

Soviet Russia, from the S. P. of C. Viewpoint

Editor's Note:—The length of the manifesto precludes the possibility of its printing all in one issue. The other half will appear in next issue and will include, following from the sub-divisions of the subject herein presented, the Socialist Party Attitude Towards Soviet-Russia; The Process of Revolutionary Change; The Effort to Re-establish Foreign Relations; Soviet Mistakes. The reader is asked to keep the present issue by him until the appearance of the next, and to study the Manifesto in its appearance as a whole.

AS a perspective or point of view on social life drawn from the Socialist philosophy, it is realised that what is outlined below falls far short of what might be, both in conception and execution. Taking courage, however, of the knowledge that individuals and parties are never so great as the causes they fight for, the contents of his manifesto are published in the hope that they may assist in a general readjustment of views toward unanimity of working class opinion on Soviet Russia, as well as on the general social problem.

For the purpose stated above, a detailed survey and analysis of Russian affairs might be most effective but is for the present beyond our compass. In any case, such a treatment would lose some of its interest and value as the future brought on its changes. The Party perspective here submitted, however, is offered as a permanent standpoint of valuation, which the reader may acquire and further improve by a study of the Socialist philosophy, and from which he may in the shifting course of future events be enabled to evaluate them and form his judgements.

Naught in what follows is set down in a censorious spirit. When it is taken for granted that there prevails a habit of reasoning from wrong principles, or it is implied that opinions may be derived from other than rational considerations, it is so done in the belief that a frank recognition of the sources of error is essential before a readjustment of views is possible and unanimity of opinion reached.

Truth about Russia necessary

To know the truth about Russia is more than ordinarily necessary because that country has, to use a figure of speech, conducted a reconnaissance into the Socialistic future. The taking thought of and discussion of the experiences of that venture and its successes and failures, credited to whatever factors or combinations of factors they may be—influences domestic or foreign, or to facts of administration—should be of great value to the working class movement everywhere and to society at large.

Yet the truth, prosaic and matter-of-fact, has been hard to come by, not because its materials were hidden, but because Russian affairs have not been viewed clear-eyed, objectively. In the main they have been seen through a perspective of subjective passions and prejudices, for the most part unconsciously motivated by material interests, and blind unreasoning partisanship aroused by the revolution's challenge to deep-rooted social habits. It is probable that no other event in history has ever evoked such a mess of "faked" reasoning, emanating from all sides in the clash of dispute it brought on.

The deplorable lack of unity on the Russian question in the working class movement itself, is due to lack of a common perspective rather than to misinformation; subjective biases rather than objective considerations. Here, in general, been the

bases of opinion. What is especially unfortunate, even the class-conscious revolutionary section of that movement is but little less at fault in that respect, and with less excuse. Much of its thought on Soviet Russia has tended to degenerate into romantic sentimentalism. And this, largely because revolutionary ends have been kept in view, to the exclusion of any studied and rational regard to the means, always conditioned by circumstances of time and place. Sentiment is not here decried, for it is recognized as having a survival value in the struggle for existence; but its value is as a stimulating, sustaining influence, not as a substitute for intelligence strengthened by knowledge, without which it is blind, impotent for good, and often a sign of weakness and a source of danger.

There should be, then, an effort of detachment from all influences that would prevent an objective consideration of Russian affairs. As the basis of the manifesto's argument, it is taken as a general truth that the differences of opinion on the Russian question are due to differences of perspective. From the standpoint of the Party perspective, or line of thought, by which it throws historical forces, human nature and human conduct into perspective in the social flux, and which is submitted as a truly rational perspective, what must be regarded as erroneous opinions are to be attributed to faults of perspective.

The exposition will open up by outlining the nature and origin of social perspectives in general, and of the Party perspective in particular. As a whole, the exposition will also serve to illustrate why the Party recognizes and supports the Soviet regime as a revolutionary administration.

Nature and origin of mental perspectives

It is often said, as clinching an argument, that "facts are facts." Yet the saying seems inadequate in that it conveys the impression of ignoring the quality inherent in facts, and of stressing mere quantity. Opinions differ on social questions, in the main because varying points of view lead to varying estimates as to the relative importance, or quality, of the facts considered. Where emotional interest, or material interest, or both combined are strongly engaged too, facts maybe are very often under or over-estimated, distorted out of semblance of reality, or altogether ignored.

But even when such irrational interests are the motives, equally as when the reasoning process is free from such ulterior influences, there are always preconceptions held in common to which resort is had as a basis of rationalization for conduct or opinion. These preconceptions are social standards and principles of knowledge and belief, and of law and morals, as to what is fact and credible and what equitable and good. By a people of any social epoch, such principles and standards of judgement are regarded as matters of common-sense, eternally right and good and true; they are, in fact, the common-sense ideas of the epoch and make up what is known as its point-of-view. So we can speak of the point of view of antiquity as differing from that of mediæval times, as does that of the latter from that of modern times. In such wise, that witchcraft, sorcery, miracles, the casting of horoscopes, etc., once believed in, are now no longer held credible in the modern point of view.

Points of view are habits of thought unconsciously acquired, which become orthodox under the

long enduring and unremitting discipline of habits of life enforced by the material conditions of social life. In particular, among these forces of habituation, the facts of industrial use and wont must be regarded as fundamental, conditioning the growth and scope of culture and giving character to the scheme of institutional facts which may obtain. These latter facts in turn, react back upon the state of the industrial arts and, as in feudal and predatory states, where the social relationship between the graded classes are those of status or mastery and servitude, the high institutional character of the society stamps its marks deeply in the culture of the time—religion, philosophy and such science as may be, betraying its influence.

So soon as new material conditions of life appear, including a change in the state of the industrial arts sufficiently profound, enduring and comprehensive in character as to enforce new habits of life, then there is a corresponding growth of new habits of thought; a slow upward infiltration of new principles and standards into the general body of social concepts takes place. The old concepts may continue in force as traditional concepts gradually losing force, or they may perhaps disappear by displacement, those sections of the population upon whom the new material conditions bear with greater force being the first to give evidence of the new habits of thought in a changed and unorthodox point of view. Thus, the character of the "idea" appears as a matter of material causation or, as the response of an organism to the stimuli of its environment. As it has been said: "The history of man shows that, collectively, he has learned by habituation rather than by precept or meditation." Or again: "While man may, to a great extent be the creator of the world he lives in; he will always be its mirror."

The Machine Proletariat. Cultural Basis of its Viewpoint.

Intellectually, in so far as new habits of life have weakened or have displaced traditional habits of thought with new ones, the modern proletarian wage workers are creatures of the modern method of production. As a cultural factor dominant in their daily life, directly, the modern productive process has two aspects. In one aspect, that is, technically, the character of the process is a mechanical process. For that reason it is known as the machine process of production, even so when in some branches of industry mechanical appliances may not be used. It is a question of the "character" of the process. In its other aspect, the productive process is large-scale, the work being carried on co-operatively; it is "social" production, world-wide in its scope and inter-connections.

This "social" nature of modern production, in its cultural effect on those engaged in the process, begets a habit of thinking on social affairs in social terms rather than in individualistic terms. In the other aspect of its processes, being mechanistic in character, the work of attending to or taking thought of the processes inculcates a habit of reasoning in the mechanistic or materialistic terms of material cause and effect. "The machine throws out anthropomorphic habits of thought" as being useless for the work to be done.

The chance interventions of daemonic powers
(Continued on page 3)

The Origin of the World

By R. McMillan.

CURIOUS FACTS.

CHAPTER XX

THE things you read out of a book are not half so interesting as the things you see for yourself, and all book-reading is intended to sharpen your powers of observation. If you do not think and observe for yourself, you will be very little better for all the books you read. In fact, I have known people to read themselves stupid. I feel I would like to tell you some of the things I have seen myself, and, while they may not be as clever as the things I have read in books, I am sure they will interest you quite as much.

When I was about eighteen or nineteen years of age I was living in a little town in Peru, named Tumbes, and I used to spend a good deal of time on the banks of the river watching the alligators and the iguanas, and wondering about things in general. I knew nothing at all about natural history, so of course I learned very little; but all the same I acquired quite a lot of knowledge, unconsciously. I saw that the lizards liked the banks of the river, but they never went into the water; and I remembered the snakes in Manila, in the Philippine Islands, which had taken to the water. We used to catch the snakes in Manila when we were fishing, and very disagreeable things they were till you got accustomed to them.

These gorgeously-coloured "goanas" on the Tumbes River liked to live near the water, but they never went into it. It seemed to me then that the lower forms of life, like frogs, snakes, and iguanas, could take to the water very easily, and become either land or water animals, as necessity arose. But that was only a vague notion. I did not really think it out, but the idea was there.

About 500 miles from Tumbes, away out in the Pacific Ocean, right on the equator, there is a group of islands called the Galapagos Islands. They are nearly all volcanic, and they are set in the deep, deep sea. If I had understood the laws of nature then, I could have learned such a lot; but I did not know anything about science, so I missed my opportunity. I knew the islands were made of lava, because they were mostly hard and black, or dark brown, and the "soil" cut our boots to pieces. There were no mammals on the islands, no warm-blooded animals that suckled their young (that is what mammals are), but there were plenty of birds and tortoises, and the sea was swarming with fish and big, hungry sharks.

