

WESTERN CLARION

A Journal of
CURRENT
EVENTS

Official Organ of
THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

HISTORY
ECONOMICS
PHILOSOPHY

Number 827

Twice a Month

VANCOUVER, B. C. SEPTEMBER 16, 1920

FIVE CENTS

Concerning "Rights"

IT is characteristic of the Classical Economists that they should have taken the laws of private property for granted as something fixed and immutable. This followed naturally from their belief in a "natural order" governed by "natural laws," and under which mankind were endowed with "natural rights"—the right to life, liberty, property, contract, the pursuit of happiness and so forth. These beliefs formed the philosophic background for the principles of individual initiative, personal enterprise, free competition and "laissez faire" which were the outgrowth of the conditions following the revolution in industry in the eighteenth century, and which formed the intellectual stock-in-trade of the rising middle-class, fast becoming dominant, and of their political spokesmen, the Liberal party.

This may be observed in the literature of the bourgeois revolutionary period as, for instance, the Declaration of Independence and the Declaration of the Rights of Man. It will also explain why the petty bourgeois reform parties are so much given to insisting on "human rights." A case in point is that of the S. L. P., who used to insist upon "the inalienable right of all men to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness."

Sir Henry Maine has laid it down as a generalization, that modern civilization, considered as a process, consists in a progression from **status** to **contract**. That is to say, from a condition in which a man's standing or position in society determines his duties and privileges and the services to be given or received, to a condition in which his actions are governed by contracts either implicit in society or freely entered into. There is, under feudalism for instance, no question of rights as we understand the term. Custom, prescription and birth dictated what one might require of others and what one had to do in return.

This process, the substitution of rights for privileges, has gone on very unequally in various countries, being dependent on the extent to which these countries were industrialized. A new transition period has, however, resulted in a general house-cleaning in the matter of ideas and opinions and the doctrine of "natural rights" is now very generally discredited. As a matter of fact there are no such rights. A man living in isolation could obviously have no "rights" whatever.

"So far from being absolute or natural or necessary to every State of society, these Rights have always been limited, have always been changing, and have their origin and justification in social expediency."—Ely.

Now, then, these rights, which we shall now call legal rights, are fundamental institutions or conditions of the capitalist system and, as they can no longer be taken for granted as having been "established by Nature," modern economists find it necessary to devote some space to some account of their origin and nature and to show some cause for their continued existence. This applies more particularly to the "right of property." Such justification usually consists in an appeal to their "social utility." It is argued that they are necessary to the continued existence of society as we know it and promote the well-being of men in society.

"History and facts show in that private ownership has, up till now, been the best con-

dition of utilizing wealth, the most energetic stimulus to production."—Gide.

Hand in hand with the use of the bourgeoisie and the development of industry there grew up the modern State. Let us hear Prof. Ely:

"For the maintenance of these fundamental conditions of the existing social order which we have described, we are dependent upon the State. No other instrument of Society is adequate to the task."

We shall now hear Prof. Commons:

"The necessity of a sovereign power employing force is shown by the following facts:

(1) Private self-interest is too powerful, or too ignorant, or too immoral to promote the common good without compulsion.

(2) The common wants of society—justice, roads, military defence, etc.—can be supplied only by compulsory contributions for individuals, and compulsory administration of government.

Law is the expression not of the whole society, but of the sovereign element or social class. It is imposed simply by virtue of the **might** residing in government. The most obvious characteristic of law is that it is coercive. Even when it operates in favor of the legitimate actions of individuals, it does so by restraining any interference with such action.

At the same time, laws are not the fortuitous and blind coercion of nature. There are always human purposes underlying the enactment of laws, and these are the purposes of whatever may be the ruling political class at the given time, and in the given country. These may be good or bad. Historically considered, they may be classed as follows:—

(1) The determination of the ruling classes to exploit other classes.

(2) The desire of the ruling classes to realize certain ethical and political ideals.

(3) The desire of the ruling classes to facilitate or suppress the industry of the country.

It is the function of the State, by means of law, to create and define legal rights. This it does in its legislative capacity.

It is also its function to aid and conserve legal rights; to enforce the performance of contracts. This is carried out by means of the courts and the machinery "whereby the physical force of the State is set in motion through appropriate State officers to carry the judgment into effect."

"A right (in general) is one man's capacity of influencing the acts of another, by means not of his own strength, but of the opinions and the force of society. A **legal right** is a capacity residing in one man of controlling, with the assent and assistance of the State, the actions of others. That which gives validity to a legal right is, in every case, the force which is lent to it by the State.

An analysis of a legal right shows it to be the result of the following elements:—

(1) The person entitled—A person in whom the right resides, or who is entitled to the right, or who is benefited by its existence.

(2) The Object.—In the case of property rights, an object over which the right is exercised.

(3) The Act or Forbearance.—Acts or forbearances which the person in whom the right resides is entitled to exact.

(4) The Person Obligated.—A person from whom these acts or forbearances can be exacted; in other words, whose duty it is to act or forbear for the benefit of the subject of the right."—Holland.

Personal rights have been variously classified but may be given as:—

(1) Life.

(2) Liberty.—Personal freedom, freedom of movement, of enterprise, of employment and of contract.

(3) Property.

Further consideration of this subject will involve some account of each of those classes, and will make clear the general bearing of these remarks and why personal rights are so important to capitalist society. Sufficient for the present to say that the continuance of the capitalist system depends on the maintenance of certain of these rights, for the simple reason that the legal claims which result in the appropriation of the products of labor as rent, interest and profit are based on them. The State, as we have seen, guarantees these rights and the claims based on them. It is for this reason that the apologists and defenders of capitalism agree in denouncing the Socialist movement as an attack on the State and society as at present constituted. It is my opinion that they are quite correct.

The works quoted in the foregoing are:—

The Distribution of Wealth	Prof. Commons
Political Economy	Prof. Gide
Elementary Economics	Profs. Ely and Wicker
Jurisprudence	Holland

GEORDIE.

PLATFORM

Socialist Party of Canada

We, the Socialist Party of Canada, affirm our allegiance to, and support of, the principles and programme of the revolutionary working class.

Labor, applied to natural resources, produces all wealth. The present economic system is based upon capitalist ownership of the means of production, consequently, all the products of labor belong to the capitalist class. The capitalist is, therefore, master; the worker a slave.

So long as the capitalist class remains in possession of the reins of government, all the powers of the State will be used to protect and defend its property rights in the means of wealth production and its control of the product of labor.

The capitalist system gives to the capitalist an ever-swelling stream of profits, and to the worker, an ever-increasing measure of misery and degradation.

The interest of the working class lies in setting itself free from capitalist exploitation by the abolition of the wage system, under which this exploitation, at the point of production, is cloaked. To accomplish this necessitates the transformation of capitalist property in the means of wealth production into socially controlled economic forces.

The irrepressible conflict of interest between the capitalist and the worker necessarily expresses itself as a struggle for political supremacy. This is the Class Struggle.

Therefore, we call all workers to organize under the banner of the Socialist Party of Canada, with the object of conquering the political powers, for the purpose of setting up and enforcing the economic programme of the working class, as follows:

1. The transformation, as rapidly as possible, of capitalist property in the means of wealth production (natural resources, factories, mills, railroads, etc.) into collective means of production.
2. The organization and management of industry by the working class.
3. The establishment, as speedily as possible, of production for use instead of production for profit.

Economic Causes of War

Article No. 12.

MOROCCO, on the African coast, opposite Gibraltar, is one country above all others that brought about the cessation of the hostile attitude of England towards France, which had existed for centuries. The first International Convention over the affairs of Morocco was held in 1880, on the question of trade being extended to all nations, largely owing to German influence. In 1890 Germany signed a commercial treaty with Morocco for five years, and informed the signatory powers of the Convention of 1880 that she would not ratify the treaty if they objected. Britain supported Germany at this time. It was at this period that the Emperor visited England, once in August, 1889, and again in July, 1891, where he became exceedingly popular. Heligoland was transferred at this time, and there were other transactions with Germany in 1890, to withdraw her opposition to British enterprise in Egypt. Yet we are told that Germany prepared for forty years to make war on Britain.

In 1891 Lord Salisbury dispatched a commission to Morocco, defining British policy as having as its aim the independence and integrity of Morocco. This commission was supported by Germany, but was a complete failure because of the intrigues of France. The Moorish Minister prevented the Sultan from concluding a British treaty, having received \$10,000 from the French agent at Fez, the capital of Morocco. The French cause during the nineties advanced slowly, but in 1901 when Britain was busy with the Boer war, France pushed ahead with a burning wish to avenge her collapse in Fashoda, where she had challenged Britain's position in Egypt, but had to withdraw owing to the failure of her ally, Russia, to come to her aid.

