

DEC 31 1922  
LEGISLATIVE LIBRARY

# WESTERN CLARION

A Journal of  
CURRENT  
EVENTS

Official Organ of  
THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

HISTORY  
ECONOMICS  
PHILOSOPHY

No. 881. EIGHTEENTH YEAR Twice a Month VANCOUVER, B. C. DECEMBER 16, 1922. FIVE CENTS

## The Farmer's Misery

BY D. MACPHERSON.

“WE appeal to you. The farmers of this country are ruined.”

This is not the voice of the Industrial Proletariat in the wilderness of despair looking for a job, but that of H. W. Wood, the leader of an organized movement which was 38,000 strong one year ago, but has since dwindled to around 16,000. Mr. Wood was sending an “S.O.S.” for help to the Mackenzie King government at Ottawa, to help them out with their wheat pool. The wheat pool, I may add, was a red herring that was drawn across the trail previous to the stampede that drove the farmer candidates to power in the Alberta Legislature. The move has since been held in abeyance by Wood & Co. after they had received full power to proceed from the Mackenzie King outfit in Ottawa.

The farmers are ruined. Wheat pool or any other palliative in the way of political or social reforms will not save him from damnation. Mr. Wood and his political alliance with past masters at labor faking, with their empty ravings about group government and other political novelties, can avail nothing for the farmers, when the world markets are the dominating factors under Capitalism, that rule the price of farm produce and all other forms of commodities.

The slough of despond in which the farmers find themselves, can only be explained through the historical method of analyzing capitalist production. To the superficial observer who has not made the acquaintance of Marx's Capital the farmer's problems cannot be anything but a mass of confusion and perplexity. The farmers are easy prey; they see around them property in the shape of land, machinery and live stock. They never give a thought that they are allowed these things around them, that their real masters can more effectively fleece them of the wealth they produce in abundance. If the farmer had to produce, with primitive implements, there wouldn't be a vast surplus produced for the capitalist to fleece.

Modern farm equipment plays a great part in the skinning game. The gigantic machinery companies, with a mighty organized capital, are in business to make the maximum of profit. The farmer, finding himself in the vortex of capitalist production has to use high priced machinery and work long hours to produce a larger volume of low priced commodities. The farmer we must bear in mind, is an individualist with small, ill organized capital. In fact today there being only around 3 per cent of the farmers solvent proves that as a bunch they are practically not even in the category of the petit bourgeois, their small capital has practically been gobbled up by the real owners of all wealth. The wealth the farmers produce goes to the machine companies with their 10 per cent interest, the bankers and mortgage and loan companies with their 8 to 10 per cent interest. The transportation companies and elevator companies have all got to have their toll; a host of smaller parasites too numerous to mention are all eating off the farmer's wheat bin. The modern mechanism of Capitalist exploitation has drained the last vestige of bourgeois vitality out of the farmer animal and has left him insolvent.

We find that the bankers, machine companies and

the other parasites on the farmer's back have not decided to oust him from his nest of misery,—the farm. They own him anyhow and what is the use of driving the present bunch off their farms and putting another bunch with less experience in their places. The present beast of burden has shown himself to be a hog for work during the prosperous times of war, but now that the gods of the world's market drought and other conditions are against him, they have mutually decided to leave him his hide anyhow.

The farmers grow wheat not for use but for profit. In the great process of wheat production the farmer only play a part. Under modern conditions it takes a multitude to produce a bushel of wheat. Modern machinery and a never ending string of industries are linked up and take part in the process. The farmer, with practically a low capital of his own, gets a price as “Geordie” puts it, below value. The highly organized capitals get a price which is above value. The law of value holds good taking an average of the capital employed over a period of time.

The U. F. A. Premier Greenfield and his farmer legislature, cannot function even as social reformists; all they can do is to carry on the business of the capitalists. The money barons of Wall Street call the tune, Farmer legislators merely dance to the capitalists' music of bonds, dividends, interest and profits. Whatever pipe dreams some of the farmer members may have had when they were talking to the farmers during the political campaign, they got rudely dispelled, when they came in contact with the grim reality of doing the dirty work of their masters.

The farmers are ruined and disappointed, no wonder the membership of the U.F.A. has slipped from 38,000 to 16,000. We don't wonder, as Marxists that the farmer legislature can do nothing, even if they were capable of carrying out petty reforms.

That cancer, that running sore of capitalism that is draining the vitality of society can never be healed by reforms. The present social order like previous ones had its birth in the throes of revolution. It will take its course no matter how many social and political quacks will come on the scene. Changes will take place and social undercurrents will ripple occasionally on the surface, driven for ever by irresistible economic forces.

The cumbersome mechanism of capitalist exploitation will grow more clumsy, waging war against its own vitality. New forces will appear to hasten the pulsating death struggle. The present order will die a natural death of ripe old age. Everywhere we see serious complications; we can almost hear the death rattle of a fast decaying social order. The farmers' miserable condition and its cause can only be understood by the class conscious slaves, who have been stripped of the last vestige of property, except their power to labor. The haze that obscures the issue with the farmer, is the concept of property. During normal times of peace, and as time goes on he can be seen more clearly in his real position as a beast of burden, whose real function in society is to pile up mountains of wealth from which he is separated, by the complicated and cumbersome mechanism of capitalist exploitation.

This year 300,000,000 bushels of high grade wheat have been produced in the western provinces of Canada; over and above there have been thousands of fat cattle, sheep, swine, butter and cheese, fruit and other foods produced. Sufficient to feed the whole population of Canada for five years.

The farmers who produced all this wealth find it hard to buy themselves a suit of overalls or a plug of tobacco. Usually they sell all their cream and use skimmed milk for their own use. They sell all their fat stock; if there is a cull among the bunch they keep it for their own use. Volumes could be written on this theme, about the peculiarities and characteristics of the docile and humble creature under discussion.

There is a small percentage among the farmers who think they have made good. As far as their credit in the bank is concerned, they may have got a few thousand dollars, and a title deed to show for a whole lifetime of self denial, hard toil, and possibly extra fertile spots due to good luck, etc. At what a price have this “faithful few” gained their prize? Usually their youth has been spent, isolated from the real good things of life.

The wave of discontent among the farmers following the slump of war prices of farm products in the fall of 1920, shows that he is capable of moving, even if his energy is guided and moulded by the press, U. F. A. leaders, politicians, and other capitalist funkies, as was seen in Alberta during the election of the year following. The capitalists who know, do not fear the farmer's political movement, as long as they control their minds and their financial mechanism. Shortly after the farmers took control at Edmonton, their first job was to borrow from Wall Street sufficient funds to run their capitalist government. This was readily forthcoming on condition that their policy would be a safe and sane one for capitalism, which entails, of course, a policy of exploitation of wage slaves, and a continuation of fleecing the farmer slave who elected this bunch of legislators. The farmer who really does not want the abolition of capitalism has his brains running disconnected on an endless pulley. He has been fleeced under a liberal government, then he was skinned under the Onion government, but taxation has increased and farming went to the dogs under representatives of his own calling at the political helm. Mr. Farmer Slave has lost confidence in his fellow man; to him they all appear to become traitors whenever they are elected. It never occurs to him that the system of profits which he has for ages cherished and hugged to his bosom is the cause of all his misery. It never occurs to him that the present system is changing rapidly, developing abnormalities and contradictions as it approaches its final collapse. Social systems take us along with them, we are drawn into the vortex of their political whirlpools, unless we are guided by the chart and compass of understanding in accord with science.

We of the Marxian Socialist movement appeal to you, Mr. Farmer, as members of the working class movement, working for economic freedom. We know that whatever you may have thought your-

Continued on page 6.

# The War Documents

## PART 2.

It had been agreed by treaty that Belgium and Switzerland be made neutral, but I am not disposed to attach very much importance to such engagements, for the history of the world shows when a quarrel arises, and a nation makes war, and thinks it advantageous to traverse with its army such neutral territory, the declarations of neutrality are not apt to be very religiously respected.

Lord Palmerston (a signatory of the Belgian Treaty of 1839), Hansard, June 8, 1855. . . See "Economic Causes of War," p. 53).

**W**HETHER or not the British Cabinet as a whole was fully advised of its Foreign Office commitments during the period we have been considering is a matter that is still being discussed in some quarters. The evidence, however, is against any such notion. Indeed, affairs in the Near East reported in the press just a week ago indicate that in the British House of Commons and House of Lords Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Chamberlain and Lord Birkenhead have denied ever having seen a letter sent by the late Greek Premier last February to Lord Curzon, Minister for Foreign affairs, in which the uncertain nature of the foothold of the Greek Armies in Asia Minor was stated. Curzon had replied, encouraging the Greek armies to hold on. George, Chamberlain and Birkenhead deny that they were consulted by Curzon and place the responsibility for any advices tendered the Greeks on the Foreign Office. So it would seem to be still a practice to hold such matters as Foreign affairs secret, and to withhold information from responsible members of the Cabinet itself. At any rate, Sir E. Grey on 3rd Aug. 1914 spoke somewhat in an offhand way of "the conversations" that had taken place between his department and the French Foreign Office, which "conversations" were later to appear as actual agreements. The Anglo-French agreements being in existence, Sazonov, Russian Minister of Foreign affairs, in pursuit of the "encircling offensive" visited London in Sept. 1912 and the Russian Imperial archives reveal his report to the Czar of the outcome:

After I had confidentially initiated Grey into the contents of our Naval agreement with France, and pointed to the fact that according to this settled compact, the French Fleet would be concerned with the safeguarding of our interests at the Southern scene of war, in that it would prevent the Austrian Fleet from breaking through into the Black Sea, I asked the Secretary of State whether England on her side would not render us a similar service in the North by diverting the German squadron from our coast in the Baltic? Without hesitation Grey stated that, should the conditions under discussion arise, England would stake everything in order to inflict the most serious blow to German Power. In the competent departments the question of war operations in the Baltic has already been discussed, but it appears that the English Fleet, which would certainly not have much difficulty in reaching the Baltic, would be exposed to a serious danger there, as it would be shut up as in a mouse-trap owing to Germany having the possibility of laying her hands on Denmark, and blocking the exit through the Baltic. England would probably have to confine her operations to the North Sea.

