

WESTERN CLARION

A Journal of
CURRENT
EVENTS

Official Organ of
THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

HISTORY
ECONOMICS
PHILOSOPHY

No. 878.

EIGHTEENTH YEAR

Twice a Month

VANCOUVER, B. C., NOVEMBER 1, 1922.

FIVE CENTS

The Near East

THE immediate problem of the Near East is the reconciling of the old Turkish status quo with the growing Imperialist business of Greece; the appeasement of the rival ambitions of Turkey and Greece for sovereignty over the lands and peoples of the Near East. The desire for this sovereignty springs directly from the desire to possess the natural resources within such territory; that desire, in turn, being fostered and compelled by the exigencies of capitalist society. And as long as capitalist society exists that ambition shall be the driving impulse of every economic—and in great part of every social—problem, and the arch of every international crisis.

To be successful capitalist business must expand; ultimately that expansion assumes the proportions of Imperialism, in rivalry for commercial supremacy. Those rival Imperialisms are vast networks of diplomatic intrigue and interlocking monopolies, originally, perhaps individual and national; latterly, wholly international in scope, in organisation and personnel. Through this intrigue of business and politics runs the red thread of national ambition and dynastic sovereignty, absorbed in its own exclusive interest, hiding, pleading, fawning, obstructing, conciliating, as it counters and encounters the subconscious currents of native custom and social discipline, and the invisible forces of foreign intervention. Now appearing on one side, now on the other, as the turn of events favors its prime objective, sailing, like Ella Wilcox's ships, "East and West, with the selfsame winds that blow;" but continually scheming for the furtherance of its central ambition and never, however contradictory the actions appear, forgetting the "main chance."

The main chance is business: the control of peoples and resources: the fundamental assurance of tribute. As business entails growth, growth entails contact with external sources, and the particular conditions of the country determine the nature and direction of the relationship. And inevitably that relationship involves particular interests,—with the sure accompaniment of particular power. So the concession and syndicate obtrude themselves subtly and inconspicuously against the old national interest; the commerce of the Imperial Empire dominates the trade of the national domain; and the life and activity of the society of the people is farmed for the behests of the society of finance. And just as the wealth, the power, the influence of the vertical trust ramifies in countless directions and its potency is maintained—yet concealed—through subsidiary associations and interlocking directorates, so the spreading flag of the Empire overshadows all the activities of the financially subsidiary little nations, bidding the iron hand of control beneath the velvet glove of a skeletal "majesty" or the mask of an "elected" chief.

The evidence is everywhere abundant: so abundant it is wonderful it escapes general notice. In all times, in the daily press, world wide. The "freedom" of Napoleon draped the traders of the 3rd estate. The same principle was crowned at Sadowa—at Versailles—at Sevres. The national aspirations of Serbia concealed the rival aggressions of Russia and Germany, of Britain and France. The Balkan Wars were but minor eruptions of the underlying competition of the "All Red Route" and "Deu-

thland Uber Allies." The ups and downs of Mexican politics reflect the counterplay of Standard oil and Royal Dutch. The land of the Incas presents the same pull to the same powers. Monarchical or Republican China is the manifest of vested interests. In the Transvaal, and in Haiti we saw the little people in the dark toils of giant finance. In India and in Egypt we see independence, "with gyves upon its wrist." In lovely Tahiti, in "mandated" Nauru, amongst the fisher folks of Saghalien and the untutored tribes of Africa exploitation reaches out and drags down. Feisal rode out of Syria—for overstepping the limits of French "protection". Britain made him a "king"—and he is now tripping the beatific dance of freedom under Sir Percy Cox.

We said that the problem of the Near East was the settlement of the national differences of Turkey and Greece. It is. Nevertheless that would be a false impression, left unqualified. Certainly the problem is the composition of the Graeco-Turkish quarrel, but it involves the settlement of the deeper quarrel of Imperialist rivalry for commercial supremacy. Behind Greece and Turkey are Britain and France, the primal participants for Empire—and with them the whole world will participate in the final issue. Three quarters of the Turkish debt (about £150 million) is in French hands. And the security from that debt is precisely the question at stake—the resources of Asia Minor and its hinterland. Greek capital is interlinked with British capital in the lucrative Eastern traffic, in fruit, corn and cotton. Greece and Britain are in collusion in the cotton enterprises of Egypt. Their common interests are deep, and for Britain momentous. Consequently, if the Greek drove the Turk clear of Europe and out of Asia Minor, Greek nationality, i.e., the royal and merchant charters of capitalist Greece, would triumph,—and British influence would be in the ascendant. But Turkey would disappear as a catspaw nation and her defeat would involve the dividend bearing bonds of the Parisian money-lords. France, thwarted in reparations, stripped of her Russian investments, partially dependent on Britain for oil and opposed by Britain in her Meternichian scheme of hegemony is in no mood to calmly suffer the further looting of Asia minor. If the Turk vanquished the Greek that would make little material difference to Greek capital; but it could eliminate Greek ambitions of sovereignty—and might seriously menace the luscious fruits of the British Empire.

During or after the war the Allies partitioned the Turkish Empire among themselves. To France was awarded the "mandate" for the "protection of Syria and its Christian populations." To Britain came Mesopotamia, and Greece was "awarded" a rather precarious footing in Western Asia Minor. But the "protection of Christian minorities" in Syria—or elsewhere—carries with it exactly the same obligation as the protection of British freedom in Canada—the exploitation of the natural wealth of the country. And the independence which Britain presented to Irak was—as Karl Radek pithily puts it "independence from the naphtha deposits of Mosul." While the holy Greek, in pursuance of his Christian principles pushed the Sick Man back to the fastnesses of Angora. Here the young Turks succeeded in halting the Greek "Drangosten," subsequently in-

stituting a vigorous offensive. Britain averred that those man-eating monsters the Bolsheviks supplied their brother terrorists the Turks with the golden means for that purpose. Miserable people. But Britain—wise in the ways of the dove and the serpent—was partly right. For in 1921 there was a bumper wheat crop in the plains of the Turkish East; and as Russia was a land of famine there was a ready market for the golden staff of life. Russia paid for that wheat in good metal roubles of gold,—enabling the Kemalists to fortify their hopes and their hands with the bounteous products of Schneider-Creusot. Truly it would be a doubtful shekel that failed to tickle the eye of Sir Christian Capital.

So the tables are completely turned. During the war, when the main business of life was the annihilation of the "corps-stewing" Hun, Tino was deposed—as a possible emissary of enemy machinations—and Venizelos "guided" the Republic—the mediating Pope of Graeco-French capital. When the Turks were flying from the proselytising Greeks there arose a clamor in the land of the Olympian gods for the beloved Tino. For does not Royalist Greece fly the house flag of English finance? With the Turk once more overlooking the storied fields of Thrace the good Cretan casts darkling looks on the place of the throne. These incidents are the indications of the undertow of the rival Imperialisms of Britain and France. They are insignificant in themselves; and the local suffering they cause is the direct—and foreknown—result of a mendacious diplomacy in the interests of the rulers of the world. The atrocities of Armenia, like the atrocity of war, is the inevitable sequence of capitalist privilege in wealth production; and whether those atrocities eventuate in Armenia, or China, or Timbuctoo, they happen always with the long cognisance and direct connivance of world finance. It is not chance and it is not a calamity. It is the studious fostering and the studied direction of national and international misunderstandings for the seizure, or the maintenance, or the further extraction of privilege and profit in the common means of life.

But there is a deeper significance to the question. "Oil," said Briand, "is the key to the future." Mosul, the oil centre of Syria is more securely in French influence with the demise of the Greek from Asia Minor. And since Turkey is linked with French interests on one side, and with Russia on the other, it might be that France dreams of a contact with Baku—direct or indirect. With the Turk reinstated in Constantinople, the hinterland of Thrace, and with Thrace, Bulgaria cannot but be a fertile field for intrigue. In that intrigue the chief prizes will be the right-of-way of communication, and the oil wells of Rumania and Macedon, now controlled by Anglo-Persian. And with Central Europe in the leading strings of France—and partly of Italy, an associate of France—with French post war necessity, the failure of reparations, the burning of Russian bonds and the necessity of salvaging Europe for and to her own supreme interests there can be no amicable relations between France and Britain.

Britain fought the good fight of Empire through the medium of Greece because it was probably cheaper that way; because she was invisible in the affair
(Continued on page 7)

The Origin of the World

By R. McMillan.

THE HISTORY OF THE HORSE.

CHAPTER XIX.