France annexed the Tuat oasis together with two other places she had threatened in 1891. A French subject was murdered at the psychological moment, and the French Minister in Morocco demanded the dispatch of a couple of men-of-war. The Sultan, seized with panic, made an agreement with France. This was the time the British press said: "If the French cannot cease their insults their colonies will be taken from them and given to Germany and Italy." This was but fourteen years before the Great War. The "Daily Mail," November 9th, 1899, said: "The French have succeeded in thoroughly convincing John Bull that they are his inveterate enemies, and that all attempts at conciliation are useless. There will be no more such attempts. England has long hesitated between France and Germany, but she has always respected the German character whereas she has gradually come to feel a contempt for France. . . . Nothing like an entente cordiale can subsist between England and her nearest neighbor. Enough of France; she has neither courage, foresight, nor sense of honor."

In 1902 France approaches Spain secretly to divide up Morocco. The British lion hears of it, and although France promises diplomatic support, the Spanish Prime Minister takes cold feet and resigns. The opposition returns to power at the general election. The new Prime Minister, who favored the treaty in the opposition, refuses to ratify it, and then France begins to make overtures to John Bull.

The young Sultan of Morocco, who had become Europeanized and extravagant, was unpopular. In 1903 he borrowed \$4,800,000 from French, Spanish and British syndicates. In the summer of 1904 these loans were paid off, but only at the price of contracting a much heavier liability towards France alone, amounting to \$12,500,000 bearing interest at five per cent. This loan was confined to French banking establishments and was practically forced upon the Sultan by M. Delcasse. M. Jaures in the French Chamber, pointed out that by clever manoeuvring on the part of the French bankers in Morocco, that Morocco actually obtained \$9,500,000 the banks made a profit of \$2,500,000, Morocco paying interest on the full amount of the loan. To

secure the interest on this loan, the Sultan consented to set aside 60 per cent. of the customs receipts, which virtually gave France control over the customs to that extent. Further small loans were contracted in 1905 and 1906. A portion of these loans was spent in purchasing guns and ammunition from the French war industry, Le Creusot. This firm, I may say in passing, refused to supply Britain with war material during the Boer war.

In 1904, Spain, France and Britain signed treaties regarding Morocco. They published that part of them which dealt with the upholding of the integrity and independence of Morocco, but they secretly agreed to divide her up when the opportunity arose. This secret arrangement became public when the crisis of 1911 arose, when Germany wanted to maintain the independence of Morocco. In April, 1904, when the secret treaties were unknown, Prince Buelow, answering a question in the Reichstag, declared he had no reason to believe they were directed against Germany. Britain's opposition to France in Morocco was bought off by France withdrawing her opposition in Egypt, but Britain stipulated that Spain would control Morocco opposite Gibraltar, and build no fortifications or lease this to any other Power.

Article 10 of the secret treaty provides that all schemes for public works, railways, etc., mineral development and economic undertakings in general in the French and Spanish spheres respectively, shall be executed by French and Spanish enterprise. Germany being alarmed, managed to get the Sultan to call a general conference in 1906 of all the Powers to discuss the status of Morocco. German trade with Morocco amounted to over 14,900,000 marks. M. Deschanel, President of the French Parliamentary Committee on Foreign Affairs, admitted they could not ignore the German efforts in Morocco for half a century; the travels of her explorers, the activity of her colonists, her agricultural and mineral enterprises, her steamship lines and post offices. She participated in the tobacco monopoly, and Krupp and other firms held a preponderant position in the mining interests, extracting iron. Her enterprise developed harbor works and public drainage, a bank, a newspaper printed in German, and a tobacco factory. The Germans held more land paid for in cash in Morocco than all other nations combined, and without massacre or pillage they established industries by the peaceful penetration method.

At the opening of the Conference of Algerias, an act was drawn up in the name of "God Almighty," based upon the sovereignty and independence of the Sultan, and upon economic liberty without any inequality. All existing treaties were to remain, but in case of any conflict the Algerias Act shall prevail. Britain, France and Spain signed this Act with the firm intention of never observing it. The French ignored the Act in 1911, applauded by the British press, and with the open approval of the British Foreign Office the French marched on Fez because it was reported to be blocked by insurgents, and that Europeans were in danger. Spain, despite French protests, proceeded to occupy territory which was promised her in the secret arrangement of 1904. This was the position when Germany made the display at Agadir with the warship "Panther." Lloyd George compared Germany to Dick Turpin, and practically uttered an ultimatum when addressing a meeting of bankers in London, July 21st, 1911. The Sultan of Morocco believed Germany to be his friend because she insisted on the independence of Morocco, but it was discovered that she was willing to let France control the country in return for compensation elsewhere. The crisis was ended by France ceding that part of the Congo known as the Cameroons to Germany, who recognized France in Morocco. So near was war that Jowett, M.P. for Bradford, told us that Britain had her torpedo nets laid, but the

differences in the British Cabinet and the unpreparedness of the German bankers enabled the inevitable clash to be postponed.

This was another example of the methods of the upholders of integrity and independence, and a lesson on how to divide Morocco. Germany upheld that independence, not because she is any better morally than the others, but because of her economic interests.

Tardieu, in his "French Alliances," page 190, quotes Prince Buelow as saying in October, 1905, "In Morocco we have important economic interests; we intend to safeguard them." And on another occasion: "I consider the duty of the German Government to see that in the future our economic interests are not injured. . . . If any attempt is made to modify the international situation in Morocco or to check the open door in its economic development, we must see more than ever that our economic interests are not endangered." And again: "Our interests are first and foremost commercial. . . . We owe it to ourselves to protect our commercial interests in Morocco, and we shall protect them." Germany did not raise her objections to the French attitude in Morocco until Russia, France's ally, had been defeated in the war with Japan, yet Tardieu says on page 194: "In spite of the disorganization (of the Russian army) inevitably caused by an unsuccessful war, England, who, had France been willing, would have made war in 1905."

Although it was 1911 before France carried out her designs on Morocco, she bombarded Casablanca in 1907 because some European workmen, who were building a railway for a French syndicate, had been killed. This road was being built through a Moorish cemetery, the desecration of which created an opposition by the natives that developed into a riot. The French permanently occupied Casablanca as the first step in the greater grab of Morocco. France also used the incident of a Frenchman being killed to enter the interior, and she never withdrew, although Germany protested as she had a right to do under the Algerias Act. This Act also stipulated that tenders for erecting public works or furnishing supplies should not contain any condition of a nature to violate the principle of free competition, or to place the competitors of one nationality at a disadvantage against the competitors of another.

In the British and French agreement regarding Morocco the governments declared themselves "equally attached to the principle of commercial liberty," also that they would not "countenance any inequality either in the imposition of custom duties or other taxes or railway charges . . . that the trade of both nations should enjoy the same treatment in transit through the French and British possessions in Africa."

For information in greater detail on Morocco I would suggest the reading of Ed. Morel's "Ten Years of Secret Diplomacy," or his "Secret Diplomacy in Morocco." A study of history has inevitably led me to the conclusion that British antagonism to Germany did not arise until 1904, and then as a result of German commercial rivalry.

PETER T. LECKIE.

SOVIET RUSSIA MEDICAL RELIEF COMMITTEE.

Moneys as under received by Local (Vancouver) No. 1, S. P. of C., from Local (Winnipeg) No. 3:—
 Donation Local Winnipeg, S. P. of C. \$ 25.00
 Donation R. C. McCutchan 10.00
 Collection, minus expenses, Winnipeg Workers' protest meeting, Strand Theatre, August 15th 86.60
 \$121.60

The Effect of the Peasants' Revolt

WE have noticed in previous issues that the Peasants' Revolt was a secular rather than religious movement. It was the culmination of an effort on the part of peasant and artisan to wrest certain privileges from the ruling class of England. Still, the circumstances of the case forced the movement to assume a religious phase. There was no possibility of the workers organizing in any other than a religious manner.

In feudal England there was not that great migration of workers from one section to another that we find today. Most of the inhabitants residing in a manor had been born and reared in the same locality. Manufacturing industry had not yet developed to the stage where a large influx of workers, skilled and unskilled, was imperative. As the whole social group was confined practically within the boundaries of the manor it can easily be understood that the business of every individual would be well known to all his neighbors. There would be no opportunity for effecting a combination of interests along political or industrial lines.

Though the lord of the manor might, himself, be absent from his domain for lengthy periods, his affairs were always carefully attended to by his agents who were left in charge. They would detect, with little difficulty, any organized attempt on the part of the workers to overthrow the power of their owners and rulers. The bands of armed followers possessed by the feudal lords would soon make known as **Lollardy**, which was founded by the serfs, as the latter would be poorly equipped and trained in a military way.

An organization making use of religious weapons, however, would not be subject to the same scrutiny. Such was feasible. For many years previously religious divisions had existed. All sections of the ruling class had not accepted the same plan of salvation. From the rising manufacturing and trading classes bitter hostility to the Church of Rome was becoming apparent. This antipathy had its incentive in the wealth possessed by the church rather than in the doctrines preached, and the schemes formulated, for entering the kingdom of heaven. The established church by relegating to itself the right of specifying what should, and should not, be investigated and explained had become a decided brake on progress and, in consequence, incurred the enmity of those who found it compulsory to understand the ways in which nature worked, as well as the physical properties of the materials they used, before production and exchange were at all possible.

