WESTERN CLARION

A Journal of CURRENT EVENTS

Official Organ of
THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

HISTORY ECONOMICS PHILOSOPHY

No. 845 | Twice a Month | VANCOUVER, B. C., JUNE 16, 1921 | FIVE CENTS

The British Government Engineered the Coal Strike

SOME spiritists claim that houses built for and inhabited by individuals having earned sinister reputations, attract towards them characters of similar disposition long after the original tenants have passed out of existence.

There is one case such people could cite with the assurance of its standing the severest acid test of analysis that could be applied—No 10 Downing St., London, England.

The original owner of this house, Sir George Downing, was a soldier in Cromwell's army during the revolution and, afterwards, a spy in the pay of the merry monarch, Charles II

George (the "Sir" came later) Downing, for so many gold pieces and certain privileges, betrayed the more dangerous and most powerful of his Puritan comrades to the scaffold.

At this business he prospered and, having acquired the lease of a portion of land, he set a number of masons and craftsmen to build three houses which he numbered 10, 11 and 12 Downing Street, which he named after himself, and in No. 10 he made his home. Satisfied with this rascal's ability, as shown so far and the possibility of still greater development as a knave, the King knighted and then promoted him to the post of Secretary of the Treasury.

When the lease lapsed, the property reverted to the Crown, which happened at the moment to rest on the head of George II., who made a present of No. 10 to Sir Robert Walpole. Walpole was afraid to accept it without some condition; for, wise as he was, he knew that even though a man be worth his price he sells himself by accepting it. The condition, which he succeeded in attaching to this present from the King to the chief of state, was to make No. 10 Downing Street belong in perpetuity to the First Lord of the Treasury.

Of all the knaves who have inhabited this house since the demise of the original owner none ever succeeded in earning more gold pieces and honors than the last occupant, Lloyd George, who was domiciled here until "Chequers Court" was presented to the nation. If Carlyle was right in his judgment that "England possesed a population of twenty millions,—mostly fools," it is just as likely as not that the Welsh lawyer is more fool than knave, more clown than statesman, while his supporters are simply dropping to lower stages in imbecility than was the case in Carlyle's day. Whether this be so or not depends upon the reader's judgment after I have duly presented this case of the miners' strike.

The strike itself is but one more event in the long sequence arising out of the European war. When the British Government decided upon operating the mines for the duration of the war and for a certain period afterwards, the policy was laid down that they would be responsible for the wear and tear of machinery, the payment of labor power, royalties to landowners, on whose ground the collieries are located, and an even rate of interest to the stock and bondholders of the different companies.

When you remember that there is a great difference in the quality of coal in certain districts, that the cost of production in some is greater than in others, which imposes an extra handicap on such managers to obtain for their lovers of unearned increment (!) the average rate of profit, you will agree that government control under these circumstances was a considerable advantage to colliery owners in those districts where the grade of coal was lowest and where the cost of production was highest.

With the signing of the armistice and the demobilization of the great armies of workers in the huge war plants, the machinery of production in such industries became still—the power that moved them was shut off. And from this moment a surplus of coal was inevitable, a surplus which must always mean idle workers clamoring in the market for jobs. A "ca' canny" policy was adopted by the miners as a check upon this condition, a policy which brought the landowners, whose royalties are proportionate with the tonnage produced, to the seat of government, and into the press, with wrathful cries to "Speed up!" And in the general chorus the stock and bondholders, who were getting fat with export coal selling at £12 per ton in Italian ports, at which price there was a great demand, lent their voices The miner simply retorted, "Pay more!"

With the signing of "Peace" and the arrival of the first portion of the German indemnity paid in coal, a problem was presented to Lloyd George that required his closest attention. France at this time was receiving more free coal than Britain, and her domestic requirements were less, that is for factory purposes, her factories, taken on the whole, were not operating to the same extent as in Great Britain. Moreover, she was now operating the mines in the Saar basin and repairing others less damaged by the retreating German army. With all this enormous quantity of coal the French capitalists engaged in export trade in a market strongly dominated previously by British merchants. The foreign policy of the French Government was planned with a view to possessing the Rhur district and Upper Silesia; in these countries immense deposits of coal and iron ore are found, and the under currents of secret diplomacy were set in motion with the view of controlling these areas. A successful achievement in this direction by the French would have been detrimental to the coal industry of Britain, and it is this which is responsible for the present relations between these two countries, and the change of heart in the British Government's body towards Germany.

From 1920 onwards not only was France plucking the trade in coal from British owners, who were blind to the fact that monopoly prices were bound to react upon them, the coalowners in the United States became a strong competitor in such markets as the British had played a hold-up game for some time. Coal was rushed from Atlantic ports to European centres, cutting the price of British half in many instances.

Knowing that his foreign policy had been somehow mis-calculated, the loss of export trade being the proof of it, George decided on decontrol of the coalfields at the earliest moment, to place once more on the shoulders of the former owners the trouble of making profits for themselves, leaving only the free coal from Germany to be disposed of by the government for national purposes.

You will remember that towards the close of 1920 trade depression was universal throughout the capitalistic countries, and in Great Britain the textile industry collapsed, while shipyards laid off men by the thousand.

At that time the surplus of coal on hand must have reached a prodigious size, and even then it was rumoured in the press of the country that decontrol would take place soon. In March the government plot had ripened; on the 31st the mines were turned over to their previous owners. And the immediate effect of this was the decision of the company operators to declare a cut of nearly 35 per cent. in wages.

The cut in wages was made first in those districts where the general nature of the mine was such that the cost of production was greater than in others, and the average rate of profit harder to obtain. The effect of this reduction was the strike itself. The miners' proposition was to have the profits of the entire mine regions pooled, the output of coal from the rich and the poor districts to be, as it were, the property of one, and a uniform rate of wages to all the different grades of labor used in the mines. In this proposition is involved a sacrifice on the part of those miners in the highest paid districts, who were prepared to accept a reduction in wages sufficient to make up the difference paid in the worst areas. As the "Westminster Gazette" puts it: "The miners will not think it fair that a man should be paid only £2 5s. a week in the Forest of Dean for doing exactly the same work as another man is paid £5 1s. 9d, for doing in South Yorkshire."

The "Nation" (British) in an editorial commentary on the situation has this to say:

> "Because the Prime Minister could not keep faith with the coal miners and has made the men engaged in that industry distrust him; because his **foreign policy has temporarily ruined the British coal trade,** and his treatment of it at home has set the two parties to it by the ears, because he would not ask the richer coal-owners to reduce their profits, though the better-to-do-miners were willing to cut their wages to help the worse-paid ones; because he had called on thousands of workmen to accept, at an hour's notice, wages on which no self-respecting man with a family can live, and on a scale of reduction such as no household economy could stand; because he has talked the language of the class war, when there was not a scrap of reason for using it, and then encouraged that war by summoning one part of the nation to take arms against the other . . . . . it seems as if the country had beenmuddled into a struggle which no one wants, from which no one can benefit, and which a good half of the people cannot understand."

In short, it was Lloyd George's plan to blot out from the ken of men the records of his defeats at the hands of the diplomats of Europe and elsewhere, by deliberately precipitating a bloody war in England, reduce the British slave class to still lower depths of degradation and poverty, or leave them to fertilize the fields for the next generation. Like Macbeth he must go on murdering first one and then another. But Macbeth was a nobleman compared with this fellow.

R. K.

Materialist Conception of History

FOR BEGINNERS

THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

Lesson 15.

IN a previous lesson it was pointed out how manufacturing towns with their division of labor had grown up in country places outside of the Guild restrictions, and a new system of economy began to make its way. The older methods of production still continued alongside of the new, but gradually the new system asserted its superiority. The introduction of machinery in industry became possible only when manufacture had instituted the division of labor, dividing up the old handicrafts into simple detail operations. Not until the laborer performed one simple task could he be displaced by the machine. A machine could not take the raw material and produce the finished commodity as the handicraft worker could, but when the work was divided up in sections, as it is in the boot industry, machines could be made to perform the separated, simplified operations. Machinery at first was driven by animal power, windpower, and man power. The domestic system had simple machines operated by the producers in their cottages. Later when the machine grew bigger and man's power insufficient to operate the machine, animal power was introduced. Arkwright's first power loom was worked by a bull. The first factory towns grew up near streams, utilizing the water to drive the machinery by waterwheels. Arkwright's factory was water driven.

