

THE Socialist Standard

The Official Organ of **THE SOCIALIST PARTY** of Great Britain.

No. 215. Vol. 18.]

LONDON, JULY, 1922.

[MONTHLY, TWOPENCE.]

FROM AN AFRICAN CORRESPONDENT.

17th May, 1922.

As you may have noticed, events in Nairobi took a serious turn about two months ago. The Press, as usual, describe the occurrence as a riot, though in actuality the first exercise of violence proceeded from the forces of "law and order." They arrested a proletarian propagandist of democratic ideas, a native named Harry Thuku, on a "special warrant," which appears to obviate the necessity of a public trial as a preliminary to imprisonment. As a result of this, several hundreds of natives assembled and held a mass meeting outside the police barracks, which lasted for something like eighteen hours! In fact, from the evening of one day till noon the next the crowd remained in the hope that their petitions to the authorities and their prayers to God (their most active spokesman being obviously mission educated) would result in the release of Thuku. The authorities, however, put their faith in things more tangible than ancestral spooks, and called out a detachment of the King's African Rifles. This in spite of the fact that up till that time neither person nor property had been damaged, and the demeanour of the crowd was (according to the evidence of the police chief) "orderly and peaceful," and reminded the local State parson of "a Sunday School picnic"; *while the police were armed*. The arrival of the military was the signal for the beginning of the tragedy. A stampede among the crowd took place which was subsequently described as "an attack on the barracks." The *police* fired, killing over a score and wounding about thirty others, whereupon they left the barracks and proceeded to clean up the streets, ably assisted by the K.A.R. At the subsequent inquiry into the incident it transpired that the police

(a native body) had fired *without orders*! But, as the learned presiding magistrate observed, "if the authority of the Government was to be maintained, the firing must be justified." And so, of course, he justified it. The casualties on the Government side were *nil*; those on the other side included women and children. No wonder the *Daily Mail* and other rags thought it necessary to drag in the bogey of Bolshevism, trusting in popular ignorance and credulity to swallow the ludicrous myth.

The causes of the agitation with which Thuku was associated were described at the beginning of the year in the pages of the *Socialist Standard*. Most important of these were the increase in Hut and Poll taxes, decrease in wages, the system of native registration and the absence of any form of political representation. Thuku was instrumental in forming the original Kikuyu Association, but as this body soon fell into the hands of a junta of Government-paid chiefs, and sought to exclude all but Kikuyu, he and others withdrew and formed the East African Association, a body aiming to unite *all* native tribes and races to gain political equality. He also incidentally exposed the corruption of the above-mentioned chiefs, as instanced in their acceptance of bribes from European planters for procuring labour! In vain did they retaliate by endeavouring to prevent their tribesmen from listening to Thuku. The natives flocked in *thousands* to his meetings, and their spontaneous demonstration following his arrest, while fatal as tactics, afforded ample evidence that they, in the mass, endorse his views. The massacre has simply intensified the bitterness with which they regard their oppressors.

E. B.

THE "RIGHT" TO LIVE.

Upon the publication of a work explaining the natural development of the world, the author Pierre Laplace, the celebrated French mathematician, was asked by Napoleon the 1st why there was no word of God in his system. Laplace replied, "Sure, I have no need of that hypothesis." And if we were asked why we had not mentioned God in our declaration of principles we should answer in a similar manner.

There was a time when the idea of a God who created, controlled and guided the universe passed practically unchallenged. The heaven and earth, the sun, moon, stars and everything including man and the most minute organism was supposed to have been conceived, fashioned and completed within the short period of six days. Whether overtime was worked we cannot say, but judging by the output no modern foreman would be likely to complain that it was not a fair week's work for one person. Primitive man being ignorant of the operation of natural laws, and living in a community of a small and scattered kind, the victim of dangers seen and unseen, created his gods through fear and ignorance. How the gods of the savage have become modified under the pressure of a continuous social development, and have resulted in the idea of one all powerful God is foreign to our purpose here. Suffice it to say that the idea of a supernatural power has considerably influenced human thought throughout the ages.