The direct result of this clash between those economic interests was the religious movement known as **Lollardy**, which was founded by the famous ecclesiastic Wiclif. There was nothing proletarian about this religion. The fact that some of the greatest dignitaries of state, persons of power and affluence, aligned themselves with this attack on papal authority is a pretty fair indication of whose interests were best conserved.

But out of the ranks of the Lollards emanated a force unseen by the leaders of church and state. The "poor priests" whom Wiclif commissioned to carry the new doctrines into the midst of the populace carried them to a greater extent than their masters desired. Those priests, coming in contact with the peasantry and artisans of the town, were not slow in seeing the identity of interests existing between all members of the lower orders, and the necessity for combining their forces in opposition to lord and manufacturer. Those, then, were the agents chosen by the discontented serfs to further their cause and present their demands in a formidable manner. Thus, through the channel of a religious movement, the secular interests of a class were presented and advanced.

Just what followed the fateful day at Smithfield

is still problematical. Young Richard, mounted on a fiery charger, receiving from the Mayor the head of the rebel Tyler, and triumphantly dictating terms to a broken and beaten mob would surely indicate that the whole rebellion was a dismal failure, and the conditions of the peasantry rendered doubly unbearable. But such a conclusion is scarcely warranted by the facts. The immediate victory lay with the heads of the state. The rebels were dispersed. The Mayor — Walworth — was knighted and given dictatorial powers over the city, while the insurrections that still lingered or threatened were suppressed by drastic measures. A number of ring-leaders met their doom at the executioners block.

The Essex insurgents sent a committee to the King to arrange affairs in an amicable manner. They were told that the pledges made during Tyler's regime counted for nothing, as they were extorted by force. Anyway they did not conform with the law of the land, and could not be binding. The charters were soon declared invalid. The king himself was greatly incensed. His reply to the committee that "Villeins ye are and villeins ye shall remain," shows that no sentimental sympathy, as told by some modern historians, was fostered by the head of the realm. Now, with the conditions favorable, he was doubtless anxious for vengeance. His first step was to issue a proclamation which formally revoked all the charters issued at Mile End. Both those of manumission and those of amnesty for crimes done in the early days of the revolt were consigned to the flames. But, authoritative and arbitrary as were the measures devised by Richard, it must not be concluded that he possessed, even temporarily, the power to exact vengeance in whatever manner he desired. The victory was at no time so decisive as to warrant the annihilation of the opposing forces.

Neither was London the exclusive scene of revolt. In Kent, Essex, Norfolk, Suffolk, and Cambridge they had outbreaks following that of London. The means of communication in those days were crude and unreliable. When the news of Tyler's revolt reached the outlying shires, these in turn resumed the attack, which was continued till several days later, when the news leaked through of Tyler's defeat and death.

There is one thing we cannot fail to notice in the course of the revolt. This is the fact that the most violent outbreaks, and the most determined onslaughts, occurred in those shires where the conditions of the peasants were relatively good. In Kent and Norfolk—the richest shires in England—the greatest attempts at securing freedom were made. The stage they had already reached in their development was sufficient to whet their appetites for a larger measure of freedom even though they had to secure it by armed force. Nowhere either in England of 1381, or in Germany of 1525, do we find those sections on which the feudal yoke pressed heaviest taking any active or stubborn part in the rebellion. They were beyond the stage of asserting themselves.

When parliament met in the following autumn the legislators were in an angry mood. They were not in any degree the representatives of the enslaved class. The interests of their masters—the landlords and manufacturers—were uppermost in their minds. The illegality of the pledges and charters granted by the king was explained. The repeal of the charters was endorsed. They decided that no manumission of serfs could be decided upon without the consent of all who had an interest in the matter. Still regardless of their partiality to the owners, and animosity to the owned, they were compelled to act with caution and deliberation. Harsh measures would only lead to another out-

break. Their experience in the last one was sufficient to convince them of the desirability for peace. Another insurrection and all property rights might collapse. With this in mind they applied the soft pedal. The king was advised to grant amnesty to all with the exception of a few of the most violent and outspoken leaders. No obstacle was placed in the way of manumission.

In examining the authorities for a general summary of the revolt and its results we are unable to find an unanimous verdict. Rogers and Stubbs are convinced that though the formal victory lay with the masters the real victory was with the workers.

Rogers, in particular, draws a rosy picture of the results from the standpoint of the peasants. He claims that all the demands of the landlords were dropped, and that such terror was caused in their ranks by the attack of the peasants that the latter gained all the redress they demanded without delay. The English labourer, he asserts, became virtually free and constantly prosperous for a century or more succeeding the revolt.

On the other hand Reveille, who probably examined more minutely than any other authority the manorial records of the period, is not nearly so confident concerning the rebels' success. In this connection it may be noticed that access to documents of several centuries previously does not necessarily imply that the conclusions arrived at are always sound, or the records properly studied. In many cases two impartial judges might easily arrive at altogether different decisions after viewing the evidence. Maillard, Cunningham and Powell seem to lean to the side of Reveille.

Oman probably sums up the situation as best as such could be done in one paragraph when he says that "Neither villeinage nor all the manorial grievances in the country-side nor the class wars within the towns, were in any sense brought to an end by the popular outbreaks that we have been investigating. The problems were settled so far as they were ever settled, by the slow working out of economic changes."

To the student who makes use of the materialist conception, to explain the cause, origin, and existence of social and political events, the path is clear. The Peasants' Revolt is one of those inevitable manifestations of discontent and violence that class society engenders. There is nothing to be gained either by lavishing sentimental eulogies on the rebel peasants of '81, or by deploring the judgment of a class who made a move to right wrongs that they little understood. A moment's reflection suffices to show that there are periods in the course of class society when the economic conditions make imperative an outbreak on the part of the oppressed. Such spasmodic clashes are inherent in a system of slavery. Regardless of how little or much they may accomplish, so long as the social structure is built on a class foundation, rebellions and revolts are a logical sequence.

The Peasants' Revolt did not terminate, any more than originate, the conflict between landlord and peasant, or merchant and wage laborer. The strife continued afterwards as it had before. Villeinage had started to make way for a new system long before the revolt. Gradually, changing conditions enabled the serfs to commute all liabilities for money payments. The old system died from natural causes over a period of several centuries. When it ceased to function properly there remained but one alternative—it must cease to exist. This villeinage did. It vanished away almost imperceptibly as social and economic changes demanded its removal. The Peasants' Revolt remains as one of the landmarks, or decisive points, in a gradual change.

J. A. McD.

Western Clarion

A Journal of History, Economics, Philosophy,
and Current Events.

Published twice a month by the Socialist Party of
Canada 401 Pender Street East, Vancouver, B. C.
Phone Highland 2583

Editor Ewen MacLeod

Subscription:

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

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

EDITORIAL WE ARE DISCOVERED.

AN astonishing document has been issued, August, 1920, by the Department of Labor, Canada, entitled: "Information Respecting the Russian Soviet System and its Propaganda in North America."

We thought the day had gone by when any action or pronouncement of Hon. Gideon Robertson, Minister of Labor, would astonish us. By our estimate of that worthy, based upon past experience, we did not expect to experience surprise at anything he might do. This pamphlet, however, is of the political muck-raking order, and it would seem that it has been compiled by some press hireling whose moral code is as loose as payment dictates. Everyone is familiar with the manner of propaganda that evasively and scurrilously suggests, without the appearance of direct lying and falsehood, the ease of an opponent to be of such a nature as is commonly understood to be subversive of the ordinary decencies of life. This is just such a document. Its opening paragraphs announce that the Department of Labor has been at pains to gather information from reliable sources respecting the Soviet system. We hold no objection to that, but nothing in the ill-conceived and shuffling paragraphs is presented to show it. The usual half-truths that are in the lying dailies are there, to be sure, and their arrangement is not of a very clever order of workmanship. The attempts at discrediting the various bodies of working-men and others in Canada are crude and amusing. That is where our astonishment comes in. We did not think Hon. Robertson could amuse us. The document places us in some queer company, but it has just discovered that we are engaged in the spread of Socialist propaganda in Canada. Alas for our efforts of many years.

And we have a grievance. The Hon. Minister failed to send us a copy. From our examination of the one we appropriated, we conclude that we shall be glad to freely distribute the hollow screed as fairly good propaganda—for us.

AMAN who has frequented the halls of learning may conceive a grudge against us if we should classify him as being in fit company with such an example of mental artificiality as the Hon. Robertson. And, to be sure, we are quite willing to concede varying degrees of mental health in our several opponents. In another column we present the reply of our Winnipeg comrades to John MacLean (not the John MacLean) who has forsaken a professorship in mathematics for the more lucrative practices of the law, with an ever open avenue of relief in times of stress, in the press.

This John MacLean has been writing a series of articles in the "Free Press" (Winnipeg), on the industrial situation in Canada, and in his seventh article he devotes three columns to the Socialist Party of Canada. We usually are consumed with awe in the presence of so learned a person as a professional mathematician, and it is ordinarily our pleasure to make haste to grant him a point at once, bearing in mind always that a point has no dimension.

