C., with a straw hat on. It was the custom to put straw hats aside on the first of September; and the small boys and small-bore adults who garnished Pennsylvania Avenue that late-summer afternoon did not purpose to allow even a philosopher to be comfortable, if by so doing he violated the sacred usage of the tribe regarding straw hats.

It is often surprising to persons of progressive tendencies that men are so fixed and helpless that they go along year after year and age after age in the same old paths of prejudice, without ever being able to see other and better ways of looking at things. Reforms always move up-hill. Converting people to new ideas is like wearing away stone.

Mental evolution has not proceeded far as yet. Human reason (what there is of it) has grown out of animal instinct. Originality is so rare that it is almost discreditable. The foundations of human thinking are still largely instinctive.

Progress is not natural. We are geared to go round and round. The reformer should not expect too much. We are only as far along as we are. And it is the nature of man to be mechanical.

No wonder we have such high regard for the

past! No wonder we shake our heads at new ideas! No wonder we burn our geniuses at the stake! Considering the kind of beings we have been made out of, it is surprising that we are not worse than we are.

Imitation will not always be stronger than reason, but it is today.

CORRESPONDENCE

NEW WESTMINSTER LABOR PARTY

Editor, Clarion:

The Labor Party group of New Westminster enclose herewith an article, the first of its periodical contributions. It is not an essay on Politics or economics but a program of practical work—a very important work—and we are hopeful that through the medium of your valued publication the attention of other bodies be drawn upon our program and comments be the result.

We further wish to have fifty copies of the issue in which this article appears for local distribution by us.

Yours fraternally,

The New Westminster Labor Party.

D. B. McCormack, Sec'y.

609 Belmont St., New Westminster.

The Labor Party group of New Westminster has come into being as Labor's central organ for political action and the dissemination of propaganda and education. It is primarily built to give service to both organized and unorganized labor and one of its first moves toward this objective was a critical analysis of the actual as well as the possible voting strength of Labor in this constituency.

The following interesting data was collected based on figures as disclosed at the last Provincial Election and supplemented with a survey of the possible voting strength.

| | Votes |
|--|-------|
| The Labor candidate polled | 678 |
| The candidates of the Conservative, Liberals and Progressives polled | 3312 |
| Total votes cast | 3990 |
| Registered as voters | 5700 |
| On Voters' List not voting | 1710 |
| Population New Westminster City about | 18000 |
| Foreigners, sick and absent | 2000 |
| Assuming those under age | 6000 |
| On Voters' List | 5700 |
| | 13700 |

Eligible to vote not registered

5300
18000

Allowing even a very generous deduction from this figure for dissentients it must still be admitted that this is a very great latent force.

We are fully justified in claiming that the larger percentage of these 5300 eligibles plus those that did not vote but had the franchise, i.e., 1700, making a total of 7000 rightly belong to Labor.

The old parties have well organized political and electioneering machines and can mobilize the electors to a far greater percentage than Labor. In fact in this particular field Labor has never been active. Here, therefore, is the greatest scope of activity for the Labor Party of New Westminster; the registration of these 5000 eligibles and the education of the 7000 individuals. We concede that an efficiency of 100% in this direction is out of the question for reasons obvious to all students of the Labor movement. The amount of Labor votes that can be won from this group of 7000 individuals depends on the sincerity, sense of duty, willingness and enthusiasm of the active members of the Labor Party aided by co-operation of the Labor Unions and other bodies and individuals in sympathy with the cause of Labor, and the added facilities which must be secured, giving the widest opportunity for these unregistered eligibles to register and vote. Education has then to do its important work.

The Labor Party group of New Westminster is of the opinion that similar conditions with respect to latent and as yet undeveloped voting power must exist in Vancouver and other cities and municipalities and hopes that surveys be instituted and analogous work undertaken. It is hard spade work but the result of such work in this virgin field is obvious. We invite an expression of opinion.

The Labor Party of New Westminster.

MANIFESTO

of the
SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA
(Fifth Edition)

Per copy 10 cents

Per 25 copies \$2

Post Paid.

The Burning Bush

COM. "C" invites us to hit the sawdust trail and be good—which is the natural habit of the reformed. But the "grace" has not come upon us. While the main issue—the tactics of socialist progress—is still with us, obdurate as ever. To which "C" has plausibly tacked on the identity of his reformism with Marxism. And asks us to show "our colors." Well, on the principle that fools may go where angels baulk, we are not disposed to shirk the issue. Nor waste time on the ragged ends.

We agree with those quotations from the Manifesto—offered to us as a *sep*. Hence, paradoxically, we agree with "C." Accordingly, we are under no necessity of "repudiating Marx" and have no glass houses to fortify. But—and we emphasise the point—those quotations are not identical with Com. "C's" original thesis—that socialism is to be accomplished by a full blooded working class, strengthened by constant improvements in living conditions, by means of reforms; by the seduction of habit; and the feasibilities of authority and human nature. That is labor politics, not proletarian identity, opportunism, not Marxism; and is therefore not in harmony with his new orientation as quoted.