But step by step the advance of science and industry has expelled this power from its celestial throne, and now-a-days it is almost a commonplace to assert that the universe is governed by ascertainable natural laws. The Socialist sees everywhere in nature a complex chain of cause and effect, a variety of natural happenings which occur in accordance with immutable laws, leaving no room for the existence or the operation of an external power. Thus, in making a study of social relationships, we know that the movements of man grappling with the forces of nature to sustain himself, no less than the forces which mould a planet, are governed by laws. The supernatural is ruled out here as elsewhere.

The life history of the human race from the simple untutored savage to the highly skilled civilized man, shows that man has

depended entirely upon his own energy and nature given material to maintain his existence. It does not require a great amount of knowledge to see that if the mental and physical qualities of man fail him, no matter how much he may look to heaven for support, he ceases to exist.

Thus, if man is thrown back upon himself to obtain the wherewithal to live, the "God-given right to live" about which we hear so much from the priestly cult, cuts a sorry figure, and in various ages men have solicited the support of their gods or God in times of trial and trouble, implying that the final word as to the preservation of life rested with some power external. The Christian chants "Give us this day our daily bread," and although his eyes be heavenward, his thoughts cannot be separated from a knowledge of the fact that he will have to get it for himself.

Apart from a consideration of other sides of the God-given right to live idea, one has only to examine present day society to see how the "right to live" is respected. A few people monopolize the means of life, which enables them to live in luxury and affluence, while those who produce the wealth live in life long poverty, many of them dying of starvation amidst plenty. The "right to live" is here shown to be a sham and a mockery.

The right to die might be more appropriate.

Throughout all organic existence we observe the various forms of life struggling to adapt themselves to the conditions of existence for the purpose of preserving life.

The tiger tracks down its prey and devours it. The swallow devours the gnat. The ichneumon fly lays its eggs under the skin of the caterpillar where they are hatched by the warmth of the caterpillar's blood, producing a brood of larvae which devours the caterpillar alive.

In human society, although there is a code of morals to obscure the parasitism prevalent, nevertheless, it is there just the same. The policeman with his baton; the soldier with his gun; the airman with the aerial bomb all bear witness to its existence. The "right to live" of the ruling class is no other than their power to live upon the backs of the subject class. In view of what has so far been said it may be argued that if the right to live really means that there is no right but might, then the Capitalist

class are justified in holding the means of life in spite of the poverty and misery arising from their ownership. This is quite all right so long as those who starve will allow them to do so.

The Capitalists when they found the restrictions of feudalism a hindrance to their social advancement needed no other right than that of expediency, to aid them in their struggle for power, and the feudal lords did not forego their power without a struggle to retain it.

The Socialist does not direct his appeal for the establishment of Socialism to the Capitalists. He knows it would be worse than useless. No ruling class ever gave up its power of domination without being forced to do so. Make no mistake about it, when the master class are confronted with a serious attack upon the private property institution no abstract "right to live" will prevent them using all the might at their command to maintain their power. To those who think that the Capitalists may respect the rights of the workers to live as they want to, the slaughter of the communards in Paris in 1871 provides a conclusive answer. The appeal of the Socialist is directed to the working class because this class has everything to gain by the acceptance of Socialist principles. At this stage the question arises as to the means to be employed against the might of the ruling class. While we are on this point we wish to refer to a recent interpretation of an article that appeared in the *Socialist Standard* some years ago. The writer of the article in question made clear what the present writer has intended to make clear, namely, that there being no God-given right to live, the workers must look to themselves if they desire a more comfortable existence. The interpretation just referred to is on a passage in an article entitled "Might is Right," which states: "We deserve nothing more than what we can get with our teeth and our claws." In a recent controversy this was quoted as though we favoured the stupid tactics of the broken bottle and big stick variety. The passage will not bear this interpretation except to knaves or fools. Granted that we deserve nothing more than what we can get. The question then is: Since we assert that the workers must look to themselves to get out of Capitalist conditions, by what means can they do so?

The solution of the problem lies in the conditions of the problem itself.