But the strange circumstance that surrounds our opponents always is that they just will not gather the information, about us, that lies at their door. This one charges us with having changed front, from a "ballot-box" party before the war, to a

party of revolutionists after the Russian Revolution of 1917, and the queer thing about it is that Mr. MacLean bases his whole contention as to this point, on the S. P. of C. Manifesto. He quotes the Introduction to the Fourth Edition of that Manifesto in support of his claim, assuming that it was issued for the first time in or after 1917, whereas it was issued in 1916, and the Introduction to the Fourth Edition appeared in the "Western Clarion" of 1st February of that year. But this is not all. He quotes various sections of the Manifesto to show that we have changed front, since 1917, and these paragraphs have been in the S. P. of C. Manifesto in all its editions, for more than ten years.

So that, bad as Mr. MacLean thinks, us, we have to say that he must have been asleep for ten years, for we have not changed our fundamental basis in that time, and he can locate the sentences which impress him so forcibly in our literature of that time.

Some other items might be dealt with, but we shall leave him to the eager attentions of the Winnipeg comrades. His critical and somewhat appreciative testimonial to our reasoning capacity is quite welcome to us, but he doesn't have to lie about us. When we proceed to a criticism of our masters, we don't have to introduce the lying habit. If these people who so dislike us would come to us for all the information they need about us, we would be awfully truthful. But then of course they won't, because if they met with the truth it might consume them.

We would direct Mr. MacLean's attention to the fact that the Fourth Edition is now entirely sold out, and he may now provide a customer for a copy of the Fifth. Our readers will see, elsewhere in this issue of the "family journal," the text of the preface. The Preface to the Fourth will appear in the new edition also.

Book Review

THE STATE AND REVOLUTION: Marxist teaching on the State and the task of the Proletariat in the Revolution. 124 pp. paper, 1s. 6d. By V. I. Ulianov (N. Lenin). Published by the British Socialist Party and The Socialist Labor Press.

THIS book is one of the finest I have read by any Marxian scholar. He shows how Kautsky distorts Marx because of the conflict of Marx and the opportunist attitude of Kautsky. Lenin resuscitates the real nature of Marx's teaching to offset the widespread distortion of Marxism.

Lenin begins with Engels' "Origin of the Family," where Engels summarizes his historical analysis thus:

"The State in no way constitutes a force imposed on society from outside. Nor is the State the reality of the 'Moral Idea,' the image and reality of Reason, as Hegel asserted. The State is the product of society at a certain stage of its development. The State is tantamount to an acknowledgment that the given society has become entangled in an insoluble contradiction with itself, that it has broken up into irreconcilable antagonisms of which it is powerless to rid itself. And in order that these antagonisms, these classes with their opposing economic interests may not devour one another and society itself in their sterile struggle, some force, standing, seemingly above society, becomes necessary so as to moderate the force of their collisions and to keep them in the bounds of order. And this force arising from society, but placing itself above it, which gradually separates itself from it—this force is the State."

Lenin says that this expresses in all its clearness the basic idea of Marxism on the question of the historical role of the State. When, where and to what extent the class antagonisms of a given society cannot be objectively reconciled, the State is the product and manifestation of the irreconcilability of class antagonisms.

Lenin points out the attempt made by petit bourgeois to make the State an organ of the reconciliation of the classes, yet according to Marx the State can neither rise nor maintain itself even if the reconciliation of the classes were possible.

The opportunists twist Engels' withering away of the State as to mean a gradual process by means of political representation and government majority. Lenin goes into the whole argument and points out that the capitalist State is destroyed by the proletarian revolution, while the withering

away refers to the remains of the proletarian State, which will become superfluous when it represents the whole of society.

The Kautskian opportunists repeat the phrase that what Marx taught was "The proletariat need the State." Lenin goes on to say that they forget, however, to add that they need only a withering away State, and the proletariat organized as a ruling class need a State which is a particular form of organization of force to hold down some class, in this instance the exploiting class.

Lenin quotes from Marx's "Civil War in France," "The Eighteenth Brumaire," "Communist Manifesto," "Poverty of Philosophy," and makes Kautsky look like ten pins.

When Lenin goes into the dispute between Marx and the Anarchists, he points out that Marx protested, not against the abolition of the State, when classes disappear, but against the workers who should deny the use of the State to break the resistance of the exploiters. The anarchist idea of the abolition of the State is muddled and not revolutionary. Lenin points out that when Engels wrote to Bebel on the nonsense of the People's Free State, Engels said that during the period when the proletariat need the State, they do not require it in the interests of freedom, but in the interests of crushing their antagonists.

This letter had been hidden for thirty-six years, and first published in Bebel's "My Life" (1911). Lenin says:

"Kautsky still continues to repeat those very mistakes against which Engels gave his warning."

Dealing with the religious question, Lenin points out that Engels said in relation to the State "religion is a private matter," but today the opportunists have twisted this to mean religion is a private matter in the party.

Lenin is very lucid on the withering away of the State, which also means the withering away of democracy, and says:

"At first sight such a statement seems exceedingly strange and incomprehensible. Indeed some one or other may begin to fear lest we be expecting the advent of such an order of society in which the principle of majority rule will not be respected—for is not Democracy just the recognition of this principle? No, democracy is not identical with majority rule. Democracy is a State which recognizes the subjection of the minority by the majority."

He points out that during the development of Socialism into Communism, people will grow accustomed to observing elementary conditions of social existence without force and without subjection.

"Between capitalism and communism there lies a period of revolutionary transformation from the former to the latter. A stage of political transition corresponds to this period, and the State during this period can be no other than the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat." (Marx).

Lenin says:

"Marx grasped the essence of capitalist democracy, when in his analysis of the Commune, he said, that the oppressed were allowed once every few years to decide which particular representatives of the oppressing class are to represent and repress them in Parliament."

I have only touched the fringe of the book, and would advise all Socialists to get a copy. It sells at one shilling and sixpence, so that locals could order bundles from either the British Socialist Party, 21a Maiden Lane, Strand, London, W.C.2, or The Socialist Labor Press, 50 Renfrew Street, Glasgow.

PETER T. LECKIE.

SUBSCRIPTION FORM.

WESTERN CLARION.

A Journal of History, Economics, Philosophy and
Current Events.

Official Organ of the Socialist Party of Canada

Issued twice-a-month, at 401 Pender Street East,
Vancouver, B. C. Phone: High. 2583.

Rate: 20 Issues for One Dollar (Foreign, 16
issues.) Make all moneys payable to E. MacLeod.

For enclosed herewith
send issues to:—

Name

Address

The Economic Development of Russia

The subjoined letter has not, so far as we know, been published before in English. We translate it from the French, in which language it was originally penned, towards the year 1880. Found in Marx's posthumous papers, it was first published in a Russian periodical during 1888, was reprinted by Nikolai-on as an appendix to his work upon the economic development of Russia, and was reproduced in *Le Mouvement Socialiste* for May 24, 1902. In the aforesaid appendix Nikolai-on explained that during the latter half of the decade 1870-80 there was a lively controversy in Russia ancient the ideas put forward by Marx in the first volume of *Capital*. In 1877, Mihailovski, taking part in the controversy in answer to critic of Marx named Zhukovski, pointed out that in the concluding section of his book Marx was not merely concerned with giving a historical sketch of the opening phases of capitalist production, but had done much more than this, for he had expounded a complete theory of the philosophy of history.

This theory, continued Mihailovskii, is of universal interest; but for Russians the interest is supreme. If we fully accept the philosophic system of Marx, according to which every nation, in the course of historical development, must inevitably pass through the capitalist phase, then every Russian disciple of Marx, if he desire to be consistent, must play an active part in the process which divorces labor from the means of production, which expropriates the peasants, which mutilates the organism of human society, and threatens the future of the human race. On the other hand, this same Russian disciple of Marx must regard as his ideal, that ownership and labor should coincide, that the actual producers should own the land and the other means of production.

We had not had the advantage of reading Marx's letter when we wrote the article "Short Cuts in Social Evolution," which appeared in the "Plebs" for February and March, 1918. We now subjoin the full translation of Marx's reply to Mihailovskii.—E. and C. P.

THE author of the article "Karl Marx before the Tribunal of L. Zhukovski" is evidently a talented man, and had he been able, in my account of primitive accumulation, to discover a single passage in support of his conclusions, he would have quoted it. In default of such a passage, he is compelled to avail himself of a controversial excursus against a Russian belletristic writer printed in the appendix to the first German edition of "Capital" (suppressed in subsequent editions). In that appendix, what is the charge I make against the Russian writer? I declare that he discovered "Russian communism," not in Russia, but in the book of Haxthausen, a Prussian privy councillor. I show that in his hands the Russian commune is used merely as an argument to prove that Europe, aged and corrupt, must be rejuvenated by the victory of panslavism. The opinion I pass on the aforesaid Russian writer may be sound or unsound; but it certainly cannot be regarded as furnishing a key to my views concerning the efforts "which the Russians are making to discover for their country a developmental path different from that which western Europe has followed and is following."