Since we agree that the interest of the proletariat is one, whence came our divisions? If it does not matter which way we go, but "what we pick up on the way," why the fuss? Why not willy nilly, go with popular acclamation? Why not join the A. F. L. for instance? It claims to be the representative of labor. Why the discrimination? Are they right or wrong? Can a stiff-necked minority of reactionaries stay the progress of labor? "That's a blazing strange implication," as Jerry Cruncher might say. Why do the labor bodies never pick up socialism, or the means of socialism by the way? Why are they invariably on the service of capitalist interest? side-tracked on illusions? hedging, dallying, obscuring the fundamental issue of capitalist property right? Put it another way. Would Marx associate with Gompers and Lewis, or Moore and Draper, or British radicals, or the B. C. Federationists. Under the historic circumstances of the day, would he struggle for R. MacDonald's Russian Treaty, or the Dawes plan, or Treaty revision, or Reparations, or Liberal Land Reform, or Wheatly Housing? or similar free buns for free plugs? All of them are hailed by labor parties as beneficial to labor. The Manifesto gives its own answer—that all those things and bodies are but varying expressions of "Bourgeoisie Socialism."

With whom, then, are we to co-operate? What institutions are we to set up, or pull down? How choose and devise, amidst the conflict of aim and unidentified interest. By what standard are we to judge right and wrong? By what criterion differentiate the true interests of labor? How adopt the habits and aptitudes that lead to real Socialism from amidst the inextricable tangle of bourgeois socialism? How distinguish between true reforms and class interest? How persuade the authority of property to righteousness, and the human nature of capital from its iniquity. By one standard alone—Capitalist property in the means of life. And by one means alone—class conscious understanding of Capitalist property relations and consequence. The lack of that understanding is the one cause of labor divisions, here the understanding, is the essential of proletarian identity. Without the perception of that identity, no unity; without unity, no Socialism.

The haunting irrelevancy of the comforting axiom of picking up by the way is consequently obvious. What we pick up by the way is according to the way we go: the way we go depends on the way we see. If we see by the moonshine of revisionism, we shall dally with circuman reform. If our vision is the class conscious vision of Capitalist property right, we must stand in antagonism to all who do not directly and consistently oppose that right. We can-

not co-operate with antagonistic aims. The conflict must be settled in the mind before the mind can settle the conflict in society. That is why labor never "picks up by the way." Un-classconscious, it pursues a chimera, redecorated, by the crafty skill of exigent politics, in shimmering hues of its own confusion. That is why labor is divided and broken. Its immediacy is the conservation of sectarian interest, irrespective of its proletarian implication. That is why "C" himself pleads for unity. The constant pressure of the daily struggle, with its irremediable provocation of the immediate, present socialist theory as an abstract, a romantic incursion into the future. That is why "C" emphasises the process of change, rather than the condition of change. That is the real issue between us, "C" says, the process is the thing. We say, it is time condition. The process, in virtue of its own potential, induces the means and material of change; but the ever-varying circumstance of an ever varying necessity conditions it. The process creates the impetus; the condition concatenates its form. In other words, the process is static, cosmic; the condition dynamic, vital. Hence the lag or the leap in human affairs, its tragedy or comedy—the reflex of contemporary contingencies, laden with harmonic reagents, flashing through the reason of being, in terms of the human equation.

But the Manifesto.

It was written under the revolutionary conditions of 1847. In conditions when the critical and analytic founders of Hist. Mater, expected optimistic results. As Engels points out in the preface (p. 7) some passages require modification and specifically its reforms. The conditions productive of those modifications have been enhanced since then—due either to a fall in the intelligence of the modern proletariat, compared with 1848, or a rise in the virility of governmental control, or both. Either the "aptitude" of the workers of '48 was greater than their modern brethren, or Marx was mistaken in his hope of immediate revolution. But since the conditions of development engendered less stress on the applications of reform—and have continued to do so—it would appear that Marx was led astray by that contemporary wave of reform. That is to say, that he regarded those historic turbulences of changeful reform as a proletarian understanding of the social conditions that occasioned them. Else why did he expect revolution? The same thing magnified accounts for our own magnificent wobbling. Not science.

Nevertheless, the manifesto is the substantial of Hist. Mater. And stands beyond criticism. But it affords little sanction to reformist vagaries. Naturally. Since it is the expression of scientific socialism, it can hardly express labor politics. Its real meaning, its spirit and its truth, must be read and applied by its own philosophy—the materialist conception. Over and over again it emphasises the fundamental antagonism of Capitalist property; that the function of socialism is the expression of class struggle; that no party ignoring that fundamental can be socialist; that the struggle for reform is but "practical politics,"—a side play of the Capital issue—the capture of political power, and that the organization of the proletariat for that purpose is its essential condition. Consequently, its fundamental expresses time condition, i.e., that Capital can be abolished, when, and only when, its reason of being becomes class conscious. Time-condition is not the equivalent of habit and reform; of occasion, or human nature. It is the manifest of the stage of capitalist development when class conscious perception of material interest rises superior to all the subterfuges of exigency.