While it is true that the master class use their power to consolidate their domination of the working class, it is also true that this power has been handed to them by the latter. In other words at every election the workers have voted the Capitalists into power. It is as though the lamb delivered itself over to the lion. The workers must understand that they can use this political weapon in the interest of themselves. This weapon, together with the knowledge of their class subjection, is their "teeth and their claws." They must study Socialism wherein they will learn the cause of their subjection, how they are subjected, and the means by which they can combine their forces as a class and use their might to ensure the right to live a comfortable and healthy life.

R. REYNOLDS.

"The work of the individual and that of the family, the work of the factory and that of the whole society, is an organism, each part of which contributes to the whole. The contribution of each organ cannot be mechanically weighed or measured. The Socialist is quite aware that the workers are organs of the work process. He has completely given up the idea of individualising and dividing up a Communitistic product, and paying to each according to his deserts. Present society; with its misunderstood principle of *sum cuique* (each unto his own) and its grotesque justice, acts as unreasonably as the man who gives his eye an overweening care while utterly neglecting his leg. As the engineer is more careful about his smallest screws than about his big wheel, so do we desire that the product of social labour shall be divided according to the social needs, so that the strong and the weak, the swift and the clumsy, the mental and the physical labourer, in so far as they are human, shall work and enjoy in human community."

JOSEPH DIETZGEN.

Readers who find it difficult or impossible to obtain the SOCIALIST STANDARD through the usual channels should communicate with the Head Office, 17, Mount Pleasant, W.C.L., when regular delivery will be arranged.

LOYALTIES.

On March 20th, "The Silver Box," by John Galsworthy, was produced at the Court Theatre. The play was written some years ago, and in spite of some care in bringing details up to date, the atmosphere remains rather old-fashioned. But in essence it is as true as formerly, being concerned with the subjection of the propertyless to those who own the means of life. The economic relation is shown reflected in the privilege which in every department of social life is secured to the ruling class, and the savage dissatisfaction of the more spirited among those who suffer by it.

An unemployed man, exasperated by long privations and indignities, steals a silver cigarette-case on an impulse of drunken spite. The son of a wealthy Member of Parliament is also guilty of a drunken freak—makes off with a harlot's purse. The offences are parallel: but by reason of his fortunate social position the one escapes the consequences of his action, the other is convicted and the tragedy involves his family.

Galsworthy has a clear eye for social antagonisms, of which the most irreconcilable is the conflict of interests appearing as the class struggle. He sees that it is not possible to act upon one set of principles without coming into collision with men who hold to another. "Our loyalties cut across one another," "To be loyal is not enough," are the themes of his latest play at St. Martin's Theatre.

Though the author was not here treating of the class-war, the first observation can with truth be extended to it. The more steadfastly masters and workmen prosecute their respective interests, the completer the solidarity of each class, the more intense is the hostility between them. Only when classes are merged in the Socialist Commonwealth will such contention disappear. But let no enthusiast deem, therefore, that employers and employed alike are to be enlisted in the cause of its establishment: that the class which fights with advantage, and to which fall the spoils of the contest, will throw down its superior weapons and restore the plunder, with no other inducement than a perception of the excellence of harmony among men. No. The revolution will be achieved, not only without its assistance, but in despite of its utmost opposition.

From time to time good people, grieved

by present misery and impatient for its cure, make a bid for the co-operation of capitalists by endeavouring to formulate a scheme which shall recommend itself to both masters and workers as "a more equitable organisation of social life." Setting aside the impracticability of arbitrarily modifying the capitalist system, and the question of how far anything other than Socialism would prove a remedy for the evils they deplore, what is less possible than at once to satisfy two antagonistic ideas of equity?—the one requiring the recognition of private property in the means of production, and consequently to the wealth produced; the other holding that since labour applied to the earth is the sole source of wealth, those who produce have a common title to the fruits of their labour.

A careful reading of history will show that human societies advance by stages, each one of which is marked by equitable organisation—according to the ideas of the then ruling class, and tyranny—according to the revolutionary class. Once it was the rising capitalists of England who shattered feudalism in what Walton Newbold aptly calls "the great struggle for Right, the Right of Property in Hand and Credit." Next will come the turn of the workers, who will set free for the service of mankind the great powers which capitalism, though it has developed them, cannot profitably employ.