It seems very easy to talk about the way that things change, but we see little or no change in the things about us, do we? The horse was always a horse, and the donkey was always a donkey; just as the sheep was always a sheep, and a man was always a man. Yet here I am saying that everything has changed, and that all we see and know, even to the solid and mighty hills, was developed from the white fire-mist which once spread out in hazy mystery in the realms of space. If you believe that the world was really developed from the fire-mist, then you are compelled to believe that all things have developed on the earth, although it seems difficult. It would take such a long time for all things to change from a fire-mist, a simple fire-mist, to the complicated things that are on the earth today. It would take a long time, of course; but time is plentiful in eternity!

We have made time a real thing with our clocks and watches and calendars, but that is all human imagination. There is no such thing as time, really. What we call time is just the sequence of events. The world turns round in twenty-four hours, and we call that a day; but a day is not a real thing. It is only the revolution of a ball. How many times will the ball revolve before it gets tired? The number of revolutions will give you the age of the world. We think that it is an important matter, but it is not, really. You have to change your point of view when you dare to ask how the world originated.

You think of the horse as a fixed type of animal, and so it is, relatively to other animals. All the same, a horse has developed, just as everything else has, and we are only now finding it out. I remember when Professor Marsh found the fossil remains of the horse in America, and yet we used to think there never had been any horses in America till the Spaniards took them over, after 1492. That was the date when Columbus discovered America. Think of Spaniards taking horses across the Atlantic in their little ships, over four hundred years ago. We bring horses from England to Australia now, 13,000 miles; but we carry them in steamships, and we know how long it will take, almost to the hour. When the Spaniards took horses across the Atlantic they had to trust to the wind, and they never knew how long they would be, and the ships were very, very small, and storms were just as frequent then as now. Yet they took the soldiers' horses to America.

When I was a little boy, and read about Cortes and Pizarro conquering South America, I remember what an effect the sight of the horses had on the natives. They thought the horse and the man were one animal, and when the man fired his gun, and they saw the flame and heard the report, their terror of the new animal was complete. That was how the small band of Spaniards were able to conquer Mexico and all South America. The point I want to make here is simply that horses were quite unknown to the people in America. They had never seen or heard of one, and when the Spaniards came with their horses they were terrified at the sight of them. When the Spanish horses escaped to the great level lands of South America—the "Pampas" they call them—they flourished exceedingly, and grew wild, and galloped over all the land in enormous droves, like the waves of the sea.

You wonder why the horses had never appeared in America when they had been so common in all historic time in Europe and Asia. When you learn that the bones of the fossil horse were discovered in America afterwards, when men began to study geology, you wonder still more. The horse was very common in America "once upon a time," be-

fore men had ever seen America. The ancestor of the horse was developed in America, and must have been very widespread on that great continent. But how did it get from its home, in what we now call America, to the other parts of the world? Once you start thinking about this subject, you will find that there is no end to the wonder and to the curious things in connection with it. There must have been a great change in America to destroy the equine life entirely, but what that change was I am quite unable to explain. I want you to understand that the mystery of life and the world is greater to me than it can possibly be to you, for I have found out what a lot of things I do not know, while you are ignorant of your ignorance, to some extent at least.

An old-world poet named Lucretius, who lived in Italy before the time of Christ, must have known that all things change, for he sang:—

Time makes mutable the whole world's mass,
Which on from phase to phase must ever change;
Naught keeps its native likeness; all things pass,
All things by Nature's laws must shift and change.

When I first read the history of the horse, as written in its own bones, in the Peabody Museum, in New Haven, Connecticut, U. S. A., I was too much surprised to understand it. I had always thought that the horse had been a horse from the commencement; but when I looked at the bones in the museum I saw that there had been a time when the horse was not a horse, as we understand the word. The geologists found the bones of the horse in Western America, buried in the rocks and clays and stones of an ancient world. They found that the horse, as we understand it, was an old animal in point of time, but—they discovered something else. They discovered that there was once a horse with three toes instead of the single hoof which it has now. They saw that an animal like the horse had existed in the Upper Miocene times, but, instead of having one toe, it had three. They called it the hipparion, and they studied its character. Then, in the Upper Eocene, they discovered the ancestor of the hipparion, and it also had three toes; but the side ones were longer than in the hipparion, and it showed other differences as well, and they called it the anchitherium. Then they discovered the ancestor of the anchitherium, which they called the orohippus, and it had four toes; and there was another named eohippus, but I forget when it came in. Now look at the bones of the horse's feet, and tell me what difference you see! I have seen the bones themselves, and have read a good deal about them; and I am quite certain that these bones are the bones of the horse and its ancestors; and I am also quite certain that the horse of today is the descendant of the horses that lived in America long, long ago. But now, you look at the bones! *

At the top of the foot marked A you will see four bones, one for each of the fingers, or toes, whichever you like to call them. At the top of the three-toed horse's foot you see three bones; but at the top of one marked D—the modern horse—you will see that there is only one big bone, and two very little ones. Now look at the foot and ankle of a horse, and you will find that the splint bones—as they call them—are the relics of the big bones that existed long ago. The horse has developed one toe, and the others have all disappeared except the splint bones, which are but the milestones to direct us back to the horse's ancestors.

I have not shown you the foot of the five-toed horse, for the simple reason that I did not see it myself; but I have no doubt at all about its existence. There was once a five-toed horse, but it was

* This has reference to the illustrations in the book which, as we have already said, we are unable to produce owing to the matter of costs.—Ed. Clarion.

no larger than a fox or hare; it was a swift little creature, that flourished in the western parts of America a very long time ago—millions of years ago—and it grew bigger and stronger and swifter all through the ages, and gave rise to the quagga, and the ass, and all the varieties that exist today. It died out in America. You can read all that I have been telling you in the stone books of geology; but you cannot read why the horse died out in America, nor how it reached Europe and Asia, nor can you read—as yet—where and when the changes took place in the varieties of the horse, but—there are the bones in the New Haven Museum to show you that the changes have taken place.

The development of the horse is but the sign and token of all changes that have taken place in the world since first began the flight of time. I do not know what exterminated the horses from the American continent; but Sir E. Ray Lankester, one of the greatest naturalists in the whole wide world said:—

"It is not a far-fetched hypothesis that the disappearance of the whole equine race from the American continent just before or coincidentally with the advent of man—a region where horses of all kinds had existed in greater variety than in any other part of the world—is due to the sudden introduction, by means of some geological change, of a deadly parasite which spread as an epidemic and extinguished the entire horse population."

No explanations explain much; but there you have the problem—for you to solve!

Next Lesson: CURIOUS FACTS.

THE HARVEST.

This year's harvest is believed to be adequate to satisfy all the requirements of Russia's population in food and seed, and even to provide a considerable surplus. The question as to whether any of this surplus of grain should be exported abroad has been much discussed. However gratifying it would be for Russia to resume her place once more as a grain exporting country after having been a needy importer for the last year or two, there are nevertheless good reasons for retaining this surplus in the country. In pre-war years there were always substantial reserves of grain, in the hands of merchants and peasants, carried forward from harvest to harvest. Since the war this stock has been completely consumed. It is of vital importance that new reserves should be built up, not only as insurance against famine, but to stabilize the price of food. The existence of grain reserves will afford welcome relief to industry, which for two years now has suffered from the repeated food shortages. On the other hand, some regions, such as the Ukraine and the south-east, will have comparatively large surplus of grain, which from transport considerations it might be just as profitable to export as to retain, and which would serve to purchase abroad articles much needed by the peasants. A certain quantity of Russia's surplus grain may therefore seek the foreign markets.

UNSETTLED POLICIES.

In conversation with Lloyd George at Genoa, Chicherin said jokingly that it was not fair to demand repayment of the war loans, as Russia had not received her part of the bargain—Constantinople. Of course, he added, Russia would at once return it to its rightful owner, Turkey. A special correspondent of the "Manchester Guardian" discovered this statement recently, and embellished an article on Russia and Constantinople with the remark that "seeing how quickly the political mind in Russia is changing, what was yesterday a joke might tomorrow be a settled policy." Five days later (September 27) the "Manchester Guardian" developed this as "the present Russian Government has made known its claim to Constantinople. The claim was made by M. Chicherin at Genoa." The rolling joke certainly gathers moss!

—Russ. Info. and Review, (London)

Parliament or Cabinet— Which?

EDITOR'S NOTE:—The following replies by comrades Harrington and "R" conclude the discussion with comrade J. A. McDonald under this heading. The course of the discussion may be followed by reference to Western Clarion issues of Sept. 1st and 16th and Oct. 16th.

REPLY BY "R."