The extension of the world's markets and the ever-increasing size of the machines made it necessary to find a more reliable, regular and controlled power. The invention of the steam engine or its improvement by Watt in 1769, and the blow furnace for smelting iron and the discovery that pit coal could be used to smelt iron, led to the building of ironworks beside coalpits. The introduction of the fly shuttle enabling weavers to double their output of cloth led to the invention of the spinning-jenny, and spinning frame to keep them in supply with the yarn used in weaving. Therefore machinery applied in one branch of industry became imperative in other branches in order for them to keep step. Crompton in 1779 combined the advantages of Hargreaves' spinning jenny and Arkwright's spinning frame, by his invention of the spinning mule. The weavers then were unable to keep step with the increased production of yarn until Cartwright introduced the power loom, which brought weaving up to spinning again.

The cotton industry still suffered for lack of raw material until Whitney invented the gin for cleaning cotton. Previous to this machine, 5 or 6 pounds of cotton per man were cleaned per day; after its introduction one man cleaned 1,000 pounds per day. De Gibbin says: "In little more than 20 years all the great inventions of Watt, Arkwright and Boulten had been completed, steam had been applied to the new looms and the modern factory system had fairly begun. Nothing has done more to make England what she is at present, than this sudden and silent Industrial Revolution, for it increased her wealth tenfold and gave her half a century's start in front of the nations of Europe." The cutting of the Manchester Canal increased the facilities of transportation of this increased machine production.

Bell's printing cylinder (1783) used to print calico goods with the aid of one boy and one man, performed the work formerly done by 200 blockprinters. Coalmines were improved because the steam engine enabled man to dig deeper shafts, and the difficulties of mines which flooded were overcome with steam pumping-egines. The industrial towns with large populations became linked up near coalmining centres. The textile industries, being in the forefront of development, were the first to be revolutionized. The discovery in the new process of procuring coal and making iron helped the textile industry by supplying any amount of fuel and machinery. In 1740 the production of iron annually was 17,000 tons, which increased to 68,000 in 1788. De Gibbon points out that this increased wealth enabled England to come out of the European struggle with France in the Napoleon wars, as the foremost nation in Europe. The consequence of this Industrial Revolution was an increased population and a large proportion of the people living in poverty and distress. The workers had now become a proletariat. Labor was impoverished—1st, by the base money at an earlier period; 2nd, robbed of his guild capital; 3rd, evicted of the land because sheep farming was more profitable to the landowner; 4th, the enclosure of the common lands. The labor, having nothing left but his power to labor, became a wage slave.

Although the Industrial Revolution made a great demand for labor, the workers were not much benefitted by it. Compared with the old methods of production the new machinery was easy to operate and required no high degree of skill or training in craftsmanship. Women and children were brought into the factories, regardless of age or health conditions. They were employed in old barns, sheds and other places that had been transformed into hives of industry. The story of the enslavement of boys and girls, mere infants, the buying and selling of pauper infants, their violent deaths and secret burials, are the basis upon which is built up England's commercial supremacy of the last century. Children of 9 and 10 years were dragged out of bed at two, three and four o'clock in the morning and compelled to work for a bare subsistence until 10 11 or 12 midnight. In the potteries, children of eight years work from 6 a.m. to 9 p.m. and sometimes all night, with no increase of pay. Read "Capital," vol. 1, page 268, on where Marx takes his illustrations from magistrates, government commissions, etc.

The handicraftsmen could not compete with the tireless machine and its abundant supply of cheap labor. They were obliged to seek employment in the factories and take advantage of the poor law, which had become a subsidiary medium to encourage low wages. The worker could not own the machine, engines or factories that the new manufacturing system required. These could only be possessed by the merchants who had large amounts of capital at their disposal, obtained by exploiting labor at home or by selling slaves to planters of the new world, and the various other methods of plunder we previously noted during Elizabeth's reign. Free competition and non-intervention of the State was the new doctrine. Each profit seeker was a law unto himself, and would brook no interference with his right to do what he liked with his own. Production increased with leaps and bounds, and great fortunes were made out of a helpless working class who were ground between the factory wheels. The death rate increased enormously, disease was rife in industrial centres; men, women and children were struck down and deformed. Thousands of families left the country-side to go to the towns, making the conditions still more acute for those already there. Factories and warehouses sprung up in a night, old buildings were transformed into factories and filled with machinery, side by side grew up the slum districts as a fitting monument to the coming of the capitalist class.

With the increased population, and the shutting out of foreign wheat with a heavy tariff, corn rose from 30s. a quarter to 45s. The farmers became prosperous, then the landed class increased their rents. They also increased their property by more enclosure acts. Rogers points out that the agricultural laborer with his land allowances was able to eke out an existence, but the enclosure acts of the eighteenth century, and the influence of the Corn Laws, made it necessary for him to supplement his wages by an allowance from the parish fund. With the loss of the commons and the increased price of food the worker was worse off than the worker a hundred years previous.

We have reached the stage of the proletariat, therefore let us see the difference that existed to distinguish the slave, serf and wage slave.

The slave of antiquity, like the slaves of backward countries of recent times, e.g., in the southern States of America, did not sell himself by the day and hour like the wageslave today. He was sold generally for a life period. The master, in his own interests, had to maintain his property just as he would a horse today. The worker today has not the assurance of existence like the slave. He becomes the property, not of an individual but of the capitalist class, to whom he sells himself by the hour, day or week. No buyer, no wages. Therefore his existence is not as secure as the chattel slave. There must always be workers under capitalism, but the competition for a job brings starvation to individual workers. The slaves did not compete with one another. When he was sick he was attended; when work was slack he was fed, clothed and sheltered, because he was property that would deteriorate. The modern worker is thrown on the scrap heap as the worker is so cheap, while slaves cost up to 1,000 dollars in the Southern States. The slave was not regarded as a member of society but a working animal. The modern worker is recognized as a member of society and to this extent is on a higher social plane than the slave. In order to set the slave free it required the abolition of a single private property relation—private property in slaves. The freedom of the wage-slave involves the abolition of the private propety of the machinery of production.

When agriculture was the main occupation and land the principle means of production, the workers were feudal serfs. When landownership controlled the means of life slavery was unnecessary, because whoever owns the means of life owns those depending on such means. The serf could not be sold, neither could he sell himself. He was tied to the feudal state in which he was born. He also, like the chattel slave, had a guaranteed existence. He had the use of a piece of land for maintaining his own family, and worked part of his time for the lord. Unlike the worker, the serf stood outside of the competition with his fellow serf. The modern worker, divorced from the soil and all other means of production is a free laborer; he is free to sell, but he must sell (because he is free from having anything else to sell other than his labor power) in order to live. Under the guild system during the early development of industry, the craftsman protected himself from outside competition and regulated trade by his guilds. To participate in these guild industries an individual had to be a member, which involved an apprenticeship period. His apprenticeship finished, he became a journeyman and was only a temporary wage-worker, sooner or later becoming a master. The relation between master and worker was a close personal one. They worked together and lived together in the same house, sometimes he married his master's daughter. His tools were small and were his own. He belonged to the same social class.

The modern worker and the capitalist relation is a money relation, and they belong to two different social classes. The gigantic tools are not easy to acquire, like the petty tools of the handicraft period. The worker today cannot pack his tools in a bag and take them home with him. It is easier to own a hammer than a steam hammer. The handicraftsman made the finished article, he was a composite laborer. The division of labor has made the worker a detail laborer. The master and worker in the guild, combined against competition. The modern worker may be crushed with competition without any injury to his master; the master may benefit by this competition. The worker having to depend on himself for a livelihood, hunting for a job, has a higher standard of manhood than the slave or serf whose existence was secure through their property relationship and the absence of competition to ob-

(Continued on page 3)

The Agrarian Question

(Continued from issue of May 16th)

(Thesis Adopted by the Second Congress of the Communist International, Moscow, August, 1920)

4. The revolutionary proletariat cannot make it its aim, at least for the near future, and during the beginning of the period of proletarian dictatorship, to win this class over to its side. The proletariat will have to content itself with neutralizing this class : i.e., with making it take a neutral position in the struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie. The vacillation of this class is unavoidable, and in the beginning of the new epoch its predominating tendency in the advanced capitalist countries will be in favor of the bourgeoisie, for the ideas and sentiments of private property are characteristic of the possessors. The victorious proletariat will immediately improve the lot of this class by abolishing the system of rent and mortgage, and by the introduction of machinery and electrical appliances into agriculture. The proletarian state power cannot at once abolish private property in most of the capitalist countries, but must do away with all duties and levies imposed upon this class of people by the landlords; it will also secure to the small and middle peasantry the ownership of their land holdings and enlarge them, putting the peasants in possession of the land they used to rent (abolition of rents).

The combination of such measures with a relentless struggle against the bourgeoisie guarantees the full success of the neutralization policy. The transition to collective agriculture must be managed with much circumspection and step by step, and the proletarian state power must proceed by the force of example, without any violence, toward the middle peasantry.