To the working class, then, belongs the mission of putting an end to economic conflict, and so to the hatred and wretchedness which grow from it. With its emancipation the world takes another leap forward. For the worker to be loyal to the aspirations of his class is enough: for devotion to the Socialist ideal is in our day the truest service to the human race.

N. P. M.

AN ECONOMIC CLASS

is being held by

BATTERSEA BRANCH, S.P.G.B.

at

16, Creek Street, York Road, Battersea,

EVERY MONDAY EVENING, at 7.30 p.m.

THE GOOD SHEPHERDS.

The report of the I.L.P. Conference, extending over three copies of the "Labour Leader," contains ample evidence to justify the attitude adopted towards that party by the Socialist Party of Great Britain. As they have done hitherto, when it suited their purpose, the leaders and delegates of the I.L.P. loudly proclaimed themselves Socialists and pioneers of the working-class movement, while the result of their deliberations published as a "new constitution," brands them as confusionists.

The Chairman, Mr. R. C. Wallhead, in his opening remarks said that the Party believed and declared:—

"That for the permanent advantage and improvement of working-class conditions, it is essential for the workers to obtain power in politics. That, it believed, was the first great step towards the establishment of an organised society in which the exploitation of men should end through the possession of the means of wealth production by the people themselves. It has persistently pursued that task until to-day it sees, largely as a result of the pioneer work it has done, the establishment of a political working-class organisation which occupies a position of second place in the country, and is accepted by the opposition leaders as the challenger for the premier place in British politics."

The working-class organisation referred to above is the Labour Party; but how many parliamentary representatives of that Party have fought their elections on the question "of the establishment of an organised society in which the exploitation of men should end through the possession of the means of wealth production by the people themselves?" The truth is that all of them have obtained their seats in the House of Commons by keeping that position in the background, while discussing what they term questions of immediate interest, and advocating all sorts of reforms calculated to patch up capitalism and postpone the establishment of the system they profess to be out for.

Such a party may become dominant in British politics, but will always be powerless to establish Socialism because the votes of the workers are not given to them for that purpose.

It is true that the workers control in politics, in the sense that they have a majority of the total votes; but once they have voted that power, either to Coalitionists, Liberals or Labour Leaders, their control is gone, and the party they vote into

office wields the full power of the State. The workers can only use the power that their number gives them when they consciously organize for a specific object and send their own representatives to the national and local assemblies for the accomplishment of that object.

In his address Mr. Wallhead told the assembled delegates that the main thought he wanted to leave with them was that he believed that in the midst of present doubts and perplexities, all the signs and indications tended to prove that the people were looking for a strong lead. If he is justified in this belief, then there are few signs of the workers controlling in politics. If the workers look for a lead, they merely look for leaders on whom to confer power. Their outlook is the same as it has been since the first Reform Bill; or since 1918, when they allowed the present Coalitionist politicians to lead them, with promises far more alluring than those the Labour Leaders dangle before them to-day.

The whole question of slavery or freedom centres around this point: will the workers continue to allow themselves to be led, or will they direct the affairs of life in their common interest, through representatives selected and appointed by themselves?

They can only do the latter when they are in agreement as to the object of their political activities. The only object, correctly understood, on which all workers could agree is the Socialist object. The establishment of a system of society based on the common ownership and democratic control of all the means of wealth production. This is not the object of the I.L.P., nor is it the object of the Labour Party. The objects of the latter party are too numerous to mention; they consist chiefly of any reforms or palliatives that are likely to be popular with the workers at election times. The I.L.P. declares its objects to be:—

"The communal ownership of land and capital, and the performance, as social functions, of the processes of production, distribution and exchange."

Such an object merely means nationalization and bureaucratic government—in practice, what we see in the Post Office—and is what the I.L.P. has always stood for, as anyone can see by a study of their leading publications. Capital is "wealth used for the production of profit," in other words, wealth used for exploitation. It is absurd,

therefore, to talk of the communal ownership of capital. Whether wealth is held and used in this way by individuals, companies, or governments, the workers are still wage-slaves because they must still sell their labour-power in order to live. The modern processes of exchange, too, is a capitalist institution and implies ownership in the means of life, either by individuals, sections, or bureaucracies; it is, therefore, in flat contradiction to communal ownership.