Arising out of this, Grey, upon his own initiative, corroborated what I already knew from Poincare, the existence of an agreement between France and Great Britain, according to which England undertook, in case of a war with Germany, not only to come to the assistance of France on the sea, but also on the continent, by landing troops.

Russia's interest lay directly in the hope of dominating Constantinople and the Straits, and the documents of the war period reveal clearly her interest in using the Balkan League toward that end. The question of the Straits had not approached a definite settlement among the Allies until March 1915 when the World War was in the first year of its progress, but already in October 12th, 1911, Izvolski, Russian Ambassador at Paris sent this telegram to Neratov, Russian Foreign Minister.

If we really decide to raise at once the question of the Straits, it is very important that steps should be taken

to insure a good press. Yet in this respect I lack the principle weapon, for my insistence that I be provided with special funds for the press have had no result. . . An instance of the advantage of spending money on the press here is furnished by the Tripolitan affair. I know that Tittoni worked up the principal French papers very thoroughly and with a very generous hand. The results are evident.

Izvolski, in previous despatches to Neratov, had written of his success in "influencing" the "Matin" and the "Journal des Debats," and his hopes concerning Tardieu's "Temps,"—that he might succeed, by monetary persuasion, to secure the presentation of a pro-Russian viewpoint in the French press. Sazonov succeeded Neratov as Russian Foreign Minister, and in May, 1912 Izvolski, referring to some press excitement over the recall of the pacifist Georges Louis, French Ambassador to St. Petersburg, sent him a message in which he said:

This renders even more serious the fact that it is impossible for me to bring sufficient influence to bear upon the lesser papers which live upon blackmail and "gratifications."

This press "friendliness" was promoted in order to prompt French public opinion toward a Franco-Russian unity policy. In the meantime, in August 1912 Sazonov reported to the Czar that he had concluded a naval agreement with Poincare, French President and Minister of Foreign Affairs. Incidentally his letter mentions that Poincare indicated the desire of the French general staff that the carrying capacity of the Russian railways running toward the western frontier should be increased by double tracking the lines. In this letter to the Czar Sazonov reports:

The relations between France and England formed the subject of the most candid exchange of views between M. Poincare and myself. Having pointed out that these relations have lately, under the influence of the aggressive policy towards France on the part of Germany, assumed the character of especial closeness, the French Prime Minister confided to me that although no written agreement existed between France and England nevertheless both the military and the naval general staffs of both countries maintain with each other a close contact and continually communicate to each other with complete frankness all information that may interest either of them. This constant interchange of views had as its consequence the conclusion between the French and the English governments of a verbal agreement by virtue of which England stated her readiness, in the event of an attack on the part of Germany, to give assistance to France with both her naval and her military forces. On land England promised to help France by sending over to the Belgian frontier an army of 100,000 men in order to resist the German invasion of France through Belgium which is anticipated by the French general staff.

Lord Haldane had apparently brought his task to a successful conclusion. The military and naval agreements were reached and the plans perfected which he had undertaken to formulate. In the event of an anticipated clash between Russia and Austria, France would enter a war in alliance with Russia provided Germany entered in alliance with Austria. Britain would enter a war in alliance with France and Russia in the event of German intervention in alliance with Austria. So it worked out. Izvolski advised Sazonov, Dec. 18, 1912:

According to the information received here (Paris) Austria is at present carrying out the complete mobilization of ten corps, a part of which is ostensibly arrayed against Russia. This mobilization weighs heavily upon the Austrian budget, for the financial situation is already difficult, and a decisive step by the Austrian Cabinet may be expected any day. This step, it is believed here, may provoke the intervention of Russia, which in turn would automatically and inevitably bring in first Germany and then France. The French government calmly recognizes this possibility, and has firmly decided to fulfil its obligations as an ally. It has taken all the necessary measures: the mobilization on the eastern front has been checked up, supplies are ready, etc. . . (Here follow more references to the process of influencing the French press).

By May, 1913, Poincare was writing to the Czar urging again the need "of hastening the construction of certain railroad lines upon the western (German) frontier of the (Russian) empire. The great military effort which the French government proposes to make in order to maintain the equilibrium of European forces renders particularly urgent today the correlative measures upon the necessity of which the general staffs of the two countries have agreed," etc. No wonder Izvolski wrote to Sazonov, Jan. 16, 1913, when Poincare's election as President of France was still uncertain: "If—may God not will it—Poincare should be beaten, it would be a catastrophe for us."

Poincare was safely elected. As Baron Guillaume, Belgian Minister at Paris wrote to his chief at the Belgian Foreign office, Feb. 14, 1913:

The new President of the Republic has in France today such a popularity as none of his predecessors experienced. . . . This popularity is made of diverse elements; his election was skilfully prepared.

It was following Poincare's election that Delcasse replaced Georges Louis, French Ambassador to St. Petersburg, a course which in 1912 Izvolski said in the interest of Franco-Russian relations would be necessary sooner or later. War was even then considered an immediate possibility. The campaign in favor of the three years' military service law was raging in France (and which, incidentally, was supported by the Northcliffe press in England). Germany had raised her army estimates. Russia, it is agreed on all hands, was even then conducting trial mobilizations and Guillaume was informing the Belgian Foreign office that France was favorable to war. Already, while Poincare was French Minister of Foreign Affairs, Izvolski was writing to Sazonov:

M. Poincare has not ceased, on every occasion, to invite the London Cabinet to confidential conversations, with the object of clearing up the position which would be adopted by England in the event of a general European conflict. On the British side no decision has been taken hitherto. The London Cabinet invariably replies that this will depend upon circumstances, and that the question of peace or war will be decided by public opinion. On the other hand, not only has the examination of all eventualities which may present themselves not been interrupted between the French and British Headquarters Staffs, but the existing Military and Naval Agreements have quite recently undergone a still greater development, so that at the present moment the Anglo-French military convention is as settled and complete as the Franco-Russian convention; the only difference consists in the fact that the former bear the signature of the Chiefs of the two Headquarters Staffs, and, on this account are, so to speak, not obligatory upon the Government. These last few days General Wilson, the English Chief-of-Staff, has been in France, in the most rigorous secrecy, and, on this occasion, various complementary details have been elaborated; moreover, apparently for the first time, it is not only military men who participated in this work, but also other representatives of the French Government.

Yet on August 4, 1914, before an extraordinary session of the French Chamber, Poincare opened his speech by declaring: "Gentlemen, France has just been the object of a violent and premeditated attack." Nobody need be astonished at the contradictions manifested in the official utterances at one time and another. For instance, referring to Lord Haldane's visit to Berlin, February 1912, Izvolski wrote to Sazonov:

From my conversation with Poincare and Paleologue, (French Ambassador to Russia) I have been able to learn in the most confidential way that in the course of the famous visit of Lord Haldane, to Berlin, in February of this year, Germany made a quite concrete proposal to England to the effect that the London Cabinet should undertake in writing to maintain neutrality in the event of Germany finding herself involved in a war not provoked on the German side. . . . the London Cabinet rejected the German proposal, which caused great umbrage in Berlin.

Yet concerning Haldane's visit Mr. Asquith said, July 25, 1912:

Our relations with the great German Empire are, I am glad to say, at this moment, and I feel sure, are likely to remain, relations of amity and goodwill. Lord Haldane paid a visit to Berlin early in the year; he entered upon conversations and an interchange of views which have been continued since in a spirit of perfect frankness and friendship, both on one side and the other.

He (Asquith) had another viewpoint on this "perfect frankness and friendship" by Oct., 1914:

They (the German Government) wanted us to pledge ourselves absolutely to neutrality in the event of Germany being engaged in war, and this, mind you, at a time when Germany was enormously increasing both her aggressive and defensive resources, and especially upon the sea. They asked us—to put it quite plainly—they asked us for a free hand so far as we were concerned, if, and when, they selected the opportunity to overbear, to dominate the European world.