In the postscript to the second German edition of "Capital," I speak of an "eminent Russian critic and man of science" with the deference which is his due. This writer, in a series of remarkable articles, discusses the question whether, as the liberal economists wish, Russia should begin by destroying the rural commune in order to pass to the capitalist regime, or whether, without having to endure the tortures of that regime, Russia can enjoy all its fruits by developing her own historic possibilities. This writer favors the latter solution. Now my excellent critic would have just as much right to infer from my appreciation for this "eminent Russian" that I share his views, as to conclude from my polemic against the panslavist and belletristic Russian writer that I reject the views held by the latter.

But since I have no wish to leave my readers to guess at my meaning, I shall speak without circumspection. To enable myself to acquire a first-hand knowledge of the economic development of contemporary Russia, I learned the Russian tongue, and I then devoted myself for many years to the study of official and other publications upon the subject.

I arrived at the following conclusions: If Russia continue to advance along the road entered in 1861, she will lose the finest opportunity history has ever

offered any nation, and will expose herself to all the vicissitudes of the capitalist regime.

II.

In the chapter on "The Secret of Primitive Accumulation" I have merely attempted to trace the steps by which, in western Europe, the capitalist economic order emerged from the womb of the feudal economic order. This chapter describes the movement whereby the producer was divorced from the means of production; the movement whereby he became a wage-earner (a proletarian in the modern sense of the term), and the means of production became capital. In this history "all revolutions are epoch-making that act as levers for the capitalist class in course of formation. . . . The expropriation of the agricultural producer, of the peasant, from the soil is the basis of the whole process." A little later, in the chapter entitled "The Historical Tendency of Capitalist Accumulation," I affirm that the last word of that tendency is the transformation of capitalist private property into socialized property. I offer no proof of the assertion, for the excellent reason that it is no more than a summary restatement of the arguments given at length in the chapters on capitalist production.

Now, what application to Russia was my critic entitled to deduce from the aforesaid historical sketch? Nothing beyond this; that if Russia attempt to become a capitalist nation, following the example of the nations of western Europe (and of late years Russia has taken a great deal of trouble to achieve this end), she will not succeed without the preliminary transformation of a large proportion of her peasants into proletarians. Thenceforward, having entered the capitalist fold, Russia, like the rest of the capitalist flock, will be subject to the inexorable laws of capitalistic development. That is all. But it is too much for my critic. He finds it absolutely essential to transform my sketch of the genesis of capitalism in western Europe into a historico-philosophical theory of general social evolution. According to this theory, such an evolution is inevitably imposed on all nations, whatever the historical conditions of their environment. According to this theory, they must all in the end achieve an economic structure which will ensure, concurrently with the highest development of productive power for social labor, the fullest integral development for man. But I ask my critic's pardon. He is at one and the same time too kind and too unkind. Let me take an example. In various places in "Capital," I refer to the fate of the plebians in classical Rome.

Originally these plebians were free cultivators; they were peasants, each tilling a plot of land on his own account. In the course of Roman history they were expropriated. The same movement which divorced them from the means of production and subsistence, implied, not merely the formation of great landed estates, but likewise the formation of large aggregations of money capital. Thus it came to pass one fine day, that there existed, on one side, free men dispossessed of everything except their labor power; and, on the other side, as potential exploiters of this labor power, the holders of all accumulated wealth. What happened? The Roman proletariat did not become a class of wage workers but a mob of idlers more abject than the sometime "poor whites" in the southern States of the American union. Side by side with this development, there came into existence a method of production based not on capitalism, but on slave-holding. Thus events striking in their analogy, but occurring in different historic media, led to totally diverse results.

Those who study these evolutions separately, and who subsequently compare them, will readily discover the key to the phenomena in question. But no one will ever unlock these doors with the master-key of a historico-philosophical theory whose supreme virtue it is to be supra-historical.

"The Plebs" (London), May, 1920 KARL MARX.

MANIFESTO OF THE S. P. OF C.

PREFACE TO THE FIFTH EDITION

This pamphlet has been in the hands of the working class for ten years. Over 20,000 copies have been sold, and the demand continues unabated, we are venturing another edition.

We have had criticisms from all parts of the English-speaking world, and have, after much discussion, revised some theoretical errors and obscurities. It has been our care in making these corrections not to interfere with the work as a whole, preferring to leave it, as far as possible, just as the author, who is dead, wrote it.

The Preface to the Fourth Edition draws attention to the Great War, and was written shortly after the world went mad, like the dog in the poem, for spite. The real causes of the war were set down, causes which very few today care to deny. We took the stand then that the war was not regrettable, and the grounds that "forward it must carry us to the Social Revolution." And we set down this principle that the outbreak of peace would be "as cataclysmic as the outbreak of war." There are other forecasts we could claim credit for, but let these suffice.

That we have been carried forward toward the Social Revolution requires no proof. The Russian Revolution has been carried through and the working class of Russia are masters of that country. They have retained mastery after almost three years of warfare against both the victors and vanquished of the Great War. They have overthrown the national autocracy which was suited to early capitalism, have conquered the seat of power from the capitalists, and have done a dozen counter-revolutions of formidable character, which were strongly supported by foreign powers, have driven several foreign armies from their territories, and have, isolated from the civilized world, evolved an economy which has fed and clothed, and armed the men who accomplished this amazing feat.

It is a working class achievement and harbinger of the accomplishment possible when the workers take control of social life.

It is fortunate that Russia was the first to revolt. We can conceive of no other country so admirably situated which could have withstood the rain of fire and brimstone showered down by the outraged God of Capitalism. Its geographical position prevented the capitalist world from bringing all its tremendous resources to bear, and its wealth of natural resources neutralized the Allied blockade. If they have sinned against the Holy Ghost in revolting before the evolutionary alarm clock called them, we freely forgive them, and humbly hope that those who await the appointed hour, will bear themselves as manfully.

Other revolts which followed the war were for the time being crushed. The reports from Hungary show to what lengths a master class will go in avenging itself upon an unsuccessful working class revolt. That the Hungarian revolt was premature, in so far as the suffering entailed by Hungarian workers is concerned, we will concede, but social development is not concerned with human suffering, or human happiness. We have all seen if we have not all been seized with it, the madness that causes a man to strike blindly at some inanimate object, which in some innocent manner causes him injury. And in just some such manner do revolutions occur, not from any premeditated design, but from the inherent consequences of a particular social condition. While we confess the difficulty, nay, the well nigh impossibility, of organizing a revolution, we can at least try to understand one when it occurs, and we can furthermore realize the inevitability of a social change in a world where social changes have been constantly occurring since the dawn of civilization and the advent of slavery.

It is for the purpose of furthering an understanding of this social phenomenon, inherent in a system where man is enslaved by man, where in the midst of plenty, the powerful many are starved and sweated by the feeble few, that this Manifesto is issued.

A thorough understanding can only come by study of the actual conditions which confront mankind. We do not pretend to reveal the secret in these pages. All we hope to attain by inducing the members of our class to read this book is, to call their attention to the fact that a thorough investigation has been made of society, and the results are available to almost any one who will devote some time and a little cash to that end.

The Great War has torn down, with that careless and aimless ruthlessness manifest in natural forces, many barriers to social progress. It has, just as the Crusaders did for the rising capitalist class, thrust the working class into positions of power which they cannot help but enlarge. It has, just as the crusaders did to the feudal barons, torn from the hands of the capitalists many of their most powerful weapons. It has further, just as the Crusaders did, disrupted the economic machinery of the ruling class. It has, in short, carried us forward to the Social Revolution.

This is so apparent, and the murmurings of revolt are so frequent—thunderings would be a more appropriate word, but we admire the soft pedal,—which, coupled with the manifest stupidity of the official hirelings of the capitalist, might precipitate a revolution in half a dozen countries in Europe. Socialist literature abounds with information which discloses the economic motive underlying every move of the recent peace conference, and which also shows the utter impossibility of carrying into effect the proposals of the Versailles Treaty, or the League of Nations. Lloyd George can no more create a nation than he can create the country they are to inhabit; Millerand cannot extract tribute from Germany without injuring France any more than he could cut off his arms and increase his strength. These are facts known to all students of Marxian Socialism, to which this pamphlet is an introduction.

HERE AND NOW.

Following, One Dollar each: J. A. McD., J. H. Moon, T. Darnley, Ilmar Oberg, J. Gorley, A. G. Rose, J. Martin, W. Staples, K. Dengg, G. Wallack, J. A. Ancil, Oscar Motter, C. R. Morrison, C. Bowie, W. Moriarty, F. Oliver, Wm. Bennett, P. Bach, F. Shimek, J. Rosenfeld, W. S. Matthews, C. A. Churgin, Harry Judd.

N. Booth, 96c.; P. W. Bishop, \$3; Alex. Shepherd, \$3; C. Cezar (Winnipeg), \$4; E. D. Mitchell, \$2; Joe Naylor, \$2; J. Carson, \$4; J. Watson (Winnipeg), \$4; O. Erickson, \$2; J. E. McGregor, \$3; Parry and Sim, \$2; A. Tree, \$6.

Above subscriptions received from 27th August to 10th September, inclusive. Total, \$58.96.