IN my last attempt at this question, I conceded Comrade McDonald that in theory Parliament was the will of the people, but maintained that the concession was barren. For in practice, Parliament never effects what the people really want and what they really vote for—the amelioration of their social conditions. Com. McDonald admits that, I think. I said further, that I was writing apropos of a pending election, the object being to show that the elective machinery was in fact not the expression of the social will, as popularly understood, but as an apparatus to safeguard the property right of the capitalist class through the illusion of electoral freedom. Our comrade will admit that too, I think. Com. Mc. avers, as we do, that Parliament is a class institution, and parliamentary procedure the prerogative of class privilege; and he implies through quotations that the capitalist class has little to fear from the election of a Labor Government. Clearly, therefore, in practical effect—the objective we had in view—Parliament is not the reflex of the will of the people.

Com. Mc. says I regard Parliament as without eyes and teeth, etc. Pardon me, I do not. But its eyes are fixed exclusively on class interests, and its teeth are invariably used to bite the workers, who vote for it. And because it does so it delimits its functions—not in theory but in practice—as the rendition of Caesar's things to Caesar.

Let me try to explain again the contention that it has lost its ancient powers and privileges. Genetically—not politically—considered, Parliament is the modified descendant of the tribal assemblies and communal moots of people in the completely different association of Gentile society and primitive feudalism. Those assemblies gathered together to consider the customs and duties, the common rights and privileges of the social organisation, and for all practical purposes they really represented the total community. With the advent of political concepts, engendered through the slowly changing years, the ancient customs and traditions changed form and hue through the pressure of immediate condition, and those free assemblies gradually acquired definite complexions of class law. The definite advent of capitalist condition entailed a new rendering of class law, and the old idea of compounded custom and law was modified by the new need, in the new form of political practice. Political change and industrial revolution have hidden both changing form, varying concept, and transitional stage; while the general hardening of economic conditions very naturally drapes and colors the socially misapprehended past. It is the confused traditions of the past, intermingling with the misunderstood present, that induces the empty concepts of present thought. And from that thought, laden with prejudice and preconception, results the chaotic volitions and meaningless terms of the present reality. Hence, in this transmitted light of social ideology Parliament is stripped of its ancient privileges and lives in traditional prestige.

Strictly speaking in the terms of political Parliament, although the theory remains unaltered its character has changed with changing times, and its application with changing conditions. Does the present not afford bounteous proof of that? Fifty years ago parliament certainly represented a wider body of interests and was more strictly sensitive to peculiarly parliamentary principles. Today the corruption of parliament is a byword, its legislation the scorn even of its administrators. And if, by the

book, the cabinet is the creation of parliament, by the book parliament is the registrar of a multitude of D.O.R.A.'s, emergency acts, radical jockeyism and general Imperialist legislation. *And as business has developed from the individual interest to the vertical trust and international combine, so representation has passed dominantly from the national trader and liberal manufacturer, to the purse-holder of foreign securities and international banking. And as foreign affairs are not in the nature and beyond the scope of the national parliament, so its oldtime prerogatives are changed with its new personnel; the superior departments which it theoretically creates and governs become its dictators, leaving it the "privilege" of blindly—and faithfully—endorsing the policies of foreign continuity and Imperialist accumulation. It is social ignorance, of course, that returns the representatives who support the system; but it is the underlying economic development that energises the changed method and decreasing social right.

If the idea behind parliamentary representation is the emancipation of the wage worker, it is doomed already. Class consciousness is far superior in political domination than in proletarian organisation; industrial condition far ahead of social understanding. And through the irresistible necessities of its gathering, yet restrained forces, it will probably impel an issue by other means than the ballot. Circumstances, by the colossal impounding of political reconstructions may drive the workers in general, in the unity of social need, to seize the powers of government. But in seizing them the class nature of parliament will be abolished, and the new state will have as its foundation, not the privilege of class, but the administration of social necessity. That is to say the state will be seized only to abrogate the exploitation of the state. And in doing so the will of the people, consciously, will find its real expression, and its social administration resume, in a higher form, its lost traditions and long extinguished privileges.

REPLY BY J. HARRINGTON.

SO far as I can see, no fundamental difference has been raised in this discussion, and I have neither time nor inclination to enter into a 'tis and 'tish't argument. I too have an alarm-clock. If comrade McDonald can see no difference between Wilson and his second election promises and performances and a horse and its stable, then I'll let it go at that.

Concerning the matters of detail I touched on, the facts are articulate enough and can speak for themselves.

The President of the United States is elected by the Electoral College, the seven million votes notwithstanding. The constitution provides for that, and twice in actual practice the College vote has killed the popular vote: In 1876 Hayes beat Tilden on it, and again, in 1888 Harrison beat Cleveland.

The Prime Minister of Britain takes precedence next to the Archbishop of York thanks to King Edward who "is not" in matters of legislature; not by act of parliament. He is not selected by the victorious Party. Parliament cannot dismiss him or his Cabinet. There is no law on this matter, only precedence, and as one sapient historian has it: by accident.

A group of a little over a hundred aristocrats meet in the Carlton Club and take a vote; Lloyd George, without a word from Parliament or a word to Parliament resigns. The King, without a word to Parliament asks Bonar Law to form a Cabinet; the latter, without a word to Parliament says he will await a vote taken in the Hotel Cecil, where 400 autocrats select him and he is Prime Minister. He, in selecting his Cabinet, out of the eleven so far chosen of the nineteen required, includes two

who are neither members of the Commons nor the Lords.

Touching the Labor Party voting against their own measure and the comments thereon, I am sure that "gulling" the workers as an explanation is not going into the matter much below the surface. And whatever relation a Bach fugue or Handel sonata may bear to the result, the fact remains that had the Labor members voted for their amendment Parliament would have been dismissed, not by law but by precedent or, as our aforesaid Sapience says, by accident.

FROM RUSSIA'S STANDPOINT.

The Conference at Chang-Chun, between the Japanese Government, the Far Eastern Republic, and Soviet Russia, opened with favourable prospects of success. The Japanese Government appeared to have realised that the continued occupation of the territory of the Far Eastern Republic could lead to no permanent advantage, political or economic, in the face of determined opposition from the great bulk of the population. From the very opening of the conference, however, the attitude of the Japanese representatives showed clearly that the Japanese Government was actuated merely by a desire to cut its losses, and not by any motive of principle. The Japanese delegation at first attempted to prevent the participation of the representatives of Soviet Russia. They then reverted to the terms of a Japanese ultimatum which resulted in the breaking off of the Dairen negotiations five months ago. Finally, the Japanese delegation refused to give any definite undertaking to evacuate the northern half of Saghalin Island, which is as indisputably part of the territory of the Far Eastern Republic as are the Maritime provinces, which the Japanese are prepared to evacuate:

The conference has therefore broken down, as the essential basis for any possible agreement must be the evacuation by Japan of all territory now wrongfully occupied. It appears clear that the Japanese were only willing to evacuate those portions of the mainland which they had found untenable, but hoped to retain their dominion over the northern half of Saghalin, with its immense mineral and timber resources. The position at Vladivostok is not clear, but on September 22 the Japanese command at Nikolaevsk formally transferred authority to the provincial assembly of citizens, pending the arrival of the Far Eastern Republic forces.

—Russian Information and Review. (London)

The conflict in the Near East places Soviet Russia in a peculiar situation. The Soviet Republic cannot help rejoicing in the lowering of the prestige of British imperialism which with the help of Greek cannon fodder was going to convert the entire Near East into an English colony. But it is also far from full and unrestrained enthusiasm for the other tending party. The object of the struggle is only the question whether the Straits should be controlled by the Black Sea nations or by Great Britain. Neither is it exclusively the struggle of a down-trodden Oriental nation against enslavement by European imperialism. In either of these cases Russia's sympathies would be entirely with the enemy of England. But the problem is complicated by the fact that the main backer of Turkey is France whose intentions are just as honourable as those of its "perfidious" rival. The Russian oil fields of the Caucasus are in close proximity to Turkey's North-Eastern frontier, and they have been for years the object of unexpressed desires of German and Turkish, as well as French and English imperialists. A successful Franco-Turkish collaboration against the British might possibly have as its sequel a similar collaboration against Soviet Russia "for the liberation of the Moslem peoples from the Russian yoke" and for implanting of French capitalist rule in the Caucasus, on the Russian Black Sea shore and in Turkestan.

This is the reason why Soviet Russia, while viewing with sympathy the justified demands of Turkey, has nevertheless decided to adopt an attitude of "watchful waiting."—"Soviet Russia" (N. Y.)

Western Clarion

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

Published twice a month by the Socialist Party of
Canada, P. O. Box 710, Vancouver, B. C.
Entered at G. P. O. as a newspaper.