Of his visit to Berlin in 1912, Lord Haldane at Leeds, January 17, 1913, said he found the Germans to be "big men" who "tried to look at things from something higher, from a point of view wider than that of mere controversy between nations, and who sought to realise the standpoint of humanity." Morel, in "The Poison that Destroys" outlines what attitude Lord Fisher proposed should be adopted toward the "big men":

Lord Fisher was First Sea Lord from October 21, 1904, to January 25, 1910. Extracts from Fisher's narrative, pp. 63-64; ". . . on Mr. Churchill's advent as First Lord of the Admiralty in the autumn of 1911, Lord Fisher most gladly complied with his request to return home from Italy to help him to proceed with the great task that had previously occupied Lord Fisher for six years as First Sea Lord, namely, the preparation for a German war, which Lord Fisher had predicted in 1905 would certainly occur in August, 1914, in a written memorandum and afterwards also, personally, to Sir M. Hankey, the secretary of the Committee of Imperial Defence, necessitating that drastic revolution in all things naval which brought 88 per cent. of the British fleet into close proximity with Germany, and made its future battle ground in the North Sea its drill ground. . . . When, on October 20, 1914, Mr. Churchill asked Lord Fisher to become First Sea Lord, he gladly assented to co-operating with him in using the great weapon Lord Fisher had helped to forge." In 1907, Fisher states that he urged upon King Edward VII to "repeat Nelson's Copenhagen," i.e., to seize the German fleet" in time of peace without any declaration of war. It was "peculiarly timely" to do so, in view of the "time of stress and unreadiness in Germany" (p. 19). But he had been urging this before, because he tells us (pp. 33-35 and 182) that, in December, 1905, or January, 1906, the German Emperor informed Mr. Beit (the South African millionaire) that he was cognisant of Fisher's plans to seize the opportunity of German unreadiness to provoke war, to make a sudden attack on the German fleet, and to land 100,000 men either in Schleswig-Holstein or on the Pomeranian Coast, and that King Edward VII sent Lord Esher (permanent Committee of Imperial Defence, Fisher's closest friend, and both close personal friends of the King) to see Mr. Beit about his conversation with the German Emperor. "He really was a dear man was Beit" (p. 34). "In March this year, 1907, it is an absolute fact that Germany had not laid down a single 'dreadnought,' nor had she commenced building a single battleship or big cruiser for eighteen months. . . ." (p. 14). "Admiral Tirpitz, the German Minister of Marine, has just stated, in a secret official document, that the English navy is now four times stronger than the German navy. Yes that is so. . . ." (letter to Edward VII, p. 16). Letters to Esher (1908): "Even in 1908 Germany had only four submarines" (p. 18). "But the good Frenchman. . . is lost in admiration of what moved Mahan to his pungent saying that Garvin seized on with the inspiration of genius—that 88 per cent. of the English guns were trained on Germany!" ". . . " "By the way, I've got Sir Philip Watts into a new indomitable that will make your mouth water when you see it! (and the Germans gnash their teeth!)" March 1, 1909: "The unswerving intention of four years has now culminated in two complete fleets in Home waters, each of which is incomparably superior to the whole German fleet mobilised for war. . . . This can't alter for years, because we will have eight dreadnoughts a year. So sleep quiet in your beds; and I might also add, "The Germans are not building in this feverish haste to frighten you! No, it's the daily dread they have of a second Copenhagen. . . ." August, 1909, after the visit of the Tsar to witness the review of the fleet: "I told the Emperor (Tsar) it was a fine avenue!—eighteen miles of ships—the most powerful in the world, and none of them more than ten years old."

December, 1911: "I happen to know, in a curious way but quite certainly, that the Germans are in a blue funk of the British navy, and are quite assured that 942 German merchant steamers would be gobbled up' in the first forty-eight hours of war, and also the d-d uncertainty of when and where a hundred thousand troops embarked in transports and kept 'in the air' might land.

N.B.—There's a lovely spot only ninety miles from Berlin." July 15, 1912: "But the most ludicrous thing of all is that the dreadnought caused such a deepening and dredging of German harbours, and a new Kiel Canal, as to cripple Germany up to A.D. 1915, and make their coasts accessible which were previously denied to our ships because of their heavy draught for service in all the world" (p. 216). September, 1912: "The one all prevailing, all absorbing thought is to get in first with motor ships, before the Germans. . . . We shall have sixteen British dreadnoughts with the 13½-inch gun before the Germans have one. . . . Then came after this the 15-inch gun; then the 18-inch gun, actually used at sea in the war. . . ."

These are not the ravings of an irresponsible journalist seeking notoriety through sensational writing, but are authenticated extracts from the memoirs and letters of a responsible British Admiral and First Sea Lord. They have not, now that Germany is broken in naval and military strength, been disclaimed by the British Government.

It is no doubt due to the deceptive propaganda of the Allied Governments concerning "unpreparedness" and the "unprovoked attack" that the great mass of documentary material published by investigators since the war has seemed to present the German government's part in the proceedings in an innocent light. That is the natural response, in a large measure, from many of the writers, themselves patriots, who were deceived by the war propaganda. The German and Austrian governments in their negotiations presented to their populace similar pretexts for their actions. The Kautsky documents reveal the workings of the deceptive process on the part of the German government toward the German people. Lewis S. Gannett's article (The Nation, N. Y., Oct. 11, 1922) is headed "They All Lied," and there is no mistake about that. The important thing to remember is that the workers of all the countries involved believed them, or at least the majority of them did, including the well "organised" Socialist parties of Europe, millions strong. The various government officials are under no reproach from the propertied groups of their respective countries. Their lying was a form of loyalty to those interests, protected in national garb. As Trotzky very well says, (Bolsheviki and world Peace): "Had Bethmann-Holweg been an English minister he would have acted exactly as did Sir Edward Grey." The workers, upon whom those propertied groups depend in peace and war alike, are subject to the process of deception only because they are ignorant of the factors which determine it.

It is impossible to present here any more than a brief selection of the evidence from the documents of diplomacy connected with the war. In conclusion, it will help toward an understanding of recent events in Europe and present quarrels in the Near East if we extract a passage or two from the texts of the Secret Treaties (first collection) from the Imperial Russian Archives published by the Soviet Government, Novr. 1917, which caused such consternation among the worshippers of President Wilson's famous and fatuous fourteen points. Viviani, French President of the Council, in the Chamber of Deputies, Aug. 4, 1914, had referred to the German attack as a "hateful injustice. . . . emphasised by its calculated unexpectedness." (He did not mention that France's ally, Russia, had mobilized her forces before Germany took that step, which mobilization had been previously "understood" by the Entente as the signal for united effort toward the commencement of the "encircling offensive." (Readers of "Red Europe" will recollect that this mobilization, over which the Czar

was deceived by his own ministers, was dealt with there in chapter 1). Viviani, in the speech above referred to said: "Italy with that clarity of insight possessed by the Latin intellect, has notified us that she proposes to preserve neutrality." This manifestation of the "Latin intellect" was no doubt prompted by previous experience of joint success in territorial plunder, as Italian occupation of Tripoli had been consequent upon French occupation of Morocco. The Secret Treaties revealed that on 26th April 1915 the Italian government agreed to enter the war on the side of the Allies provided that Italy would receive (among other things), upon the conclusion of peace, the Trentino, the entire Southern Tyrol, control of the River Brenner, the city and suburbs of Triest, numerous slices of Austrian coastal territory and Islands, the province of Dalmatia, the Adriatic Islands, control over the future "Albania's" foreign relations, a share in the division of Turkey, extension in Eritria, Libya and Somaliland, and so forth, all good evidence of the quality of the "Latin intellect." In addition, Gt. Britain undertook to help Italy to a loan of £50 million. The last clause of the Treaty provided that its terms must be kept secret.

Negotiations begun in 1916 in London and Petrograd resulted, on February 21, 1917 in an agreement over the division of Turkey, and the parts to be swallowed by Gt. Britain, France and Imperial Russia. Russia acquired Erzerum, Trebizond, Van, Bitlis, South Kurdistan to the Persian boundary. France acquired the coast of Syria, Addank and territory south and north. Gt. Britain acquired Southern Mesopotamia, with Bagdad, and in Syria she reserved to her use the ports of Harpha and Akka.

On February 14, 1917, Russia agreed with France that the peace terms would claim for France Alsace and Lorraine, the industrial iron basin of the Saar Valley, together with other territories on the left bank of the Rhine, in return for which France agreed to the regulation of the Straits in accord with Russian wishes, Russian occupation of Constantinople, western shores of the Bosphorons, Sea of Marmora domination, the shores of Asia Minor, etc. The "freedom of passage for merchant ships" was part of the understanding. Russia was to have, in addition, a free hand in determining her own western boundary.

A recent writer in the London "Daily Chronicle" is appreciative of present events in Asia Minor when he says: "If Kemal gets his way now, the war might just as well never have been fought. It was really a war for the Turkish-succession."

Anyway, Germany's "B. B. B." project—Berlin—Byzantium—Bagdad—came to nothing, and the areas referred to have been since the war and are now the grounds of dispute between the international property groups.

In setting forth this hurried sketch of these matters we have in mind that Secret Treaties are still being made and war is threatened here and there every other day, according to press news. The process of deception may be a little harder next time. This is devoted to making it a little harder.  
E. M.

#### SUBSCRIPTION FORM.

(This is as handy a way as any to send your subs.)  
Western Clarion, P. O. Box, 710.  
Vancouver, B. C.  
Official organ of the S. P. of C. Published twice  
a month.  
Subscriptions: Canada, 20 issues, \$1; Foreign:  
16 issues \$1.

Enclosed find .....

Send "Western Clarion" to .....

## 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

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

VANCOUVER, B. C., DECEMBER 16, 1922.