5. The landed peasants or farmers (Grossbauern) are capitalists in agriculture, managing their lands usually with several hired laborers. They are connected with the "peasantry" only by their rather low standard of culture, their way of living, and their personal manual labor on the land. This is the most numerous element of the bourgeois class, and the decided enemy of the revolutionary proletariat. The chief attention of the Communist Party in the rural districts must be given to the struggle against this element, to the liberation of the laboring and exploited majority of the rural population from the moral and political influence of these exploiters.

After the victory of the proletariat in the towns this class will inevitably oppose it by all means, from sabotage to open armed counter-revolutionary resistance. The revolutionary proletariat must therefore immediately begin to prepare the necessary force for the disarmament of every single man of this class, and together with the overthrow of the capitalists in industry, the proletariat must deal a relentless, crushing blow to this class. To that end it must arm the rural proletariat and organize soviets in the country, with no room for exploiters and a preponderant place reserved to the proletarians and the semi-proletarians.

But the expropriation even of the landed peasants can by no means be an immediate object of the victorious proletariat, considering the lack of material, particularly of technical material, and further, of the social conditions necessary for the socialization of such lands. In some, probably exceptional cases, parts of their estates will be confiscated if they are leased in small parcels, or if they are specially needed by the small-peasant population. A free use must be also secured to this population, on definite terms, of a part of the agricultural machinery of the landed peasants, etc. As a general rule, however, the state power must leave the peasants in possession of their land, confiscating it only in case of resistance to the government of the laboring and exploited peasants. The experience of the Russian proletarian revolution, whose struggle against the landed peasants became very complicated and prolonged owing to a number of particular circumstances, nevertheless shows that this class has been at last taught what it costs to make the slightest attempt at resistance, and is now quite willing to serve loyally the aims of the proletarian state. It begins even to be permeated, although very slowly, by a respect for the government which protects every worker and deals relentlessly with the idle rich.

The specific conditions which complicated and prolonged the struggle of the Russian proletariat against the landed peasantry after the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, consist mainly in the fact that after the coup d'etat of October 25—November 7, 1917, the Russian revolution traversed a stage of "general democratic" (in fact, bourgeois democratic) struggle of the peasantry as a whole against the landowners, and there was further the low standard of living and scarcity of the urban proletariat, and finally the enormous distances and exceedingly bad transport conditions. As far as these adverse conditions do not exist in the advanced countries, the revolutionary proletariat in Europe and America must prepare with much more energy and carry out a much more rapid and complete victory over the resistance of the landed peasantry, depriving it of all possibility of resistance. This is of the utmost importance, considering that until a complete, absolute victory is won the proletarian state power cannot be regarded as secure and capable of resisting its enemies.

6. The revolutionary proletariat must proceed to an immediate and unconditional confiscation of the estates of the landowners and big landlords, that is of all those who systematically employ wage labor, directly or through their tenants, exploit all the small (and not infrequently also the middle) peasantry in their neighborhood, and do not do any actual manual work. To this element belong the majority of the descendants of the feudal lords (the nobility of France, the Lords in England, the former slave owners in America) or financial magnates who have become particularly rich, or a mixture of those two classes of exploiters and idlers.

No propaganda can be admitted in the ranks of the Communist Party in favor of an indemnity to be paid to the owners of large estates for their expropriation. In the present conditions prevailing in Europe and America this would mean a treason to Socialism and the imposition of a new tax on the laboring and exploited masses, who have already suffered from the war—which has increased the number of millionaires and multiplied their wealth.

In the advanced capitalist countries the Communmunist International considers that it should be a prevailing practice to preserve the large agricultural establishments and manage them on the lines of the "Soviet farms" in Russia. It is also advisable to encourage collective establishments (Communes). In regard to the management of the estates confiscated by the victorious proletariat from the owners of large landed property, the prevailing practice in Russia, the cause of economic backwardness, was that of the partition of this landed property for the benefit of the peasantry, and comparatively rare exceptions were the preservation of the so-called "Soviet farm," managed by the proletarian state at its expense, and transforming the former wage laborers into workers employed by the state, and into members of the soviets managing these farms.

The preservation of large landholdings serves best the interests of the revolutionary elements of the population, namely, the landless agricultural workers and semi-proletarian small landholders, who get their livelihood mainly by working on the large estates. Besides, the nationaliation of large landholdings makes the urban population, at least in part, less dependent on the peasantry for their food.

(To be continued).

———:o:———

C. M. O'BRIEN DEFENCE FUND

Previously acknowledged, $104.85. A. C. Roga, Lettonia, $1—total to 13th June, $105.85.

MATERIALIST CONCEPTION OF HISTORY

(Continued from page 2)

tain it. The serfs, slaves, and guildsmen were narrow and conservative in their outlook. Even when they rebelled they were reactionary, like the early proletariat who broke the new machines when introduced.

The growth and expansion of modern industry tends to broaden the minds of the modern worker. He learns that it is not the past but the future wherein lies his salvation. Apart from the wage laboring class in the 17th century there was an independent producing rural class, who combined spinning and weaving in the home with the cultivation of a small plot of land. The producers originally bought their own raw materials and sold the finished cloth. With the growth of commerce in the 17th century, there stepped in between the rural producers and the market a merchant class, who brought the raw materials to these domestic factories and took away the finished article to the market. In this way the rural producers became more and more dependent on the merchant class. These must be distinguished from the modern workers who own neither land or tools, but it was out of the ruins of rural production, out of the expropriation of the more or less independent producers, originated the modern proletariat. The breakup of the feudal system, the migrations to the towns, the shutting out of the later immigrants from the guilds, helped to furnish the first elements for the formation of a labor market. The division of labor in the workshop became the means of raising the productivity of labor and the master's profits.

The revolution which specialized the worker led to the specialization of tools. Just as the laborer became confined to a single operation so also the machine was adapted to a single operation, a result obtained because of the simplification and multiplication of specialized tools requisite in the methods of a division of labor. The industrial revolution was made possible because of the preceding evolution of the specialized tool.

We have now reached the period of the American Revolution, which we will take up in our next lesson, pointing out the economic causes which were the fundamental forces of the revolution.

PETER T. LECKIE.

———:o:———

PLATFORM

Socialist Party of Canada

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

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

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

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

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

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

Therefore, we call all workers to organize under the banner of the Socialist Party of Canada, with the object of conquering the political powers, for the purpose of aiding 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.

Western Clarion

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

Published twice a month by the Socialist Party of Canada 401 Pender Street East, Vancouver, B. C. Phone Highland 2582

Editor ..... Ewen MacLeod

Subscription:

Canada, 20 issues $1.00

Foreign, 16 issues $1.00

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

VANCOUVER, B. C., JUNE 16, 1921

LESSONS OF THE STRIKE.

THE central argument of the miners—equal pay for equal work—produced the demand for the national pool, and also the subsidy proposed by Hodges—a proposal which (commercially) weakened the case for the miners by exposing them to the derision of master class economics, which left them without an answer to the practical exigencies of trade, and which afforded the ruling class an opportunity—quickly taken up—of confounding and confusing the first issue.

In this confusion equal pay for equal work was conveniently forgoten. It was an excellent trade slogan. On the ethic of business it was unanswerable. It commanded consideration. It was a puzzle to the henchmen of capitalist equities. It was conceded to be eminently "fair and reasonable." Lloyd George was so hard put to it that he was driven for refuge in the "act of God" idea. But—unwittingly—friend Hodges turned the trick, demonstrating once again (if demonstration be required) that no association of slaves, however strong, incognisant of its fundamental interest—the abolition of wages—can transmute the trade mongering vicissitudes of commerce into higher standards of social betterment.

That was a serious blow to the miners. The break up of the Triple Alliance was another. We had heard much talk "about it and about," but when the strain came upon it, the Alliance wilted like a plucked flower. And for the same reason precisely: it was separated from the source of its sustenance—the sustenance of a common interest. Now wrath and its abandon are much in evidence, "treachery" and "betrayal" are frequent terms, bitterness and disgust keen and acid tongued among the disillusioned worshippers of numbers. Quite natural perhaps, but quite futile.

But the consequences may not be so futile. An organization so imposing as the Triple Alliance can hardly dissolve without producing far effects. Great stress was laid upon its power and cohesion, the "mighty works" it was to accomplish. It was almost the symbol and guarantee of the coming triumph of labor. Action and reaction being equal and opposite, the rebound can hardly be other than violent, the sense of disappointment as cuttingly deep as the enthusiasm of anticipation was passionately keen.