I had no idea of asking why there were no warm-blooded animals on the islands. You see, I had no idea of the way the world had grown, and if you had asked me then as to the origin of the world I would have told you the wrong thing, and been quite sure that I was right. But now I know how the world really originated, and I realize the vast mystery of it all and its incomprehensibility, and I never laugh at anybody's ignorance. I know my own! I had not, in those days, read even Tennyson who tells the story in *The Princess*. He says:—

This world was once a fluid haze of light,
Till toward the centre set the starry tides.
And eddied into suns, that wheeling east
The planets: then the monster, then the man;
Tattoo'd or woaded, winted-clad in skins,
Raw from the prime, and crushing down his mate;
As yet we find in barbarous isles, and here
Among the lowest.

You see that is just the story I have been trying to tell you, and if I had read Tennyson then I might have known enough to ask questions about the Galapagos Islands. But I had no knowledge at all, so I was dumb before the mystery of the volcanic islands, the fierce tides, the rugged hills, and the

strange living things thereon. It was only when I read Darwin's books, years and years after, that the veil fell from my eyes, and I saw the miracle of the lonely oceanic islands.

There were iguanas on the shores of all the islands; but they were not the bright-coloured, swift-moving things that lived on the banks of the Tumbes River. They were big, black, horrid-looking things that made you shudder to look at, and they were very sluggish—on the land. They were absolutely helpless, and seemed to have no idea of either fighting or running away. I had chased the "goanas" in Peru; but they were too swift for me, and now I could lay hold of these horrid ones, by the tail, and they would scarcely struggle. If you stood on the edge of a cliff and threw one into the sea, it appeared to wake up, and would swim as fast as lightning to the shore, and come right back to your feet and let you throw it in again. Why? Mr. Darwin told me! These iguanas came from the mainland, ages ago, on the roots of floating trees. The tough, leathery eggs of the iguanas stood the trip, and were cast on to these rough, volcanic shores. Then the little iguanas found nothing to eat, and they were very hungry. The only green thing about was the green laver, a sort of sea-lettuce, in the salt water; so the poor little beggars had to eat that. And they lived—at least, some of them did—and their children learned to like the green laver (if they did not, they died); and so through the ages the family learned to go deeper and deeper for the laver; and they learned to swim very fast, for the sharks came and caught them, and ate them up if they were not pretty quick at getting ashore.

All the slow iguanas were eaten up by the sharks, especially the coloured ones; so colours went out of fashion, and the only iguanas that survived were the sombre-skinned ones, and the ones that could swim fast. The only danger that was recognized by the "goana" was the shark; for its poor little brain could contain no other idea, and that meant getting ashore as quickly as possible. When man came and flung it into the water, its little brain was too sluggish to understand that men were worse than sharks. So, as soon as it struck the water, it came right back to the shore, where the man was, thinking it was safe on the rocks.

Do you observe now how the law was working out? The iguanas loved life—as we all do—and, in the struggle for existence, the only ones that survived were the ones that adapted themselves to the new conditions. That is to say, the survivors were the ones that had varied in a direction that was favourable to continued existence. The coloured ones—such as I used to admire in Peru—were soon eaten up; therefore the coloured variety soon died out. Then the slow swimmers died out, and the only ones that lived were the dark-coloured ones and the swift ones. They were the ones that brought forth young, which inherited the parental tricks and appearance; so that in the struggle for existence, on the Galapagos Islands, the survivors were the ones best fitted for the new conditions.

It was not through any cleverness on the part of the iguanas themselves, but just owing to the operation of very simple laws. The laws of Nature are simple in the extreme; but we will keep on thinking that they are complicated. They are no such thing. The entire world originated in response to those simple laws, and is kept on its course by them, and we are what we are by their operation.

I hope you see what I mean, and how things work? If you do, and care to study the matter carefully, read good books, and keep your eyes open and your mind alert, you will come to understand the origin of the world.

The Galapagos Islands were furnished from the mainland of South America by drifting timber, carrying the eggs and seeds of living things which found a resting place on the volcanic islets, and

found means to live there. But the change was very great from the mainland to the islands, so the living things that survived had to adapt themselves to the new conditions, just as the iguanas did. Thus it has come to pass that nearly all the island life—birds and tortoises, turtles and insects, snails and trees—are different from those on the mainland. But not much different. They are all South American, with a difference. They have varied a little, owing to the changed conditions of life on the islands; but they are the same sort as they have in America, only different. You see what I mean, do you not?

There are differences, also, between the forms of life on the various islands, because the water separating the islands is of oceanic depth. It forms a barrier between island and island, except to the fishes, which appeared to me to be the same all round the islands. The abysmal depths of the ocean, and the fierce tides which sweep between the islands, have made the forms of life on them vary in each place. Taking them full and large, the Galapagos Islands are the best examples I know of the law of development and variation. But you will see the same kind of thing wherever you go, and as clearly in Australia as in the Galapagos Islands.

We had no rabbits here (*) till somebody brought them from England. Why were there no rabbits here? Because they did not develop in this continent. But as soon as ever they were let loose here they developed into a pest that threatened, at one time, to ruin the pastoral and farming industries. We have spent millions of money in fighting them, and I am not sure that we have got them down now. If you think out the rabbit problem and the briar question, and the prickly pear and the Bathurst burr, and a lot of these things, you will see that my story of the origin of the world is necessarily true.

Next Lesson: **EARLY MEN.**

(*) The book was written in Australia.—(Ed.)

Obituary

COMRADE James A. Teit died at Merritt, B. C., on Oct. 30th, of cancer, a disease which had been undermining his constitution vigorously, particularly of late years. His death is a loss directly, not alone to the Socialist movement specifically, but to the world of investigation in natural history and racial development, and cultural advancement generally. He had lived in British Columbia about 40 years, landing on this coast from a sailing vessel which had brought him from the Shetland Islands, where he was born.

Since the inception of the S. P. of C. he had been actively associated with its work, especially those branches of it which, in the educational field, bordered on the investigation of primitive forms of society, in the written work of past stages or in the records of present researches in tribal forms and kinship, customs, ceremonies, folk-lore, etc. in which field of enquiry he had accomplished much among the various tribes of Indians on the coast and the inner and upper country of B. C. He was known among the Indians everywhere from the U. S. boundary to the Stikine country and, possessing the "language faculty", he spoke over twenty tribal dialects, besides Norwegian, Danish and French.

His researches, unfortunately, have been cut off, but we hope the collected records of his unfinished work will be preserved. His "The Thompson Indians of British Columbia," (1900) and "The Shuswap" (1909), both published by the American Museum of Natural History, have proved to be useful contributions to anthropology. The reader of this note is referred to "Primitive Society," by Robert H. Lowie, (1920. Boni and Liveright). In this work, and in "Culture and Ethnology", Mr. Lowie is critical of some of the conclusions of Lewis H. Morgan's "Ancient Society," a work which has served somewhat as an anthropological text book for many years in Socialist study circles. The work of comrade Teit, brought to the use of this investigator, proves itself invaluable, coming as it does from the field of practical research and personal association, and tends somewhat to modify that critical treatment which, in any case, is essential although not necessarily altogether tenable, as a present day treatment upon a work written in the day when a certain dogmatic attitude was allowable, induced as no doubt it was, by the then prevailing "fixity" ideas of orthodoxy.

We conclude our obituary note with the record of that keen sense of loss in the comradeship of association in our common cause which is the feature attending the passing out of any comrade. In addition, we extend our earnest sympathies to Comrade Teit's wife and children.

SOVIET RUSSIA, FROM THE S. P. OF C. VIEWPOINT.

(Continued from page 1)

familiar to superstitious ages, the personal will, likes and dislikes once attributed to things, the rule of thumb, are all ruled out of the machine process. It is no longer even largely a question of the arbitrary will of the worker, he but attends on the process whose detail working out is calculable and set beforehand. Thought on the process is in terms of mechanical force, pressure, strain, velocity, chemical reaction; is in terms of quantitative precision, known and calculable factors, standardized processes and materials and predetermined output. As is the practice in the application of the scientific method in enquiry into natural phenomena, "the machine process compels attention to phenomena of an impersonal character and to sequences and correlations not dependent for their force on human predilection nor created by habit and custom."

This habit of mind, of thinking in the materialistic terms acquired in work-day activity, tends to pervade all thinking. It asserts itself even when thought is taken of religion, the propositions of which are of another, alien order of thought. The much ado about supernatural powers in religious thinking, to the materialistic habit of thought, seems "so much ado about nothing." In likewise, social institutions and conventions become subject to other criteria than "make-believe". With the passing of time it becomes less and less generally accepted that they are eternally sacred, or have any justification for existence at all, by mere right of prescription, immemorial custom, authoritative enactment or divine ordinance. To the materialist conception, institutions and conventions are social habits, habitual ways of response in which human energies and instinctive impulses are enchanneled; they are a social apparatus of ways and means, instruments for furthering human welfare and, as they function in that respect, well or ill, their right to exist is rated accordingly.

Those interested in the discipline of habituation as a social force, particularly as a causal factor between industrial use and wont and institutional facts, are referred to the "Instinct of Workmanship" and other works of Veblen. His development work in that phase of the "Materialistic conception" is proving the virility of that foundation tenet of Marxian theory.

Economic Basis of the Class Struggle.

In many other ways the modern productive process has brought into being conditions of life which tend to foster a habit or settled frame of mind inimical to the traditional institutions of the present order. Chief amongst these ways is the conflict of economic interest between the proletarian masses and the capitalist class.