### "INTELLECTUALITY AND ACTION"

THE above title is from the "B. C. Federationist" (10/11/22). It is purely arbitrary, since, in fairness to the meaning of words it can hardly be accounted action, and probably not even its author deems it intellectual. "Intellectuality," says the writer, "without action has brought the workers of B. C. just what could be expected, . . . nothing." Yet the very first sentence denies this, implying that it has made Vancouver the considered centre of human affairs (unless the author stipulates "intellectuality" as the product and possession of the bourgeoisie.) But there is the "civil a doubt" but "action" without intellectuality has brought the workers,—the W. P., labor "politics," the "yellow" international and the White Terror. Would we could "say it with flowers."

The writer continues: "It is hardly good taste to knock one's own town." Why not? And what is the difference between this and jingo patriotism? And how is it one's "own town?" Yet in the very next breath it is stated that "Vancouver has too many intellectuals and too few who realize that action counts." If this is "action," may the statement be true. And how well our friend speaks of learning. "The working class movement," he tells us, "has become subservient to the great knowledge of intellectual individuals." There can be nothing so genuine as unconscious flattery. Surely that is a gallant tribute to the "Harrington Academy." May we hope that it will afford inspiration to the W. P.?

His next paragraph is wierd logic. It is two sentences connected by a "therefor," (not that we are at all concerned with logic, but that its implication is distorted.) That "therefor" is entirely misplaced. Because it connects an affirmative—that only applied knowledge is power—with a negative—that mere action is more useful. And that too, after "recognising that working class activities can only be stimulated when knowledge is applied to the movement of the workers." Why not be consistent comrade?

"It may be claimed that the move made in Edmonton is not scientific." We agree, and nourish the belief that the claim is secure. Our writer continues: "It is a move however, and if the effort put forth results in the working class of Edmonton getting a move on, we have no fear as to the results." That is, the workers of Edmonton having gotten a move on, there need be no fear that the Edmonton workers will get a move on. Doubtless. "If" and "then" are poor causes to die for. The report of the Edmonton "action" (same paper, same date) says in conclusion, "Mrs. Mellard struck the keynote of the meeting when she appealed to all present to lay aside petty differences, and advance unitedly in the interests of the workers." Many hymns of love and hate have been sung in that same "keynote." It is merely a pious sentiment—calling forth a soft smile from those of us who hold a job; a shrug, or a curse, from those of us who suffer the pangs of unemployment. And if it rouses a new enthusiasm among those of us who, like our author, are anxious to "get there;" it shows in its nondescript affiliations its ultimate ineffectuality. It is all to the credit of the manhood of its supporters, but it is to their subsequent disillusionment that the "getting

there" can never be by the loose alliance and vague hopes of separatist interests, temporarily non-clashing in the abyss of depression.

There is no "it" in the application of knowledge. It is power. If it is not applied it is only because its application is not socially desired. If it is not desired it is only because the consciousness of its benefits has not been kindled in the social mind. To "appeal to all to lay aside petty differences" is to ask us to be false to ourselves; is to ask us to discredit, unanalytically, our life experience; is to ask us to surrender our convictions of conceived things and go forth in a crusade whose motive we do not comprehend, and whose aim we cannot visualise. Any party so organised is a weakness to the "working class movement; and its component members, not understanding the real issues at stake, are ready to listen, and fall out, to the first piping of immediate interest. If we have no social convictions we can have no social principles. And if we have no social principles, definitely conceived, and couched in definite terms, the "casting aside of petty differences" is the broad road that leads to multiplied class divisions; to interested office, to partizan reform, to personal ambition and labor misleadership.

In the same paper there is another editorial, on "Dual Unions," thus: "Any man who has the right idea as to the objects of the working class movement, which must of necessity be, that the workers must be united, must see that dual organizations, must be eliminated, and real unity brought about, by absorption in reorganised labor organisations." It has a "musty" odor. The "right idea," apparently, being the idea "recognised" by the scribe. But, between the "example set by the workers of Edmonton"—based on superficial sentiment—and the "necessity of real unity of reorganised labor organisations" there is a yawning gulf, which can only be bridged in the real unity of social understanding. and this same apostle of "action," in the same "Dual Unions" question quotes Foster (approvingly) that "the American Labor movement has expended oceans of energy to bring the new Labor movement into realisation. But they were pouring water upon sand." The result being "a poor bargain, for the enormous price they cost." Again, the same paper has a paragraph or so on the Fascisti. It says, "the White Guard of Great Britain" (the ultra Tories) "has assumed control." After quoting a detailed summary of Fascist methods the writing concludes: "If the above words do not stir the workers of this continent to organise they never will organize." Since then the workers of Britain have ratified the control of the White Guard, and the workers of "this continent" are following in their footsteps. So that the value of action, without understanding, as exemplified in its own advocacy, is no foregone affirmative.

At the beginning of the "matter" on action the writer says: "Conditions must eventually force . . . action,"—seeming to imply that it is not so. At the end he says, "only by experience do we learn." We agree. By social experience do we learn; by the force of conditions do we act. The progress of the "working class movement" is thus conditioned by the progress of social development. And as social development is the amelioration of fettering social circumstance, so-sectionally considered—class movement takes on the cast of dominant conditions, and develops—through the repeated failures and bitter disappointments of the palpatives of "practical politics." It cannot do otherwise. Not because the working class has no courage or lacks ability and enterprise, or is devoid of mind or ideal, but because all things, social or organic, invariably express themselves in the line of least resistance, by the means whereby the minimum of toil returns the greatest happiness, and because, in spite of the distortions of history and the perversions of vulgar ethics, the instincts of peace are stronger in man than the strong arm wastery of violence.

Direct action presupposes direct seeing. If the social vision is the vision of reform, then by the barren ways of reform must development go till experience, thick-piled with broken promises and ruined hopes proves its vanity. But, if the vision is the ultimate of straight issues—the utter abolition of

Capitalist society, not panaceas for its accrued evils—how vain, how futile and how misunderstanding is the "appeal" to cast aside the principles of grounded fact for the already proven, reactionary inanities of temporary expediency.

Action, like labor, must be necessary and useful to be of value. The working class movement does not call for any action; it demands particular action. Particular action is inspired by particular incentive; and that necessary incentive is derived primarily and mainly from the social experience of the utter failure of capitalist society to satisfy the needs and aspirations of humanity, plus the conscious cause of its failure. That is the prime base of effective action. The conscious painfulness of the former is commonly felt, not so the conscious expression of the latter. And although the initial difference of first principles may be unnoticeable it is by no means negligible; and its latest effects are both vital and costly. Just as a slight deviation of a compass course increasingly magnifies its differential; so a basic misconception of capitalist relations fundamentally alters the pattern of growth and resistance. Surely, it is well to join forces. But the union of proletarian forces is necessarily conditioned by the conversion of summary interest into social principle. And whoever holds that principle in concept and purpose must await the advance of those whose eyes are yet dimmer with the illusions of political expediency. And whether interest or principle obtains the ascendancy, it is through the very determinate character of forceful conditions; very little by the perorations of emotion.

Thus the first necessity is not "local organisation" but social perception. It is, however, unfortunately true that the former appeals; the latter must be known. Local organisations are the resultants of local conditions. They have been forced upon labor, "willy nilly," in consequence of the necessity of industrial development. They are reformative in character because they are immediate in interest and objective. And they have been forced to this immediacy by the grim struggle of daily existence. They were compelled to accept this form because the nature of political democracy was not at once apparent in society; and its inherent antagonisms not yet driven home on the social consciousness. Given the conditions of development, the conditions of organisation were imperative. But given the perception of the class struggle and the realisation of conflicting class interests, the old form of organisation for immediate economic purposes becomes no longer a prime objective. And the development of capitalist industry negates even its economic opportunism.

Consequently, the first necessity of labor organisation, effective internationally, is the necessity of class understanding; the clear knowledge that a master class and a slave class are of necessity antagonistic; that there can be no social relief in conciliation and reform, and that the society of economic freedom is to be acquainted only through the socially acquired concepts of economic unity. We cannot act without motive; we can act only as we see. If we want "something now," we must follow the law of the moment. If we see merely craft interest, political action is meaningless. Only as the final aim of the class struggle becomes clear is the social cohesion of unity possible. The "petty difference" between the workers and their organisations is, in reality, the difference between final aim and present object. And to cast those differences aside is to know, clearly and indubitably, that in a society of trade and profit the immediate object of working class reform is a contradiction in the terms of capitalist society. Until that contradiction generates its likeness in the terms of social experience; until the darkening conditions of the common social life manifest the inadequacy of capitalist society to secure social welfare, we cannot "advance unitedly in the interest of the workers," because we neither perceive that interest, nor the unity which that perception can alone bequeath.

R.

# What Is The I. W. W.?

IN ANSWER TO F. J. McNEY.

**Editor's Note:** The following articles have reference to two articles by F. J. McNey which appeared in the "Western Clarion" of November 1st and 16th, 1922. Comrade McNey's reply, as under, covers only the criticism of Comrade Thompson; at the time of writing he had no opportunity to read the criticism of Comrade Mackay.

BY F. W. THOMPSON.

SINCE McNey propounds the question in his headline and does not answer it, presumably he is unacquainted with the answer. So I will inform him in the first place that the I. W. W. is neither an aspiration, nor a scheme, nor a theory, but primarily a fact—a bond of actual living workingmen organized in such a manner as circumstances have proved most appropriate for getting as much for their labor-power out of the employing class as possible, and consciously working toward the elimination of that employing class and of all the misery and disorder that goes with it. If McNey is unaware of the fact that the I. W. W. is such a reality, his capitalist masters are well aware of it as is demonstrated by their very evident distaste for the I. W. W.