Editor.....Ewen MacLeod

SUBSCRIPTION:

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

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

VANCOUVER, B. C., NOVEMBER 1, 1922.

UNITY AGAIN.

IF the fellow next door persisted in visiting you three times a day for several days, asking the same questions to which you had already replied, or making the same proposals which you had already declined, you would very likely conclude that he was "hard o' hearin'" or that his understanding of your attitude required speedy adjustment. By recent advices from the secretary of the Winnipeg Local of the S. P. of C. (Comrade W. Ashton) we learn that the Workers' Party in that neighborhood has been manifesting similar characteristics to those possessed by our supposed fellow next door, as above.

The matter in question is of course (as before) unity: this time in connection with the forthcoming Winnipeg civic elections. Last time the Provincial elections provided the occasion. Then the W. P. had a string of immediate reform measures on its political platter—the dish was scorned by the electorate—and this time the dish is similarly garnished. The question from the W.P. to us now (as before) is will we unite with them to secure these immediate reforms? Our answer (as before) is no.

This, we suppose, will be again received and recorded as evidence of our unbrotherliness, our impossible position, our meagre addition of the sum of class loyalty, our leftism, our theoretical purity, our lack of political initiative—and all the rest of it. In short, it will be seen by our misguided friends that we are a Socialist Party.

The successful conclusion of a unity programme on a reform basis should be easy enough to accomplish. Obviously it should be directed exclusively toward reform parties. There are many of them in this country east and west and it is not easy to see what keeps them apart, the W. P. among them. There is no use denying the reform nature of a party which has a reform programme. The appearance of the programme itself makes this conclusion permanent.

Unity within, we suppose, precedes unity with-

It certainly should, at any rate, although a sorry examination of recent events in the W. P. itself inclines us to the view that while it is much concerned over unity without it has something to worry about in disruption within. For instance, it showed no uniformity whatever in support if its three candidates in the last Manitoba Provincial elections. It has been the home of dissention since the day of its inception, members' resignations or members expulsion being constantly a busy order of business. It has proven a keen disappointment to many an enthusiast. In the day of its inception it aimed at comprising "a synthesis of theoretical Marxism with revolutionary practice." It was to be "a party of the masses and not a mere educational club." It professed a fine revolutionary disdain for our "academy." Incidentally it recently ejected through the members' expulsion route J. Kavanagh and J. G. Smith, these being two of the four signatories to "The Parting of the Ways," a document which some nine months ago expressed that disdain with an air of finality—its authors having, as they thought, found political salvation. It is quite apparent that unity may be achieved by reducing the sum of your membership as well as by

increasing it through party alliances. The W. P. folks practice the principle at both ends, although we suspect they don't quite see the logic of it.

This solicitude for unity is not newly born. In the Socialist movement of the English speaking world it has been persistently voiced in the political arena for forty years anyway, and forty years ago there were not so many parties as there are now. Its main prop has been political accommodation, irrespective of divergent viewpoints. Form without substance has been its practical content. From a Socialist standpoint it has shewn an amazing capacity for adaptation to the shifting scenery of practical politics, and there the Socialist standpoint has yielded place to those policies which have followed immediate advantage. The history of the S. D. F. in Great Britain well enough bears this out.

We know very well that the cry for unity meets a widespread response in working class ranks. Class sentiment invites it. Unity is strength, the basis of organization and the principle of its advocacy. But by counting noses you do not prove the strength of a Socialist organization. The war demonstrated that. The parties of the masses were too little acquainted with the educational club. They were used to do their master's bidding and they harbored mutual hatred for class loyalty. A little understanding, wherever it manifested itself, was of more use to the working class than much organization and no understanding.

The logic of the Socialist position allows for no political trimming. If you understand what you are at your foolishness lies in adjusting your case to accommodate your master's convenience. His convenience lies in the way of reform and when you play that game you play the game that suits him best.

Marx's dictum: Workers of the World, Unite! in these late days has come to be inscribed on the board of common palaver. It imposes the breaking strain on human patience to see it recruited to the miserable service of petty reform.

1917—22.

NOVEMBER 7th, 1922 will mark the fifth year of governmental control by the Soviets in Russia. The years that have followed 1917 have borne to world attention events charged with anxiety for the rulers of society, and for the toilers the augury of their hopes.

The pathway to working class emancipation has been beset by almost every possible obstacle. Four years of incessant struggle with the armed invader, culminating in the appearance of famine in the autumn of 1921 held the Russian workers to a task that laid claim to an abundant store of courage, energy and resource. The fifth year has brought Russian representatives to the council tables of the outside nations, for the first time since Brest Litovsk.

The November revolution has been the most auspicious event in working class history. The years that have gone have sustained Soviet power in administration against all odds. The moment at hand finds that power, at the dictates of social necessity, in consultation with the commercialism of the commodity world.

The practical, administrative side of the Soviet forces provides the most interesting study in the whole field of world politics today. The matter of sitting in judgment—in the doctrinaire sense—is far short yet in the duration of time. It will be found, we think, that the conduct of affairs in any social sense is not to be imposed by the book. The bare process of marshalling the facts must be accompanied by interpretation, and that, in turn, must be the impulse toward understanding. The S. P. of C. outlook on the present Russian situation will be set forth at an early date.

The local press contains news of the Japanese evacuation of Vladivostok. It does not say a word about the landing there of American marines, the excuse for which action by the U. S. is the protection of U. S. nationals and their property.

AN INVITATION.

OUR attention has been drawn to a letter in the "B. C. Federationist," Oct. 20th, 1922, by T. A. Barnard, in which it is stated that the S. P. of C. adopts tactics which are hard to defend, even by those adopting them.

We cheerfully extend the courtesy of a couple of Clarion columns to the writer in which to set forth his case, to which no doubt we shall have a word or two to say in reply if the call warrants it.

SECRETARIAL NOTES.

COMRADE C. Lestor left Vancouver on the 26th October on the way to Calgary and points east. He will be in Alberta a month, perhaps more, speaking at various points under the direction of the Alberta P. E. C. Comrade R. Burns (secretary Alta. P. E. C.), 134a 9th Avenue, West, Calgary, Alberta, will be in touch with him until December, and enquiries, if any are forthcoming, should be addressed to him as to the places of call. This has particular reference to points in Saskatchewan which could very well be covered by Com. Lestor on the way to Winnipeg. His address in Winnipeg will be in care W. Ashton (secretary Local Winnipeg, S. P. of C.), P. O. Box 2354, Winnipeg, Man.

Here is the time-table of Lestor's route in Alberta:—

Nov. 27:—Leaves Youngstown for Excel 9.55 a.m., arriving Excel 12 noon. Comrades there might arrange two or three meetings.

Dec. 3:—Meeting in Calgary at 8 p.m. Details later.

Dec. 4:—Leaves Calgary 7 a.m., stopping off at Seven Persons. Comrade Polinkos will arrange meetings there.

We hope the Locals will facilitate Comrade Lestor's movements and take advantage of his tour for the good of the movement in every possible way.

Novr. 2:—Leaves Calgary at 9.40 for Swalwell. Comrade Beagrie will make arrangements.

Novr. 3:—Trochu. Meetings may be held at Collingwood school and Finnish Hall, Trochu; Aberdeen, Innisfail. Lestor will remain in this neighborhood for a week. Comrade D. MacPherson will arrange meetings.

Novr. 12:—Meeting in Calgary, possibly in the Empress Theatre 8 p.m. Details later.

Novr. 13:—Leaves Calgary for Hanna at 6.10 a.m. Comrade Roberts will make arrangements for that point.

Novr. 18:—Takes 12.34 a.m. train for Stanmore, arriving at 1.06 a.m. Comrade Donaldson will make arrangements.

Nov. 22:—Leaves Stanmore 8.35 a.m., arriving Youngstown 9.55 a.m. Comrade Mrs. Hughes will arrange for meetings in Youngstown.

* * *

Local (Vancouver) No. 1, will hold its organizational meeting of the class for the study of History on Wednesday, November 1st, at 8 p.m. at Rooms 11 and 12, 163 Hastings Street West. The organizational meeting of the Economics class will be held (at the same place), Sunday November 5th at 3 p.m.

We had intended to say something as to the importance and practical uses of such studies as these, and to set forth the nature of the studies and the manner of approach. The students themselves, perhaps, will provide us with an outline before we go to press again. One feature of class work we would emphasize as worth serious consideration: the matter of essay writing. This is of importance to the students. It helps the students to find their own errors, and it will help them along the way to the habit of ink-spilling. We cannot have too many speakers. The need is evident and growing. Writers are needed also. Every encouragement is offered toward a good crop by the method suggested.