The growth and development of large-scale machine production out of small-scale handicraft production, has divorced the once independent producing masses from ownership in the means of production. Thus have been created vast armies of proletarian wage-workers whose only means of securing a livelihood is to sell their labor power to the capitalist owners of industrial plants. Hence there arises a conflict of class interest over conditions of work and wages. Another factor contributing towards this conflict of interest is, that the means of production are not operated primarily to provide a livelihood for the workers or the community at large. Industries being owned by the capitalist class, the rate and volume of output are necessarily restricted to such point as the market price will guarantee profits for capital investments. As a result there is increasingly a condition among industrial workers of part-time labor and unemployment, low wages and a low standard of livelihood, due to excessive competition on the labor market. Hence, the feeling, and the ideas which correspond to it, on the proletarian side of the conflict tend to take on the nature of a challenge to the institution of capitalist ownership of society's means of wealth production.

In so far as the point is reached of antagonism to the present order, consciously or unconsciously, for very often the revolutionary implications of the standpoint of criticism are not recognized, the new

habits of thought furnish the principles and standards which are the standpoint of criticism. Thus, it is coming to seem a common-sense proposition, not to be objected to with any show of reason, that the means of production should be instrumental in furthering nothing less than the welfare of society as a whole; and that personal labor alone should constitute a claim on the product of industry and not absentee-ownership, whose only evidences of connection with industry are stocks and bonds and shares. Yet the tendency of thought of that "common-sense" is not in the direction of a redistribution of capitalist property, though, as a relief, there is a theory that by raising wages to the point of each worker getting the full product of his toil that end would be achieved. The tendency of thought, however, is towards taking over in common to society as a whole, such industries as are basic, large-scale and operated socially. Among those who are consciously revolutionary to the established order, the new principles and standards of criticism are conceived of as the institutional foundations of the future order of society.

Socialism is of this modern proletariat and, in the domains of social theory and social program is an intellectual reflex of the same compulsion of things in the social environment, elaborated by the findings of modern science in the study of man, his institutions and social organizations. Significantly, socialist theory and program receive greatest acceptance among those laboring in the strictly mechanical trades.

The cultural background of the socialist perspective, or so much as is given by the current situation in the social environment (as so laboriously sketched above), gives to that perspective a social consciousness or a sense of society as a unity: a habit of reasoning along lines of material causation, and of rating institutions according to their functional capacities. So equipped, the Socialist should be peculiarly fitted for taking an objective view of Russian affairs. Nor need his sympathy for a people struggling to reconstruct a new order of life bias his viewpoint; rather, his insight should be keener because he is able to recognize the integrity and social idealism of their motives: because he has an acquaintance with them, in respect of social theory and ideals, intimate and confidential, to which other men are strangers.

The Point of view.

George Bernard Shaw once said that, to an Englishman, there are only two classes of people in the world—Englishmen and Foreigners. That piece of satire is recognized as a caricature of the English, but yet as performing good service in holding up to ridicule a national trait. If not equally so, yet with almost equal truth the same may be said of all nationals. Shaw's satire serves as a text for the next few remarks.

In studying Russian affairs we must be on our guard against measuring Russian ways of reacting to Russian problems with the yardstick of our own preferences, preferences acquired under racial and individual experiences far different from those of the Russian people. Our standards, being the product of habituation to a different economic, political and social environment, will hardly form a basis for an intelligent criticism of the Russians.

Russian social environment, compact of institutions, and Russian psychology, should be taken into account. The half-feudal, absolutist character of those institutions had been a dominating fact in the lives of the Russian people to the eve of the revolution, and their character, through the centuries, has left its impress on Russian psychology. It is generally recognized by Russians themselves, as well as by those acquainted with them, that though they are a people capable of rising to moods of high exaltation and under that influence to states of intense activity, that yet, perhaps beyond most people of the temperate zones, their characteristic state is one of fatalistic resignation and social inertia. Consequently, when the first white heat of revolutionary ardour had cooled with the passing of the crisis which had called it into being, and with weariness of war and social strife, old social habits began to reassert themselves. The Soviet administration

then fell heir to an enormous drain on its energies in the effort necessary to induce that widely distributed population to continue to see Russia's problem whole, and to enthuse and organize that population for social reconstruction and defense of the revolution. In such a posture of things, what wonder that centralization of power, that bug-a-boo of idealists, blind to the compulsion of circumstances, should naturally take effect.

All of which is to say that in discussing Russian affairs we ought to remember we are foreigners discussing the domestic affairs of a neighboring people, a people, moreover, who had inherited dire distresses from Czarist times prior to the revolution which the old methods of action, the established social institutions, had failed to relieve. In fact, being the root cause of the distresses, those institutions should naturally take effect.

It is to the fact that Russia's problems were institutional problems, as are all social problems at bottom today, that they assume such a baffling and stubborn character. The social process has reached a pass demanding a basic change in the purpose of organized social life in the interest of further progress and human well-being. Things, as it were, are ready—a highly developed state of the industrial arts, modern science, more than a sufficiency of expert technicians, production economists and production managers who even now are directing and overseeing the industrial processes though under the discretionary control of the profit seeking business class—things are ready, but the peoples stand inert in the grip of old social habits and loyalties while the calamities, inherent in the capitalistic organization of social life, prey on them.

The dead hand of the past on the forces of progressive social change! That is why, for one reason, in studying Russian or any other country's affairs, we must apply the historical method. By that method we may discover the underlying forces that work against social progress. Behind every social situation there is a historical background out of which it evolved. Thus every present is related to the past as effect to a cause. All societies are compact of such things as institutions, customs and tradition, conventional habits of life and thought whose influence in retarding change must be considered. Besides the internal factors in the Russian situation, there are also external influences affecting it. It must be viewed as an arbitrarily selected section of a larger whole, as a part of a world process in which incidents, events, and social movements are surface indications of underlying forces of which, in this age, the great characteristic forces are economic.

Much of present anxiety, or of exultation as the case may be, would not prevail at the so-called Soviet compromises with capitalism if the habit of a large, detached, historical perspective were more prevalent. In that respect, it may be well to quote the historian John Richard Green: "Writing of history," he says, "or its interpretation, needs philosophic insight or it becomes a mere chronicle of events. . . . Proportion is apt to be forgotten and the greater currents of history to be lost, while intellectual and moral forces which tell only on long intervals of time are overlooked in the crowd of minor incidents which affect human action directly and at once." Or, we might quote Premier Lenin, when, in one of revolutionary Russia's darkest hours, because he was capable of rising to a historical perspective, he, calmly, in seer-like mood made the following affirmation to Colonel Robins, United States chief of Red Cross in Russia:

"This system is stronger than yours because it admits reality. It seeks out the sources of daily human work-value and, out of those sources, directly, it creates social control of the state. Our government will be an economic social control for an economic age. It will triumph because it speaks the spirit of the age that now is. . . . You may see foreign bayonets parading across Russia. You may see Russia dark again as it was dark before. But the lightning out of that darkness has destroyed political democracy everywhere. It has destroyed it not by physical striking it, but simply by one flash of revelation of the future."

(To be concluded in our next issue)

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

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

VANCOUVER, B. C., NOVEMBER 16, 1922.

WINTER STUDY TIME.

IT would appear to be obvious that as there is a recognized antagonism between wage worker and master in the field of production, that antagonism must find recognition and must manifest itself in the body of thought in the community at large. It would seem that since in the workshop the wage worker is in constant dispute with his master over rates of pay, hours of labor, protective devices and so forth, and has come to distrust the workshop viewpoint of the employing class, he would readily get to the bottom of that viewpoint on the outside. But it is not so, and because it is not so, or because it is insufficiently so, the S. P. of C. study classes in history and economics are promoted. If the employing class bring their resources to bear in suppressing workshop aspiration toward material betterment in any sense, it is reasonable to suppose that they will also order to the same end all the agencies at their command in the educational field, or in any or all of the avenues of instruction, news information or general institutional administration. We know that they do, for instance in school and college, press, pulpit and in the political arena. The worker's viewpoint, considered in relation to these institutions, is still the viewpoint of his master and it is the chief among their functions to keep it so. The aim of our educational efforts, therefore, is to uncover an altogether different viewpoint than that which expresses harmony and identity of interest and ideas between wage worker and master. Our aim in education is to find the fundamental class antagonism that exists, to be able to recognize it, to understand how it arose and to find its solution.

Education—the word itself—appears to be something formidable to the average worker. He is not yet familiar with the course of education as presented by the socialist. A first acquaintance with that course brings out, as a general rule, all the antagonism and conflict of the preconceptions and prejudices set in his mind and fostered by the agencies we have already referred to. He discovers that, particularly concerning such like matters as religion and patriotism, his ideas and our explanations are far apart. As his study and observation proceed, and his understanding and knowledge develop, his attention is devoted to the realism of life and the observable facts of his everyday experience are recognized and accounted in the order of his ideas. God, king and country, the “ever was and ever shall be” ideas of religious supernaturalism give place to the idea and understanding of social change in society's development, and the supremacy of man in harnessing to his use the forces of nature as a gradual and unfolding process. Reliance upon the superior man, the great man, charged with ideas supposedly self-conceived, gives way under an acquaintance with the historical process of development to the appreciation of the influence of social forces, broadly considered, in influencing change and moulding the characters in whom it finds its advocates.

Thus, a consideration of the facts of life in present day society at once directs our attention to the past. It is obviously true that present day society, considered in relation to the manner of its wealth production and distribution, performs that function insufficiently well to satisfy the needs of the com-

munity as a whole. It is a fact apparent that the working class position is subjective, that its condition is miserable at the best of times, employed or unemployed. At the present time, the “system” itself (so-called) functions only in such a manner as to manifest its own weaknesses. Thus our new student, interested very likely in the condition of the members of the working class as these weaknesses affect them, will find himself at once, through the pressure of present events, thrown into a consideration of the past. The process of accounting for capitalist and wage worker will of necessity bring to his attention patrician and plebian, chattel slave and feudal lord, the day of serfdom, of guild masters and journeymen, of propertyless and property-owning, the historical background of proletarian and bourgeoisie.