McNey's many fallacies appear to proceed from an inability to differentiate between a universal principle and the exigencies of a particular problem. To instance the matter of sabotage: If a group of workers, whether Wobblies or otherwise (i.e., unwise), at any point in the struggle deem it advisable to use sabotage they will do so and it is neither necessary nor necessarily desirable that they be told to do so in a pamphlet from headquarters. Or to take McNey's other instance of "filling the jails:" There is a strike on at present on the waterfront in Portland, Ore. The powers that be in that city decided to arrest all Wobblies on sight. Foot-loose Wobblies wandered into Portland and filled the jails—and got them empty again too. They came in such numbers that the masters in that city had to discard their jailing policy. To grant that such methods do not overthrow capitalism does not dispose of the fact that here a particular problem has been solved by this particular tactic.

McNey's article is mostly concerned with politics. Many Marxists have become accustomed to use the term politics to describe in general the relation that subsists between a governing and a governed class. If they wish to so use the term there is no stopping them; but I would recommend that they call parliamentarism parliamentarism, the class struggle the class struggle and bullets bullets. But while using the term as they please they will surely note that current convention has made the term politics practically synonymous with parliamentarism. It would be ridiculous for a man with a Fahrenheit thermometer to argue with one who had a Centigrade whether water commenced freezing at 32° or at 0°. And it would be equally ridiculous for me to argue out Wobbly quotations insofar as the term politics coincides with parliamentarism for, no doubt, McNey would be far from recommending such as the means of workingclass emancipation.

However it seems that in the passages taken from "What is the I. W. W.?" the term politics is used in much the sense that McNey ascribes to it. Omitting parliamentarism, we come to the armed overthrow of the powers that be. McNey will probably agree that the chances do not look particularly bright for doing so. Engles appears to have seen its impracticability with the advent of the machine gun. Considering the variety of gases in modern military use, the efficiency of the aeroplane, and some of the more recent productions in hand grenades, the practicability of armed overthrow as fundamental to working class revolution is reduced to zero. True, these could be used against strikers and may be so used. Yet, for our masters to use them against a disorganized mob attacking what popular political superstition supposes to be the citadels of their power, is but to save their hides; while to use them to destroy men organized as units of produc-

tion is to cut off their own bread and butter. Bullets may be incidental to the revolution, but only incidental. The real revolution consists in the workers acquiring possession of the means of production. From this they are restrained by the State, which, true enough, is a reality. So, some suggest that we capture the State. It is recorded of a philosophic hobo that on seeing a dog run after a train he wondered what the dog would do with it if he did catch it. Marx, Engels and Lenin all inform us that all we could do with the existing State machinery if we did get it, is to get rid of it. No doubt it is a good thing to be rid of, but that scarcely makes it a primary objective.

By acquiring control through revolutionary industrial unionism of the process and means of production, we destroy the basis upon which the state rests, we destroy the means by which it operates. Large bodies of troops can be rapidly moved on land only by trains. Strikes have shown that skilled men are necessary to keep the railroads running. There are left autos and aeroplanes. Both require "gas." Current demand stops any large accumulation of crude oil and especially of gasoline. The producers of oil can therefore decide whether or not it shall be used against the working class.

At best the social revolution is a gory than a rosy prospect, and there are but two ameliorating factors in it—education and organization. If McNey cannot see the advantages of the latter it would be well were he to stick to the former. For both are necessary, and the I. W. W. carries on both. Good Wobblies, instead of philosophizing on which of the two is the more important will do their damndest with both. Should a group of workers think they could enhance their educational activities by parliamentary participation and organize a political party for that purpose, the I. W. W. Constitution provides that while the organization as such cannot ally itself with any party "or anti-political sect," its individual members may, but it "disclaims responsibility for any individual opinion or act which may be at variance with the purposes (of concentrating on the industrial battlefield) herein expressed." If members of the I. W. W. have not joined any such party it is because they have deemed no party beneficial to their interests, and looking over the current political life of the U. S., McNey will no doubt agree that there is not much amiss in their having reached that conclusion.

The general trend of McNey's article might have been compressed in the silly syllogism:

All class struggles are political struggles.

The I. W. W. does not engage in politics.

Therefore, the I. W. W. does not engage in the class struggle.

But the weariest round of illogical gyrations cannot remove the fact that the I. W. W. is very much in the class struggle and in it is performing a very necessary and desirable function. While McNey is wondering if the I. W. W. has gone and got religion, Wobblies are delighting the American populace with the strains of "We'll have pie in the sky when we die." While McNey is arguing on the premises of his dictionary in disregard of all premises of fact, that the I. W. W. is not a revolutionary organization, the latter is lining up wage-plugs with applications for membership that read: "Will you study the principles of the organization and make yourself acquainted with its purposes?"—and, moreover, seeing to it that the membership lives up to that promise.

Much more objection could be raised to McNey's article, but this will suffice for the present. And it will have well served its purpose if it impresses any Marxist with the fact that it is important for us to understand the labor movement, out of which alone can arise the force to overthrow capitalism, as it is, rather than as organizational prejudices might make us wish to see it.

REPLY BY F. J. McNEY.

BEFORE I read Comrade Thompson's criticism I thought I might have a job on my hands to answer it. After reading it I came to the conclusion that it did not require an answer; it answers itself. However, I suppose I may as well comment on it a little just to be sociable, or disagreeable, as the case may be.

As there appears to be some misunderstanding regarding my purpose in writing the articles, I might say it was much the same as my purpose in writing any other article, merely a malicious and depraved desire to inflict my personal and pernicious opinions upon an innocent and unsuspecting public. I hold that the opinions and "beliefs" criticized in the passages quoted, which are samples of the I. W. W. propaganda, are reactionary, are detrimental to the revolutionary movement and a hindrance to working class education. Such propaganda, coming from capitalist class apologists or from working class organizations that do not claim to be revolutionary is bad enough, but coming from a working class organization that claims to be revolutionary it is much worse. If the I. W. W. position is correct the Socialist position is not, and no garbling of dialectics can reconcile the two. Or you may put it this way. If Comrade Thompson's opinion is correct, my opinion is not. Again, we may both be mistaken. For mark this: Nothing that I say and nothing that Comrade Thompson says can decide anything. We merely put the proposition before you as we see it, from our various points of view. Use your own judgment, and decide for yourselves.

Now for the comment: I am pleased to note in the first place that the great problem has been solved. "Eureka" at last. The question that baffled me has been answered by Comrade Thompson. The I. W. W. is a fact! True, the A. F. of L. is also a fact. So are all the various brands of Socialist, Communist, and reform parties, the Ku Klux Klan, the American Legion, the Knights of Columbus and hundreds of other organizations. I do not remember ever saying that the I. W. W. was not a fact, but if I ever did make any such statement I take it back right now, and if in my articles I have wandered from facts into the realm of myths and "shadows" I sincerely apologize to Comrade Thompson and the I. W. W.

The theory that because members of the I. W. W. have been persecuted by the capitalist class and its hirelings it must therefore be a revolutionary organization, that its position must be correct and that it must be a menace to the continued existence of capitalism, is a theme so much harped upon that we must consider it here at some length, even if we do take up a little extra space. To assume that the capitalist class hirelings never oppress nor persecute the members of any organization except it is an actual menace to the existence of capitalism, is to credit them with intelligence they do not possess. It is well known to Comrade Thompson that the suffragets have been as persistently persecuted as the members of the I. W. W. Does he hold that the suffragist movement ever was a menace to the existence of capitalism? It is also true that in the early days of the Salvation Army its members were persecuted and oppressed; does this prove that the Salvation Army ever was a menace to the existence of capitalism? On the other hand, the hostility of the I. W. W. to the Russian Revolution has been second only to the hostility of the capitalist class itself. And why? Because the Russian Revolution was accomplished by political action, and the Communists who are in control of the situation in Russia are advocates of political action. And yet, the capitalist nations of the world have spent hundreds of millions of dollars trying to crush the Russian Revolution. Suppose it had been crushed; does Comrade Thompson think

that the Communists would have been spared because they were not members of the I. W. W.?

Comrade Thompson tells us that "current convention has made the term politics practically synonymous with parliamentarism." The only "current convention" that I ever knew to hold that politics and parliamentarism were synonymous was the I. W. W. itself, and even the I. W. W. has abandoned that fallacy, according to its own definition of political action in its latest publications.

"The real revolution consists in the workers acquiring possession of the means of production. From this they are restrained by the state, which, true enough, is a reality." . . . "All we could do with the existing state machinery if we did get it, is to get rid of it."

It is not worth our while to abolish the existing State even if it does restrain us from possession of the means of production. This does not require comment, except to remark that the whole significance of the Russian Revolution, not to mention my perfectly good definition of political action, has gone over Comrade Thompson's head.