Consequently, scientific socialism, recognising this, must find itself in antagonism to labor, politically entangled in the toils of trade issues. Scientific socialism calls upon the workers to muster un-

der its banner for the capture of political power—the only power there is. The only way to capture that power is to understand it. If then the workers rally instead to the support of "practical politics" it can only be because they are yet imperceptive of their identity. As political representation expresses economic interest, socialism can find its following only in the ranks of understanding. As Socialism is organized for political supremacy, it must conflict with organizations of ulterior expediencies. And, as capitalist development enforces political action, and action connotes the mind, the political color of that action must measure our social consciousness. Therefore Socialism standing on proletarian identity, must conflict with all from whatever cause, who oppose that identity. But this conflict is not against labor, but against the labor of reform (or the reform of labor); not against the proletariat, but against their borrowed organizations of bourgeois traditionalism. And while politics is the mature field of emancipation, it owes that maturity, singly, to class understanding. Outside of that understanding, the organization is just like a "milling" herd, potent, powerful, dangerous—and helpless.

Thus the appeal for co-operation is a false sentiment. It ignores the conformations of reality; and confuses political antagonism with labor reaction—a most extraordinary common idea. It puts the field of struggle in the shifty plane of opportunity. It transforms energy on inconstant vicissitudes. It seethes the kid of ignorance in the mother milk of confusion; and subsides the mind, with its magical potencies of developed faculty and material, with the reactionary visionism of a once pregnant condition.

If, as Comrade Macdonald avers, the resolve is taken, the deed done (*) then we say that at no distant date it will have to be undone. We say it not as matter of prophecy, but as statement of fact. And we say "have to," because, in the new terms of oligarchic Imperialism, it is an attempt to set back the shadow on the dial. It is an effort to force an issue, where force is futile. It strives to foster a false alliance amongst incoherent elements, forgetting, seemingly, its own materialism, that unity is of mind, and mind of circumstance, and that the verbal word quickens the mind effectively only when circumstance quickens its dispossession. A powerful and unscrupulous state, intent on its pound of flesh, on one hand, and a grovelling confusion on the other calls for another intermediary than a hybrid of "class conscious reformism!" Just as the petty bourgeoisie strove in vain against its destruction; so petty labor, its descendant, strives unavailingly for its sectarian interests. The continuous process of social degradation merges both in proletarian unity, and straight Socialism can alone point the remedy and show the way out. In spite of hope and appearance, the mixing of aims and issues, and the spreading of terms, can avail nothing against the power of the State, nor advance confusion to Socialism. It cannot be stolen; it must be thought. The true appeal is the class struggle. The real issue Capitalist property—undiluted.

Hence we agree with proletarian unity and its common identity. But we still disagree with "C's" full blooded braves, skipping the whirlpool of revolution on the stepping stones of improved conditions. And it isn't Marxian. The whole trend of Marx proves progressive social degradation. Its inevitability in fact. Explicit and implicit it is scattered throughout "Capital," e.g., "machinery and industry," "the general laws of accumulation," and

(*) Editor's Note: If we manage to outlive the argument, dear "R.," when the battle is over we'll be able to write letters to one another asking where the human factor—in readers and party members—has escaped to.

Meanwhile, no resolve has been taken, and no deed has been done. That needs—at least a quorum.

(Continued on page 6)

THE BURNING BUSH.

(Continued from page 5,

in "wage labor and capital." (We need not burden a harassed Caledonian, scant of space, with quotations of the obvious.) We note, to prevent confusion, that we do not mean mere poverty and physical deterioration, but positive social degradation, the progressive inhibition of the social forces, means, and potentialities. The manifesto is explicit against specific attention to reforms—and as already noted that specification is augmented. In "Value, Price and Profit, (p. 77) the watchword is "abolition of the Capitalist system." And as, and "for reason already given, Socialism must struggle to fulfil its function, it must find itself, in the byplay of opportunist politics, in direct opposition to all who cannot in first attention, carry the flag.

In "aspects of social change," "C" sums up his particular issues on the Party—"Anti Labor Party; Anti-reform, apathy for constitutional change." Nos. 1 and 2, may fairly be accepted, on the first count, but not on the second, i.e., not Marxian. We think they are Marxian. That is, they find their necessary place in the philosophy of the materialist conception. In brief, that, in that facile gospel of social change, economic conditions inevitably create class conflicts; that those conflicts must be fought out between the classes in the ideological concepts of their consciousness, and that in spite of wavering appearance and medial issue, the fundamental interests of class organisations must clash, sharp and imperious, on the final field of political emancipation. The clear concept of the new must clash with the romantic tradition of the old. If the concept is not clear, i.e., not extricated from the old tradition, it must seek conciliations with affects. Because it cannot walk alone in the darkness of its confusions. But if the concept is clear, it must be anti to those effects. Hence, it must be anti to parties organized primarily to grapple with those efforts. That is, anti "practical politics," which includes both labor and reform, but which also harmonises it with proletarian identity, without separate interest or currency.

Says "C," again: The function of revolutionary parties is not to destroy the workers' organisations, but to act as a special environment of education and criticism, along with the complex of forces making for Socialism." Quite so. But that is not "C's" philosophy of reform. On the contrary. It is the philosophy of straight Socialism. The application of which by the S. P. C. has earned for it the romantic titles of the troglodyte. That "special environment" is, of necessity, the unmisted concept of the class struggle, else it had no critical value. To have critical value it must oppose false organisation and illusory interest, and consequently it carries with it, as a direct sequence, political hostility to whosoever cannot fly the red flag of Capitalist abolition.