Only by establishing the connecting thread between past and present will present events be understood. The weakening structure of bourgeois society appears now to be beyond repair, otherwise, that is, than beyond argumentative repair. The hollow speeches of the “great men” representative of the present ruling interests in the British elections are devoted entirely to a defence of capitalist administration. If there is a ruling class confidence today it is surely inspired by working class ignorance. Positively nothing else can explain, not only working class approval of their point of view, but the confidence of their own impudent, audacious and barefaced lying in support of it. In support of their property right it is no doubt natural that the master class, through their spokesmen, should present this as “the best of all possible worlds,” “our country and our empire,” of course, being the most favored areas contained in it. Mr. Lloyd George, for instance, a political porch climber of considerable skill and repute, in support of capitalist property right in the essential means of social wealth production portrays acquisitiveness as this property instinct, an inherent and deep rooted quality in human nature. That is to say, in actual fact, this instinct is satisfied in but a very small proportion of the population (the capitalist class) at the expense—forever and all time, we are to suppose—of the greater proportion (the working class). This nice, innocent, natural and harmless instinct which supposedly expresses itself in the washwoman's half crown in savings is presented to cover the greed, covetousness and hoggish indecency of what we know as the capitalist class, rulers of what we are to consider as a natural order. Their property right is to be “let alone,” as a natural right. There is an instinct of which these apologists prate not quite so much—on their own behalf—the creative, or constructive instinct which, in the social sense, is expressed in the fields, factories and workshops of social production, and is monopolized entirely by the workingclass. In the eyes of our capitalist it is the outstanding virtue of the worker that he actively exercise this latter instinct. How else could the capitalist property instinct find satisfaction?

This is perhaps a digression from the course of our discussion, but it is illustrative of the flimsy apologetics of the defenders of capitalism, the substance of which is, concerning property right as a subject under general enquiry nowadays, that the working class have a “right” to property, but if they have none—and it is agreed that they have none—that is simply incidental!

The hold of the ruling class on their system loses its grip proportionately with the inability of that system to furnish the means of procuring a livelihood to its workers. If the process of production cannot smoothly continue, the maintenance of the workers devolves in some fashion upon the rulers of society. The workers themselves have no surplus. The system is brought to the point where the production process is seriously out of gear. It is usual for the working class to attend to the material wants of society at large; if the rulers are now to attend from their store to the feeding of the workers, the whole structure of the capitalist order is challenged and thus we have the present tendency toward enquiry into its fundamental principles, and the consequent tissue of more or less convenient accomoda-

tions mouthed by Lloyd George & Co., with their usual hard faced attitude, amid a welter of such general community miseries as should welcome a universal and wholesome proletarian damnation.

It would appear that we are educators with a prejudice. Well, we deal with matters of fact. We are appreciative of the circumstances surrounding us and of the trend of events. We make no false pretensions. Such theories or interpretations as we harbor are useless to us if we cannot find their corroboration in the world of reality. Such a matter, for instance, as the identity of interest between employer and employee is clearly disproved in the everyday experiences of employer and employee. Our student will find in economics the theoretical expression of the fact. There is no desire and no need to add color to it.

Our new student may find education to be unattractive and to contain no pleasurable appeal, although we hope not. He may be a good observer whose contact with the multiplicity of events has impressed him as being sufficient for his understanding, in keeping with his needs as a rule-of-thumb, practical man. Our educational courses will prove interesting to him. They are certain to be useful. He may present the common excuses that he cannot with confidence master the terrible words. Certainly he will find all sorts of excuses for indolence if he sets out to look for them. He may already have sagacity and no “learning”, or he may have some learning and little sagacity. In any case, he will most readily appreciate and understand a treatment of those things he already has a practical acquaintance with.

His class-room skill will eventually parallel his skill in the workshop and, unlike the uses to which his workshop skill is devoted—the profit of his master—his class-room skill he will be able to bring to his own use and the use of his class.

SECRETARIAL NOTES.

COMRADE LESTOR reports good meetings already held in Alberta at Trochu, Swallowell, Collingwood and Aberdeen. Carbon was unfortunately missed through his misunderstanding of the arrangements, aided by a slight attack of sickness on Comrade Lestor's part. He reports bankruptcy on the part of the farmers in the sense of financial health, but he records, nevertheless, and asks us to extend appreciation of the hospitality extended to him all round. Other meetings to be held in Alberta beyond the schedule given in our last issue, are:—Dec. 5. City Hall, Medicine Hat. Dec. 6. Seven Persons. Dec. 7. Whittla. Dec. 8. New Dale School. Dec. 9. Winnifred. Dec. 10. City Hall, Medicine Hat. Dec. 11. Thompson. Dec. 12. Many Berries.

The comrades in those districts will, we hope, bring to the meetings as many of their friends as they can induce to come.

Calgary reports the resumption of class study work with the oncoming of the hard weather. Two or three weeks will see the Comrades there back to their usual winter activity with the usual good educational results.

We regret that the “Clarion Mail Bag” feature is crowded out this issue through pressure on space and last minute hurry. This, however, will allow for a wider treatment in next issue.

VANCOUVER, B. C.

Western Clarion office and D. E. C. address, 1305 Tower Building, 500 Beatty St., Vancouver, B. C. address all mail matter to P. O. Box 710.

Local (Vancouver) No. 1. Headquarters address, Rooms 11 and 12 Flack Block, 163 Hastings Street, West, Vancouver, B. C. Business meetings every Tuesday, 8 p.m. History Class every Thursday, 8 p.m. (Present textbook, “Socialism, Utopian and Scientific”). Economics class, every Sunday at 3 p.m. (Present text book, “Wage-Labor and Capital”). Propaganda meetings every Sunday, 8 p.m., Star Theatre, Main Street. Every encouragement is offered to new students in class work, and every effort should be made, and the invitation is here extended, to bring as many workers as possible to attendance.

CLARION MAINTENANCE FUND.

Following \$1 each:—J. Mitchell, C. Bright, A. M. Davis, Mrs. Annie Ross, J. G. Brown.

Norman McAulay \$2; John F. Maguire \$2; B. H. L. \$5; Local Ottawa (per Peter T. Leckie) \$3.50. Comrades of St. John. N. B., (per M. Goule) \$12.50.

Above, C. M. F. receipts, 27 Oct. to 14 Nov., inclusive, total \$30.

Setting Us Right

TWO LETTERS.

South Vancouver, Nov. 4th, 1922.

Mr. E. McLeod.

Dear Comrade:

In your editorial of the issue of Nov. 1st, you quote the following: "Incidentally it recently ejected through the members' expulsion route J. Kavanagh and J. G. Smith."

This excerpt is in relation to the Workers' Party. I wish you to give publicity to my denial of this statement. Comrade Kavanagh, myself and several others resigned from the Workers' Party on account of the action of that party in regard to the "Federationist". A perusal of the columns of the "Federationist" for the last few months will give sufficient explanation of our action.

Yours for Progress,

James G. Smith.

S. Vancouver, Nov. 3rd, 1922.

Editor, "Western Clarion," City.

In your editorial, appearing in the last issue of the "Western Clarion" you make the statement that J. Kavanagh and J. G. Smith were ejected from the Workers' Party via the members' expulsion route. That statement is untrue. Your source of information for the same was either malicious or ignorant, probably both.

I resigned from the Workers' Party for reasons fully explained to its C. E. C., and which, in view of recent happenings locally, must be apparent to anyone laying claim to a modicum of proletarian understanding. I trust you will give this denial as much publicity as the statement of which it is a contradiction.

J. Kavanagh.

Editor's Note:—We had understood it to be a case of expulsion, whereas it appears to have been a case of resignation. Comrade Smith will, no doubt, appreciate a reminder that "those who never do anything never make mistakes."

The point we had laid under stress, it should be noted, was not the matter of expulsion particularly but of divided opinion, which, on any fundamental principle of cohesion renders unity useless in organizational practice. As a slogan of working class appeal, with a surface appearance of plausibility and solidity, it has been lately carried to popular favor in working class sentiment. Momentarily, it is a kind of "intoxicating self-deception." It is, in fact, as at present used, an importation from the literature that has come out of the Russian Revolution and, as Marx said of the French literature (following upon 1830) imported to Germany to the use of the "philosophers" of that country, its practical significance is lost through the fact that the social conditions of the country out of which it arose have not immigrated along with it. We stress the point again that unity of form is dependent, in practice, upon a uniformly accepted and understood point of view and common purpose. Without that, disintegration will sooner or later show itself in any organization. The circumstance of resignation or expulsion is altogether a minor detail, a matter of form secondary to and dependent on that condition. To be brief: its importance is only a matter of personal importance.

A THIRD LETTER.

Vancouver, B. C., Nov. 2nd, 1922.

Editor Western Clarion,

Sir:

I was amazed (on reading your editorial in the issue of November 1st) at the dogmatic manner in which you allude to the activities of the S.D.F. of forty years ago and since, for only a person entirely ignorant of the propaganda of the S.D.F. of that period could so flagrantly mis-state the case.

The present writer, and the late P. Curran, M.P., were the two first in Scotland to join the S.D.F., and as we grew stronger, and enthusiastic to emancipate the world, we had not the slightest or corrupt thought of compromise or affiliation with other parties.

Hoping you will publish this and show your readers by avoiding in the future such palpable errors, and therefore a more trustworthy guide of public thought. I am,

Yours fraternally,

Joseph Cairney.