—o—

A STEADY JOB.

WANTED — UNDERTAKER FOR PERMANENT position out of town, in large camp. Address Box 296 Province.

"Province" (Vancouver), 27th Aug., 1920.

—o—

CLARION MAINTENANCE FUND.

E. Kennedy, \$2; J. Garson, \$2; Oscar Motter, \$4; A. Paterson, \$4; C. A. Churgin, \$4.

Above contributions to C. M. F. received from 27th August to 10th September, inclusive. Total, \$16.

An Answer and a Challenge

J. MacLean, ex-Professor of Mathematics in the Manitoba University (who for the past seven weeks has been contributing articles to the Winnipeg "Free Press") has evidently forsaken the science of which he is an expert, to indulge in excursions into the realms of Economics, Sociology, and the position or principles of the Socialist Party of Canada, where he evidently has not made the same thorough and systematic study as in mathematics, or, allowing that he has thoroughly studied the subjects mentioned, then he is guilty of misrepresenting or misconstruing, for such a mixture of truths, half-truths, un-truths and meaningless platitudes it is hard to find anywhere, and any member of the Socialist Party of Canada who has been a student for six months would have no difficulty in answering the learned Professor.

In his seventh article, which is a general confusion of words and ideas, the writer either misunderstands or is misrepresenting materialism, the Materialistic Conception of History and the tactics of the Socialist Party of Canada. Learned Professor,—the philosophy of materialism has nothing to do with the ideal motives of the individual, therefore, we fail to see why Socialists, being Materialists, should be the greatest bluffers in the world. Materialism in Philosophy is simply an explanation of the Universe, or a question whether we need go outside or beyond the world that we perceive with our senses to get to the "real world." Are the objects around what they appear to be or do they possess something in themselves that is distinct and separate from their qualities or attributes as perceived by us? Do ideas have any real independent existence apart from matter or are they merely the reflection of the material world? The answers "yes" or "no" to these questions determine whether they are Idealistic or Materialistic in character. Applying the materialistic principles to history we have Historic Materialism, or the Materialistic Conception of History. In other words, are changes in the material conditions of life caused by changes in ideas, or are changes in ideas due to the changed conditions of life, which have largely been brought about by changed methods of production and distribution? Do the general ideas prevalent in any given epoch precede or proceed from changes that have taken place in the way a people get their living?

The Materialistic Conception of History maintains that in any given epoch changes in ideas are due to changed material conditions of life, and while many factors may enter to produce a change in the material conditions of life, changed methods of production and distribution have basically been the most important. Historic Materialism then, has nothing to do with the influence of, or adherence to, the ideal motives of the individual, nor with anyone who is gross, mean and egotistical and seeking his own personal ends, or again, the materialist of Professor MacLean's description, "who may consider any means justifiable which will compass an object one may have in view." Such are found most anywhere and everywhere, even to adherents of Idealistic Philosophies, who are but victims of the system of competition under which they live, and even the worthy Professor may not be altogether guiltless if he has written these articles for a monetary consideration.

The tactics of the Socialist Party of Canada, we are told, have been changed, first, from the use of the ballot to the advocacy of direct action or use of physical force and violence, and again since the strike, reverted once more to the ballot, and so have again come within the law. We are told that the first change was due to the Russian Revolution—to the Bolshevik regime. That is, that the Socialist Party of Canada, advocating direct action, was responsible for the Winnipeg general strike, which,

when not successful in producing a revolutionary change, the ballot was again resorted to. This contention is not borne out by the facts. The Socialist Party of Canada has always realized that it is an educational body, using at all times, when possible, the ballot by placing candidates in the field to that end, because we realize that social production produces ideas of social ownership, and being victims of the material conditions under which we live, naturally we are impelled to the spread of these ideas, which, when they permeate the minds of the majority of a population, that majority will seek to gain control of political power, and when that occurs a revolution has taken place, a political revolution, which has followed a revolution in ideas, and both have been preceded by an industrial revolution.

Mr. J. MacLean, ex-Professor of Mathematics, you will admit that when the majority are in favor of a given solution to a question they are not seditious in taking the necessary measures to apply it. The Socialist Party of Canada, therefore, is more concerned in making Socialists than in advocating either party reforms or direct action, for reforms, even when granted, do not materially benefit the workers, nor do they prevent the accumulation of wealth of those who own the means of life, or stop increasing poverty and misery to the mass of toilers who own nothing but their power to labor. As for direct action, why the advocacy, when the majority, having certain ideas, can take the necessary steps to fulfil them?

But it is not always possible for the party to nominate and run candidates for political honors, sometimes due to financial reasons and at times due to the bias existing. During the period of the war Socialists were decidedly unpopular, when any of its speakers might have been at any time victims of physical force and violence. Nevertheless, the Socialist Party of Canada contested various constituencies during the war period: 1916, B. C. Provincial Elections, four candidates; Alberta Provincial Elections, 1917, five candidates; one candidate (B.C.) Dominion Elections, 1918.

The Winnipeg General strike was not caused by the Socialist Party of Canada, or by any change (which did not occur) in its tactics, but was the result of conditions. The workers had passed through a war period, and while during that period their monetary wages had increased, the purchasing power or real wages had decreased. Expressed in the workers' terms, while the weekly pay envelope contained a twenty-five to forty per cent. increase during the period of the war, the cost of living nearly doubled. Hence, not being able to maintain their standard of living the workers made an effort, by striking, to do so. Out of this general condition arose a general strike, which spread both East and West. Revolution? Why mention it? The majority of the workers in Canada were not Socialists, and therefore did not strike to realize social ownership. There was no attempt at revolution, peaceful or otherwise. The workers were not demanding the full product of their toil, they were only striking to recover their standard of pre-war times. Socialists know this, and knew it in 1919.

The Socialist Party of Canada did undergo a change, like all other socialist organizations the world over, which was directly due to the success of the workers in Russia. Prior to the Russian Revolution, Socialists, while considering the collapse of capitalism inevitable and that Socialism was the logical outcome, still its establishment was considered vague and was a matter of speculation. Although Socialism is not the system of society in Russia, the workers have gained control, and control through their form of organization, namely, the Soviet. The success of the Russian workers has certainly acted as a stimulus to Socialists the world over. The establishment of Socialism is not now

so vaguely considered for the dim and distant future, but to the near future, because it has proven the Socialist contention that if the workers have the necessary intelligence to produce the wealth of the world under capitalism for their masters they can also produce for themselves. Steps to this end are now being taken in Russia. Social ownership is the object. Social ownership of the means of life is also the object of all Socialists, hence the stimulus produced by the success of the Russian worker, which, however, did not change an educational organization to advocate direct action, nor turn a body of students into a band of bluffers who would use any means to attain their object.

Professor John MacLean,—The Socialist Party of Canada hereby issues a challenge to you to prove in public debate your knowledge of Economics and Sociology as represented in your articles, and also to prove your statements respecting the tactics of the party. In doing so we are governed by ideal motives in that we desire to correct incorrect impressions, rectify half-truths and untruths, eliminate your meaningless platitudes, and unravel the general confusion of words and ideas so that you may not in future impose too much upon a long suffering public without knowing better.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA.

(Winnipeg Local No. 3).

Conflicting U. S. Interests

THE fight that is now going on in the United States between the steel interests, which function through the Democratic party, and the oil and coal interests, which function through the Republican party, for the control of the political machinery of state; the campaigns of propaganda carried on by the oil interests for intervention in Mexico; the backing of the Polish invasion of Russia, and for a mandate of Armenia by the steel interests, all of which are of course carried on under the cloak of looking after the welfare of those peoples, tells its own story.

The steel interests, which have become international under the Harvey Steel Trust, are dependent largely upon the oil and coal interests of the United States and Mexico for their fuel. Therefore we see Davidson, of the house of Morgan, becoming very solicitous of the sufferings of Poland and Armenia trying to bolster up the campaigns against Russia by government appropriations, and failing these, through the Red Cross and other benevolent activities. Why?

That the steel interests may get hold of the vast oil wells of Russia, thereby obtaining an independent supply of oil, the fuel of the immediate future. On the other hand we see the coal and oil interests (Rockefeller), blocking every move of the steel interests (Morgan), in order that it may not have a competitor for its own commodities nor lose the markets which they now control.

To cover their ulterior purposes they both carry on campaigns of falsehood, that the dear public, of which they are mighty solicitous when they want something for themselves, may be deceived into turning over to one or the other of these vast interests the administration of the government for another four years.

We are paying a great compliment to Russia in expecting her to accomplish her task of reconstruction which took us three times as long under much less trying circumstances, after "our" revolution.

It only remains for the workers of the United States to unite with those of England, France and Italy in "Hands off Russia," and she will work out her own salvation.

KATHERINE SMITH.

Countering the Counter Revolution

DIPLOMACY goes softly through the bewildering tangle of class confusions, measuring, testing, gauging the temper and spirit of the times, balancing and calculating the conflicting powers of progress and reaction, watching with the deep cunning of man, waiting with the infinite patience of the wild for the psychological moment when, in its ethic of frightfulness, it may set ignorance against his brother discontent. And all at the behest of a master class, soulless with the soullessness of economic power, hesitating at nothing to preserve its property right in social necessities.