We are run out of space, of enough, at anyrate, to enter a sufficient treatment of the subject this time. Both in History and Economics the subject matter studied will provide good ground work for writing between classes. The first consideration, in each department, no doubt will be "The Nature of the Study." May we hope for short articles accordingly thereafter?

Parson Malthus

WHO of us that have addressed Socialist meetings has not been interrupted by someone in the crowd declaring that the evils of which we complain are due to over-population, and that they can be cured only by restricting the number of births, and not by Socialism or Communism? These people call themselves Neo-Malthusians, and they take their name from the Rev. Malthus, who in 1798 wrote "An Essay on Population." His disciples used the arguments set out in that book to attack the early trade unionists and Socialists by means of the Wages Fund Theory and the Iron Law of Wages Theory.

Now, Malthus certainly made an important contribution to thought by indicating the importance of the population question; and we only put ourselves in a weak position if we deny this. Malthus' theory may for simplicity be divided into two parts:—

(1) He stated that population always tends to increase faster than the food supply. The number of mouths to be fed will increase faster than the wherewithal to feed them. This is due to the existence of the Law of Diminishing Returns on land. This law is that in the absence of new inventions an increased food supply can after a point only be obtained at an ever increasing cost in labor-power expended. After a certain point more potatoes can only be got from that piece of ground at the expense of a great increase of time and trouble—so great as to make it possibly worth while to extend the size of the allotment, rather than to go on crowding the existing plot. Malthus showed that this tendency for population to grow faster than the food supply would involve poverty and a low standard of life, unless population was checked in either of two ways: (a) by positive checks—wars, famine, infantile mortality, etc.; (b) by prudential checks—late marriages and conscious restraint. (Since Malthus' time the use of contraceptive methods has added another effective prudential check). Malthus showed that if over-population is not checked by (b), (a) would inevitably come into operation.

(2) Since there was a "natural law" of population, viz., that a population of human beings tended to double itself every thirty years, poverty, disease, and wars were inevitable, said Malthus, unless by late marriages or sexual continence people voluntarily restricted increase. Hence all social reforms, Socialism, and trade union action were not only useless, but they would defeat their own ends. An increased standard of life among the masses would merely enable them to breed and rear more children; and the population being increased, poverty would ensue again. Hence poverty, infantile mortality, and bad social conditions were not due to the social system, but to a law of nature.

Now (1), as a mere description of facts and a tendency, is a truism, but is none the less important. True, there may be inventions and discovery of new sources of food supply; but inventions are uncertain, whereas increase of population is certain, and the food supply per head would be greater if the population were smaller. (2), however, is completely fallacious for the following reasons:—

As Marx indicated in his reply to Malthus, there is no natural or absolute law of population. The ratio between population and food supply tends to be different at different stages of historical evolution. Both rate of increase of production, and rate of production are relative to economic conditions. For instance, in a predominantly peasant and petit-bourgeois society like France, the population is stationary. On the other hand, as Dr. Marshall points out, it was the bad conditions under which the proletariat of the early 19th century were forced to live that was chiefly responsible for the immense increase in the birth-rate in this country at that time. Moreover, prevalent codes of private and social morality exercise a powerful influence, and as Marxists we understand the relativity of morality to economic conditions. At the present time orthodox bourgeois

religious morality is one of the greatest obstacles to the spread of birth-control. Imperialist ideology directly encourages a high birth-rate. The mother of sixteen children is complimented by jingo magistrates on rearing sons for the Empire, and gets her photograph in the "Daily Mirror." One of the chief arguments against concerted restriction of population is always the Imperialist one that it would weaken the nation's military position. Instances abound of the fact that Imperialism is a factor making for a large birth-rate, e.g., Imperialist propaganda for increase of population in France, legal restrictions on birth-control propaganda in U.S.A., and in Germany before the war; prohibition of public lectures by Mrs. Sanger in Japan. The law of population is not, therefore, a law of nature, a tendency fixed for all time. It is itself largely the effect of the economic system; a change in the economic system will change the ratio of population to food supply.

One of the most important things written on this subject recently has been the article by Prof. Brentano in the "Economic Journal," September, 1910. The facts and figures given there abundantly prove the contention I have just made. He proves both that the birth-rate is higher among proletarians than among peasants, and that a rise in the standard of life tends to decrease the birth-rate, and probably to decrease it faster than the decrease of infant mortality (i.e., the survival rate decreases also). He gives the following interesting facts:—

The birth-rate in the industrial departments Nord and Pas de Calais has fallen only very slightly during the 19th century; in the department Seine-Inférieure it has even risen; while in the more prosperous departments, Yonne, Cote d'Or, Garonne, Maine et Loire, Charente, etc., with their well-to-do peasant population, it has diminished by one-half. On the other hand, in Brittany as well as in the department of Corseca and Losere, where the peasant population is poor, the birth rate is as high as in the industrial districts. . . . The more proletarian the department the higher the birth-rate. . . . (and) fertility decreases with increasing prosperity.

Loria expresses the matter clearly in his chapter on population in "Contemporary Social Problems":

It is a remarkable fact that those departments of France in which the number of children to a family is smallest are precisely those in which small holdings of land are most general; while the birth-rate is much higher in the departments having a large wage-earning population. . . . When the workman is insufficiently paid he procreates madly. . . . Precisely because it is owing to economic factors peculiar to the wage-system, the excess of population is an essentially historical phenomenon.

The following are figures of the rate of increase of population during the last fifty years in Great Britain:—

	1871—5.	1901—5.	1912.	1917.
Birth-rate	35.5 (per 1,000)	28.1	23.8	17.8
Death-rate	22.0 (per 1,000)	16.0	13.3	
Net increase	13.5 (per 1,000)	12.1	10.5	

These figures show that the rate of increase of population has been on the decline, though slowly, during the last fifty years. The following figures also show that the higher the standard of life the lower tends to be the birth-rate:—

	Births per 1,000 married males aged under 55.
Upper and Middle Class	119
Intermediate	132
Skilled Workers	153
Intermediate	158
Unskilled Workers	213

This is not to say that the population question is not an important one. It will certainly be a problem to be tackled in a Socialist community. But only in a Socialist community will it be a primary interest of society that there should be a rational restriction of population, so as to secure the maximum social welfare. Under capitalism the ruling classes are not primarily concerned with limiting the num-

bers of the working class, although they may be interested enough in practising birth-control themselves. A large labour supply is good for capitalists; cannon-fodder is desired by the Imperialists. The economic emancipation of women in a Socialist community will also be an important factor in the restriction of prolific increase.

The Malthusian claim that excess of population is the cause of Imperialism and war, is supported by so great an authority on the population question as Mr. Keynes. But the facts do not seem to support this view very adequately. At any rate, the Marxian interpretation of Imperialism is a "working hypothesis" which explains the facts much more adequately. First, Imperialist policies are formulated and carried through by the ruling class. An increase of population among the workers does not harm the interests of the ruling class, except indirectly through social unrest caused by poverty. On the contrary, it benefits them by affording a cheap labour supply. Therefore it seems much more likely that the cause of Imperialism lies in some factor touching directly the interests of the capitalists, rather than in something affecting the interests, not of the capitalists, but of the workers. At the present time the Imperialism of France is producing propaganda in favour of increased population. In such a case the tendency to increased population is rather an effect than a cause of Imperialism.

Second, an important fact working against the Malthusian interpretation of Imperialism is that the percentage increase of world population was greatest during the pacifist, Cobdenite period of 1840—1870, and began to decline between 1860 and 1870, when modern Imperialism began. The rate of increase in the United States had steadily declined since 1860, while the United States has become steadily more Imperialist.

	Percentage Increase of:—		
	World Popn.	Popn. in Eng.	Popn. in U.S.A.
1820	9.5	18.	33.1
1840	12.2	15.6	23.7
1860	12.1	12	35.6
1870	8.7	13	26.6
1880	9.9	14.2	26.0
1890	3.4	11.5	24.9
1900	3.7	11.9	20.7
1910	4.7	11.0	21.0

These figures are not themselves sufficient to do more than throw a doubt on the Malthusian claim. But what is a stronger argument is that when modern Imperialism began round about 1870, the tendency to diminishing returns on land was not in operation, owing to the development and opening up of new fertile land in the Middle West of America. Not till after 1900, as Maynard Keynes himself admits, was "the Malthusian Devil, for half a century chained up and out of sight . . . loosed again." "After 1870 the pressure of population on food . . .

became for the first time in recorded history definitely reversed. . . . Up to about 1900 a unit of labour applied to industry yielded year by year a purchasing power over an increasing quantity of food" (Economic Consequences of the Peace, pp. 7 and 8). Therefore "the Malthusian Devil" cannot be an explanation of the sudden change round about 1870 from the pacifism of the Manchester School to the Imperialism of the Birmingham School.