Editor's Note: The Social Democratic Federation, formed in 1884, was an extension of the Democratic Federation of 1881. The late H. M. Hyndman was active in the formation of both. The D.F. (1881) was largely an embodiment of the views of political radicals and followers of Henry George. Nationalization of the land was its most important feature. The S.D.F. (1884) took on a decidedly Socialist complexion, extending its programme toward socialization of the means of wealth production, distribution and exchange. It is worth noting that before the S.D.F. was a year old William Morris withdrew in disagreement with its policy and was active in the formation of the Socialist League. (Many writers have ascribed the division to personal reasons, but while splits and divisions give vent generally to a measure of personal feeling, only surface observers fail to see that there is an underlying variation in ideas and a reason for it.) Morris undoubtedly entertained a deep dislike of politics in its practical and some-

times personal expression, and he did not see it as an essential course. The Socialist League devoted itself to Communist propaganda, alienating itself from promoting practical, political measures, and lived for several years. Morris, we seem to remember reading somewhere, afterwards supported Hyndman's candidature for Burnley, acknowledging a change in his ideas.

In 1893 the I.L.P. was formed. Later (1900) the Labor Representation Committee of trade unions, Socialists (including the S.D.F.) and co-operative bodies was formed to discover ways of maintenance for political representation. Payment of members of parliament by the state was not at that time a practice in Great Britain. The L.R.C. became the Labor Party, following upon the general election of 1906, at which time the L.R.C. candidates met with success, forty (odd) of them being returned, which represented about 80 per cent of their nominees; the majority were trade unionists. Over the years the S.D.F., in face of the uncertain and indefinite policies it pursued and in face of the growing favor accorded the I.L.P. and trade union combination, found itself out of favor among those who saw the need for a clear and independent policy free from compromise and at the same time shut out from success in the political arena by the policy of the I.L.P. At the same time it was common to find members who belonged to both parties and speakers who spoke in agreement on both platforms. Arising out of this there naturally grew such parties as the S.L.P. and the S. P. of Gt. B. In the meantime the S. D. F. had followed the policy, for whatever reason, of changing its name, and became in turn S. D. P., National Soc. P. and B. S. P. It is now again the S. D. F., and as far as we are aware its influence is not great. It did good work in what were really pioneer days in the modern expression of the Socialist movement. It would be foolish to overlook that fact. It would be equally foolish to ignore the lesson of its errors.

When we mentioned the S. D. F. in last issue of the Clarion we had in mind that the chief lesson to be learned from the history of the S. D. F. as a party was that in seeking to merge itself in action with other bodies, by lack of a certain rigidity, it had lost its identity as a useful organization in a day when a definite and intolerant socialist expression was sorely needed in what was a time of early development and consequent confusion.

We have no wish to treat our correspondent unkindly or to belittle in any way the strenuous efforts of forty years ago. That credit being extended (and it was never withheld) we are unable to see wherein Comrade Cairney finds cause in our remarks for his disturbing amazement. Not only the beginning, but the present appearance and the in-between periods must be taken into account in considering any organization and its history. It seems to us that our correspondent has failed to appreciate that fact, which must serve as our excuse for entering a note of this length.

ALBERTA NOTES.

Alberta and Saskatchewan P. E. C. of the S. P. of C. Secretary, R. Burns, 134 a 9th Avenue, West, Calgary, Alberta.

Local Calgary. Same address as above. Business meetings every alternate Tuesday, 8 p.m. Study class in Economics every Thursday at 8 p.m. Correspondence from all parts of Alberta and Saskatchewan is earnestly invited from all comrades interested in the organizational and educational work of the Party, and attendance at the classes and interest in their development and usefulness will be welcomed.

HERE AND NOW.

SPACE PRESSURE eliminates any elaboration on the wheeling process this time. The figures themselves, however, are eloquent of the good work and interest of many comrades.

Following \$1 each:—Peter T. Leckie, A. W. Osterberg, T. W. Nevinson, F. Shaw, R. C. McKay, J. Cunningham, M. S. Grott, J. Mitchell, D. Melver, G. Helliar, Cumberland L. and A. Assn., A. M. Davis, T. B. Roberts, C. Bright, E. Collings, W. McQuoid, A. Whitechurch, A. Lescaubeault, J. M. Sanderson, M. Goudie, G. Hubbard, T. Hanwell, S. J. Rose, J. G. Brown, Jim Fletcher, S. Oliver, C. Lester, B. C. Provincial Library, Norman MacAulay, Fred Harman, Geo. Silk, C. A. Stein.

E. Anderson \$1.12; M. Zusire 50c; C. F. Orchard \$1.50; Mrs. M. A. Lewis \$1.50; H. G. Minko \$2; M. Farrell \$2; Dr. Inglis \$2; H. Judd \$2; J. A. McDonald \$2; A. A. McNeill \$3; Roy Addy \$2.50; Jim Cartwright \$4; W. A. Pritchard \$17.

Above, Clarion subs., 27 Oct. to 14 Nov. inclusive, total \$73.12.

MANIFESTO

— of the —

SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

(Fifth Edition)

Per copy 10 cents

Per 25 copies \$2

Post Paid

The Moscow Trial

SOVIET RUSSIA has had its first brush with treason, and the trial, lasting for days, has awakened more response outside Russia than inside. Which is significant, both of the temper and perception within Russia, and the mind and intent of the Western world. For were the Russian people alarmed by the event, it would be proof of the same confusion of mind as exists among the "advanced" democracies of "this freedom." And because they are not so feared and worked up explains the fear or the anxiety of the bourgeois rulers, conscious of its inner meaning.

The fundamental charge against the 20 unfortunate social revolutionaries was for receiving "western gold" and assisting the Western Governments, for the purpose of overthrowing the Soviet Government. They were alleged to be in league with the reactionary agents and forces of the Capitalist world, who were blockading Russia, invading and pillaging her territory; bringing famine, disease, pestilence, in the desolate wake of attempted conquest; bringing death to unnumbered thousands; hindering the reconstruction and organizations of the Soviet regime, and challenging the legality of the Soviet Government. The summary of Krilenko—the representative of the people—painted the result in terrible colors, clearly establishing the connection between the Revolutionaries and the capitalist agents; bringing home—to some of the accused at least—conscious collusion and understanding; involving their dupes in the same toils of participation; and coinciding with a demand for a capital penalty. It is all so pitifully tragic.

Representatives from the yellow-pink Internationals of the several countries attended the trial. But they shortly left—disgusted with the "travesty of justice." There was no excitement, no emotion, no enthusiasm. Nothing but the ominous calm of an austere realism, and cold precision of reasoning. Moscow was quiet as a rural village. Patriotic palaver there was none. Nor the pomp of capitalist legality. Nor political oratory. Nor the chaos of "moderate" revisionism. It was an atmosphere wholly unsuited to the fastidious constitutions of "labor representatives."

But there was no travesty of justice. Every opportunity was given the defense; every freedom of means and choice and counsel. Nothing was disallowed. Nothing suppressed. Every point and counter was weighed and balanced with the simple deliberateness of single purpose. Against Moscow no claim can be sustained that justice was voided, or right denied, or truth distorted or suppressed.

What those "socialist" representatives saw was the superficial purpose of internal politics; the cross play of party interests, necessarily interwoven with the deeper issues at stake. In the broad politics of Soviet reality, they saw only the narrow occasions of a sordid necessity. The confused ideals and wavering tactics of their own misconceiving reformism. Aurora-like, fleetly in trembling folds across the subtler fundament of Soviet purpose. And they were altogether blind to the intermingling of the fact of accomplished revolution; with the plain failure of political idealism. And that revolution—successful though it was, and conscious of its own wrath and purpose—struggling desperately with political necessities, and a sluggishly misunderstanding proletariat, steeped in the ethic of political radicalism, they utterly failed to grasp the inherent and inviolate antagonism between the ideal and purpose of logical communism and the "practical" policies of moderation.

What those representatives did not see was the workers' Republic, fighting for its life in the maelstrom of Capitalist diplomacy. They did not see that its success was the ideal of completed communism. They did not see that its triumph was the earnest of the triumph of the world proletariat. They did not see the social democracy in the Soviet dictatorship, mustered in martial array against the cohorts of militarism. And they could not see

(Continued on page 8)

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

BY F. J. McNEEY.

IN this article we will examine a few extracts from the pamphlet, "The Lumber Industry and Its Workers," as I stated in my last article on the same subject. But before doing so, a few words concerning the pamphlet itself will not be out of place.

It begins with a very good short history of the development of the lumber industry on the American continent from the earliest times down to the present. Following this is a review of the conditions, good, bad and indifferent, mainly bad and indifferent, in the various camps throughout the country in which the lumber workers live and work, which is also true to life. Next, we are informed as to what the I. W. W. has done to improve those conditions in the past, and what it plans to do in the future, all of which is open to discussion. And lastly, we are given a further statement of the principles, objects, methods and "beliefs" of the organization. This last is the only part we are concerned with here, so without further preliminaries I will quote a passage from page 72, regarding governments:—

"The I. W. W. is non-political. It is not concerned with the empty forms of a fake political democracy. Industrial unionists know popular government can never be anything but a fraud and a sham under a system of industrial autocracy. Knowing the industrial government is the real government they refuse to waste time electing the hirelings of Wall Street money kings, but aim straight at the root of all human power-control of industry."

Again, on page 87 we find another spasm concerning governments.

"The objection is often made to the I. W. W. that it does not believe in government. This is a mistake. The I. W. W. believes in the most efficient form of government possible. Some revolutionists object to the word government on the ground that it implies a governing class and a class that is governed. The word government is used here in the sense of self-government, or administration of their own affairs by the workers."