Yet as all things that have been, so too with this. Its strength was but an appearance, its unity an imagination. The bubble has been burst, and with its bursting there falls away from us another fallacy of idealist misconception. And that is a very real advantage, although as yet its incidence is but vaguely realized.

Disapointment may fly to egotistical extremes for a time ,but materal conditions must compel a return to the realities of daily existence, and out of the reaction will arise a new organization with a spirit sharpened through failure, and with an understanding vitalized with the friction of fact. And in that understanding resides impregnable power.

The stoppage of the mining industry, implying as it does, the stagnation of almost all industry, is, at the present juncture of world affairs ,a serious impasse—so serious indeed, that we may almost prophesy that the lost ground can never be regained. With the losing of that ground, will certainly follow a tenser struggle, and a deeper misery. Yet evil though that be—evil i.e., in its immediate effects on the workers—it is a necessary prelude to the new discipline and unity which must weld the exploited masses together for their emancipation from wage labor. As it clears away the status and possession of the middle classes, so also, it clears away the obsessions of the workers to their slave gods, presenting the fundamental problems ,the inherent antagonism of class, in bold and unequivocal relief.

The Triple Alliance did not topple over because of its bulk—indeed ,it was not large enough. It did not fail to function because it lacked discipline or ability. Nor did it stand back for want of courage or fear of consequences. Not at all. Courage and ability are in the fibre of the working class, in woven in their being by the historic development of progress. That is the backbone of every class that has ever risen to power, and in the last analysis, our hope of final victory is founded there. No The flaw does not lie there, but in the immediate form of the organization itself.

The Triple Alliance is——or was—a more or less artificial alliance of sections of labor, united principally by the transient juxtapositions of self-interest. Like all trades unions it represented the preservation of particular interests, and as those interests are its dominating influence, on those interests it must stand. But craft interests, being patterned on trade associations, are trade interests. They are chiselled out of commercial purpose, and being so, are bounded by the adventitous circumstances of the moment. To the moving influences of the moment they must of necessity respond; to hazard an ideal is to gamble with their existence. And, by the same token they are individualistic in character—for trade needs are compelling—and as such, are grimly in conflict with the fleeting substance of industrial relationships whose conditions drive us irremediably towards sociality and collective endeavor.

That is why the Triple Alliance failed. The interests of its component elements were trade interests, unequal and diverse. They were not united on the fundamental of exploitation. The pressure put upon the miners did not affect the economic interests of the others, and until the economic interest is touched none will, or perhaps, can move.

But the lever to touch the economic interest is being steadily applied. Capitalist production has entirely lost its original individualism. The process has become a social collectivity. No one is a unit; no category stands by itself. All are irrevocably bound together, mutually interacting and dependent. What befalls one today happens to all tomorrow. Capital is world wide; its exploitation is single and complete. As single and as world wide does it engender antagonisms to itself, arousing the conditions where social necessity meets and oversteps class law, and which compel all creating labor to organize, not on craft lines for trade mongering benefits, but on the broad foundation of class unity, to carry the class struggle to victory and extinction, and society to the further and higher achievements of economic freedom.

R.

———:o:———

SECRETARIAL NOTES.

Comrade Leckie's articles on the "Materialist Conception of History," like his "Economic Causes of War," are commanding attention everywhere the "Clarion" is read. We have had many enquiries and appreciative references. The latest we have seen is this, from "The Socialist," Melbourne, on "F. C. of W."

"Comrade Leckie has carefully examined the available official records and other relevant documents dealing with the events leading up to the war, and lays bare the hypocritical nature of the pretension that Great Britain was motivated by purely ethical considerations in decaring war upon Germany. The writer also deals with post-war problems, and scathingly exposes the sordid hypocrisy, selfishness, and greed that has characteried Allied diplomacy since the signing of the armistice. "Economic Causes of War" may be obtained from the Socialist Party of Canada, Vancouver, B. C."

Read it and pass it on to the next man you hear asking what causes all this war talk.

* * *

Many queries have been sent here asking for the whereabouts of Comrade Lestor. He was supposed to return from England to Canada sometime during the spring of this year. As far as we know he is still in England. We have had no word during the past month. Previous to that he was in London, whence he sent us a copy of "Out of Work," dated April 9th, weekly, published by the London District Council of the Unemployed. This contains a front page article by himself, entitled "The Blooming Empire, from the Standpoint of a Red."

The comrades in the eastern provinces have been expecting Comrade Lestor for some time, and have been making arrangements for him to address meetings in various places. Better step aboard the Atlantic canoe, Charlie, and be counted in on the census.

* * *

Writing from Manchester, May 6th, Moses Baritz has this to say of the miners: "The miners "leaders" are positively impotent, and a real new spirit pervades the union atmosphere. Unlike the N. U. R., which is dictated to by Thomas, who has run away to U. S. A. rather than face his own union which is passing resolutions of protest against his actions recently. (That means **branches or locals of the union**) The miners are keeping a tight grip on the bearing rein of the "leaders." I can tell you this with the greatest assurance, **that a move is on among the high "leaders' 'to try and put the South Wales Federation out of the national organization.** This, of course, is not much abroad, but it was given to me from such a source that you can accept it as being correct. I have no doubt that Havelock Wilson's crowd—the Sailors and Firemen's Union—will scab on the others. The Dockers will soon be in trouble over the landing of coal from Belgium. It is hardly likely that the Dockers will tolerate that. The Transport Workers will have to join with the Dockers, and the N. U. R. will follow. Thomas can see the way things are going, and ducks by going to the States."

* * *

John A. McDonald passed through Vancouver a week ago on the way to Australia. He expects to be over there for a year or so, lecturing to the heathen of wagedom in Australia, N. Z., and South Africa.

* * *

We have no information further concerning the case of Charlie O'Brien, and when this comes under his notice he will remember that he used to wander around this big farm and made a few friends here and there. They keep on asking us if he's executed yet.

* * *

Comrade Frank Cassidy is at Seal, Alberta, and will be in Edmonton on the 1st July. Frank has been scrambling around the Alberta country during the past five or six months and in some farming areas he has managed to get a meeting several nights a week, in some cases as many as six. He has been doing this on his own initiative, without monetary outlay to the Party, and he reports good audiences and hospitality among the farmers around the country. One of these days he's going to send us a write up of his impressions of Alberta as a field for Socialist propaganda, which will be of interest to all Clarion readers and particularly Alberta readers. This is the work that counts.

* * *

Looking over this column it seems to take on the appearance of "Social and Personal," as per the vanity page in the stuffed dailies. So be it. We haven't arrived at the stage of garment description, however,—to do that might lead to several arrests. These are good intentions.

* * *

CLARION MAINTENANCE FUND.

Dave Watt, $5 Tom Mace, $1; Wm. Stokes, $1.50; Malcolm Bruce, $1.50; G. Lamont, $2; F. S. F., $1; "Pat," $1.

Total C. M. F. contributions, 27th May to 13th June, inclusive,—$13.

Anglo-American Relations

If Americans still possess their traditional sense of humor, they must be hugely intrigued to find that one of the chief spoils of war turns out to be a tiny island in the South Pacific by the name of Yap, that our government has for many months been exchanging weighty diplomatic notes about Yap with the Imperial Government of Japan, and that all the great Powers of the world are in some measure involved in the controversy. Whoever heard of Yap before? Can obscure trifles like this, lying in the files of foreign offices, suddenly emerge to confound us with international friction?

The sole reason for this impressive debate is that Yap is the meeting-point of four submarine telegraph cables. One comes from Guam, which we seized in the Spanish War. It is in turn connected with San Francisco, Tokio, and Manila. Another goes to Borneo and another to New Guinea. Our Government's fear is, crudely stated, that any nation which controls the cable station at Yap might interrupt, censor, or read the contents of messages passing between San Francisco on one side of the Pacific, and Shanghai, Borneo, and New Guinea on the other. Of course no nation could do so publicly without compromising its honor. But apparently we have reason to believe that nations are in the habit of doing so privately. If they do, they steal an unfair advantage not only in secret diplomacy, which of course still exists, but also in trade and business. That is the whole story.