"C" wanders on in faith sublime to "argue for revolutionaries to influence the future in feasible ways." But he "does not throw down the class struggle." In that confusion alone he violates his own contention. For, if he does not throw down the class struggle—in effect, if not in theory—he will find himself, almost immediately, in political antagonism to labor representation everywhere, save in the parties of the straight issue. The straight issue is not step at a time ameliorations, but abolition of capital. The incidents of the daily struggle are efforts of property rights. The incessant encroachments of that right on labor compel that struggle for preservation. But the right of property to itself turns that blind struggle to futility. The sequence alters the tempo of the process, but not its direction; alters its conditioning, but not its conditions. In the last resort it is abortive, thus forcing the struggle to the issue of power. That is the class struggle. And it is anti-thesis of reform. And "feasible ways" are the ways of truth. Not the temporisations of expediency. The ways that make the meaning and significance of life conscious to itself. Not the subterfuges of the political. The ways that declare the reality of things as they are.

Not the puny antidotes that would leaven a finitive lie for social purpose. Society cannot thrive on a lie; it cannot be regenerated on deceit. It must know itself, or perish; know the truth, or languish in superstitions.

The class struggle is the ideological aspect of Socialism. The terms of equated interest. The clear recognition of that struggle implies the clear recognition of our slavery—the bondage of wage-dom. The recognition of our slavery manifests itself in unmistakable opposition to property right in the means of life. Not joint management of its exploitation. It involves the complete shattering of traditional freedom. Not the dim travesties of conciliation. Therefore the class struggle, implicit in the daily occasions of existence, against a rapacious master class, must be organized for the abolition of that class. It cannot keep political house with temporisations. While the same perception prevents it from fantasias in the industrial field. To organise a party entails perception of the reasons for the organisation. And therefore, explicit principles. If the reasons do not appeal, the principles cannot apply. And the reasons can only appeal when time condition quickens necessity. Thence the principle is not to be achieved by the forced marches of "intelligent minorities," nor the diplomacies of co-operation, however skillful. Consequently, "the creation of institutions as instrumentalities for furthering our interests" are finally dependant, in formation and permanence, on the class consciousness of a social majority.

Moreover, the only "indispensable institution" for the promotion of our well-being, is knowledge of capital relations. The social organisation and discipline which its necessities have developed are ripe to our will for the furtherance of our interest—the socialist commonwealth. Whenever the ideation of its benefice kindles the passion of intelligence. The awakening of that knowledge is primarily the development of the capitalist system. The steady, unalterable, antipodal accumulation of its excess, destroys the forms of its institutions; shatters the content of their traditions; and unveils, like morning dawn, the livid night that is past, the day that is to be. Our function is the "special environment of education," which in accord with the unproven sequences of time, may forward their complex of forces to the triumph of "constitutional means." That environment is the oil on the turbulent waters of change, which alone can abate the last terrors of insatiate privilege. It is the symbol, lifted up and understood, for the comforting of peoples, and the healing of the nations.

A DIALOGUE ON WAGES.

BY WM. P. BLACK.

(With apologies to E. T. Kingsley and others)

Comrades and Friends:—

All of you have heard in the past times of men and women having to work for their board, a state of affairs which always creates the greatest sympathy, for the victims. Now, if this state of affairs creates sympathy, a case where a man or woman worked for nothing and boarded him or herself would create much more, wouldn't it? And if you heard of a man or woman who worked for nothing and boarded themselves and paid the employer for the privilege of doing so you would say he or she who did so should be in the house for the feeble minded; yet there are millions of men and women doing this very thing. Maybe you think not, but let me tell you there are lots of folks doing it right here in Vancouver, and there would be many more if there were jobs for all workers here at present, and any of you working women and men who are in possession of a looking glass can see the gink or ginkess any time you want to if you get into a room by yourself and take a good look in the mirror. Those words—gink and ginkess—sound slangy, but they express what we are better than calling ourselves men and women, we won't be men and women in the full sense of the words until we abolish the condi-

tions that make us wage slaves to a small portion of society.

Now it is up to me to prove that the state of affairs outlined above exists.

To begin with, one cannot think of wages without thinking of money, and cannot think of money without thinking of wealth, as the average citizen thinks that money is wealth.

So we will analyze the word wealth and find out what it means.

What is the meaning of wealth? Of what does it consist? Is it gold, silver, diamonds, paper notes, stocks and bonds, deeds or first mortgages? There is wealth in gold, silver and other valuables when they are viewed from a commodity nature point of view, and then only, when any of the above metals are used as a means of exchange in the form of money. They are simply a means of exchange; that is what money is—a means of exchange.

Wealth consists of all kinds of commodities created by the labor power of workers from nature's products, that is the meaning of wealth. Jewelry is wealth because of its commodity nature, people wear it, especially "cullod" folks and the ladies.

Now that the word wealth is disposed of we will take the word wages.

What are wages? Wages is money or goods paid for labor power when it is delivered!

What do wages do for the working class? They keep them in food, clothing and shelter of a kind.