It would appear from the above that there is a multiplicity of governments. A whole flock of them. We have governments to the right of us, to the left of us and in front of us, in short, governments to throw at the birds. Amidst all this volley and thunder about governments one is tempted to ask a few questions. First, how many senses can the word government be used in? Second, if a popular government can never be anything but a fraud and a sham would an "unpopular" government be the genuine article under a system of industrial autocracy? Third, does the I. W. W. admit that there is a governing class and a class that is governed? If such classes exist then it stands to reason that the word government cannot possibly imply anything else. On the other hand, if human society is not divided into two classes, "a governing class and a class that is governed," then the word government does not imply anything and all this talk of the I. W. W. about the governments it "believes" in, is bunk. In other words, when there is no longer a "governing class and a class that is governed" the word government will be obsolete.

However, let us forget about the "word" government for a few minutes and examine the condition or state of affairs that the word government "implies." It is generally agreed by authorities on the subject that all government is based on armed force. In fact, no person of any intelligence would dispute the statement. And armed force, as far as human society is concerned, is the court of last appeal. But what is armed force? Bodies of men armed with weapons of various kinds. Now remember, the I. W. W. itself has told us that "bullets and political revolution" are means of political action. And don't forget that bullets are used not only for revolutionary purposes but also to suppress revolution. What more do we need than this to

prove that all government is political?

When we come to theories regarding the use and function of government we do not find the same agreement. Among the many and various ideas and "beliefs" in this respect we find three main theories which we will examine here briefly. The first one we will take up is the most ridiculous one of all: the theory that the function of a government is to govern itself; in other words, "a government of the people, by the people, and for the people." This theory agrees with the "self-government" theory that the I. W. W. "believes" in. Let us see how it works out. Here we are, the whole population of us. We are going to govern ourselves in our own interests. We will arm ourselves with rifles and machine guns and make ourselves do as we want ourselves to do, even if we have to use force. And if ourselves refuse to do as ourselves want ourselves to do we will turn the rifles and machine guns on ourselves, and kill ourselves off. Now it is obvious that no reasonable person could doubt the "efficiency" of such a government. There is only one possible objection to it, namely, that it does not exist, it never did exist, and it never could exist. In short, it is a joke.

Next, we have the theory that the function of a government is to protect the rights and interests of the good, honest, virtuous, pious, peaceful citizens against the treachery and duplicity of the bad, vicious, avaricious, blood-thirsty scoundrels who seek to destroy everything that is good and beautiful, out of pure perversity. These natural born criminals, fiends of iniquity, are supposed to exist in considerable numbers within our own borders, not only that, but also outside of our own country there are whole nations of them awaiting a favorable opportunity to spring upon us, hence the need of government to suppress the scoundrels within, and protect us against aggressors such as "blonde beasts," "yellow perils," and "Mohammedan hordes" from without. Now if this theory applies at all, it must apply to all countries. But here is the rub. If the government of every country is a government for the protection of the good people against the bad, then we must assume that the good people are in control in every country and are able to keep their own bad people in subjection. Where then are the cut-throat nations that are likely to attack any country from without? On the other hand, if we assume that the bad people are in control in some countries then the whole theory falls to the ground. To save space I will leave this question open for the present. Think it over.

Lastly, we come to the theory that appears to exasperate the I. W. W., the theory that a government (not the word) "implies a governing class, and a class that is governed." In other words, wherever we find a government we find two economic classes, one class governing the other. The suppressed class is either governed for the purpose of exploiting it in the interests of the governing class, or else it is a class that was at one time a governing and exploiting class itself and is suppressed for the purpose of keeping it from starting any more monkey business of that kind until all classes have been abolished. This theory also explains the cause of war between nations or groups of nations, which is not a case of good, honest, pacific nations merely defending their culture and religion or their "right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" and so forth against the attack of cut-throat nations who are devoid of all these things, but in capitalist society is purely a question of commercial rivalry, a conflict between different capitalist groups for control of the world's markets in order that they may have a place to dispose of the surplus wealth produced by their wage slaves. Or to put it another way, the conflict between either classes or nations is not a question of ethics, but is purely a question of the

conflict of economic interests which must sooner or later come to a head and eventually be decided by political action, the final and ultimate form of which is the application of armed force. It is hardly necessary to point out that a government of persons by armed force, which is the only way they can be governed, is one thing, and the "administration of affairs" or things is another. Bodies of armed men are not required for the administration of affairs, but they are required for the government of persons.

There is another theory of government that I have not included in the above classification, for the simple reason that it is not of earth, earthy, and therefore requires special treatment. I refer to the "shadow" theory. If a government, "popular" or otherwise is a mere shadow, "a fraud and a sham," a poorly informed person might wonder what it was maintained for at all. "Industrial unionists know," however, that the capitalist class spends millions of dollars annually to support an army and a police force just to ornament the landscape with pretty uniforms. Come to think of it, this "shadow" theory of government reminds one of Christian Science.

If a policeman strikes you over the head with his club you are not actually struck, you just think you are. If he takes you by the collar and throws you into jail you are not in jail at all; that is a mere hallucination. If a soldier shoots you or sticks his bayonet through you, don't worry; you are not shot or struck, you just imagine you are. It is all "a fraud and a sham." "There is no such thing as matter: nothing but divine mind."

That will be enough about government for the present. Now we will have a little economics for a chaser. It is strange, indeed, that a working class organization which puts so much emphasis on the need of "economic action" would not try to make itself conversant with, at least, the elementary principles of Marxian economics, which is the only school of economics of any use to the working class. Many people, no doubt, imagine that all well informed members of the I. W. W. are Marxists. Let us see. On page 84 of the pamphlet, "The Lumber Industry and Its Workers," we find the following passage:—

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

Now, you Marxian economists, keep your shirts on. Will somebody please hold Peter Leckie by the coat tail for about five minutes? I have a few remarks to make myself. I am not going very deeply into economics, I merely wish to state that the passage just quoted is about the best exposition of the capitalist class conception of capital that I ever read, namely, that wealth or the means of wealth production is capital, at all times and under all circumstances. Let us try and get this. "A capitalist is one who owns capital and lives off profits produced by workers." Good! "Capital is necessary to society;" and will still exist with a system of industrial democracy, but it will then be owned by the useful members of society. Good again. Then we will all be capitalists and live off profits produced by ourselves. I hope Peter will be able to unravel this tangle, it is too deep for yours truly. Oh! I almost forgot that we started out to answer the question, "What Is the I. W. W.?" Well, you can search me," I give it up. I am stuck. Send and get the pamphlets, read them, and figure it out for yourselves.

A Talk With New Students

BY C. STEPHENSON

Approach to the study of History and Economics. Their relationship and functions. Factors bearing upon the studies. Importance of the studies, their application and essential usefulness to workers.

HISTORY and economics, as studies are inseparably related to each other because, if history may be said to be a record of man's past experiences, a record of what men have thought and done, the science of economics deals with the conditions of economic existence which underlie and determine the scope and method of men's thoughts and actions. In their broad cultural aspect those studies should cultivate a scientific habit of mind, history in particular inculcating a sense of proportion, and thus increasing our powers of judgement, through the study of racial experiences. Experience is a necessary factor in all skilful activity; otherwise we should remain forever novices in all the arts of life, those of industry as equally those of politics or the strictly cultural. Specifically, these studies should be brought into relation with the conditions within the current social situation. What follows is in the nature of discussion of that specific purpose.

To commence with, economics and history may be defined briefly as follows: Economics, is the science which deals with the laws governing the production of wealth and of its distribution among the respective classes in society. A study of history looks to the discovery of the laws of social development; as a record of man's past experiences history enables us to add past to present experiences, and thus to form new syntheses of thought and action.

It has been charged against orthodox economists that their treatment of economic phenomena has resulted in a science that bears little or no resemblance to the realities of the world of actual experience: that as a help to understanding social problems it was practically worthless, whatever might be its due as a somewhat tedious mental discipline, or as a body of business maxims useful in the quest of profits. Hence, no doubt, the bad name of economics as "the dismal science." The science has, it seems, mainly concerned itself with the classification of economic phenomena, looking to "states of equilibrium" or "normality" towards which all things in their movement are supposed to tend. Hence its economic laws, as traditionally conceived, "are laws governing the accomplishment of an end—that is to say, laws as to how a sequence of cause and effect come to rest in a final term." Orthodox economics is thus, it is claimed, a science of statics rather than a true evolutionary science looking to a continuous process, a science which should explain phenomena in terms of an unremitting process of consecutive change in which the sequence of cause and effect are cumulative. Other apparatus of exposition characteristically used by orthodox economists have been "conjectural" history as a substitute for a true genetic account of economic phenomena as, for instance, on the origin of capital; an "economic man," a pure individualist who, coldly calculating, balanced present pain of abstinence against the advantages of future pleasure to come from an increase to his savings loaned to a needy, generally a thriftless, producer. Thus, the critics.

We shall, however, claim an exception to those strictures on the method of the orthodox economists in behalf of Marxian economics. Marx's treatment of economic phenomena lends itself easily to an explanation of social affairs. In regard to the study of history, we should guard ourselves against falling into the easy habit of reading history merely to gratify either curiosity or a sentimental interest in the past. As well as may be, we are to strive, in

both our studies, to make causal connection between the responses of man in thought and action at whatever period in history and the conditions of his social environment, industrial, economic and political.