There are other cables which have been in controversy. Before the war there were two cables connecting New York with Germany. In 1914 Great Britain and France interrupted our communication with Germany by cutting both these cables, and towing the eastern ends respectively to Penzance, England, and Brest, France. Two years later Britain cut the western end of the Penzance cable outside of New York and connected it with Halifax. What was a cable between the United States and Germany has now become therefore, a cable between Canada and England. We cannot communicate directly with the European continent without having our messages pass through French or British hands. We cannot communicate directly with the continent of Asia without having our messages pass through Japanese hands. The Allies have seized all the German cables and claim them as the spoils of war. Great Britain owns most of the other important ocean cables, having laid them as a result of her commercial enterprise and her virtual monopoly of gutta-percha. But the matter has not stopped here. Many of us are puzzled to read in the newspapers about what seems to be a private war between the United States Government and the Western Union Telegraph Company. The company is trying to land a cable at Miama, Florida, and the Government has prevented it from doing so by the power of the navy. The cable in question is British owned; it comes from Barbados, which in turn is connected with Brazil, and it would, if completed, give British interests control of the most important line between the United States and western South America. The Department of State was so eager to prevent this result that it actually employed arms against a domestic commercial concern.

An International Communications Conference was held in December to adjust the question of the former German cables. The American delegates urged a compromise and gained the support of the Italians for it, but the British and French delegates would not agree. Presently the latter requested that the conference be adjourned, since they wanted to be home for Christmas. The American delegates reluctantly let them go. The conferees were to meet again on March 15 of this year. They did so, almost in secrecy. You may search the newspapers in vain for the story until March 19, when an inner page of the New York "Times" carried a circumstantial account of what had happened. Nothing could be announced officially, said the article, for "technical" reasons. Yet it was understood that United States was to receive full ownership of the New York-Brest cable and of the Guam-Yap line, while Japan was to hold the YapShanghai and the Yap-East Indies wires. The question of the control of Yap itself was differentiated from the ownership of the cables, and until the mandate issue was settled, Japan insisted on operating the Yap and of the Guam-Yap cable. Official approval of the French government had to be obtained before any final announcement could be made. Since March 19 there has been a silence about cables.

Wireless is, in one sense, a substitute for the cable, but it will be a long time before wireless facilities are as well distributed or as dependable as the submarine telegraph. Besides, since secrecy is the chief desideratum, wireless is really no substitute, because there is little hope of concealing the contents of a wireless mesage from anyone who is willing to take a little trouble to decipher it.

While we are thus in effect questioning the good faith of other governments in the matter of cables, we are preparing to exercise bad faith in the matter of canals. The Suez Canal, owned by Great Britain, is open to the ships of all nations on equal terms. The Panama Canal, owned by the United States, is also, in consequence of an explicit clause in the Hay-Pauncefote treaty, open to all ships without discrimination. But the United States shipping interests are trying to get lower tolls for our vessels, backed, apparently, by Congress and the Administration.

These two controversies have much to teach us about international relations. They prove again, to anyone who still doubts it, that most of the quarrels between nations are concerned not with high and pure ideals like democracy and honor, but with material interests like trade and profits. They show that the Allied and Associated Governments, which only yesterday proclaimed to the world that they were engaged in a mighty crusade to crush selfish imperialism, to banish war forever, and to establish the sanctity of treaties, cannot even trust each other not to snoop or not to violate solemn agreements when there is a little money to be made by it. These difficulties are too insignilcant, taken be themselves, to lead to open hostilities, but they indicate how alert peace-loving peoples must be if they are to prevent rulers who place themselves above humanity from leading them into a situation where wholesale slaughter becomes "inevitable." — "The Nation," New York.

:o:

Book Review

THE AMERICAN EMPIRE. By Scott Nearing. **Publishers:** Rand School of Social Science, 7 East 15th Street, New York, 266pp., paper covers, price (American) 50 cents.

SCOTT Nearing has recently issued a book savouring much of its publishers, the Rand School of Social Science, in which he ably contends that the U. S. has entered upon the stage of imperialism. Like a true pilgrim to the Rand Mecca, he delights in contrasting the earlier statements of Woodrow Wilson and other American statesmen with recent American policies, and finds the new imperialism a thing opposed, never to the interests of the working class, but of the great American "people." To him the significance of his entire studies appear to be that "Liberty is the price of empire. Imperialism pre-supposes that the people will be willing at any time to surrender their 'rights' at the call of the rulers." (p. 21.)

He gives as the characteristics of empire:

"1.—Conquered territory.

2.—Subject peoples.

3.—An imperial or ruling class.

4.—The exploitation of the subject peoples and the conquered territory for the benefit of the ruling class."

He fits the first two characteristics to the American empire by the following table of conquest:

"1.—The Indians from whom they took the land and wrested the right to exploit the resources of the continent;

2.—The African negroes, who were captured and brought to America to labor as slaves;

3.—The Mexicans from whom they took additional slave territory at a time when the institution of slavery was in grave danger, and

4.—The Spanish empire from whom they took foreign investment opportunities at a time when the business interests of the country first felt the pressure of surplus wealth." (p. 29.)

To deal briefly with his extensive data on these four points:

1.—Three hundred years ago the whole three million square miles that is now the U. S. was the Indians; they were the American people. Today they number 328,111 in a population of 105,118,647, and the total area of their reservations is 53,487 sq. miles. p. 37.

2.—To meet the demand for plantation labor in the south, negroes were imported from Africa in ever increasing numbers; in 1768 the slaves shipped from the African coast numbered 99,000. p. 43.

3.—Texas from Mexico, 1846.

4.—In 1899 Spain ceded to U. S. Guam, Porto Rico, Cuba and the Phillipines.

Besides these, won partially by force, we have the Lousiana purchase, 1803, the purchase of Alaska. 1868, the conquest of Hawaii, 1898, when "for the first time the American people secured territory lying outside the mainland of North America. Altogether "Between 1776 and 1853 the area of U. S. was increased more than eight-fold." (p .161.) And the peaceful U. S. has been engaged in 114 wars since 1775. (p. 27).

Economic Foundations of Imperialism Classifications of the Total U. S. Wealth (*) in Groups:

1.—Real property (land and buildings, 57 per cent.

2.—Public utilities, 14 per cent.

3.—Live stock and machinery, 7 per cent.

4.—Raw material, merchandise, etc., 13 per cent.

5.—Personal possessions (clothes, etc.), 7 per cent.

So, "American wealth is in the main designed for further production of goods rather than for the satisfaction of human wants." The way in which this wealth is held further determines its application. "Start with the total non-personal wealth of the country; subtract from it the share-values of the small stock-holders; the value of all bonds, mortgages and notes; the property of the small tradesman and small farmer; the value of homes—what remains? There are left the stocks in the hands of the big stockholders; the properties owned and directed by the owners and directors of important industries, public utilities, banks, trust companies, and insurance companies; this wealth in the aggregate probably makes up less than 10 per cent. of the total wealth of the country, and yet the tiny fraction of the population which owns this wealth can exercise a dictatorial control over the economic policies that underlie American public life." p. 92.

The only solution for the problem of surplus is foreign investment. "Surplus is to be invested; investments are to be protected; American authority is to be respected. . . . Therefore the American nation under the urge of economic necessity; guided half-intelligently, half-instinctively by the plutocracy, is moving along the imperial high road." p. 176. It is a question for them of "Eat or be eaten."

"The Great War brought noteworthy advantages to the American plutocracy. At home its power was clinched." "It gained social prestige and internal economic power." "Among the nations the U. S. was elevated into a position of commanding importance." p. 157. As a result of the war "The Japanese empire dominated the Far East; the British empire dominated Southern Asia, the Near East, Africa and Australia; the American empire dominates the Western Hemisphere. It is impossible for these three great empires to remain in rivalry and at peace. Economic struggle is a form of war, and the economic struggle between them is now in progress." It may be noted that the late reports of the friendly relations between Japan and Great Britain corroborate Neering's conclusions as to the alignment of empires. He says: "After Sedan it was

(Continued on page 8.)

(*) Total U. S. wealth, $187,739,000,000.

The S. P. of C. and the Third International

"LET US MARCH."

To the "Western Clarion,"

Dear Comrade,—Just a few words in regard to the Third International.

One comrade gave his reason against joining that the capitalist had failed in their Internationalism. I would refer this comrade to the Marxian and Darwinian theory. Then think a bit, and analyze the question, and try and find out where we now stand in the progress of evolution.

It was in the ninth century that there were at least seven kingdoms in England. But for greater protection they ultimately became one nation. Rome fell only to be replaced by a greater power—Spain. Napoleon with his wars caused an international union of nations to be formed to resist him, and so on down through the times to the present day, we have great empires and international unions of capitalist powers organized for economic supremacy, which were one time thousands of feudal nations. There is now being formed a capitalist international. We must form a counterpart to this. The workers first formed their shop councils. In the advance of economic evolution, these shop units became town and city units, which are now national federations. But Marx's Socialism is "Workers of the World Unite" (Internationalism.)

I notice that most of us agree on this point, that Comrade Lenin is a true Marxian Socialist, and is putting the Marxian theories into practice as fast as conditions will allow or that is humanly possible.

