

# ORGANIZER KINGSLEY'S LETTER.

Vancouver, B. C.  
Oct. 27, 1903.

Editor "Socialist":

I note in your issue of October 25 a communication from Alex. Lang, referring to an alleged fusion dodger printed and distributed in this city on election day; also your comments thereon.

The manager of the "Western Clarion" assures me that the dodger in question was not printed in the "Clarion" office as you state. However, this has nothing to do with the matter, as the "Clarion" office is a job office and no doubt prints much stuff that would fail to pass muster before an "International Censor" did one exist.

Was the dodger in question in any way authorized by the Socialist Party of British Columbia? From all the evidence obtainable it would appear it was not. If some simple and misguided member did willfully and maliciously distribute said treasonable document, I would humbly suggest that this would be a matter for the Party here to deal with, rather than a matter involving international complications.

However, as you opened the matter up, you certainly will not object if

we see it through. Coming from an author and critic of world-wide reputation like yourself, your comment on Mr. Lang's letter is particularly rich. You need not be disturbed about Mr. Lang's preference for a Capitalist Labor Party. He expressed no such preference other than that determined by the fact that the I. L. Ps were decent and clean in their campaign, refrained from indulging in lying and abuse and were at all times inclined to listen to reason and argument while the S. L. P. Griffiths was quite the opposite.

Such preference speaks well for Mr. Lang's judgment and good taste, and by no means indicates any treasonable proclivities upon the part of that gentleman towards the Socialist movement.

You say "to support unionism on its own field, the industrial field, is Socialist policy."

To support unionism in its own or any other field is not Socialist policy, but the policy of those who are ignorant of the economics of the movement they so loudly profess.

The continued attempt to make such ridiculous folly the policy of the Socialist Party of the United States is responsible for much of the confusion

so widely in evidence in California and other places.

The trades-union movement never rises above the matter of wages, the price of labor power. Better conditions through higher wages is its cry.

As the labor market is always overstocked it is forced to accept within its ranks only a portion of the workers and the struggle soon develops into one between union men and non-union, the latter forced by their necessities to get work somehow, the former trying to maintain their wages and their monopoly of the jobs. The trades-union movement never rising above, or looking beyond the question of wages, never threatens the existence of the capitalist system, but on the contrary tends to prolong its existence. Its tendency is therefore to prolong the misery of the working class as a class. It is therefore essentially reactionary in its character.

Reaction is at no stage of the game Socialist policy. The policy of Socialism is revolutionary. It is not the policy of Socialism to bolster up, or prolong the wage system, but to overthrow it.

To support unionism when it leaves its own field and enters politics on a capitalist basis is treason to Socialism.

When unionism enters politics it must of necessity do so upon a capitalist basis, and it by no means leaves its own field in doing so. The premises upon which unionism builds are the premises of capitalism. The economics of unionism is the economics of capitalism. Unionism views everything from the wages standpoint; it sees nothing but wages, and it remains within its own field and is strictly logical in its action when it casts its political lot with that party which promises the best wages.

To support unionism either in the industrial or political field is treason to Socialism.

In your judgment "every Socialist in Vancouver should have voted for Mortimer Stebbings and Griffiths." If your judgment be sound then the position of the S. L. P. is correct. If so what excuse can you offer, for the existence of the S. P., your own party? The S. L. P. was in existence for some time prior to the birth of the S. P. If the S. L. P. position is correct enough to warrant the following of your advice in the matter of voting for Griffiths, it would seem to be rank impudence upon the part of the S. P. in having been born.

When you condemn fusion with one party and recommend it with another, you seem to be like unto that person whose "consistency had lost its jewelry."

For heaven's sake don't refer to these S. L. Ps. as "Socialists on a Socialist platform." They are ignorant fanatics upon a platform almost as meaningless as that of the S. P. of the United States.

The movement in this Province is equipped with "Seven League Boots," because it caters not to trade unionism or any other ism by teaching unsound or shady economics. It considers the workers as class only, and recognizes the class struggle to be a political tuggle for supremacy, betwixt

the working class and the capitalist class.

Less censorship and faultfinding, and a more thorough spreading of sound economics will speed the revolution.

You of the United States have much to do, and before you go abroad to remove the "meat" from your neighbor's eye, be sure you get the "beam" out of your own.

E. T. KINGSLEY,  
Org. S. P. of B. C.

### ROTTEN IN IDAHO.

Lewiston, Ida., Nov. 9, 1903.

Dear Comrade:

Things are rotten in Idaho. This is something which you perhaps already know, but as attention has never been called to the fact, I feel it my duty to make a roar. Local Lewiston has labored under the load of inefficiency and criminal neglect of party affairs by the state committee a long time and now feels it time to protest, as witness the enclosed resolutions passed at our last meeting.

We have a constitution in Idaho, the party has, a poor one at best, but even its express commands are not obeyed. When the constitution was adopted a couple of years ago, Sec. I of Art. III read: "The members of the state committee shall be elected annually, by and from the districts which they respectively represent by a referendum vote. They shall take their seats in the month of April." There was no provision for nominations or for election, but such things could have been fixed. Just about, or a little before the time for election, an amendment to the constitution was submitted to the membership, and carried, providing that state officers hold their positions for two years. Anyone with a grain of common sense would know that such a law would not apply to the officers already in power, but that the state committee so construed it is evidenced by the fact that no call was made for nominations for state committee.

The present state officers are therefore holding office illegally. Were they doing anything for Socialism it would not be so bad, but they are not. Three weeks or more ago, to wit, the 16th of October, Local Lewiston sent dues for three months to the state secretary and to date have heard nothing from him or the dues. Under the circumstances we feel it our duty to protest to the national secretary and call for reorganization of the state. In our efforts to establish a class-conscious, effective and efficient Socialist organization in Idaho we be speak the sincere and earnest effort