The Marxian system of economics is especially helpful to the student of social problems, especially helpful to the understanding of those that bear most heavily on the working class, because the profit feature and the process of labor exploitation, the most characteristic features in the economy of capitalist production and most far reaching in their effects on social life are the main concern of Marx. An enumeration of a few of the matters discussed by Marx may in degree indicate how "close up" his science is to working class experiences:—

Origin and nature of Capital; Primitive accumulation of capital in so far as it is not due to the transformation of slaves and serfs into wage-workers is due to the dissolution of private property based on the labor of its owner; source of modern capital since, due to exploitation of propertyless (in the means of production) wage laborers; process of exploitation explained in Marx's theory of surplus value; dependence of wage-laborers on capital; causes of periodic industrial crises described; unemployment; part-time employment, effect on wages, low standard of living, poverty—effect on population mentally, morally and physically; control over all industrial and economic processes exercised in the interest of capital investments; rate and volume of industrial output regulated by business needs of a profitable price; social knowledge of ways and means and capacity for producing goods and services of unknown dimensions, but exceeds what is possible under the limits imposed by the needs of capital for a profitable price, perhaps by a thousand times; over population, or "population encroaching on the means of subsistence" has reference to the limits imposed on production by the needs of capital, but has no meaning in relation to social capacity for producing goods and services; wages, their nature discussed; competition as a principle in social life; commodity nature of labor power when sold on the labor market; rent, interest and industrial profit as component parts of surplus values accrue to capitalist class by virtue of "right" of ownership; knowledge of the industrial arts (technology) as of all the other arts of life, in large part inherited from the past and is carried by society as a whole, chiefly by the productive portion of it; is a social product; yet the advantages of an advance in the state of the industrial arts accrue to the owners of the means of production; on the other hand, such advances make the workers more and more dependent on capital and lower their economic and social status in relation to that of the owners of large capital.

While studying the impersonal facts of the social environment, we should not forget Socrates' admonitory "Man, know thyself." The human element in the complex of things postulated by the orthodox economists, as has been said, was an "economic man," a wholly rational creature whose conduct in reaction to his economic environment was based on lightning calculations in pleasure-pain equations. A science of economics based on such a conception of human psychology can lend but little aid to an understanding of man's responses to the conditions of his environment: Man, in fact, is fundamentally a many-sided, composite creature of unlearned and unchanging instinctive tendencies to action, which, functioning as his egoistic and herd interests, have had and have now a survival value in the struggle for existence. It is they that make anything worth while that is to be done; determining the ends of activity, they are the initiators of action and supply the driving power. Built upon this groundwork of non-rational instincts, emotions and desires, the rational faculties are relatively superficial, biologically of later development. This would imply, as the psychologists assert, that man is not primarily a rational animal, but is a rationalizing animal.

The weakness of the old psychology was that it laid too much emphasis on the intellectual faculties

as factors in man's responses. Let the reader ask himself, however, how much of the apathy among the masses of the people on social affairs at present may be due to purely rational considerations; or, on the other hand, how much of it may be due to fear, that great inhibitor of action? Sensible of the precarious state of social affairs and ignorant of causes and a solution, daunted by the complexity and stupendous nature of the problem, may not fear, a moral cowardice, paralyse in some degree both the mental and physical activity required to meet the situation? In the immediate affairs of our lives also fear haunts both the employed and the unemployed, the one that they may lose and the other that they may not find employment.

Again, what of the fear of being thought orthodox? Man is a herd animal, gregarious, and in the main conforms willingly to the herd law, its conventional moralities, norms and standards. When, through individual interests or intellectual conviction, or through loyalty to the interests and standards of a partial herd within the larger he departs from the herd law, he does so with timidity as a rule and with many a backward look, fearful of the disapprobation of the herd falling upon him, maybe in drastic ways. Add to the natural instinctive pull and influence of the herd the situation in a pecuniary society where social prestige is based on success in acquiring wealth: where the possessor of wealth draws the same easy, natural, spontaneous homage to a believed superior worth as did military prowess in feudal times, or as intellectual power received from the scholars who conversed with Socrates, or moral power from those who, denouncing the things of this world put off from them worldly wealth, and followed the "Man of Sorrows." In effect, then, the wealthy, the successful accumulators of wealth are honored in our social life as the natural leaders of the herd by all of its members whom habituation to the ways of life and thought of such a pecuniary society has led to feel that way, which is almost all its members. It is the moralities that conserve the interests of this wealthy class, their standards, tastes and preferences that dominate the schools "and echo thence from press and pulpit, bench and rostrum into the streets of life," thus reinforcing the herd compulsions towards conformity.

What of that non-rational humility that is prevalent among the producing class, due to inferiority of pecuniary status? Does it exist in such intensity as to be such a psychological "fixation" as an inferiority obsession? Always there is insidious propaganda carried on to create that feeling, to break down our pride and self-respect in the interest of the parasite ruling class. The latest fad in this direction is the pseudo-scientific chattering about the prevalence of morons or undeveloped mentalities in the population. Responsible scientists, however, are beginning to discredit the purely arbitrary tests used and the interpretations put upon the data so obtained. (See "Survey" for Oct.)

There is also the matter of interest in religions of various kinds. How much of that interest is a compensatory interest, a substitute interest for other interests frustrated of normal expression? Is not religion to many people a substitute activity? Are not its emotional "states" of religious experience and ecstatic exercises, its easy, thoughtless babble of millenniums here or hereafter, all modes of escape from an alien and unfriendly world of complex social problems that involve a strain of perplexity and thinking?

A study of humanity and its behavior in face of the conditions of its social environment will shew the social problem, as the psychologists contend, to be one of maladjustment between a fixed human nature and the economic conditions and institutions in-

(Continued on page 8)

THE MOSCOW TRIAL

(Continued from page 5)

themselves, the visionless tools of that militarism, betraying every hope, blinding every purpose, sacrificing every ideal of the lion-hearted, but chloroformed proletariat. And they were errant even superficially. For those 20 social Revolutionaries were traitors, not only to the Soviet Government, but to their own principle. They plotted the downfall of the former with an enemy they pretended to despise. They were "giving comfort" to powers they were leagued together to destroy. And they were assisting the foes of a regime, sanctioned (as they could not but know—as their outside relationships proved), not by the illusionary majority of capitalist politics, but by the real majority of Soviet democracy.

What would happen to us on this American continent in like circumstances? What would Press and Pulpit say? What happened to the political nondescripts during the late war? How fared it with Kirkwood and McLean? What happened to Roger Casement, to the Irish Nationals? to Haitian patriots? to Edith Cavell? to the Dutch danceuse whom the French trapped in the toils? And what did those scourgers of Socialism do, those haters of tyranny; the Gompers and Vanderveldes, the Rosenfelds and Brantings, the Walkers, McDonalds and Snowdens—what did they say to the "White Terror" of Mannerheim? to the excesses of Horthy? to the iron handed Fascisti? to the plundering of the Far East? to the slayers of Liebnicht and Luxemburg? to the torturers of Georgia? to the thimble-riggers of Johannesburg? to the mandated "protectionists" of Africa? What? Why, what one would expect them to say: Nothing!

The Moscow trial has passed almost without comment, almost without notice. Yet it is more momentous to us than all the spectacular foamings of capital. It preaches the stern gospel of revolution. It shows its realities, stark and clear and conscious. Its unwavering solemnity of purpose, its unimaginative simplicity, its dispassionate logic, its cold incisive reason. It points the moral of unity; the value of understanding; the futility of direct action without direct comprehension. It demonstrates the forces arrayed against us; it speaks with an authority there is no mistaking. It may outline the fruition of hope and thrill us with the glory of its ideal. But it also determines the volitions of action, and its undeviating earnestness of principle. And clear and unflinching as a rain-washed sky it declares that having put our hand to the plough of revolution there is no looking back; no recession from the necessities which confront us. R.

A TALK WITH NEW STUDENTS

(Continued from page 7)

herent in the capitalist organization of society. The following generalization about human life, if true to the facts of human nature, as it seems so to the writer, can leave no doubt of the utter failure of modern civilization to fulfil its terms:—

"That human life is dynamic, that change, movement, evolution, are its basic characteristics.

"That self-expression, and therefore freedom of choice and movement are pre-requisites to a satisfying human state."

But why has civilization failed to realize those terms? The question is rather too large an order to answer here. However, consideration is called to man's power to acquire habit and to the inertia of old social habit in the movement of all things else. Such a consideration will go far to furnish the answer. New material conditions of life may appear, brought on by a change in the state of the industrial arts, which demand a reorganization of institutions or social habits, a new adjustment of customs, conventions and institutions to conform with the needs brought on by the change. But always there is the lag leak and friction of social habit, the inertia of traditional habits of thought and stereotyped, conventionalized methods of action in which our instinctive impulses to action are enchained.

But also, it is just here, in respect of man's habits, that the possibility of social change depends. It is

because these concepts, customs, conventions and institutions are at bottom habits of thought and action and, like all other habits, capable of change, that social change takes place. Habits of thought, as such, are always in process of change and, if the new drift of the material conditions of life sets in strong enough and endures long enough, sooner or later action will follow thought and human activity will find itself exercising along certain new stereotyped channels which we term custom, convention, institutions, ways and means of socially organized activity.

To sum up: I have tried to show the human factor as standing in causal relation between the material conditions and the institutional facts of a social environment, and that human being are the active agents through which social change is accomplished.

In these days, it is the accident of history that the working class are to be the agent of great social changes. Our studies of man, his history, and of the economy of his society, will show us upon what lines the education of that working class should proceed, and to what of its defensive and constructive instincts we should appeal. So, against the inertia of old tradition and social habit, we may set knowledge and the scientific habit of mind; and pride and self-respect against a fear born of ignorance and a humility unworthy of the only useful class in society.