When Imperialism first found itself checked by Sovietism, it hurled its forces in terrible fury against this emblem of social liberty. And diplomacy, true to its nature and origin, fulfilled its mission perfectly, in so far as its purblind masters would permit. Thus Kolchak and his atrocities were curtailed off from the world; it drew a veil over the doings — or rather misdoings — of Denikin and Wrangel; it excelled itself on the matter of the Allied alliance with Von Goltz; and vindicated its own ethic in the "white" regime of Mannerheim and Churchill. Negotiations see-sawed in conformity with the movements of the field forces. When counter revolution advanced, negotiations lapsed; when revolution triumphed, negotiations were eagerly revived. Because, **at no matter what cost**, Bolshevism must be outfought, or outmanoeuvred. From every point of the compass comes the same sordid story, the same black duplicity, varying in cunning and stagnation, constant in objective and force. Yet Sovietism emerged from the ordeal, not seathless or idyllic, but clear of mind and straight of purpose, flushed with a new consciousness of power, passionate with a new meaning of life.

And now, again, is the scene changed.

Even as the first flood of military aggression battered against Soviet Russia in vain, so now has diplomacy recoiled before the gathering necessities of social development. The triumph of the workers' Soviet—that first faint harbinger of the civilized commune—marks the beginning of a new epoch in world development. And the failure of diplomacy to effect a patchwork truce between the irreconcilables (capital and Sovietism) marks the close of the first chapter in the new era. For with the fall of Poland—or even but a threat to its nationalism—Sovietism has definitely entered the field for world dominion.

But while Russia is thus a rival with capital for world dominion, it is not the old capitalist rivalry of economic supremacy. It is, on the contrary, the rivalry of Socialist society, of communism against class. We have, therefore, openly and unmistakably entered the field of class war, and the eventful times of the immediate future will involve the world in a struggle, the gathering forces of which it feels and fears, but whose significance, as yet, it wots not of.

Undoubtedly, Britain is the world power of today. Therefore must the Empire, whereon the sun never sets, be flung to the forefront of the struggle, and as the confines of that empire are world wide, so will the struggle be world wide. Lloyd George is now threatening Ireland with force. But the wily "Davie" is bluffing. He knows (and we know) that the struggle in Ireland is not of class. And he knows also that although Ireland is the gateway to the Atlantic trade routes, it is in the East that the clash must come. And there will the accounting be. Because Bolshevism, dominant in the West, inevitably threatens the East, and if the British Empire is shorn of its Eastern possessions, it will crumble away like a cloud in high summer.

The riches of India, the oil of Persia and Baku, the "mandates" of the Great War, and the desperate necessity of controlling the food-producing countries will force the struggle out of the murky

shadows, or diplomatic duplicity into the open day, will change the current of social movement from imperialist expediency into the wider channel of social necessity.

From which it follows that while the common objective of property right will tend to unite capitalist countries against Sovietism and its works, the conflicting Imperialist necessities and aggressions of the individual powers will tend,—in an exactly opposite direction—to divide their councils and thwart their efforts, even against the common foe. This mutual suspicion and distrust will weaken their forces, make their shifty policies more vacillating, increase internal unrest, and drift the working masses, more clearly, more consciously, and therefore more determinedly towards the left.

The certainty that class conditions will continue and increase in intensity, will augment and deepen the desperate economic plight of the proletariat, will consolidate their efforts, and everywhere strengthen their resistance to the crushing power of political domination. Out of their miserable necessity, in sheer defence of their very existence, the workers will be forced in a definite direction, will be compelled to take a positive stand, and from those actions, whatever they may be, will proceed a new consciousness of the meaning of the struggle. With that revelation will come the knowledge of what and where to strike to emancipate themselves from slavery.

Surely the climax has come. The capitalist class is now facing its Waterloo. It cannot trade, because, at the same time that capitalist concentration has eliminated competition, it has also eliminated the world market. In their confused bungling and juggling with imperialist necessity, the capitalists have forgotten (if they ever knew) the supreme function of social organization—the essential, i.e., the economic welfare of the total society. In capitalist society, without the world market, the dispossessed producers must starve—and will starve—until the movement of the social forces once more vindicate their supremacy over man and his transient contrivances.

The dominant issue is not empire, but revolution. The entire world is divided into two camps, and they clash, sharp as steel, on the fundamental issue of social control. Each side is gathering its forces together, with stern intent, and conscious purpose, and till that issue is settled—and it can only be settled in one way, there will be, there can be, neither social peace nor social prosperity, nor the rectitude of social sanity.

The Communist Party in Russia

By Arvid Hansen.

IN all countries there are at present in the workers' movement "Putschists"—people who think, or say they think, that knowledge, study, preparation, are worth nothing, while action, immediate action, is everything. Look at Russia, they say, a people of illiterates, who really put over their revolution, instead of talking about it. It is not education, it is action that is demanded.

Reasoning of this kind may look very attractive at first blush. The only hitch is that it is not the illiterates who made the revolution, but, on the contrary, the most educated, most intellectual portion of the working class, those who not only could read and write, but also think, people who had acquired a firm Socialist education and understanding, and who had already shown themselves to be the possessors of an organizing talent great enough to enable them to do away with illiteracy in the near future.

The Communist Party in Russia is not a very numerous party. It counts not more than half a mil-

lion members, but it is a party that has no members on paper, a party of active units who are not only masters of the language alphabet, but also of the alphabet of revolution. Only through a united organization can the party control the situation.

In the larger cities, there are higher educational institutions for the training of Communists, schools in which instruction is given in history, particularly in the history of revolutions, in social economy, and social politics. Without a certain education, and without having passed through a practical test, no one is admitted to the Communist Party. Voluntary courses in the Communist Party programme are now to be found in most of the schools in Russia. The young candidates to the party are sent out as state employes on the most varying errands, and are tested through a period of three months; only after passing the test can they enter the party. They are then sent as party members all over Russia, as commissars in order to exercise control over the administration. In every single school, every single hospital, every single railroad train, etc., etc., you will find at least one Communist. The Communists have better opportunities than others for advancing and are more certain of getting decent bread. But in return, they must devote their lives to Communism. It is one of their privileges also to be sent to the firing line, to the most dangerous positions, when the Soviet Republic is threatened by any enemy. During the combined offensive of Yudenitch and Denikin, 20,000 Communists were sent to the front at once from their work in the institutions, and it was 300 young officers in training with revolutionary inspiration from the Moscow War School, who prevented the Yudenitch vanguard from cutting off the railway line between Petrograd and Moscow. Very severe demands are made on the absolute unselfishness, zeal and idealism of the Communists. Even a slight transgression of the party programme destroys one's future. A crime of selfishness, such as speculation or embezzlement, if perpetrated by a Communist, is punished inexorably by death, at least in the more serious cases.—"Soviet Russia," Aug 28, 1920.

*From the German noun "Putsch" an unsuccessful and premature attempt at revolution.

Literature Price List

Communist Manifesto. Single copies, 10c; 25 copies, \$2.00.

Wage-Labor and Capital. Single copies, 10c; 25 copies, \$2.00.

The Present Economic System. (Prof. W. A. Bonger). Single copies, 10c; 25 copies, \$1.50.

Capitalist Production. (First Nine and 32nd Chapters, "Capital," Vol. I. Marx). Paper, single copies, 50c; cloth, single copies, \$1.00; cloth, 10 copies, 75c each.

Socialism, Utopian and Scientific. Single copies, 15c; 25 copies, \$3.25.

Slave of the Farm. Single copies, 10c; 25 copies, \$1.50.

Manifesto, S. P. of C., single copy, 10 cents; 25 copies, \$1.50.

Red Europe. (F. Anstey, M.P.). Single copies, 50c. Ten copies or more 30c each.

The Story of the Evolution of Life. (T. F. Palmer). Single copies, 10c.

Evolution of Man. (Prof. Bolsche). Single copies, 20c; 25 copies, \$3.75.

The Nature and Uses of Sabotage (Prof. T. Veblen). Single copies 5 cents, 25 copies \$1.

The Criminal Court Judge, and The Odd Trick (E. B. Bax). Single copies, 5 cents; per 25 copies, 75c.

Evolution of the Idea of God (Grant Allen), 55c per copy.

Ancient Society (Louis H Morgan), \$2 15

Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State (F. Engels)80c

Value, Price and Profit (Marx)—Single copies, 15c; 25 copies, \$3.25.

Feuerbach: The Roots of the Socialist Philosophy (Engels)80c

Introduction to Sociology (Arthur M. Lewis), \$1.75.

W. A. Pritchard's Address to Jury, 25 cents per copy.

Make all moneys payable to E. MacLeod, 401 Pender Street East, Vancouver, B. C. Add discount on cheques.

(All above post free).

Military Review

By Lt.-Col. B. Roustam Bek.

"THE victory is with the big battalions," said Napoleon, "it can be obtained only by force and no force is too strong to bring victory."