Once again, therefore, we see that whereas bourgeois economists flounder among partial truths, among "absolute principles" and "laws of nature" tinged by metaphysical assumptions, Marxism alone provides a scientific working hypothesis to correlate the complex facts of social evolution. Marxism alone enables us to dispense with the old a priori, absolutist conceptions in social science by viewing history as a process, and realising the relativity of social events to this historical process.

P.S.—The current number (No.6) of The Reconstruction

(Continued on page 7)

"What is the I. W. W.?"

BY F. J. McNEY.

DURING the last year or so two pamphlets have been issued by the Industrial Workers of the World, both of which throw considerable light on the organization. That is, they propound and illuminate a great problem, but do not by any means solve it, although it appears to have been the aim of the publishers to do so.

One of the pamphlets has for its title the question: "What is the I. W. W.?" and the pamphlet, apparently, is an attempt to answer the question propounded. It is, we are told, "A Candid Statement of its Principles, Objects and Methods." The other pamphlet is entitled, "The Lumber Industry and its Workers."

As both pamphlets are published in Chicago at the headquarters of the organization, 1001 West Madison Street, we may consider them official and authentic documents and, consequently, while criticizing certain statements made therein, we cannot be accused of holding the organization responsible for statements made by members who are not thoroughly conversant with its aims and principles.

Before proceeding with our criticism, however, we must give credit where credit is due and admit that the I. W. W. has discarded a few of its worst fallacies. For instance sabotage is not once mentioned in either of the pamphlets, so we may assume that when Bill Haywood migrated to Russia he took the wooden shoe along with him. Also, we are advised to keep out of jail if possible; that is a great improvement on the old slogan "fill the jails." Furthermore, the I. W. W. has at last realized the fact that working class education is the great need at present and that there is no short-cut "across to the bread basket." It admits that any attempt to organize the workers for their emancipation while they do not yet understand their class position is foredoomed to failure.

These changes in the policy of the organization are very good and are to be commended, but, on the other hand, there are a number of old fallacies to which the I. W. W. still adheres as well as a few new ones it has attached recently some of which we will examine as we go along, and we do not have to read very far in the above mentioned pamphlets before we find something worthy of examination. In the pamphlet entitled "What is the I. W. W.?" on pages three and four we find the following astonishing statement:—

"The I. W. W. has absolutely nothing to do with political revolution or with political action of any kind, as you will easily understand when you have read further. We do not ask a man what his politics are no more than we ask him what his religion is or what the color of his skin is. That does not interest us. In fact, so disinterested are we, as an organization, in political, religious or race problems that we prohibit all such propaganda within our organization, as tending to distract attention from our objects and conducive to strife and disruption."

There you are. You may talk to the ghosts with Lodge and Doyle, or wait till the spirit moves you with the Quakers. You may bathe in the holy water with the Roman Catholics, or in the blood of Jesus with the Salvation Army. You may roll with the Holy Rollers, or howl "Good Lord deliver us" with the Episcopelians. You may be a liberal or a conservative, a democrat or a republican. You may vote for the man who keeps us out of war or for the man who kicks us into war and still be a member in good standing of the I. W. W. All of which is, no doubt, a wise and necessary policy for any union, craft or industrial, but how any organization composed of individuals holding such reactionary and superstitious views and opinions can imagine itself to be revolutionary is a mystery to me, and how such an organization, for fear of strife and disruption, can prohibit all propaganda, and must, for the same reason prohibit all discus-

sion and criticism of religion and politics, and still at the same time consider itself an educational organization is "The Riddle of the Universe."

It must be pointed out before going any further that this haste and anxiety to build up a large and powerful labor organization, and to try to keep it together by the prohibition of all discussion and criticism of religion, politics or anything else that may have a tendency to disrupt it, is opportunism pure and simple. The same old reef that wrecked the whole fleet of Socialist parties known as the Second International. Opportunism, mark you, not the fact that they were political organizations. Evidently Nicholas Lenin knew what he was talking about when he said that Syndicalism was the twin brother of opportunism, for the American I. W. W. admits the fact that it is a near relation to the Syndicalist movement in other countries.

With regard to the attempt made to draw a parallel between a man's religion, or his politics, and the color of his skin, it is the worst kind of bunk. A man may be a revolutionist no matter what the color of his skin is, but it is not logical to suppose that a worker who is an adherent of any of the above mentioned religious sects or political parties can, at the same time, be a revolutionist. When a worker thoroughly understands his class position he does not believe in nor support any brand of superstition, and he certainly will not support any political party of the capitalist class.

On page 14 of the same pamphlet we find a few definitions which are interesting to say the least, so it may be well to examine them at some length. Here we are informed that:—

"Political or indirect action is that kind of action which the workers use when they seek to attain their object by securing influence over or control of the governmental machinery. Such action may consist of ballots, lobbying, bribery, so-called mass action, bullets and political revolution. These are all means of political action. The I. W. W. rejects all these methods of attaining the aims described above."

"Economic or direct action is that kind of action which the workers use when they seek to attain their object by securing control of the place of work, the factory, the mill, the shop."

"Direct action is such action as you use when you try to improve your conditions by acting in person, jointly with your fellows on the industrial field."

"Indirect action is such action as you use when you hire or elect representatives to improve your conditions."

It will be noted in the first place that political action and indirect action are here considered synonymous terms, that is, they are supposed to mean one and the same thing. Likewise economic action and direct action. Now if the words political and indirect mean the same thing on the one hand, and the words economic and direct mean the same thing on the other hand, why is it necessary to use the words direct and indirect at all, and why is it necessary to give them separate definitions after political and economic action have already been defined? Again, it will be noted that these definitions explain nothing if we except the definition of political action alone, which covers the point in a kind of a way but does not make it clear by any means.

In the definition of political action we are told, among other things, that "bullets and political revolution," are means of political action. We are further informed that the I. W. W. reject all such methods. If the phrase "bullets and political revolution," means anything as a definition in this respect, it means the application of armed force, which certainly is the main and basic form of political action. If, therefore, the working class cannot emancipate itself without the use of armed force it is doomed to wage slavery forever, for the I. W. W. reject all such methods. This pacific attitude is a new one for the I. W. W., and appears to have been swiped from the Socialist Labor Party.

As I have already pointed out, the above definitions explain little or nothing, so, instead of criticizing them I will give my own definitions of the terms mentioned, and my reasons for defining them so. To begin with, we must understand that action of any kind is a result of the application of some power. The first thing to be considered, then, is how the meaning of the word power is limited, or modified, by the addition of another word known as an adjective.

Now, when we use an adjective to describe or qualify the noun power, it means one of two things; it either refers to the manner in which the power is generated, or it describes the purpose for which it is applied, regardless of how it is generated. It is obvious, therefore, that the adjectives economic and political, used in connection with the noun power, refer to the purpose for which the power is applied. Economic power, then, is power applied for an economic purpose. But what is an economic purpose? We find that the word economic is an adjective, relating to the noun economics, which the dictionary tells us is the name of "the science that investigates the conditions and laws affecting the production, distribution, and consumption of wealth, or the material means of satisfying human desires."

Consequently, economic power must be the power to produce wealth. The power of man over nature. The power of man, individually or collectively to transform nature given material into things fit for human consumption.

Economic action is the result of the application of power to the natural resources of the earth for the purpose of producing wealth: The action necessary to the whole process of economic production and exchange. If this is not economic action, what kind of action is it?

Political power, is, the power to govern: The power of man over man: The power used by one class to keep another class in subjection.

Political action, on the part of the capitalists, as far as the workers are concerned, is any action they consider necessary (yes, even "lobbying and bribery"), to maintain their position as a ruling and exploiting class.

Political action, on the part of the workers is any action they may find necessary (yes, even "bullets and political revolution") to overthrow the political power of the capitalist class. To establish a proletarian dictatorship, or something of that nature, and maintain it until all danger of counter-revolution is past and until all the means of wealth production, now the property of the capitalist class, have been transformed into social means of production, to be operated in the interests of the whole people.

If the term "direct action" means anything at all it means efficient action. The easiest, quickest, the most efficient, or the only way to accomplish any purpose, no matter what that purpose may be. This applies to both political and economic action. The most efficient or the only possible economic action is "direct action," even though indirect methods must be used. Likewise, the most efficient or the only possible political action is also "direct action," even though indirect methods must be used. When this is understood, the term "direct action," taken by itself, has little or no meaning; it is superfluous, a confusing and unnecessary term.