Where do wages come from? Wages are produced by the workman employed on the job, as a rule.

We have just concluded that wages only amount to food, clothing and shelter on the average for the worker; then he works for wages and pays his own board.

Now at the end of the year, what has the worker saved from his earnings? How much has he got in the bank on the average? They haven't saved a bean; so that will just prove that he has worked for nothing and boarded himself; does it not?

But that is not all, as there is a percentage of our citizens who do not do any useful labor, how do they live? They live from surplus values created by the workers, which is an incontrovertible fact.

Now when such is conceded to be the case, the worker creates this surplus value and the bourgeoisie live on it, do they not? Where they do that, they must be paying the boss for the privilege of working for nothing and boarding themselves.

In short they go to work and pay their own wages, and board themselves, work for nothing and pay the employer for the privilege of working for nothing and boarding themselves.

Now what keeps the working class in such a state of mind as to allow such a flimflam game to be worked on them?

The chief instrument in the hands of the ruling class is the church, the great lying church, as Carlyle calls it, and there will not be a better social system on this planet until it is destroyed, root and branch. People stuffed with this dope cannot do their own thinking entirely. "The preachers do not think themselves and they squelch all progressive thought in others."

How are we going to destroy it? By education of a kind. What kind? That which is dispensed through the columns of the Western Clarion.

Ladies and gentlemen I would be most pleased to take your subscription for that paper now.

ECONOMIC CAUSES
OF WAR

By PETER T. LEOKIE.

NOW READY

Preface by the author.

132 PAGES.

Per Copy, 25 Cents.

Ten copies up, 20 cents each.

Post Paid.

The Rise and Decline of Neo-Communism

By HAIM KANTOROVITCH.

From "The Modern Quarterly"
(Continued from last issue)

AS I said previously, in the last years before the war it became more and more evident that European social democracy, while holding fast to the Marxian view on social reform, practically abandoned the Marxian stand that reforms were valueless except as stimuli to further struggle which should culminate in the social revolution; from a means to goal (the social revolution), social reforms became a goal in themselves. It was evident that socialism daily lost more and more of its revolutionary character. The revolutionary minorities in the various European parties, as well as in this country, organized themselves in "left wings" and fought against these tendencies, but without success. The mass had either too much confidence in their leaders and followed them blindly, or lost all confidence in them and went over to the syndicalists. The left wing of the socialist movement, however, was not against the actual activities of the movement, but what they demanded was more revolutionary education for the masses. All we do now must be in the form of preparations for the coming revolution.

It goes without saying . . . that all socialists will lend their assistance to all elements of the population that are fighting against reaction in favor of labor legislation and reform, but it does not follow that they should consider this the chief part of their work.

Thus one of the lefts summed up their position in 1912. It is possible that this cleavage between right and left might have gone on for years without causing a split, but that finally this split would have had to come we cannot question.

The war, with the great betrayal of the principles of the largest and oldest socialist parties, caused the split to come sooner than it would have under other conditions.

At the moment when the Russian revolution triumphed, the socialist movement in Europe and America had not yet been split, but it had been demoralized and disorganized. The workers had lost all confidence in their leaders. They felt themselves fooled and betrayed beyond hope. Even those who before believed that the war was a war for democracy, a war to end war, and had therefore applauded their leaders who helped to fool them, had already discovered their mistake. In the European countries, especially in the defeated ones, starvation and disease were added. The workers were enraged, they were anxious to do something desperate, but what? Their leaders could not suggest anything to them but patience. In the midst of all this came the Russian revolution. The Russian workers, a small minority of them, took up arms and did what the workers of the world had always dreamed of—why not imitate them? Why not emulate them?

Large masses, starving and disappointed could not be expected to occupy themselves with the examination of whether the objective conditions were ripe for such an act. Their leaders, those who had not betrayed them, knew very well that what had been achieved in Russia could not, at least at that time, be achieved in any other country. They tried to explain it to the workers of their respective countries, but the workers had no more confidence in them. If the Russians could, why couldn't they? So they reasoned. The Russians suddenly became in their eyes, the saviours of socialism. The Russians and those who allied themselves with them gained their confidence. They waited for them to tell them what to do. History placed a great re-

sponsibility on the leaders of the Russian revolution. How did they use this opportunity?