When the Polish military leaders began their offensive against Soviet Russia four months ago, with Moscow as their strategical objective, they believed that their army was strong enough to accomplish this difficult task. The Russians, on the other hand, although their military strength was superior to that of the Poles, allowed the invasion to proceed, while they mobilized an army with reserves sufficiently strong and numerous not only to check the Polish advance in Russia, but also to resume a decisive counter-offensive.

Following the classical doctrine of Napoleon, the Soviet strategists looked with indifference upon the situation of the Russian frontiers, still unsettled and uncertain, and did not trouble to guard them, thus leaving open the gates of the Republic. The attention of the Russian Supreme Revolutionary Council was concentrated on the importance of uniting all the fighting forces of the Soviets in one army, which should operate under one trusted leader. This leader was Comrade S. S. Kamenev.

Since the beginning of the Polish campaign, the firm hand of the Commander-in-Chief of the Soviet Army could be discerned in every movement of the Red Army, during their most dangerous and daring manoeuvres, and especially in their retreats. The latter, on every occasion, were accomplished in extraordinary good order; there was never panic or confusion. Even the enemies of the Soviets considered the flexibility of the Russian front as remarkable.

The Soviet's military command, with no desire to achieve a cheap victory, very skilfully evaded the battles in which their enemy was anxious to engage the Russians, and did not hesitate to do this even when the Reds were numerically superior to the invaders. The main strategical aim of the Soviet command is the complete annihilation of the enemy forces, and, in order to accomplish this, suitable circumstances must be created. When these circumstances were lacking, the Russian commander held his forces in check, even at times when he would have been able to inflict on the enemy's attacking army some considerable tactical reverses. Let us remember Kiev. There cannot be any doubt now that the Russians could have defended the city and stopped the Poles west of the Dnieper, as well as prevented their crossing the Dvina and Berezina. The huge Russian reserves were already in full readiness about fifty miles east of the Dnieper, and there was no difficulty in moving them to the battle front in time. But Kamenev knew well that a battle for Kiev would certainly be followed by the complete destruction of this historic city, and, moreover, that it would have been less favorable for the Russian strategy to engage the Poles west of the rivers than to counter-attack them after they had accomplished the rather difficult crossings, which they would be compelled to repeat during their retreat under vigorous pursuit by the victorious Red Army. Furthermore, thanks to the confusion which overtook the Polish army when it was forced back across the Dnieper, Budenny was able to penetrate in the rear of the Polish battle-front, and thus to accomplish the gradual annihilation of the Polish field army.

That this annihilation has been accomplished is proved by the fact that the Russian Soviet army not only was able to reach the gates of Warsaw on August 15, but, as I predicted, entered, on August 17, the northeastern part of that city, situated on the right bank of the Vistula, and known as Praga. More than that: the fortifications of Modlin (Novo-Georgievsk) were under the fire of the Russian siege artillery. These fortifications, newly built to replace the former Russian fortress, are situated about twenty miles northwest of Warsaw, where the river Bug joins the Vistula, and presents one single stronghold, ably protecting the entrance to the city.

Furthermore, the appearance of the Russians at Plock, about thirty-five miles west of Novo-Georgievsk (Modlin), on the Vistula, and later in Wloclawek, northwest of Modlin, thus completely cutting off communications between Warsaw and Danzig, both along the Vistula as well as by the Warsaw-Bromberg railway, proves that the Reds have accomplished a gigantic movement, encircling the whole Polish army in that region.

From a military standpoint, the Soviet troops had already reached Warsaw on August 17. The Russian cavalry, having crossed the Vistula at several points, entered Praga, as I have said, and we must note that Praga is even closer to Warsaw than Brooklyn is to New York. Being masters of the east of Warsaw, of Novo-Minsk (twenty-two miles from Warsaw); Tluszcz (eighteen miles); Radzimin (twelve miles); and of several points within range of field artillery of the city, and, at the same time, encircling Warsaw on the northwest and north-northwest, there could be no doubt in the mind of any military expert that Warsaw was bound to fall, after the bombardment of the city, the usual procedure in such cases.

I expected that at any moment we should hear of the shelling of the city, which, from the tactical point of view would have been a normal development of the military operation.

We must not forget that Warsaw is not a fortress, as I have already explained in my former article. The population of this town is about 1,000,000, and it must have grown even more, thanks to the presence of great numbers of refugees. I must point out an important fact: in most cases the military command of a besieged town is far from any idea of surrender, and is forced to raise the white flag either to avoid the useless bloodshed of the civilian population, or compelled by the latter to capitulate to the enemy under a menace of revolution. Military history is full of such examples. The national spirit of the Polish people in Warsaw was at a high level of patriotism, which was strongly supported by the Catholic clergy. Therefore the bombardment would have had to be of a most vigorous character, and consequently would have caused tremendous loss of life and property.

As I have often pointed out, however, the Soviet strategy aims not at the occupation of one town or another, but rather at the annihilation of the enemy's fighting force. Destruction of the enemy's forces can only be accomplished in the field. It has already been clearly shown in repeated instances that the Soviet strategy does not aim at unnecessary destruction. The recapture of Kiev was accomplished without bombardment—the Poles left it when they lost their battle in the field. Not one bomb was dropped from the air on Warsaw, while leaflets covered all the streets of the city, after they were dropped by the Russian airmen in great abundance.

This it is clear that the Russian military command decided to forego the cheap and easy victory of reducing Warsaw, by terrible destruction, in favor of the larger strategy of drawing the Polish army out for complete destruction in the field.

Once more the Russian General Staff has succeeded in deceiving the Franco-Polish command, as was also the case during the "great offensive" of the Red Army in April, which was considered by the Allies as a decisive movement on Warsaw.

The absence of bombardment by the Russian artillery was explained by the Polish military leaders by a lack of guns in the hands of the Reds. Finally, as was anticipated by the Russian command, the Poles undertook a desperate sortie from Warsaw, a movement which has been erroneously called in the papers a Polish offensive.

In such cases usually a sortie is a very fierce venture, and as the Reds are weak in number, they must lose ground in that sector and retreat towards Brest-Litovsk, and even further to the east.

So, practically, Warsaw remains without any garrison, as the latter was sent out to the field, while the city remained still encircled and seriously threat-

ened, from the north and north-northwest, without any hope of support from outside.

Suffering from a lack of reserves, and using even battalions of women, the Polish centre is approaching the river Bug, where fresh Red reserves are in full-concentration to meet the enemy's foolhardy attack.

The southwestern Russian front is gradually advancing on Lemberg, which is now within range of the Soviet artillery. I am absolutely convinced that the complete defeat of the Polish armed force is a matter of but a short time, for the following reasons: 1. The Poles have already lost their field army, during the constant battles since the beginning of March, 1920; their reserves were already almost annihilated during their flight from Kiev. They have at their disposition a newly-formed militia, and the troops which garrisoned the fortresses, which they are now using for their so-called offensive. 2. They have Halder's army in Galicia, of considerable value, but part of that army was removed to Warsaw at the request of their French military advisers. 3. The situation in West Prussia is very alarming for the Poles, and requires serious consideration, because the hostile feeling of the German population against the Poles is growing there, as may also be noticed throughout Germany. 4. That the British intend not to interfere with the Soviets is becoming apparent, and Danzig may even be guarded by the British navy from any attempt by the supporters of the Poles to send them arms, ammunition and men; this is sufficient for an understanding of the grave situation in which the Polish strategy is now placed. 5. The Polish command knows very well that it cannot count on any reinforcement from the Allies, nor does it count at all on Wrangel's army in South Russia, especially since England has pronounced her decisive word and the workers of Europe have made their final decision to prevent a war with Russia. 6. The morale of the Polish army is very high, supported as it is by the national and religious feeling of the imperialistic portion of the Polish population. The truth is hidden from the Polish people very carefully, and the time is near when it will come out; then the morale of the people must collapse, and finally it will collapse in the army also. 7. Three separate Polish armies, or rather groups, are fighting the Russians now, and in no case is the latter's army broken up; it is the Polish army that is broken into pieces that have to act independently, in several sections of the theatre of war. Should one of these groups be beaten, the remaining portions will perish, one after another.

Some of the military critics tried to find a similarity between the Battle of the Marne and the so-called "release" of Warsaw. Such a parallel is absolutely erroneous.

First of all, the Allies were in superior numbers to the Germans during the Marne battle, and the Germans were forced to abandon Paris altogether. Paris is itself a fortress, while Warsaw is not. Moreover, the Poles never can be superior in number to the Russians.

"I have not, however, any doubt that Warsaw will fall if war continues," declared Major-General Sir Frederic Maurice, in the "Daily News" of August 18. "By throwing in their reserves, the Poles can drive back the Russian advanced troops and gain time," he continues, "but the advantage of gaining time is small unless there are fresh resources that can be brought into play, and these the Poles have not got. The Russians must win through in the end, and the sooner that plain fact is recognized, the better for every one."

Such a statement by this important British general is of great significance, and absolutely corresponds with my standpoint, so often repeated in "Soviet Russia," as well as in the American press. The hours of the Polish army are numbered.

—"Soviet Russia."