If the term "indirect action" means anything at all it means "direct action." This statement appears paradoxical does it not? Let us see how it works out. It will be granted by every revolutionist that our aim is to abolish wage slavery. Well, why don't we fly at it? The I. W. W. gives the answer to this question on page 23 of the same pamphlet.

(Continued on page 7)

THE NEAR EAST.

(Continued from page 1)

(of vast importance to the credulous Philistine); because it freed her hands, somewhat, in the delicate mendacities of diplomacy; and because of the scruples of a troubled Moslem world. But with the failure of Greece to hold the line, Britain was forced to show her hand. Under the guise of "Allied occupation" she held Constantinople—for herself. With the prop gone she was compelled to hold it openly. That was why Curzon was sent to Paris—to surface the rough edge of Imperial necessity and secure—for the moment—French compliance, through the medium of French need or cupidity. Britain holds the Straits for the same reason as she has troops in Mesopotamia—oil and communication. She carved out Irak as she fashioned Kiloit—as a counter-check in the grim struggle of Imperialist development. She could keep watch on Egypt on two sides; she had a vantage to counter hostile movements in the Levant and its littoral, and the whole historic battle grounds of the old world. She held the cotton of Egypt and the hopes of Anglo-Persian secure, and she wedged herself insidiously near to the indispensable pipe lines—and between them and her rival.

That is why the "freedom of the Straits" figures so prominently in the news. It is the smoke screen that hides the "gushers" of world supremacy. It is now one of the keys of Empire, and as Czarist Russia and Ottoman Turk and Cassellian Greek have vanished from their place, the "anointed of Israel" must fill the breach. It is a part of the question of the freedom of the seas and in ultimate reality means the "freedom" of British Imperialism. That is why the whole Atlantic and Mediterranean fleets are in Eastern waters. The issue is life or death. It is true that France lends support to "the freedom of the Straits." For to France also they are the gateway of Empire; the oil of life, the freedom of transport, the security of communication.

But she wishes Turkey to hold the city. Since, thereby, the Turk will be practically returned to "business as usual." And with Thrace and Bulgaria and the "Little Entente" in front and the Moslem ranks in the rear France will hope to play her off in the general service of rivalry against her immediate foe, and to ensure her particular service in the climax of gathering war. That political fraternity is of infinitely more account than the economic kinship of indebtedness.

But the war cloud is not ready to burst. The Dardanelles is but a spluttering fuse. Before the "issue" is touched the line up must be advanced, the necessity clear, the material ready. These things are not yet. Press and power (or its reflex of identity) are at variance on the issue in all countries; the barbed entanglements of trade are not apparently stiffened enough. But they are nevertheless, quietly coiling round the stricken civilisation of capital. The fighting units of France are seemingly in good shape and well equipped, and all that appertains to militarism, active. But financially she is sore afraid, her oil supplies are insignificant and her cotton needs unguarded. Clearly, France is not able to face the issue—alone. With whom then?

Britain is by all odds the first power. But, like all Europe she has her back to the wall and is coming face to face with her supremest struggle. Unemployment is rife, taxation intolerable, the burden of Imperialism sapping the whole life of industry. Business is stagnant; is declining. India has been "peacefully" pacified; but Lancashire appears to have derived no benefit. The henchmen of Cassel and D'Erlanger have quieted Egypt, but the cotton boom is not yet. The market of Europe has gone by the board; the coal trade is ruined. The steel industry is still; shipbuilding dead; freight rates cut by four, the merchant marine swinging to anchor in the bays of the "tight little island." Over the water, "in God's country," America has substantiated the tariff against "foreigners"—striking hard at capitalist Britain—the "workshop of the world." She has subsidised shipping, organised production and transport, cut wages to meet the

"prosperity" of cheap production, slashed deep into what remains of a world market, gathered in some of the coal trade, established foreign banks and facilities, and is the first creditor nation.

America controls the present supplies of oil; Britain apparently has secured the future. And as organisation for cheap production and efficient handling is the order of the day in Britain, as in America, the grim struggle of productive costs presages the grimmer struggle of "iron" persuasion. Obviously, Britain and America are antagonistic. Will they settle the matter alone? Both are equipped, both preparing, both have vast resources to draw on,—but America is probably the more secure.

America has kept out of European entanglements so far, but future oil and cotton may ask a sudden question. The condition of Europe is daily becoming more desperate; of France more precarious. There a conclusion cannot be long delayed. If that conclusion favors the general interest of Britain and Europe it must antagonise France. And if France propounds the problem,—what then? France, as we saw, can hardly meet the issue alone. She is antagonistic to Britain. And America is being steadily driven against the same power. Will America, with present oil, and cotton, and finance, and shipping, unite with a France who has neither? The hope of the one, immediate salvation; of the other, the future? Would Japan, who has neither steel nor coal, nor oil nor cotton, come to the support of Britain, who can supply her with them all,—I wink at her transgressions of the "open door"? The immediate advantage of Britain, the future of Japan. Britain would doubtless wish Germany to come into the fold, for that might affect Lorraine and Briey; but the German claims in American industries might prove another link in the chain of Stinnes and Lubersack. And finally, if the issue is forced on France can America afford to see her only ally crushed, as Germany is crushed, knowing that she alone would be required to face the swollen power of a victorious Britain? The not distant future will settle all those worries, Russia alone being about the only reasonable certainty, and even that is risky.

It is said that war between the Anglo Saxons is unthinkable; and it may be that the "black Douglas" will not catch us. We are no prophets. But there are the facts. Like Hump and the cook on the "Ghost" the nations are sharpening their weapons. The social forces of production are in sharp conflict with the social forces of humanity; but the former are so far the stronger. Because they are conscious and cognisant; the latter are not. Thus it is not the question of the freedom of the Straits that is at stake. Nor Turkey and Greece, nor Britain and France, nor right and justice, nor Christian nor Moslem. But two world groups of Imperialist finance, politically entrenched in the means of life, farming society for privilege and profit, deadlocked in Titan struggle and crushing the whole world in the steely tentacles of their insatiate ambitions. That is the spectre lurking in the dark shadows of the Dardanelles. R.

"WHAT IS THE I.W.W.?"

(Continued from page 6)

"Thus ignorance is the greatest obstacle we have to overcome, many times greater than capitalist persecution. . . . An illiterate workingman is as dangerous to the aspirations of the workers in these trying times as a small-pox or bubonic plague patient would be to our health."

And what is the only cure for working class ignorance? Working class education; the I. W. W., admit that much. And what is education in this respect but a means to an end? And using means to an end is an "indirect" method of doing something that cannot be done any other way and, consequently must be "indirect action." But if it is the only way it can be done it is also the most "direct" way and, therefore, must be "direct action." Let us have done with this rot about "direct" and "indirect" action, once and for all.

In my next article on the same subject I will examine a few passages from the pamphlet, "The Lumber Industry and Its Workers."

PARSON MALTHUS.

(Continued from page 5.)

tion Supplement to the Manchester Guardian Commercial (1s.), is devoted to this question of Population and the Food Supply. The a priori approach to the problem, to which I have referred, is in places in evidence, when social politics are under discussion. But the articles by Keynes on Malthus, by Dr. Brownlee on The Census, by Sir H. Rew on the World's Grain Supplies, by Prof. Sering on the Agrarian Revolution in Central Europe, and by Louis Levine on the Agrarian Problem in Russia contain much useful information.—M. H. D.

—MAURICE H. DOBB, (The Plebs.) London.

HERE AND NOW.

WE have nothing bright and startling to enter upon the record this issue. Dust and ashes, not to mention deep humility, overtake us as we set these figures up one by one. Our vocabulary of expressive words in swelling. If the figures could only keep pace with that . . . !

Following \$1 each: M. Raport, R. Thomas, H. Vindeg, Harry Johnstone, M. Safzer, G. Elliot, R. Green, J. Donovan, W. Grant, G. Crosetti, A. Mathieson, O. Mengel, W. Coleman, W. Mitchell, B. Tamarin, T. Hughes, G. Wallack, H. Arnold, Jack Dennis.

C. Johnson \$2; Nels Sorlie \$2; Alex Shepherd \$3; S. E. White \$3; C. F. Gale \$1.20; R. Inglis \$5; W. A. Pritchard \$8.

Above, Clarion subs received from 13th to 26th October, inclusive, total \$43.20.

CLARION MAINTENANCE FUND.

R. Thomas \$1; Nels Sorlie \$1; W. Grant \$1; G. Grosetti \$2; Harry Johnstone \$4; R. Inglis \$5.

Above, C. M. F. receipts from 13th to 26th Oct., inclusive, total \$14.