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-sweating 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.

**Socialist Party of Canada
PROPAGANDA MEETINGS**

STAR THEATRE, 300 Block, Main Street

SUNDAY NOVEMBER 19.

Speaker: W. A. PRITCHARD.

MEETINGS EVERY SUNDAY.

All meetings at 8 p.m.

Questions. Discussion.

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	\$1.85
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	15c
Manifesto, S. P. of C.	10c
Evolution of Man (Prof. Bolsche)	20c
Causes of Belief in God (Lafargue)	10c
Shop Talks on Economics (Marx)	15c
The State and Revolution (Lenin)	25c
Value, Price and Profit (Marx)	15c
Economic Causes of War (Leckie)	35c
The Protection of Labor in Soviet Russia (Kaplun).....	15c
Civil War in France (Marx)	35c
Eighteenth Brumaire (Marx)	35c
Christianism and Communism (Bishop W. M. Brown).....	25c
A Worker Looks at History (Starr).....	30c
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 \$2.00
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 sub.)
Western Clarion, P. O. Box, 710,
Vancouver, B. C.
Official organ of the S. P. of C. Published twice
a month.
Subscriptions: Canada, 20 issues, \$1; Foreign:
16 issues \$1.

Enclosed find

Send "Western Clarion" to

WESTERN CLARION

A Journal of
CURRENT
EVENTS

Official Organ of
THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

HISTORY
ECONOMICS
PHILOSOPHY

No. 880.

EIGHTEENTH YEAR

Twice a Month

VANCOUVER, B. C., DECEMBER 1, 1922.



FIVE CENTS

The War Documents

"When they invoke against us our Secret Treaty with Russia, we shall invoke our public Treaty with humanity."

(Jean Jaures, at Brussels, July 29, 1914).

THERE has been published already such a mass of material dealing with the events which led up to the world war of 1914-18 that at first glance it would seem superfluous to spend further time and space on the subject. In any consideration that has been given in this journal heretofore, or in the literature of the Socialist Party of Canada generally to the war and its causes, the prevailing note has been that wars between nations arise not in defence of the weak against the strong, not for national honor nor through ideal motives, but to advance the material welfare of one national group of propertied interests as against another, and that the reasons for alliance of resources between groups are marked out in the routes of trade and in projected or actual territorial dominance. (In this connection, if the reader has not already done so he will do well to read Peter T. Leekie's "Economic Causes of War." See Literature Price List, page 8). The soundness of that analysis is well borne out by the facts, and every document that has any bearing on the war and the diplomatic negotiations concerning it fully bears it out. It is with some of these documents we would deal here. There are Clarion readers in outlying districts, no doubt, who are unable to follow the investigations that have been made into the mire of diplomatic correspondence incidental to the war and the general mass of literature connected with it.

In "The Nation" (N. Y.) Oct. 11, 1922 there appeared an article entitled "They all Lied" by Lewis S. Gannett, and in the International Relations section of the same number there appeared some excerpts from various official documents, presented to show that the Entente Powers were not taken by surprise by the war and that they had been for years preparing for it. The "Manchester Guardian" last June carried articles of a similar nature, showing that the plea of an "unprovoked attack" on an unsuspecting France and Belgium as the outcome of a carefully planned German conspiracy was voiced by the British government to conceal the facts of the case, a course which in their judgment was necessary to the success of their war policy. We shall come to that in time. The mass of material is so great as to make it difficult to judge what to select. The work done in this particular field by E. D. Morel (now labor M. P. for Dundee) has received wide acknowledgment. Indeed, several books and many articles have been written based upon his work, and the documents now coming to light well bear out his conclusions. His point of view as to the primary power of international diplomacy in causing war is subject to question, but his point of view does not hinder the usefulness for us of his researches. We shall acknowledge Mr. Morel's help beforehand, therefore, for much of our material in what we have to say.

"The Nation" documents (beforementioned) are largely based on the "De Siebert" documents and on "Un Livre Noir" (A Black Book). Our

readers will remember the text of the secret treaties of the Russian Imperial Archives reproduced from "Pravda" of Nov. 23 (and later) 1917, in the "New York Evening Post" and in the "Manchester Guardian." They have now come to be known as the "First Collection" of the documents of the Russian Imperial Archives. The De Siebert documents are known as the "Second Collection. — Entente Diplomacy and the World: Matrix of the History of Europe, 1909-14."—Contains in 762 pages 853 documents. (New York: G. P. Putnam and Son. \$12.50). De Siebert was secretary of the Imperial Russian Embassy in London. The correspondence of Isvolsky, Russian Ex-Foreign Minister, is contained in the "Third Collection" to be published in two volumes, the first of which has already appeared as "A Black Book" under Soviet Government direction. (No attention is given to these documents by the press, but every attention is given to Clemenceau, or Lloyd George, or Lord Birkenhead or whoever is still prominent in maintaining the farcical story about Germany "willing" the war deliberately and exclusively). Lewis S. Gannett quotes also Professor S. R. Fay's "New Light on the Origins of the War", which is an analysis of Kautsky's disclosures of the German archives and of those of Richard Gooss in the Austrian archives. There is a point Mr. Gannett has missed in his documentation, and that is in quoting Sir Edward Grey's Note to M. Cambon, French Ambassador to London, November 22, 1912. His quotation is quite correct as it appeared in the British White Book, as follows:

From time to time in recent years the French and British naval and military experts have consulted together. It has always been understood that such consultation does not restrict the freedom of either government to decide at any future time whether or not to assist the other by armed force. We have agreed that consultation between experts is not and ought not to be regarded as an engagement that commits either government to action in a contingency that has not arisen and may never arise. The disposition, for instance, of the French and British fleets respectively at the present moment is not based upon an engagement to cooperate in war.

You have, however, pointed out that, if either government had grave reasons to expect an unprovoked attack by a third Power, it might become essential to know whether it could in that event depend upon the armed assistance of the other. I agree that if either Government had grave reason to expect an unprovoked attack by a third Power, or something that threatened the general peace, it should immediately discuss, with the other whether both governments should act together to prevent aggression and to preserve peace, and if so what measures they would be prepared to take in common. If these measures involved action the plans of the general staffs would at once be taken into consideration and the governments could then decide what effect should be given to them.

That quotation is quite correct, as taken from the British White Book. But Sir Edward Grey read that note in his speech to Parliament, August 3, 1914, and he omitted entirely the last sentence, which we have placed in italics. The note as read by Grey appears in Hansard (Aug. 3, '14), Vol. 65, p. 1813 and is without the last sentence. Viviani, French Premier, read the full text in the French Chamber next day, and in full it was incorporated

in the French Yellow Book. So it had to go in the British White Book in full. Viviani had no need to hide the truth—that there were definite Anglo-French military and naval plans laid beforehand, and jointly agreed upon as disclosed in that last sentence. He could rely upon French support against Germany, in view of the geographical position of France and the expected response to the French chauvinist appeal against Germany. But Grey had to conceal the policy the British Foreign office had pursued consistently since Lord Lansdowne's term of office as foreign minister, which policy had resulted in what has now come to be known as the "encircling offensive". Grey had to present his case in conformity with the many public declarations made previously by himself and other British government ministers: that the British Foreign office had entered into no agreements whatsoever of a military character with an outside power. Here is a reference to some of these declarations:

On 10th March 1913, Mr. Asquith, replying to a question in the Commons from Lord Hugh Cecil, denied that England was under an "obligation arising owing to an assurance given by the Ministry in the course of diplomatic negotiations, to send a very large armed force out of this country to operate in Europe." On 24th March 1913 he made similar denials in reply to questions from Sir W. Byles and Mr. King. On 14th April, 1913, Mr. Runciman in a speech at Birkenhead denied "in the most categorical way" the existence of a secret understanding with any foreign Power. On 3 May 1913 the Secretary for the Colonies, Mr. Harcourt, declared publicly that he "could conceive no circumstances in which Continental operations would not be a crime against the people of this country." On 28 June 1913 the under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, Mr. Acland, declared publicly that "in no European question are we concerned to interfere with a big army." On July 1, 1913, Lord Loreburn (Lord Chancellor, from 1906 to 1912) said, "that any British Government would be so guilty towards our country as to take up arms in a foreign quarrel is more than I can believe." On 23 April 1914 and again on 11 June 1914 Sir Edward Grey confirmed, in the House of Commons, Mr. Asquith's assertion, made 10 and 24 March 1913, of British freedom from engagements with Continental Powers. (Albert Jay Nock, The Myth of a Guilty Nation, Page 103).

It is thus very easy to see why Grey omitted that last sentence. His government had denied the existence of any commitments of such a nature. By the time the British White Book was published the nations were at war and the admission was not then subject to effective discussion. In the meantime, on 3rd Aug. 1914 (same day as Grey's speech), Mr. Asquith said in the House of Commons:—

If I am asked what we are fighting for, I reply in two sentences: In the first place, to fulfil a solemn international obligation . . . Secondly, we are fighting . . . to vindicate the principle that small nationalities are not to be crushed in defiance of international good faith.

The small nation, of course, was Belgium. The Belgian appeal was a great help to Sir Edward Grey. The "treaty" of 1839 was well used. It was a device used to present the case in a false light. The "German" had to become a "Hun." Let us quote Mr. Lloyd George as he expressed himself just eight months before the war broke out:—

The German army is vital, not merely to the existence of the German Empire, but to the very life and independence of the nation itself, surrounded as Germany is by other nations, each of which possesses armies about as

(Continued on page 2)