As a result of the Russian revolution the (third) communist international was organized. This new international was greeted with joy everywhere. The Russian Bolsheviks, though they changed their name from social democrats to communists, repeatedly assured us that the change in name did not signify a change in theory or tactics—they were as they had been, Marxists. Steklov wrote a brochure, published by the Soviet government, to show that the new name was adopted only as a defensive measure, so that the masses, who knew little about the differences that existed between the various factions of the movement, would not confuse the revolutionary Marxists with the opportunists. The organizing of the new international meant, consequently, the reunion of all the revolutionary forces of the proletariat. Unity was urgently needed at that moment, and there were no others besides the Russian communists who could bring this about. But already at the first congress of the communist international it became apparent that what the communists contemplated was not international unity of the proletariat, but international strife within the movement. Their slogan became, not "workers of the world unite," but "socialists of the world exterminate each other." This may seem exaggeration, but the facts I shall adduce will prove that it is not. The first duty of the communists all over the world was declared to be a splitting of the parties to which they belonged if they could not get control over them; and if they could get control, to expel every one that did not agree with them even in the slightest measure. The communist international could have had as its members the largest and most important parties in Europe. The Independent Social Democrats of Germany, at that time a large and powerful and really a revolutionary party; the French United Socialist party, the Italian Socialist party, even the Socialist party of America, and many other parties applied for admission, but the communist international refused them. It preferred the splitting up of these parties, the organizing of small and powerless communist sects, to the reunion of all socialist forces. I know some one will now ask, "Should Lenin and Sheidman, Trotsky and Noske have reunited?" No, they should not have. Socialists of the type of Sheidman and Noske would not have entered the new international even had they been invited. They would not have been admitted if they would have applied for admission. But this Sheidman-Noske type of socialist could have been positively isolated and made harmless by the united front of all revolutionary socialists. One of the famous 21 points was that if any one disagreed with even one point, or with any of the theses and resolutions of the communist international, he should be expelled. What was the result? The most important parties in Europe were split, torn to pieces by inner strifes. The real opportunists were given the chance to unite their forces and to demonstrate to the workers that the revolutionists are nothing but sectarians, fighting each other over hairsplitting differences. At the convention of the Independent Social Democratic Party of Germany in 1921, in Halle, a delegate asked Zinoviev, who came to split the party, "Why not unite instead of splitting?" To this Zinoviev replied:

Comrades, it has been said here, Would it not be better if we organize a united front against the bourgeoisie? Yes, of course, it would be very fine and very desirable, but to our regret, it is not possible as yet. The workers

are already strong enough to throw off the bourgeoisie, even tomorrow, if we would only all stand united for communism. If the workers will remain in their dormant state, it is because we have not yet conquered the cursed inheritance of the rotten ideology within our own ranks.

In other words, we have to fight first of all the "enemy from within." In his opening speech at the second congress of the Communist International, Zinoviev made plain what he thought the immediate task of the communist movement to be: It is to fight not the capitalists but the social democrats. "Our fight against the second international," he said, "is not a fight between two factions of the same revolutionary proletarian movement, it is not a fight between different streams within the same class; it is practically a class struggle." This fight against all other socialists (and in this fight no difference was made between the "right" and the "center"), has gone so much over the limits that Lenin saw fit to rebuke his comrades for their excessive zeal. In his letter to the United Communist Party of Germany (August, 1921) he says:

Some exaggerated the fight against the center, overstepped the bounds somewhat, thus transforming the fight into a sport and compromising revolutionary Marxism.

The fight against socialist heresy finally became a kind of "witch hunting" process, even within the communist ranks. They also began to split and fight each other, and they have continued to keep up this "revolutionary activity" to the present day.

Why has the communist international taken this attitude? Is it because the communist leaders are bad men or dishonest? Or have not the interests of the proletarian class struggle in their hearts? Certainly not. The communist leaders are neither bad nor dishonest; they are positively well-meaning, revolutionary socialists whose tactics were dictated to them by the singularity of the situation. This singularity was the complete hegemony of the Russian Bolsheviks over the Communist International; the same people who were the leaders of the Russian Soviet government also became the leaders of the Communist International; the same men who had to fight the battles of the Soviet republic also had to fight the battles of the International Communist movement.

These men had, at the time when the new International was born, not only an actual war with the whites, but also a theoretical war with all other socialists. They considered, and I think rightly, that the pamphlets of Plechanoff and Kautsky, of Martov and Bauer, were more dangerous for them than the guns of the white guards, or the blockade of the imperialist governments. Their socialist opponents attacked them especially on three points:

(1) That no social revolution could be made successfully by an armed minority.

(2) That socialism could not be established in an economically undeveloped country.

(3) That the Soviet government would not be able to hold out long against the capitalist countries of the world. The logical way for the Bolsheviks would have been for them to have drawn the attention of their critics to the specific Russian conditions, conditions so unique, which could not be found anywhere else. But the Bolsheviks, who were distinguished for their revolutionary romanticism—and fanaticism—chose the opposite way. They made a virtue out of necessity; they simply rationalized their experience and satisfied themselves that what had been done in Russia could and would be done everywhere. Russia is an economically undeveloped

Continued on page 8)

THE RISE AND DECLINE OF NEO-COMMUNISM

(Continued from page 7)

country—so Lenin declared (in his report on "National and Colonial Problems" before the Second Congress of the Communist International) that

we must give up the scientific prejudice that each country must inevitably pass through capitalist exploitation. In a time of mighty proletarian uprisings of a world-wide scope the Soviet regime can be established in those countries where capitalism has not yet developed.

Further than Lenin goes Bukharin, who says:

From an examination of the process of a world revolution, we may draw the following general conclusions: The process of the world revolution begins in those countries where the state of development is lower and where the proletarian victory is easier to get. . . . The less capitalistically developed a country is, which means the lower its revolutionary development, the more quickly may the revolution be accomplished. (Hillquit, p. 97.)

Neither Lenin nor Bukharin are willing to admit that they have deviated in any point from Marxism, yet it is easy to see that their conception of the social revolution is precisely the reverse of the Marxian.