With regard to the question as to whether the I. W. W. takes part in the class struggle or not, it all depends on what we understand as the class struggle. Between the working class and the capitalist class there is a conflict of economic interests. If we agree that this conflict of interests itself constitutes the class struggle, then it is obvious that the whole working class takes part in the class struggle, irrespective of beliefs and opinions. On the other hand, if we decide that the class struggle is the final clash between the two classes, which will take the political power out of the hands of the capitalist class and place it in the hands of the working class and by so doing put the workers in control of the means of production, then nobody is taking part in the class struggle in this country at present, unless we consider revolutionary propaganda and educational work taking part in the class struggle, a view which is open to question. You may decide the proposition whichever way you please, but note that I am criticizing what the I. W. W. calls its principles and revolutionary propaganda, not its function as a labor union nor its activities in any other respect.

Comrade Thompson tells us that "at best the social revolution is a gory rather than a rosy prospect." This is all the more remarkable when we remember that "bullets may be incidental to the revolution but only incidental."

There are several other questions that I would like to take up, but I have neither time nor space to do so here. I may touch on some of them in future articles on other subjects, but for the present enough has been said already on this subject to place the proposition fairly before all who care to consider it, and that was my main object in writing the articles. I did not write them to please any one. As a matter of fact I was goat hunting, and just wrote the articles to pass the time. As far as I am concerned this ends the discussion, and if Comrade Thompson or any else wishes to come back with further defense of the I. W. W. position, or to prove what a low-down lying scoundrel I am, he is welcome to do so; I will not retaliate further. As I stated before, if the position of the I. W. W. is correct the Socialist position is not, and the only thing for Socialists to do in that case is to abandon their own position and adopt that of the I. W. W. And when I say the Socialist position, I mean the contention that the workers must get control of the political power of the state before they can acquire possession of the means of production, in view of the fact that it is the state that restrains us from possession of the means of production: Comrade Thompson's own statement. On the other hand, if any person thinks he can, by some dialectical twist of the wrist, reconcile those two positions, he will be welcome; he might also be able to reconcile the conflict of classes by the same simple method.

BY I. V. MACKAY

THE articles under the above heading in recent issues of the "Clarion" seem to me to fall short of explaining the I. W. W. to the satisfaction of students who are more interested in understanding that organization than in blaming it for its theoretical crimes. So I will attempt to throw more light on the subject.

In the United States there are between two and three million casual laborers—commonly called "Hoboes"—who work at seasonal occupations, such as logging and harvesting, and beat their way on freight trains all over that country in their efforts to find a job. These men get no protection from the law, and the conditions of their life "on the job" or in their camps by the side of the railroad—known as "jungles"—and in the county and city jails—where they are periodically placed for the crime of having no money—are very rough and hard. These conditions develop in them the archaic virtues of self-reliance, endurance and loyalty to their group, also the peculiar outlook on life that appears in the I. W. W. song books issued before 1916.

Hobo slang has been taken over almost entirely by the I. W. W.—such words as "Scissorsbill," "Dingbat," "Fussytail," "Gaycat" (afterwards called "Sab-cat"), were in use amongst hoboes before the I. W. W. was organized—and some of these words are beginning to appear in the vocabulary of respectable socialists who have no use for sabotage.

Until 1916 the I. W. W. were few in numbers compared to the disturbance they made (about 14,000) and were too busy fighting the horrible industrial conditions to give theories and abstractions the attention they perhaps deserve. The average member of the I. W. W., like the average member of every other organization, is not adapted to study intricate sociological problems. They fall for anything that seems sensible, and in the deeper issues they are swayed by their leaders.

It was commonly understood by the rank and file that "Political Action" was the act of dropping a ballot in the bosses ballot box and letting the bosses count it. "Direct Action" was to organize until the slaves were strong enough to take over the industries by force and, incidentally, to get better conditions as they went along. Words such as Economic Action, Economic Determinism, Parliamentary Action, and so forth seeped down to them from the learned critics in the S. L. P., and the potential Congressmen in the S. P. of A.

About 1916 the "Wobblies" organized about 30,000 agricultural workers, mostly harvest hands, and caused the American Farmer great distress and the following year they organized most of the loggers in the great strike in the woods. Up until this time the American "State" was decentralized and comparatively weak. It seemed to be the policy of Washington not to interfere in local disturbances. So when the Wobs conducted a free-speech fight or a strike they were opposed only by the local authorities and the authorities were hampered by the tax-payers kicking at the high cost of "justice." Lenin tells us that the "State" becomes stronger and more centralized with pressure from within or without, and the United States went into the war in 1917.

There was a little incident happened in Seattle that showed how the Wobs were going. They had taken in more numbers in the previous two years than they could assimilate and most of the laborers down town were sympathetic to them—many of the local merchants displayed two union cards in their windows, A. F. of L. and I. W. W. I was at a "Wobby" social; the entertainment was singing, dancing and prize fights, and some of the "Petty Larceny" element (that is the way they refer to retail merchants) donated the prizes for the contests. An old Wob was lamenting the organization turning "yellow" as "those birds would not be allowed on our platform in the good old days."

The leaders of the I. W. W. were given long terms in jail and it became dangerous to be caught with a Wobby card. It is very dangerous yet in some states.

The Russian Revolution came along, led by Political Actionists, and confused the rank and file of

the I. W. W. The membership dwindled to those hard cases who cannot learn by experience so it is not surprising to find contradictions in their recent pamphlets.

I do not, however, agree with F. J. McNey in his harsh criticism of the following paragraph from page 84 of the "The Lumber Industry and its Workers."

"Labor is the creator of capital, and existed before capital; but without capital, labor could produce only on a very limited scale. On the other hand, capital without labor could produce nothing. The I. W. W. does not propose to abolish capital. What it does propose is to abolish capitalists. A capitalist is one who owns capital and lives off profits produced by workers. Capital is necessary to society; but the private ownership of capital is not necessary; on the contrary, it is responsible for most of the evils from which society suffers today. If all capitalists were to pass out of existence industry would go on as usual, for it is run entirely by workers. With a system of industrial democracy capital will still exist but it will be owned and controlled by the useful members of society instead of by a parasite class."

I contend that this paragraph is sound educational tactics and also sound economics. The average worker understands by the term "Capital" wealth used to produce more wealth and by "capitalist" one who uses wealth to exploit others. This is the sense in which bourgeois propagandists have taught the workers to understand these two words and in using them in that sense the writer of the paragraph is talking to the workers in language they understand—which is sound educational tactics. When we consider "capital" and "capitalist" in this sense the paragraph becomes intelligible and consistent and economically sound as obviously we do not wish to destroy that part of wealth which is used to produce more wealth while obviously we do wish to eliminate those who use it in the exploitation of labor. The aim thus stated is identical with that of the Marxist. The difference is merely one of language. Too many intellectuals and Marxian purists are prone to place much importance on mere words whilst losing sight of the things for which the words are but symbols.

#### THE FARMER'S MISERY.

Continued from page 1.

selves to have been in the past, today you are approaching a recognition of the fact that as a producer you are linked up with other producers and that the solution of your problem as an agricultural worker lies in the solution of the social problem, including the problem of exploitation of wage workers in industry. We ask you to read our literature and to study the position as we lay it down. Then you will understand the factors governing your sphere of production, and you will find common ground with all producers of wealth, as against those who produce none yet who own most of it.

#### HERE AND NOW.

HERE and Now registrations are like those of the thermometer these days: up and down. Even "on the average" they are not what is required to maintain a healthy circulation. Like the frozen one's with the goloshes and neck mufflers we await with anxiety the financial thaw.

Following \$1 each: F. Tidswall, J. C. Armitage, J. J. Albers, W. K. Bryce, H. Melbo, H. Ross, J. Brown, J. Carson, C. MacDonald, J. Wedin, R. C. Johnston, J. Staples, J. Brightwell.

Following \$2 each: W. A. Pritchard, M. Dase, Frank Williams, J. A. McDonald, J. Bone.

Following \$3 each: C. Lestor, J. Hubble, C. J. Kolden.

E. J. Martel \$1.25; J. Yates \$3.34; Geo. Scott \$5.60; H. H. Hanson \$4; O. Finnetig \$1.50; Sid Earp \$1.50.

Above, Clarion subs. received from 1st to 14th Decr. inclusive, total \$49.19.

#### Clarion Maintenance Fund.

Following \$1 each: J. J. Albers, J. Gray, C. Lestor, J. Carson, F. W. Moore.

St. John, N. B. Comrades, per M. Goudie, \$12.

Above, C. M. F. receipts from 1st to 14th Decr. inclusive, total \$17.

## The Clarion Mail Bag

BY SID EARP.

LETTERS received up to date give much encouragement to the task of replacing with a true understanding, the obsolete and confused opinions now held by the great mass of the people in regard to the present social order. The inevitable decline of Capitalism will intensify and aggravate the problems now facing the wage workers to an intolerable degree. In the presentation of new ideas in line with the social development of today is to be found the only policy worthy of support by progressive minded men. By that alone can the regeneration of society be accomplished.

Writing from St. John, New Brunswick, Com. M. Goudie states that "prosperity" in that city is still around the corner and seems like remaining there. He expresses wonder as to "what are we coming to," and encloses an order for literature along with \$12.00 for the "Clarion." Also asks after Frank Cassidy. If the attitude of the comrades in St. John is any criterion of working class intelligence, we are certainly coming to happier days. A good bunch!