If this is the object Mr. Wallhead has in view, no wonder he told the conference that:—

“The days of agitation and propaganda are to a certain extent ending, and the task of administration begins. In this work of administration the task of co-ordinating Socialist theory to immediate practical problems will necessarily arise.”

He (Wallhead) and the I.L.P. hold out as a promise to the workers, Bureaucratic Government. They see numbers of workers, sick of unemployment and hopeless of the fulfilment of Coalition pledges, nibbling at the bait; but Wallhead is forced to admit, even if they occupy “the premier place in British politics,” that all they can do is to co-ordinate Socialist theory to immediate practical problems. Elected by workers who do not understand Socialism, leaders who do understand it could do no more. The task for every Socialist is, therefore, to help in the work of making more Socialists.

F. F.

ON GETTING TIRED.

The story is told of Ibn-As-Sammak, a professional tale teller of Bagdad, that he one day asked his slave girl her opinion of one of his discourses. She replied it would have been good but for its repetitions.

“But,” he said, “I use repetitions in order to make those understand who do not.”

“Yes,” she commented, “and in making those understand who do not, you weary those who do.”

I wonder if there are many among our readers, who are weary of our repetitions; weary of seeing the same old tale tricked out in different words; of observing month after month the same old call monotonously sounded:—you know the phrase—“we therefore urge the working class to organise as a class, and capture the political machine, etc., etc.” Yes, its a desperate business, this saying the same thing a hundred ways,

a desperate business, only saved from becoming a weariness to the writers, or degenerating into a jargon, by their varying individualities; by each superimposing whatever he may have of wit, or style, or knowledge, upon the original truth. But after all, what would you! What else is there to do! One cannot tell the truth too often. The Capitalist press is never tired of telling the opposite. Purely as a mechanical task this spectacle filled Carlyle with amazement.

“The most unaccountable of all ready writers,” he said, “is the common editor of a daily newspaper. Consider his leading articles; what they treat of; how passably they are done. Straw that has been thrashed a hundred times without wheat—how a man, with merely human faculty, buckles himself nightly with new vigour and interest to this thrashed straw, nightly thrashes it anew, nightly gets up new thunder about it; and so goes on thrashing and thundering for a considerable series of years; this is a fact remaining still to be accounted for in human physiology.”

It is indeed a thing to marvel on, particularly when as Carlyle puts it, it is “straw that has been thrashed a hundred times without wheat.” Critical readers of our modern Capitalist press, must admit there has been little alteration in that respect since Carlyle’s day. When one pauses at the end of a week’s, or month’s reading of daily newspapers, and endeavours to gather some definite mental picture of the period, it is then one appreciates the absence of “wheat.” What screaming posters, what heavy, lurid headlines, what “news,” what easily flowing, sweetly reasonable articles. But no wheat. All straw, friends: not a grain of wheat in a thousand tons. The one thing that matters is never mentioned. The fact that you are a slave class, ruled economically and politically by a small parasitic class, is never hinted at, other than in terms of ridicule. The overwhelming fact that you spend the bulk of your waking hours in the service of a master, in return for a pittance is again scarcely mentioned, unless it be to assure you that your poverty is essential to national prosperity. Why national prosperity should involve penury and hardship to those who produce it, is another fact that will elude the crowded columns of the master’s press.

It is here the Socialist press enters the field. It endeavours to show that modern Capitalist society is broad, based upon one central fact—the dominance and enslavement of the many by the few. It says further that this enslavement is conserved and continued by the grip of the few upon the machinery of government. It follows with the inevitable conclusion, that if the mass of people want to end their slavery, they must gain control of the machine which holds them down.