Thus; if the Third International is Marxism, we will be keeping to the paths of social evolution by joining it. E'en though it fails.

Morally; put ourselves in the Russian's place. Do you not see, dear comrades, the moral effect it would have on our weak and ununderstanding brothers (and as in Russia unlearned) to know that the workers of the world were rallying to our cause?

And let us not be so narrow-minded as to turn the Third International down just because it's Russian and foreign, but to remember that they are comrades, and not aliens.

ALBERT RENN.

:o:

AGAINST

By G. Ross ("R")

Editor's Note.—This article is too long to be included in one issue. The concluding part will be published in next issue.

"And aye the o'ercome o' the sang"—is organise—for the overthrow of capital. A most desirable object, but a most impossible organization—as yet. However, there is the cry, neither new, nor less difficult, strong with its almost unconquerable philosophy of the ideal. Still, sweet exhortations on what we must do to accomplish this laudable end do not advance us one whit towards emancipation from political dominion. Only clear appreciation of reality can do that. And how many colored is that appreciation is abundantly manifested in the various views presented in this present discussion.

Suppose we leave general principles for a moment and come to concrete cases. It is not the question of affiliation itself, that matters, but affiliation, plus the "reasons annexed." Affiliation without conditions would probably be easy—as probably meaningless. But with conditions the question turns on its practicability. Can the conditions be fulfilled?

For instance, who is to determine the "reliable communist?" Who remove the opportunist and elect the revolutionary? Who determines "loyalty"? And what loyalty? Who turn the great class of "moderates" from their extreme moderation? Who turn the idolaters from the stocks of ancient error to the living revolution? Who convince the Canadian pseudo-peasant —a prospective capitalist— that spud-growing on his ranch of bush and thistle-down is not his true interest? What, indeed, but the growth of economic antagonisms, forwarded as best we may, by the unflagging effort of social understanding?

Again, by what means are we to infect, directly, the army or navy with proletarian doctrines? How are we to turn them to our way of thinking? And how far would we traverse that way before being challenged by a most hostile and virile state? How are we to turn the masses from "patriotism" and "loyalty," in the face of capitalist organizations of propaganda, co-ordinated with an almost perfect contrivance of cunning and resource? Not only against the crafty interests of self and trade, but also against the moving ideals of peace the passionate traditions of war, and the glossy oratory of Chautauquaus, playing on the deep-rooted emotions inherited from a distant past? If we turn our attention to "Home Rule" and "Colonial freedom," etc., would we not disappear in the swamps of labor party reactionaries, and Liberal decadence and impotency? To aid and abet the "expediencies" of Laborism on the American continent would be, in effect, to strive for the supremacy of a Liberalism that is all but dead; would be to oppose the march of the social forces; would be suicide with a vengeance. These, and other similar questions, are for the "pros" to answer, and if they are analytically inclined, the "18 points" will furnish them with exercise aplenty.

There is no parallel between the conditions of Canada and Russia. There is no social tie between their peoples, but a sentiment—as lax as it is dangerous. In Canada, labor has practically no political representation; it has not even an apparent voice in "its own" affairs. There is not even a political party we could associate with in the interests of the workers, in order to hamstring another —even were we so minded. The imperialist is completely in the saddle, and he drives with a strong hand. But with Russia the case is totally different. Bolshevist Russia is not, in reality, a Socialist confederacy, but a political state. It is true, it is not a capitalist State, but it is, nevertheless, in conflict and rivalry with all capitalist States, for the same object—world supremacy. Certainly, the ultimate objective of Bolshevist supremacy is the emancipation of the proletariat, but its immediate necessity is preservation of its own organization. Hence, it uses — and must use — every possible weapon and device of the political State for its preservation. Controlling the powers of the State, it can command and execute. It can oppose force to force; circumvent diplomacy with diplomacy; pit opportunism against oportunism; checkmate the reformist with his own devices.

Thus it makes its trade agreements and peace treaties: it allies itself alike with communist and nationalist: with commerce and revolution; with national ambition and hero worshipping idealism. That is "practical politics," the checker game played with the nations as pawns. Thus Bolshevism counterfoils imperialism. By stimulating national antagonisms it disintegrates the unity of imperialisms. By cutting off the feeders of empire, it hampers the co-relation of imperialist force. By striking at the co-ordination of empire, it augments the conditions of revolution in the camp of the enemy; compels the central authority to devote its attention to its domestic affairs, thus lessening the possibility of defeat. Consequently, the only effective aid which the revolutionary can render to the forces of proletarian emancipation is to understand the "game" that is being played, is to understand its conditions and limitations, to understand that what may be west, here and now, may be east, there and then: in a word, to know—as clearly as possible amidst such a babel of tongues and cross purposes —where to push, and when to "ca' canny." The wheels in a factory — all driven from the same processes of proletarian revolution are exactly like motive source, but with all manner of variety of velocity and direction.

It does not follow that what Russia can do, we can, or their tactics prove goodly for us. Russia can and does follow the most tortuous ways towards its final aim; we can only pursue the road we can. The very devices which Russia is compelled to adopt, if adopted by us, would lead, not to freedom, but to reformism, to card playing with imperialism, to confusion and probably tragic reprisals. A revolution is no jester's game, and it is no disgrace to avoid reprisals not in the line of march.

The idea of affiliation seems to be to centralize authority and action, to bring, Napoleon-like, our united strength against a particular opposition. But that is not the root of the matter,—if it could be accomplished, the task of the Socialist would be done. How is this centralized authority to act? How control diverse organizations, holding diverse views on interest and necesity? How bring dissentients to unanimity? How assert authority over conflicting opinion? How realize action through the antagonisms of sectional struggle? These are all pertinent questions, demanding answers, but which the "pros" leave very severely alone.

(Continued in next issue)

:o:

HERE AND NOW

Some attention has been drawn to the financial position of the "Clarion" by our distress signal in last issue. Since then a sum over a hundred and thirty dollars has rushed in and the hungry printer is appeased for the time. There are rocks ahead still. "Clarion" readers must keep the course clear. Previously we had been able to rely to some extent on returns from literature sales. Literature sales are low, however, when overalls pockets are empty, and most of the literature going out now seems to be on long term credit—some longer than that. We are full of confidence, optimism and good cheer, the only thing about it is that the treasury contains little but an echo, and we can't cash in on that.

The substance of all of which is that your attention is now drawn to the "Clarion's" need for subs. Without subs, it cannot survive. Our "Here and Now" item indicates that some comrades have realized that, and have made the effort. Go thou and do likewise. Amen!

Following one dollar each—J. Treeter, D. S. Smith, W. B. Durham, J. Greider, J. R. Donnenworth, H. Myers, John Wilson, J. D. McKay, Tom Mace, H. Hill, A. Barnes, J. M. Sanderson, J. D. McCuaig, Sid Earp, E. Kermode, M. Halminen, Wm. Stokes, Malcolm Bruce F. Evans, W. H. Kirby, O. Erickson, E. T. Palmer, A. A. Cronk, K. Smith, A. Lehman, M. Sanford, Dick Burge, H. G. Ross, Jas. Bone, Miss E. Hartley, "Pat."

Following $2 each—J. Dennis, G. Wallack, Katherine Love, A. R. Sinclair, W. M. Scott, A. Mogridge, J. R. Shiels, W. S. Matthews, Frank Cassidy, J. A. La Fleche.

M. W. Smith, $9; Geo. Aplin, $1.50; R. G. Pring, $1.12; Geo. Gilbert (Millerton Public Library, New Zealand), $2.10; T. Allsopp, $12.63; H. Campbell (W.S.S.S., Auckland, N. Z.), $4.50; B. Foltz (Marxian School, 'Frisco), $7.20; Harry Williams, $17.50; R. Inglis, $10; C. R. Morrison, $4; A. S. Wells, $1.50; W. Ridout, $5; J. V. Cullen, $4; H. M. Bartholemew, $3.

Above Clarion subscriptions received from 27th May to 13th June, inclusive—total, $134.05.

Error in 'Here and Now" May 2. R. C. Mutch should be $4, instead of $1. Also Dave Watt, $2.

:o:

MANIFESTO

— of the —

SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

(Fifth Edition)

Per copy ..... 10 cents

Per 25 copies $2

Post Paid

PEOPLE OF SOVIET RUSSIA

An Article Issued by the Commissariat of Public Health

THE World war laid bare the ills of modern society and forced humanity to search for new forms of social relations. Russia was the first to take a new path; she severed her connection with the past and made labor and the interests of the toiling masses the main concern of the government. The new social order was bound to reflect itself in such an important state function as the care for public health. Believing that the health of the population is the foundation of the prosperity of the country, the Soviet Government spared neither expense nor effort in the care of the population. By a series of bold and original reforms the Commissariat of Public Health was enabled to cope with the most severe epidemics, and under conditions of unparallelled difficulty.