Com. Chas. Woolings sends a nice letter from Georgetown, Ont., with notice of change in his address. From Elmira, Ont., Com. H. Schwartz sends word that unemployment is growing apace in that district and comments upon the activities of the working class movement there. Encloses two dollars for the "Clarion." Com. Geo. Schott writes from Beechy, Sask., asking for some pamphlets suitable for beginners and enclosing six dollars for "Clarion" subs. Com. H. Melba sends word from Horse Butte, Sask., that the farmers are having quite a struggle to exist at all in that area, although crops have been good. He encloses a sub. From Riverhurst, Sask., Com. W. K. Bryce sends a sub. From Regina Com. G. Alley sends two subs. and two renewals for the "Clarion."

Com. M. Dase writes from Pincher Creek, Alta., asking for Paine's "Age of Reason," and enclosing two dollars for renewal of "Clarion" subscription.

Writing from Seal, Alta., Com. H. Hanson refers to Lestor's visit there, and expresses appreciation of the good work done by the Party. Also encloses four subs. to the "Clarion."

Com. Lestor sends word from Medicine Hat regarding the good meetings he has had there, and at Calgary. He is receiving much encouragement on his tour, and is being treated well wherever he goes. Writing from Seal, Com. Lestor states that the farmers make very appreciative audiences and often keep the meetings going for three or four hours. He will send a full report of his tour when he arrives in Winnipeg.

Com. J. Albers writes from Meeting Creek, Alta., enclosing a dollar sub. and a dollar for the Maintenance Fund. Com. H. Ross sends a sub. from Wiste, and likewise G. W. Lobi from Erskine, Alta.

Writing from Stanmore, Com. G. Donaldson states that Lestor has visited there, and gave three very fine lectures. Encloses two subs. for the "Clarion" and hopes that they will be able to brighten up the movement in that district this winter.

Com. Tom Roberts sends a \$6 order for literature from Sandon, B.C., and comments upon the movement there. The spreading of sound literature among the workers is of first importance as a form of propaganda, and our best wishes go to Com. Roberts for the work he is doing.

An order for H. G. Wells' "Outline of History" comes from Com. J. Gray, Renata, B.C., also a donation to the Maintenance Fund.

From Spences Bridge, B.C., Com. E. J. Martel writes a nice letter, enclosing a sub. to the "Clarion" and referring to the loss sustained by the Party in the death of Com. Teit. A brief pithy letter comes from Com. J. E. Palmer containing \$5 for a sub., literature order and donation to the Maintenance Fund. Good work in a "hard boiled" sump.

Two "Clarion" subs. come from Lund, B.C. Com. J. Randall sends in a sub. also a dollar for the Maintenance Fund. Writing from East Wellington, Com.

J. Cartwright sends three dollars for the "Clarion" and says it is almost as hard as getting the full product of your toil under the capitalist system. He also asks that one of the "Clarion" writers deal with the idea of a natural evolutionary development towards Socialism, and the lack of activity in the revolutionary movement on this account. Com. Cartwright is of the opinion that we shall only get what we want, when we know enough to go after it. Which sounds workmanlike anyway.

Com. J. A. McDonald writes from San Francisco enclosing two subs. to the "Clarion" and giving a short sketch of the working class movement in that city. A very welcome letter also comes from Frank Cassidy, who is in Frisco at present. He sends warmest regards to all Vancouver comrades.

Two subs. come from Com. Frank Williams, Des Moines. A letter from Marius Hansome, graduate student at Columbia University, New York, has been received, favorably commenting upon Com. F. McNey's recent articles upon the I. W. W. pamphlets. The writer asks the assistance of the "Clarion" in his study of the workers' educational movement throughout the world, also desires to be put in touch with labor colleges and study groups in Canada. Com. McNey's review was especially appreciated for the keenness of point of view and insight.

Bishop Brown of Galion, Ohio, writes to inform us that another edition of his pamphlet "Communism and Christianity" (twenty-five thousand copies) is now ready for sale. He offers the Clarion Maintenance Fund, all the copies we can sell, free and carriage prepaid. He is also donating all receipts from the sale of this book towards aiding the comrades in Russia.

A letter from Francis Johnson, of the Independent Labor Party, London, England, has been received, in which comment is made regarding the success of that party in the recent British elections.

A request for one copy of the S. P. of C. Manifesto comes from A. L. Myerson, Manchester, England. He expresses appreciation of the "Clarion," and comments upon the Socialist Party of Great Britain, of which he is an expelled member on account of his attitude on the Class Struggle. He holds that it is a struggle for political supremacy. An order for "Clarions" and "Economic Causes of War" (Leckie) comes from Melbourne, Australia.

A kindly letter of appreciation and encouragement is received from Dr. W. J. Curry, Vancouver, enclosing five dollars "to assist in printing the paper I have been reading over twenty years." He refers to the weakness of the Labor movement in Vancouver, and comments favorably upon the quality and style of the articles appearing in the "Clarion" of late, particularly so, "The Moscow Trial," which he thinks should be read and studied carefully. The idea of "relativity," and the fact that the master class interests determine the social psychology seem to him the beginning of wisdom, rather than "the fear of the lord," as we have been taught.

This concludes the "Mail Bag" up to 9th December, and we now await with keen anticipation the coming of the New Year. The question in our mind is shared by every class conscious worker, "what will it bring to the working class?" To us the future is bright with promise, but whatever comes, let us be prepared to play a worthy part.

### SECRETARIAL NOTES.

REPORTS of Lestor's tour of Alberta are all to the good and indicate considerable activity and interest. The letters from the various districts visited, or from some of them, are too lengthy to reproduce altogether, so we present a summary of the contents:

Comrade Donaldson, secretary Local Stanmore, Alta., reports that Com. Lestor delivered three lectures in two days in and around Stanmore, and that the farmer's position was the subject dealt with, all listeners being interested and appreciative.

Comrade Mrs. Hughes, secretary Local Youngstown, reports Lestor's "A1" lectures at Creslow, Rainbow and Social. Local Youngstown, it is hoped, will benefit by a reorganization in the new year.

Com. W. P. Roberts, secretary Local Hanna, reports Lestor's activities while in that—as he calls it—"somnolent burg." Twelve miles south of Hanna, the first meeting was held at Olive school house: fair attendance; subject—Bankrupt Europe. Many questions and a live interest throughout. Meeting at local theatre: subject—Lloyd George down—Is he out? It was suggested by a local man of the U. F. A. that he would like to have Lestor address a convention of that organization. We suppose, whatever the U. F. A. may think of it, that Lestor would be glad to do that.

Comrade H. H. Hanson, secretary Local Equity, reports four meetings: Excel, Lawndale, McConnell and Sedalia. It is an evidence of the attention the meetings attracted that the last meetings drew bigger attendance than the first. Com. Hanson's report records appreciation of Lestor's forcefulness, simplicity of language and vivid illustrations, all of which, with the excellence of the subject matter, had good effect on the audiences. This report concludes: "We feel that Com. Lestor did good work when here and hope for his early return, if his health will permit him to travel this windy, driedout, bald-headed desert, where the slaves exist on hopes that are always a year hence."

Com. MacPherson, sec. of Local Wimborne, reports fair attendance at a meeting in Trochu. Trochu, as he says, was named after a nephew of Gen. Trochu of Paris Commune renown. Com. MacPherson was arrested in Trochu in 1918. His historical prejudices are maintained in healthy condition by personal experience. Next meeting was at Collingwood. Subject, "The Great World Unrest." Meeting lasted several hours. Many questions and much discussion, which is still going on. Next meeting Aberdeen, where some of the listeners who were interested had never heard such a point of view presented before. In spite of the many calls for a longer stay Lestor had to move on to Carbon, a coal mining area. And at Swalwell, Com. Beagrie had a meeting all set up when he arrived there. In between periods while crossing and re-crossing Calgary, Lestor has had good meetings there.

### Lestor Speaks at

Fiske, Sask., Dec. 15th (evening)  
McGee, Sask., Dec. 16th (evening)  
Fiske, Sask., Dec. 17th (afternoon)  
Anglia, Sask., Dec. 18th (evening)

He is due to arrive in Saskatoon on Dec. 21st, and may be able to have meetings in Sovereign and Mildred between 18th and 21st Dec. Comrade Ronald will arrange meetings in Fiske and vicinity.

It looks as if the Winnipeg boys will have to keep on waiting until Lestor arrives. He was supposed to have been there on Dec. 1st. The foregoing briefly outlines the manner of his loitering on the way.

### Local (Vancouver) No. 1.

The election of officers, Local and D.E.C., will be held on 19th Dec. All members are requested to attend.

## Socialist Party of Canada PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

STAR THEATRE, 300 Block, Main Street

SUNDAY, Dec. 17th.

Speakers: W. McQuoid and C. Stephenson.

SUNDAY, Dec. 24th

Speaker: W. A. Pritchard.

All meetings at 8 p.m.

Meeting at New Westminster, B. C. in Edison Theatre.

SUNDAY, Dec. 17th, 3 p.m.

Speaker: Robt. Kirk.

MEETINGS EVERY SUNDAY.

Questions.

Discussion.

# The Origin of the World

By R. McMillan.

## CHAPTER XXII.

### THE CONCLUSION OF THE MATTER.

**A**FTER the words of the great Sir Ray Lankester, I feel that anything I can say is feeble and unnecessary. He tells you how the history of man began far back in the life of the globe, and how man developed from the low, bestial cave-dweller to the god-like creature of today. That is what gives us hope for the future. The whole life of the globe has been one long, slow, painful climb, from slime-speck to philosopher, from a protoplasmic globule to an intellectual giant.