The specific Russian condition not only enabled but compelled a minority to make a revolution by means of an armed uprising; but the Bolshevik leaders did not see in this episode anything due to specific Russian conditions, and they quickly decided, and it has become an article of communist faith that "it is a minority which carries out the revolution;" continuing, and "it might be fairly said that every revolution is undertaken by the minority, the majority only joining in during the course of the revolution and deciding its victorious issue." The writer of this calls himself a Marxist; in fact, he claims that he is the real upholder of Marxism, but what he says is against the letter as well as the spirit of Marxism. It is not Marxism, but Bakouninism.

As to the question of the necessity of an armed uprising, there is no communist from Lenin down to his American followers that has not insisted upon it. Kamenev expressed the views of his comrades very correctly in the following words:

The center of contemporary life is the ultimate division of the whole capitalist society into two camps . . . not only in Russia, but in all other countries . . . this is not enough, we know that these two camps come in conflict with arms in their hands . . . civil war is the sign of our time . . . who ever wants to . . . explain to the worker . . . his real duties . . . must start out with the recognition that from now on the proletariat and the bourgeoisie are in open armed civil war. (Third International, p. 7.)

As you see, with Kamenev it is no more a question of what should be; he knows that the civil war is on, and that settles it. This was not only Kamenev's view—the first congress of the Communist International has in its initial declaration this sentence:

The class struggle all over the world, in Europe and America, has become an open civil war.

And the second congress declared:

The period in which we are living is the period of the direct civil war . . . everywhere . . . where there is a labor movement of any significance, the workers are on the eve of bitter battles with arms in their hands. (P. 64.)

Their belief that the world revolution had already come was really phenomenal. Zinoviev predicted at the first congress of the Comintern that "it would perhaps take one year, and we would already begin to forget that there was a fight in Europe for Soviet power, because during this year the fight would be finished." This belief, of course, was not founded on sober examination of European conditions. It was a rationalization of a wish. The leaders of Soviet Russia, who were (and are) also the leaders of the Communist International, did not forget that Marx had once said that the revolution could begin in Russia, but could only succeed if followed by a world revolution. As early as April 14, 1918, Trotsky said in a speech:

We maintained in the first days of the revolution that the Russian revolution would succeed and free the Russian people only on the condition that it serves as a signal for the beginning of the revolution in all other countries; but if capitalism continues to rule in Germany, and in New York the stock exchange will have the upper hand, and British imperialism will retain its power, then we are lost.

A world revolution was a life necessity for them, and they succeeded in convincing themselves that it was ready to come.

But if the world revolution is ready to come, it is simply foolish for any one to fight for reforms, for momentary relief, and whoever does it is a traitor to the working class. If the class struggle in Europe and America has become an open civil war, what are needed are general headquarters and an army and rifles. The communist movement was organized, therefore, as one world-wide party, with no national autonomy, but with an iron military discipline, as befitted an army, and the "international" in Moscow became the general headquarters of this army.

It is sometimes said that as long as we shall have armies, we shall have wars. This may also be applied to the communists. They were originally organized as the revolutionary army, an army in the usual sense of the word, an army that was to begin and finish the social revolution in a short time—within a year, Zinoviev believed. Within an army in time of war there can, of course, be no freedom of discussion; soldiers must obey orders and not argue. That is why the Communist International inserted in its famous 21 points the clause that, if any one does not agree with everything, he shall be expelled; that is also why a point was inserted stating that the communist parties must have legal and illegal organizations; that is why democracy was banished from the party. Practical democracy, which both Marx and Engels considered an absolutely necessary condition for the social revolution, was discarded by the Bolsheviks, who could not get a majority in the Russian constituent convention; in fact, democracy was declared an anathema, a bourgeois prejudice for which the workers should have no use. This attitude had gone so far that a leader of the American communist party told me personally that if danger should arise and the democratic institutions of the United States be abolished, he would not raise a single finger to defend them. This also explains how it became possible for the German communists to entertain the thought that they might, in alliance with German fascists, work for the overthrow of the German republic. This is the old anarchistic impossibilist principle of "all or nothing," a principle which Marx and Engels abhorred.

(To be concluded)

BRITISH ELECTIONS.

A Few Facts and Figures.

The numerical strength of parties in the British House of Commons on dissolution was: Conservatives 258, Labour 193, Liberals 158, Others 5. At the 1923 elections 538 Conservatives, 427 Labour and 457 Liberals contested 615 seats. Of these, 50 candidates were returned unopposed.

This year's nominations showed 533 Conservatives, 507 Labour candidates and 340 Liberals. The number of Conservative candidates has therefore remained about the same, whereas the Labour Party had up 80 candidates more than last year and the Liberal figure is about 100 down. The number of unopposed candidates this year is 32, of which 9 are Labour as against 3 in 1923.

In the last elections there were 265 three-cornered contests. In these 213 minority members were returned having obtained the relative but not the absolute majority of the votes. This time the number of three-cornered contests has dropped to 230, as a result of agreements between both capitalist parties in a number of constituencies against Labour. Such coalition arrangements are specially directed

against certain well-known members of the Labour Party.