Socialist Party of Canada
PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

STAR THEATRE, 300 Block, Main Street

SUNDAY OCTOBER 29.

Speaker: W. A. PRITCHARD.

MEETINGS EVERY SUNDAY.

All meetings at 8 p.m.

Questions. Discussion.

ECONOMIC CAUSES
OF WAR

By PETER T. LECKIE.

NOW READY.

Preface by the author.

132 PAGES.

Per Copy, 25 Cents.

Ten copies up, 20 cents each.
Post Paid.

MANIFESTO

— of the —

SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

(Fifth Edition)

Per copy 10 cents

Per 25 copies \$2

Post Paid

The Clarion Mail Bag

BY SID EARP.

CORRESPONDENCE received since last issue though smaller than usual, is of considerable interest.

The most interesting letter from Eastern Canada comes from Com. R. Inglis, Fort William. It contains suggestions for a reorganization of the Party, and submits the slogan of "Sacrifice, Discipline, Action." Comrade Inglis is of the opinion that many class conscious workers throughout the country who are now apathetic towards the revolutionary movement, would be up and doing if a few travelling propagandists could be kept going. He considers that there are at least two hundred rebels in Canada who might be got to pledge financial support to this much needed work. The district in which he lives is rotten ripe for the propaganda of Scientific Socialism, and he pleads for a policy of action at once.

This is the letter of a true rebel and an enclosure of ten dollars evidences the good faith of the writer. We shall welcome further comment along these lines from the movement at large, for indeed, the matter is of paramount importance to the working class of Canada. Com. Charles Lestor is leaving Vancouver this week on a propaganda tour, but it will be confined to points west of Winnipeg until Christmas time. We imagine Com. Lestor would willingly take advantage of an opportunity to get acquainted with the movement in the fertile districts of Eastern Canada. How about it, Reds?

Two letters have been received from Winnipeg, one from Alex Shepherd who encloses three subs. for the Clarion and comments upon the Labor movement in that city. The other letter is from Charles Stewart who expresses irritation at our previous remarks regarding Winnipeg as a future revolutionary centre. We suggest a further reading of our statement on this matter and some reflection. Com. Stewart is enthusiastic about the movement in Winnipeg and so are we. In the clash of opinions now prevailing there, much good will emerge; of that there is no possible doubt. Com. Stewart also states that the consensus of opinion among the boys in Winnipeg regarding the articles on "Ourselves and Parliament," is that they are anything but clear; particularly disappointing being, the first contribution of J. A. McDonald. In so far as clarity of expression and an incisive style, Com. Stewart refers to the "Socialist Standard," as a shining example. His letter also contains some humorous and philosophical comment upon the literary and verbal debates with which the workers of Winnipeg are being entertained. In fairness to those who have contributed to the question of "Ourselves and Parliament," we think that specific objections clearly set forth by those in disagreement, would be more in order than the vague references to lack of clarity, disappointment, etc.

Com. R. Burns of the Calgary Local sends word of their activities and the handicaps under which they labor. They hold outdoor propaganda meetings every Sunday with good results, and in which new speakers are taking part. Stay with it, Calgary! G. Elliot sends a sub for the Clarion, from Delburne, Alta.

From Demaine, Sask., comes a sub from H. Vindog who implores us to keep kicking. We will! Writing from Mildred, Sask., Nels Sorlie encloses three dollars for sub. and Maintenance Fund and hopes for the success of the movement. Two subs come from Chas. Johnson, Chase, B. C. Com. Andrews sends notice of change of address from Vernon, B. C. He is hunting for a master at present, and if he doesn't find one soon, says he will have to dig roots for soup.

Com. J. Cartwright sends in two subs from East Wellington, Vancouver Island. He says the system is getting top heavy and wants to know what is to take its place. The answer to which is enshrouded in the mists of futurity. Com. W. Raport writes

briefly from Petaluma, Calif., enclosing a sub with a promise of more to follow. From Puyallup, Washington comes a sub and an order for literature. An order for literature also comes from Magnolia Beach Washington.

A renewal of sub to Clarion comes from Cleveland, Ohio. A bright letter wishing success to the good work and enclosing a sub was received from Com. Antijuntti, Houston, Texas. W. Mitchell writes from Ithaca, New York, enclosing one dollar for the Clarion and sending regards to Frank Williams and Peter Leckie. A letter was received from Bishop Brown of Galion, Ohio, enclosing a copy of his reply to the House of Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church regarding his publication "Communism and Christianity."

A remarkable letter comes from W. J. McGibbon, Juneau, Alaska, commenting at considerable length upon the article "A Corporation with a Soul," which recently appeared in the Clarion. The writer of the article is urged to "get wisdom," also to "do a little more thinking before judging." The letter sets forth the opinion of the writer upon the forms of vice in ethical principle, too much sentiment and too much reason, and closes with an appeal for common sense. The writer also says that his letter would stand revising. We agree with him in this.

A long and interesting letter comes from Com. E. Staples, Davenport, Auckland, N. Z. He refers to the affairs of the New Zealand Communist Party in Auckland and expresses much disappointment at the failure of Jack McDonald in not speaking in that district where his efforts would have been greatly appreciated. Com. Staples states that Auckland has always been a good field for propaganda, and that any speaker coming that way would not consider the time spent in it as wasted. He sends best wishes to all Vancouver comrades.

The workers of today have not an atom of claim upon the wealth they produce. That is sufficiently self-evident to call for no proof. And while they may not be actually compelled to work for any given master, they must work for some master. They are therefore slaves in the proper sense of the word. And, indeed, the conditions of their servitude are in the main more severe than under previous forms of slavery. They are exploited of more wealth—that is to say, the masters obtain from their labor greater returns than did the masters under any other form of slavery.

PLATFORM

Socialist Party of Canada

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Literature Price List

Cloth Bound	Per Copy
Positive Outcome of Philosophy	\$1.85
A. B. C. of Evolution (McCabe)	\$1.15
Economic Determinism	\$1.65
Evolution of the Idea of God (Grant Allen)	\$1.15
Darwinism and Race Progress (Haycraft)	\$1.15
Evolution of Property (Lafargue)	\$1.15
Critique of Political Economy	\$1.65
Revolution and Counter Revolution (Marx)	\$1.15
History of Paris Commune (Lissagaray)	\$1.50
Ancient Society	\$1.85
Philosophical Essays	\$1.65
Theoretical System of Karl Marx	\$1.65
Landmarks of Scientific Socialism	\$1.65
Socialism and Philosophy	\$1.65
Essays on the Materialistic Conception of History	\$1.65
Capitalist Production (First Nine and 32nd Chapters "Capital," vol. 1, (Marx)	\$1.00
Savage Survivals (Moore)	\$1.00
Vital Problems in Social Evolution	80c
Science and Revolution	80c
The Militant Proletariat	80c
Evolution Social and Organic	80c
Puritanism	80c
Ethics and History	80c
Germs of Mind in Plants	80c
The Triumph of Life	80c
Anarchism and Socialism	80c
Feuerback	80c
Socialism Positive and Negative	80c
The American Empire (Nearing)	60c
Eighteenth Brumaire	80c
The End of the World	80c
Science and Superstition	80c

Paper Covers	Per Copy
Two Essays on History (C. Stephenson and G. Deville)	5c
Independent Working Class Education	10c
Communist Manifesto	10c
Wage-Labor and Capital	10c
The Present Economic System (Prof. W. A. Bonger)	10c
Socialism, Utopian and Scientific	15c
Slave of the Farm	10c
Manifesto, S. P. of C.	10c
Evolution of Man (Prof. Bolsche)	20c
Causes of Belief in God (Lafargue)	10c
The Structure of Soviet Russia (Humphries)	20c
Shop Talks on Economics (Marcy)	15c
The State and Revolution (Lenin)	25c
Value, Price and Profit (Marx)	15c
Economic Causes of War (Leckie)	25c
The Protection of Labor in Soviet Russia (Kaplan)	15c
Civil War in France (Marx)	35c
Eighteenth Brumaire (Marx)	35c
Christianism and Communism (Bishop W. M. Brown)	25c
A Worker Looks at History (Starr)	80c
Psychology of Marxian Socialism	30c
W. A. Pritchard's Address to the Jury, (State Trials, Winnipeg, Man., Fall Assizes 1919-20)	25c

Quantity Rates on Paper Covered Pamphlets.

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

All prices include Postage.

Make all moneys payable to E. McLeod, P. O. Box 710, Vancouver, B. C. Add discount on cheques. All above literature can be obtained from J. M. Sanderson, Box 2354, Winnipeg, Manitoba.

SUBSCRIPTION FORM.

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

Enclosed find

Send "Western Clarion" to