We have all been deceived by the human tendency to think that past days were better than the present. The old man looks back to the days of his childhood, and he thinks that the world was better when he was young than it is now. He thinks that the men of his boyhood were stronger and braver and nobler than the men of today, and he talks about the "good old times." Old men have been the world's historians, and they have so glorified the past—the olden times—that we have all been hypnotized into the idea that the golden age of the world was in the olden times. But my story will have shown you that the whole history of the earth has been one of gradual development, of progress, of slow and painful climbing through the ages.

Not only have the hills and the mountains, the rivers and the stars, the trees and the cattle, the beasts and the birds, been developing, but man himself—his mind and his body—have been developing. The Hindu of long, long ago sang truly when he said:—

Slow grows the splendid pattern that it plans  
Its wistful hands between.  
This is its work upon the things you see.  
The unseen things are more; men's hearts and minds,  
The thoughts of peoples, and their ways and wills—  
These, too, the great Law binds.

I hope you have seen, as you have been reading, that all things work in response to Law! And the laws of Nature are few and simple. You will see, in whatever direction you look, that everything has developed from the simple to the complex, and that nothing abides for long. In the olden time, in the far back time, the Egyptians built pyramids, and raised the loveliest buildings that ever had been seen. Yet, if you trace their history back, you will find that their mighty civilization came from the simple savage. The beautiful carvings of their granite columns were but the imitations of the papyrus plants with which their ancestors adorned their huts. The fluted columns in enduring stone were but the remembrance of the bundles of reeds bound together with which the early Egyptians made their simple dwellings. Before the Egyptians had learned the use of metals they had stone tools, as other savages had; and the first metal tools they used were made in the form of the stone tools which their ancestors had used for countless ages before them.

All civilization began in savagery. When you remember that the "ancient Britons" existed only two thousand years ago, and that when Caesar landed on the south coast of England he was met by painted savages, clad in skins, armed with spears and shields, you wonder if civilized England, with all her wealth, refinement, poverty, and crime, can have developed in such a brief time. Has everything developed? Yes! Everything has developed, just as I have been explaining to you that the world itself has developed from a fire-mist. As you read more widely and think more deeply—as I hope you will do—you will find that the story I have told you falls into line with all the new knowledge of the world, and with all the facts that come under your observation. All things develop, unfold, evolve, and progress.

I have told you so little about the world and its

development that I feel almost, as if I should start again and try to make it clear and simpler. Yet, if I did, perhaps it would be no clearer to you at the end; for all I hope to do is to set your mind at work, so that you may have a broader outlook on the world, and a more intelligent idea of its origin. Life and death and joy and woe are forever mixed up here. As an ancient poet said:—

Mingled is death's moan  
With wail of childhood issuing from the womb;  
Nor ever night did fail, nor dawn arise,  
Which heard not, blent with infancy's weak cries,  
The sob that speaks of darkness and the tomb.

It seems to me that the story I have told you is full of hope for the race, because it points forward to greater development—to a richer, fuller development. It suggests that the German philosopher Nietzsche was not far wrong when he prophesied that a time will come when all men will be as good as the best men are now. That seems to me to be a far cry considering the barbarism of the world. And yet the long ages of struggle in the past gives one great hope for the future. We are still barbarous, even in our most civilized communities, and it may be true (I think it is), as Nietzsche says, that men will some day look back on us as we look back on the apes.

When I go over the story of the origin of the earth, as I understand it, my soul is filled with a joyous anticipation of the future of the world, and I want so to live that the world will be the better for my having lived. None of us can do much to amend the world; but we can each do a little, and it is all the littles that make what the Scotchman calls the "muckles." We are each but atoms in the world's progress, and the progress is painfully slow; but we can each help a bit; and we can do that best when we understand what the world is and how it develops. Hitherto all progress has been very slow, because it was unconscious; but now that we are coming to realize the way in which Nature works, we are bound to adopt a conscious method, working with Nature, so that our progress will be more rapid in the future than it has been in the past. And so this good old world is bound to improve with each generation.

As I look over the chapters I have written, do you know the thing that strikes me most forcibly in all I have said? It is this: that we live in a world of miracle, in a world of mystery and beauty and glory and eternal wonder. I have been talking to myself very frequently when I seemed to be talking to you, for I realize that I have gone about the world with my eyes only half-opened to the glory of it all. It is a wonderful world we live in, and I am glad that I was born; and I am sorry I did not understand earlier what life was, for I might have got so much more out of life while I had it. I hope you will realize what I mean, and come to enjoy life with open eyes and grateful heart. Your simple question as to the origin of the world has done me a great deal of good, and if my work does you half as much good as it has done me I shall be rewarded indeed.

Now, in closing, I want to quote a few words from Sir E. Ray Lankester's book, *The Kingdom of Man*. I quote him because he seems to me to be a great man and a good man, one who has been in the forefront of the scientific world almost as far back as I remember. And this quotation is on a subject that I know your grandfather has often thought about as he has read, and that is religion! How far does my story interfere with religion? Listen to what Sir Ray says:—

"It should, I think, be recognized that there is no essential antagonism between the scientific spirit and what is called the religious sentiment. 'Religion,' said Bishop Creighton, 'means the knowledge of our destiny and of the means of fulfilling it.' We can say no more, and no less, of science. Men of science seek in all reverence to discover the Al-

mighty, the Everlasting. They claim sympathy and friendship with those who, like themselves, have turned away from the more material struggles of human life, and have set their hearts and minds on the knowledge of the Eternal."

One other thing I would like to add to that; and it is this: We are living in a wonderful age, in an age of awakening, of looking upwards, of larger ideals and greater hopes, and I am glad to be alive in this age; for I feel, as the old hymn says,—

We are living, we are dwelling,  
In a grand, an awful time;  
In an age, on ages telling  
To be living is sublime.

THE END.

## Literature Price List

Cloth Bound	Per Copy
Positive Outcome of Philosophy .....	\$1.85
A. B. C. of Evolution (McCabe) .....	\$1.15
Economic Determinism .....	\$1.65
Evolution of the Idea of God (Grant Allen) .....	\$1.15
Darwinism and Race Progress (Haycraft) .....	\$1.15
Evolution of Property (Lafargue) .....	\$1.15
Critique of Political Economy .....	\$1.65
Revolution and Counter Revolution (Marx) .....	\$1.15
History of Paris Commune (Lissagaray) .....	\$1.50
Ancient Society .....	\$1.85
Philosophical Essays .....	\$1.65
Theoretical System of Karl Marx .....	\$1.65
Landmarks of Scientific Socialism .....	\$1.65
Socialism and Philosophy .....	\$1.65
Essays on the Materialistic Conception of History .....	\$1.65
Capitalist Production (First Nine and 32nd Chapters "Capital," vol. 1, (Marx) .....	\$1.00
Savage Survivals (Moore) .....	\$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
Anarchism and Socialism .....	80c
Feuerback .....	80c
Socialism Positive and Negative .....	80c
The American Empire (Nearing) .....	80c
Eighteenth Brumaire .....	80c
The End of the World .....	80c
Science and Superstition .....	80c

Paper Covers	Per Copy
Two Essays on History (C. Stephenson and G. Deville) .....	5c
Independent Working Class Education .....	10c
Communist Manifesto .....	10c
Wage-Labor and Capital .....	10c
The Present Economic System (Prof. W. A. Bonger) .....	10c
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific .....	15c
Slave of the Farm .....	10c
Manifesto, S. P. of C. .....	10c
Evolution of Man (Prof. Bolsche) .....	20c
Causes of Belief in God (Lafargue) .....	10c
Shop Talks on Economics (Marx) .....	15c
The State and Revolution (Lenin) .....	25c
Value, Price and Profit (Marx) .....	15c
Economic Causes of War (Leckie) .....	25c
The Protection of Labor in Soviet Russia (Kaplun) .....	15c
Civil War in France (Marx) .....	35c
Eighteenth Brumaire (Marx) .....	35c
Christianism and Communism (Bishop W. M. Brown) .....	35c
Psychology of Marxian Socialism .....	30c
W. A. Pritchard's Address to the Jury, (State Trials, Winnipeg, Man., Fall Assizes 1919-20) .....	25c

### Quantity Rates on Paper Covered Pamphlets.

Two Essays on History .....	25 copies 75c
Communist Manifesto .....	25 copies \$2.00
Wage-Labor and Capital .....	25 copies \$2.00
Present Economic System .....	25 copies \$1.50
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific .....	25 copies \$3.25
Slave of the Farm .....	25 copies \$1.50
Manifesto of S. P. of C. .....	25 copies \$2.00
Evolution of Man .....	25 copies \$3.75
Causes of Belief in God .....	25 copies \$2.00
Value, Price and Profit .....	25 copies \$3.25
Economic Causes of War .....	10 copies \$2.00
Christianism and Communism .....	6 copies \$1.00
Psychology of Marxian Socialism .....	10 copies \$2.50
W. A. Pritchard's Address to the Jury, (State Trials, Winnipeg, Man., Fall Assizes 1919-20) .....	10 copies \$2.00

:0:

All prices include Postage.

Make all moneys payable to E. McLeod, P. O. Box 710, Vancouver, B. C. Add discount on cheques.

All above literature can be obtained from J. M. Sanderson, Box 2354, Winnipeg, Manitoba.