This is the Socialist position. Not all of it, but its essence. The reason we have to repeat it many times, is because the bulk of the working class have never heard it, and of those who have, but few are moved to action. At the risk of wearying those who do understand, we have to iterate and reiterate the one central truth that matters. Our task would be easier if those who do understand, in all cases squared their actions with their belief, and did the logical thing—joined the Socialist Party. Socialism is essentially a creed of action. Action, and organised intelligent action at that, is vital to its achievement. And yet, there must be thousands of workers, perfectly convinced of the desirability, and of the inevitability of Socialism, who have never lifted a finger to bring it nearer. This is a greater physiological puzzle than that of Carlyle, and for us even more unfortunate; for though his editors' thrash ever so madly, nothing but straw rewards their efforts, whilst we have a harvest that waits but the labourers. It is these who are weary of our repetitions, but they should reflect, it is they who help to make them necessary. Let them take the first step that renders repetition unnecessary so far as they are concerned. Let them cease to wait for the "other chap" to join, but be guided rather, by logic, and shew the "other chap" that you at least are a logical person.

And there is so much one can do. Get your pal interested. Take him along to our meetings; they are all open to the public. Get him to ask questions. Suggest questions to him. To keep him interested, make him order the *Socialist Standard* regularly. Then start on another pal. Do you know, we owe dozens of members and several branches to chance copies of this journal. That should tell you what to do with the extra copies you buy. But above all, and this is a repetition we insist on, if you are

convinced of the truth of the Socialist position it is your duty to yourself and your class to join the Socialist Party and help to bring it about.

W. T. H.

ON LIBERTY.

Your walk of life does not matter, neither your occupation, social standing, nor domestic circumstances. If your brains are sufficiently developed, your understanding sufficiently large to realise what a hard vigilant taskmaster Liberty is, how it must be won by bitter exertion, deep introspection, subtle selection of essentials, and the most ruthless determination to articulate and to live the essence one discovers to be oneself—then, and not till then, are you individually free.

No wonder so few people are personalities and truly human. It is so much easier to jog along simply on the lines of least resistance, to submit to the general trend without struggle, to allow habits, comfort, laziness or cowardice to hold one down, to be nothing but a reaction to other people's lack of ideas, to say and do what is generally expected, what thousands have said and done before on similar occasions.

After all, only slaves tolerate fetters. Freedom is within the reach of those who will take the trouble to grasp it. But it cannot be bestowed from without, like a diploma or a patent; it must be won from within — and one must *feel* the power to win it.

Socialism points the way. Economic freedom alone makes individual freedom possible for mankind.

W. J. E.

"HISTORICAL MATERIALISM."

The term "historical materialism" describes that view of the course of history which seeks the ultimate cause and the great moving power of all important historic events in the economic development of Society; in the changes in the modes of production and exchange; in the consequent division of Society into distinct classes and in the struggle of these classes against one another.

"Socialism—Utopian and Scientific."

F. ENGELS.

OFFICIAL NOTICE.

All communications for the Executive Committee, Subscriptions for the **SOCIALIST STANDARD**, Articles, and Correspondence submitted for insertion therein, should be addressed—The Socialist Party of Great Britain, 17, Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1, to whom Money Orders should be made payable.

The meetings of the Executive Committee are held at the Head Office, every Tuesday, at 7.30 p.m.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTIONS.

Twelve Months, post free. . . . 3s. 0d.
Six Months, post free 1s. 6d.

The Socialist Standard,

JULY



1922

CRITICAL TIMES.

Under the title of "A Call to the Churches," an article appeared in the *Daily News* (19-6-22) from which we learn that "just at this moment the history of international relations is entirely upon a critical chapter." The "international relations" referred to are the tricky, treacherous, and avaricious manipulations of different groups of financial magnates, through the medium of various political and other lackeys, for control of the different markets of the world.

There is another chapter in the social book, however, that is of far more interest and concern to the workers than the one above mentioned; and this chapter is also critical, as witness the following quotation from the article to which we have already referred:—

"The relations between nations are more rather than less strained. Hundreds of millions of money are still being spent upon armaments, while unemployment is widespread, social reform is at a standstill, and in many lands starvation and disease are ripe."