It is thought that it may interest the American people, irrespective of political opinions and sympathies, to know of the work of the Commissariat of Public Health of Soviet Russia. With this end in view, a series of articles are to be issued on various activities of the Commissariat.

The Basis of Soviet Hygiene and Sanitation and the Organization of the People's Commissariat of Public Health

At the beginning of 1917, Russia was already exhausted through the prolonged war, when she was unable to carry on, and through the inefficiency of the Czar's government and the complete incompetence of the Lvov and Kerensky governments, which followed it. The latter did nothing to conserve the feeble economic and cultural forces of the country. They only augmented the ruin of its economic life. When the power passed to the Soviets, the country was already in chaos. Then came rebellions, conspiracies and all the inevitable destruction of cities and entire regions by civil war, and boycott and sabotage by the intellectuals. Finally there came the blockade.

All these disorders could not fail to affect the condition of the public health. In July, 1918, the newly organized People's Commissariat of Public Health had to fight epidemics over an area covering almost one-sixth of the globe, among over a hundred million people living under the conditions described above. There was a shortage of physicians of whom many had been called to the front; there was a lack of medical supplies and disinfectants, which could not be brought in from abroad because of the blockade. Prior to the war, Russia had obtained the bulk of her chemical and medical supplies from abroad.

The Commisariat of Public Health had to organize on entirely new lines, and with new personnel. It had to mobilize, concentrate and distribute its forces, and at the same time combat its enemies who, although invisible, are none the less dangerous.

The Commisariat of Public Health successfully accomplished these apparently impossible and superhuman tasks. It came out victorious, and now, after a year of effort, during which the general sanitary conditions and the epidemics were brought under control, we can speak with assurance and with definite figures at hand.

What gave such power to the Commissariat in its work with conditions which apparently boded nothing but defeat?

The foreign foes of Soviet Russia prophesied in this sphere, and pointed out that the Soviet government would not be able to cope with the epidemics, and that, with the coming of peace there would be a general popular uprising, which would result in the downfall of the Soviet government. Others prophesied the almost complete extinction of the Russian people, and invited the International Red Cross to organize expeditions to save Soviet Russia and to fight epidemics.

These dark forebodings fortunately did not come true. Soviet Russia defied the epidemics by her own forces and without foreign aid, despite the blockade and the difficult conditions of life. The reasons for these surprising results can be found in the principles on which the organization of public hygiene in general, and the struggle against epidemics in particular, were built.

Never in any country was the problem of public health given such a wide and complete attention, and never was a population so actively enlisted in the preservation of its health. Even in the Western countries, which consider themselves the most advanced, public hygiene has been largely in the hands of officials, scattered among several departments. The defects of such an organization were recognized by investigators as far back as 1913. Mr. Mirman has pointed out that in the French government there is no regular department responsible for public health and public hygiene. In the case, for instance, of parliamentary interpolation on measures for the prevention of tuberculosis, such an interpolation would have to be addressed to at least four ministers of state, in addition to the ministers of the army, the navy and the colonies.

The first thing the Soviet Government did in the matter of public health was to bring all the public health work together under one organization, the Commissariat of Public Health. Thereby it removed one of the greatest obstacles to the advance of public hygiene, especially in the struggle against epidemics. This unification was not merely the setting up of a crude and formal authority. The Soviet government understood that medical work has its peculiarities with respect to different groups of the population, and in different localities. This had been taken into consideration. The Commissariat achieved the complete unification of all medical organizations, civil, military and naval. Wherever the local peculiarities of medical work required continual submission to a central authority (as is the case with the military organization) or where they do not coincide territorially with local administrative bodies, there was applied the principle of coordinating the work of the medical departments under central control. Other forms of medical work which do not require such permanent central control were given to local and medical sections, which enjoy wide freedom, and have to follow only the general directions of the central body, which does not interfere with their work as long as it is of a local character, unconcerned with questinos of state importance.

In a word, the basic principle of the organization of public health in Soviet Russia is this: The Commissariat of Public Health unites all forms of medical work and sanitation which had previously been scattered among all the departments. Locally the medical units (in the form of district and city medical sections) have sufficient independent authority for their local medical and sanitary affairs, under general instructions and regulations of the Commissariat. The Commissar of Public Health is a member of the government, and by participating in all general legislation has every opportunity to be on guard for the people's health.

The second pdinciple of Soviet hygiene is the participation of the population itself, through the representation of the toiling masses in the actual work of public hygiene. Every one who has had to fight epidemics under former conditions knows from experience how this work was jeopardized through the lack of participation by the population. The people were merely addressed through orders and regulations in the formulation of which they did not share. These regulations were enforced by the police power, without the control and participation of the population. The very essence of medical and sanitary measures, however, is such that they cannot be enforced without the conscious participation of the people themselves. The widest sanitary rule will remain a dead letter, unless the people themselves take part in its formulation and in the control of its enforcement. The Soviet Government, realizing this elementary truth, invited the population to participate in the care of its own health. "The health of the toiling people is the concern of the toilers themselves." The watchword became the guiding principle in all the activities of the Peoples Commisariat of Health.

Among the first steps taken were the introduction of certain measures for popular education in hygiene. By 1921 the Commissariat of Public Health had distributed over 15 million leaflets, a million pamphlets, and eight hundred thousand posters, in addition to books, instructions, and scientilc publications. In thirteen provincial capitals there were opened large medical museums. Medical exhibits were organized in 26 district towns. Seven travelling exhibits on wagons and seventeen exhibits in railroad cars were sent out. Sanitary schools were opened in seventeen provincial capitals. At these institutions permanent lectures and discussions on medicine and sanitation were instituted. To draw the toiling masses into this work, sanitation councils, in which the central bodies and trade unions were represented, were established in the central and provincial cities. Not less than half of the membership of the local councils consists of representatives of labor organizations. The councils have discussed the reports of the Commisariat of Public Health and such questions as the struggle against small-pox, the prevention of the spread of epidemics, sanitary measures in the Red Army, etc.

Thus the discussion of the most important sanitation measures was carried on through the participation of the interested persons, and not under the secrecy of departmental routine, as is the case abroad even now. With the same end in view, a special effort was made to secure the co-operation of representatives of the workers in special fields of endeavor. Thus, for instance, there were organized councils with representatives of labor organizations at the schools, for combating tuberculosis and venereal diseases. The participation of the population in medical and sanitary measures became necessary when the spreading of epidemics to unheard of proportions, and the special conditions under which they had to be combatted, made it obvious that the old methods of organizing this campaign were useless.

Not only in the provincial capitals, but almost in all district cities there were organized so-called labor commisions, and similarly in many villages. Their task was to look after the sanitation of the town or the village, to see that the public hygiene measures were enforced, to keep clean all places of public assemblage, such as railroad depots, prisons, dormitories, schools, etc., and also to safeguard the water supply, bath houses, laundries, etc. Besides these there were commissions to teach the population cleanliness, and an understanding and respect for the regulations on sanitation. Women workers and physicians were drawn into this work.

In the campaign against venereal disease the mothers' organizations were relied upon, the Communist Youth, and the commissions for the preservation of maternity and babyhood. In all departments of public health work, the Union of Medical Sanitary Workers,—Vsemediksantrud—took the most active part. A device to interest the people in the work of caring for their health were the special "weeks" devoted to this or that department of sanitation. During these "weeks" the entire population was invited to participate in sanitary and anti-epidemic measures. Thus, for instance, during the spotted-typhus epidemics there were the "Clean-upweeks" and the "Bath-house week", which were devoted to special measures for sanitation and personal cleanliness. "Water Supply Week" was organized to prevent cholera, and during that week it was possible to enforce quickly a series of measures for improving the water supply. Such "weeks" have great educational value. They can be compared to practical exercises in schools. They instil into the population the importance of sanitary measures, and they teach the people that common endeavor is necessary for the preservation of the public health, a

(Continued on page 8.)

Literature Price List

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

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

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

Capitalist Production. (First Nine and 32nd Chapters, "Capital," Vol. 1, Marx). Single copies (cloth bound), $1.00; 5 copies, $3.75.

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

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

Manifesto, S. P. of C., single copy, 10 cents; 25 Copies $2.00

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

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

Ancient Society (Louis H Morgan), $2 15

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

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

Civil War in France (Marx) 35c

Life and Death (Dr. E. Teichmann) 30c

History of the Paris Commune (Lissagaray) $1.50

Class Struggle (Kautsky), cloth, 90 cents; paper, 35 cents.