Since the aggregate vote this year is 13% higher than last year, the Labour Party has increased its votes by about 27%. This tends to prove that the sweeping gain in Conservative votes was won exclusively from the Liberals.

It is quite different with the question of seats. The table given below will best show how little the distribution of seats corresponds with the actual strength of parties under the British electoral system.

| | Labour Party | | Conservatives | | Liberals | |
|------|--------------|---------|---------------|---------|----------|---------|
| | % votes | % seats | % votes | % seats | % votes | % seats |
| 1922 | 30.4 | 23 | 39 | 56 | 29.9 | 19 |
| 1923 | 30.5 | 31 | 38.5 | 38 | 29.8 | 25 |
| 1924 | 34 | 27 | 46 | 66 | 18 | 6 |

Roughly speaking the Conservatives gained a seat this time on an average of 20,000 votes, compared to a seat gained for Labour on about 35,000 and for the Liberals on 75,000.

Here follows a table showing the number of seats won and votes recorded for labor party candidates in each election from 1900 to 1924 inclusive.

| Year. | Seats. | Votes. |
|-----------------|--------|-----------|
| 1900 | 2 | 62,689 |
| 1906 | 29 | 323,195 |
| 1910 (January) | 40 | 505,690 |
| 1910 (December) | 42 | 370,802 |
| 1918 | 57 | 2,244,945 |
| 1922 | 142 | 4,236,733 |
| 1923 | 191 | 4,355,000 |
| 1924 | 151 | 5,525,072 |

"International Information."

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Obey that impulse and subscribe for the
WESTERN CLARION
Address P. O. Box 710, Vancouver, B. C.

Enclosed find \$.....
Send the Western Clarion to:

Name

Address

Literature Price List

| | Cloth Bound. | Per Copy |
|--|--------------|-----------------|
| Revolution and Counter Revolution (Marx) | | 1.15 |
| Ancient Society | | 1.85 |
| Capitalist Production (First Nine and 33 Chapters | | 1.00 |
| "Capital," vol. 1. (Marx) | | 1.00 |
| Vital Problems in Social Evolution | | 80c |
| Science and Revolution | | 80c |
| The Militant Proletariat | | 80c |
| Evolution Social and Organic | | 80c |
| Puritanism | | 80c |
| Ethics and History | | 80c |
| Germs of Mind in Plants | | 80c |
| The Triumph of Life | | 80c |
| Social Revolution (Kautsky) | | 30 |
| Essays on Materialist | | 1.50 |
| Conception of History (Labriola) | | 1.50 |
| Social Studies (Lafargue) | | .80 |
| Paper Covers. | | |
| Evolution of Man (Prof. Bolsche) | | 50c |
| Wage-Labor and Capital | | 10c |
| Independent Working Class Education | | 10c |
| Communist Manifesto | | 10c |
| The Present Economic System (Prof. W. A. Bongor) | | 10c |
| Socialism, Utopian and Scientific | | 15c |
| Slave of the Farm | | 10c |
| Manifesto, S. P. of C. | | 10c |
| Causes of Belief in God (Lafargue) | | 10c |
| The State and Revolution (Lenin) | | 15c |
| Value, Price and Profit (Marx) | | 15c |
| Two Essays on History (G. Stephenson and G. Deville) | | 15c |
| Economic Causes of War (Leckie) | | 15c |
| Civil War in France (Marx) | | 25c |
| All prices include postage. | | |
| Christianism and Communism (Bishop W. M. Brown) | | 25c |
| Quantity Rates on Paper Covered Pamphlets. | | |
| Two Essays on History | | 25 copies 25.00 |
| Communist Manifesto | | 50 copies 25.00 |
| Make all moneys payable to E. MacLeod, P. O. Box 710, Vancouver, B. C. Add discount on orders. | | |

A Journal of
CURRENT
EVENTS

No. 929.

Tab

A CHIEF obst...
of the socia...
inflammato...
fundamental institut...
a mysterious sancti...
reason.

Religion, group...
the family, and cert...
ity, not merely surr...
emit passionate fum...
the brain of frivolo...
ligion is notorious...
submit his deity or...
intellect. Industri...
each of his holy rite...
etic or imitative mag...
entirely the "supers...
this magic, and to the...
which it was a part...
mony to the difficult...
is, not the emotion...
counter-bias of the u...
ogium, so conspicuo...
They are not to bla...
sanctities stamped b...
der mind can only be...
gle in which the co...
strongly as to leave...
and disgust, often i...
by well-founded fear...
complete. Students...
the higher criticism...
made in the applicat...
ter laden with such

But even more...
sanctity when its ve...
to the concepts of e...
moral and legal sup...
the obligations they...
appropriately "sanc...
is carried the same...
veneration that is re...
in religious ceremon...
In order to exp...
sentiment, political...
care the divinity th...
personal governmen...
placed, the close li...
The elaboration of...
the flag, national l...
processions, and the...
mental moulds of n...
tion of our children...
to divert to patrioti...
tion liberated for t...
religious attachmen...
feelings still survive...
sacred person of th...
Where they decay...
another world, the...
rights to its emotio...
good in patriotic pr...
How patriotic pu...
conduct of public a...
reasonableness, but...
truths about thi...
tration, familiar to...
Yet such truths con