Puritanism (Meily), cloth, 90 cents.

The Protection of Labor in Soviet Russia (Kaplun), per copy, 15 cents.

Savage Survivals (Moore), cloth, $1.

Law of Biogenesis (Moore), cloth, 90 cents.

Social Studies (Lafargue), 90 cents.

The State and Revolution (Lenin) 25c

Germs of Mind in Plants (R. H. Frances) 90c

Economic Causes of War (Leckie), single copies, 25c; 10 copies or more, 20c each.

Conditions of the Working Class in England in 1844 (Engels) $1.75

A. B. C. of Evolution (McCabe) $1.15

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

Evolution of the Idea of God (Grant Allen), paper, 55c; cloth, $1.15

Darwinism and Race Progress (Haycraft), cloth, $1.15

Evolution of Property (Lagargue), cloth $1.15

Poverty of Philosophy (Marx) $1.75

The American Empire (Scott-nearing), paper 60c

Critique of Political Economy (Marx) $1.75

Positive Outcome of Philosophy (Dietzgen) $2.15

Philosophical Essays (Dietzgen) $1.75

Ethics and History (Kautsky) 90c

Industrial History of England (H. DeGibbins) $1.75

The Student's Marx (Aveling) $1.15

Two Essays on History (C. Stephenson and G. Deville) percopy, ... 5c; 25 copies 75c.

Eighteenth Brumaire (Marx) 35c

End of the World (McCabe) $2.15

Causes of Belief in God (Lafargue) per copy, 10c; 25 copies, $2

The Structure of Soviet Russia (Humphries) 10c

No Compromise; No Political Trading (Wm. Liebknecht) 20c

Shop Talks on Economics (Marcy) 15c

Right to be Lazy (Lafargue) 15c

Marxism and Darwinism (Pannekoek) 15c

The Apostate (London) 15c

History of the Great American Fortunes (Myers) Three volumes $6.50

Woman Under Socialism (Bebel) $2.15

Economic Determinism (Parce) $1.75

Socialism and Modern Science (Ferri) $1.75

Physical Basis of Mind and Morals (Fitch) $1.75

Landmarks of Scientific Socialism (Engels) $1.75

Vital Problems in Social Evolution (Lewis) 90c

Science and Revolution (Unterman) 90c

The Militant Proletariat (Lewis) 90c

Evolution, Social and Organic (Lewis) 90c

The Social Revolution (Kautsky) 90c

Revolution and Counter Revolution (Marx) $1.15

The World's Revolutions (Unterman) 90c

"Left Wing" Communism, An Infantile Disorder. (Lenin), Detroit Edition. 60c

Christianism and Communism. (Bishop W. M. Brown ..... Per copy, 25c; five copies, $1

(All above post free).

All above literature can be obtained at the same prices, post paid, from J. Sandison, Box 1798, Winnipeg, Man.

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

PEOPLE OF SOVIET RUSSIA

(Cotinued from page 7.)

thing which in the western countries has not been recognized at all.

Those are the main features of the Soviet Medical organization which enabled the Commissariat of Public Health to come out victoriously from a struggle in which the greatest authorities on all sides predicted nothing but defeat. Life put us through the severest examination, and the Soviet authorities passed it brilliantly.

The Commissariat itself is divided into separate departments and sections. In each department and section all proposals and measures are subjected to a preliminary discussion at meetings of the workers of the respective department or section. The Commissariat debates general questions in a collegium composed of managers of departments and their assistants. Thus all institutions of the Commissariat of Public Health observe the collegiate principle which holds good with all government institutions of Soviet Russia. On scientific questions the Commissariat hears the opinions of its scientific medical council composed of representatives of medical scientists elected by the highest scientific and educational institutions of the republic.

In conclusion, we wish to illustrate the results of the Commissariat by a few figures, bearing on its struggle against epidemics. The number of cases of spotted typhus in February, 1920, was 401,907, in September of the same year it was 16,487, and at the present time (*) it is 47,288. During 1919 the entire number of cholera cases was 6,000. At the present time this disease has been almost eradicated. The bubonic plague was localized and prevented from spreading from the Urals and the Astrakhan province and Batoum to other parts of Soviet Russia. Likewise, the epidemics of typhoid fever, dysentery and smallpox have been halted.

In view of the extraordinary conditions under which this struggle had to be carried on, the success achieved cannot but demonstrate the correctness and the vitality of the principles on which the Soviet Medical work is based.

Editor's Note.—We do not know the exact date of writing. This report, however, is the latest received by the S. R. M. R. Committee from the recently organized Department of Foreign Information of the Commissariat of Public Health.

We are specially requested by the S. R. M. R. Committee to publish the report in full.

:o:

BOOK REVIEW

(Continued from page 5)

Germany versus Great Britain for the control of Europe. After Versailles it is the U. S. versus Great Britain for the control of the capitalist earth. Both nations must spend the next few years in active preparation for the conflict." p. 238

To Nearing it would appear that the significance of the adolescent imperialism of the U. S. is the likelihood of new and more horrible wars, of further repressions of popular liberties. To a Marxist, however, the significance is rather that indicated in the very title of Lenin's pamphlet "Imperialism, the Final Stage of Capitalism." In U. S. we see a country only a few years removed from the absorption of foreign capital, already completing the change from an object of imperialism to a new empire; and thereby indicating how capitalism violently works itself out to an impossibility.

Nearing's "American Empire" is a readable book, stored with data of the utmost interest, well worth the price to any slave who has it.

F. W. THOMPSON.

:o:

SUBSCRIPTION FORM.

WESTERN CLARION

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

Official Organ of the Socialist Party of Canada. Issued twice-a-month, at 401 Pender Street East, Vancouver, B. C. Phone: High. 2583.

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

For ..... twelve months

send ..... issues to—

Name .....

JAPAN AND SOVIET RUSSIA

"Novij Mir" reports: The Japanese are manifesting a strong interest in Soviet Russia. They have no diplomatic representatives in Russia and only in the Baltic states since December, 1920. The heads of this mission in Riga are Mijakava and Uda. They observe carefully how the population of the Baltic states regard Soviet Russia and collect information over Russia not only from anti-Russian sources but also from independent sources.

:o:

RUSSIAN HELP FOR CHINA

Moscow, May 8th.—As a result of the outbreak of the plague in Charbin and Manchuria the Soviet government has made the proposal to the Chinese government to send sanitary and disinfectants to the area concerned.—"Rosta Wein."

:o:

THE METRIC SYSTEM

"Trud reports that the Optical and Mechanical factory in Petrograd has begun the production of weights and scales of the metric system.

:o:

Concessions to the European Co-operatives.

Moscow, May 8th.—It has been proposed to the Council of Commissaries to grant concessions to groups of German and English workers for the preparation of agricultural products.—"Rosta Wein."

:o:

THE "WESTERN CLARION" ON SALE AT:

CALGARY, Alta.—Alexander News Stand, 304 Eighth Avenue West.
Labor News Stand, 814a 2nd St East

MONTREAL—
Popular Book and Stationery Store, 16 St. Catherines St. West

EDMONTON—Labor News Stand, 10228—101st St

NEW WESTMINSTER—News Stand, B. C. E. R. Depot.

SEATTLE—Raymer's Old Book Store 1330 1st Ave

SAN FRANCISCO—Marxian Educational Club, 566 Fulton Street.

TORONTO—D. Goodman, Blind News Agent, cor. Queen and Chestnut Sts.
The American News Agency, 81 Queen St. W.
The Theatrical Book Store, cor. Bay & Queen, W.
The Leader Lane Book Store, Leader Lane and

VANCOUVER — Columbia News Stand, corner Hastings and Columbia Sts.
John Green, Carrall Street
W. Love, Hastings Street East

BUFFALO, N. Y.—Onward Book Store, 14 Chauncey Street

CHICAGO—Walden Book Shop, 307 Plymouth Court

ROCHESTER, N. Y.—Proletarian Party, 580 St. Paul Street

TACOMA—Raymer's Old Book Store, 1317 Pacific Avenue
P. R. Haffer, 1151½ Broadway.

DETROIT EDUCATIONAL SOCIETY—25 Adelaide St. East, Detroit, Mich.
House of Masses, Gratiot and St. Aubin.

FORT WILLIAM — Stewart's Book Store, 612 Victoria Ave.
Fred E. Moore, 224 E. Mary St. (All "Clarion" literature on sale at Moore's).

ECONOMIC CAUSES OF WAR

By PETER T. LECKIE.

NOW READY.
Preface by the author.
132 PAGES.

Per Copy, 25 Cents.
Ten copies up, 20 cents each.
Post Paid.