Unemployment, starvation, and disease are indeed widespread. As time passes, this chapter not only appears to become more critical, but even appears to have no end—at least, no improvement in the general situation is in sight. The passing or easing of the crisis is delayed, not by the "failure of

Genoa," as the *Daily News* would have us believe, but by the hothouse-like growth of machinery and processes of production brought forth by the war. In other words, wealth is produced in such abundance that the effective demands are overwhelmed. That there is no shortage of wealth is clearly demonstrated by the rapidity with which new capital is subscribed and over-subscribed whenever shares are advertised for subscription.

The article upon which we are commenting provides a rather humorous thrust at the policy the *Daily News* has been advocating for some time. With much use of fine phrases and lengthy "argument," this paper has frequently sought to prove how advantageous the League of Nations would be. Whole-heartedly it has backed the movement and idolised its founders. Now, however, we read:—

"If before the League is complete a counter league or group of powers is formed sufficiently powerful to be independent of it, then we shall surely have the old balance of power in another shape and the embryo of another world war."

In other words, League or no League, the question of war lies in the hands of the powerful combinations of capitalists. Yet in spite of this, self-appointed "leaders" of the workers declaim eloquently on the necessity of supporting the campaign in favour of this side-tracking idea.

Such Will-o'-th'-wisps are attractive, but they lead to disillusion, disappointment, and apathy. When the workers leave these ideas on one side and stick firmly to the hard facts of life which are constantly forcing themselves upon us for examination and explanation, they will be on the broad highway to a knowledge and understanding of their present condition of slavery.

NOW ON SALE.

MANIFESTO

OF

THE SOCIALIST PARTY

OF GREAT BRITAIN.

Sixth Edition—With New Preface.

Price Threepence. Post Free, Fourpence

FROM THE

S.P.G.B., 17 Mount Pleasant, London, W.C.1

WHO SHOULD WEAR THE CAP AND BELLS?

To the Editors of the *Socialist Standard*.

DEAR SIRS, — From what I can gather, "J. F." wishes to convey the impression that for once he has succeeded in discarding the somewhat grumpy and miserable aspect of countenance which, it seems to me, must of necessity be associated with a scribe of his ponderous, rather than pondersome, disposition. As to whether the impression, if created, is a true record of the facts, I, for one, do not believe for a moment. It seems to suffice from "J. F.'s" point of view that, when he finds himself in difficulties, all that it is necessary for him to do is to tell his readers that he indulged in a fit of hilarity, which he describes as creating "some job to avoid choking." I have a suspicion that by those means (as well as others) it is calculated that another impression shall be conveyed, and that is—that without accomplishing the task, it shall be made to appear easy and accomplished. "The task" that I am referring to is one that has for its object the meeting of, or dealing with, the points raised in my letter, which I claim have not been even referred to. All such abusive language which questions my "method of discussing Marx" as "genuine" has nothing whatever to do with my letter, and only tends to confuse the issue. "J. F." with the rippling laughter (or it is ripping?) of the brook such as poets describe, goes on laughing and laughing and "choking," and by way of demonstrating this laughter as a fact of great importance, he describes me as being capable of "absurd assumptions," "idiotic interpretations," "blindness," with an additional designation of myself as "a short-sighted and intellectually-limited fanatic." All this, it seems, is of a very cheerful character, so cheerful that one is left to conclude that "J. F." cannot under any circumstances be very terrible, even when he is miserable. He would certainly make a great jester if he would but indulge in the cult just a little more. In any case, he has amply qualified for the cap and bells with which, before proceeding further, I must hasten to award him with all due solemnity. To begin with, "J. F." deals with my question as to whether Lenin "expected a country in a backward condition economically to establish Socialism" as follows: "The answer is Yes! Lenin pro-

claimed the upheaval in 1917 as a 'Socialist Revolution,' even as late as his 'Left Wing Communism' written in 1920."

How simple! This appears to me to be the simplification of simplicity itself. It seems that "J. F." has still a good deal to learn. Why! Even a newly-converted worker to Socialism could tell him that there can be no such thing as a "Socialist Revolution," except in so far as that it is led by *Socialists*, and in this sense the Russian Revolution of November was certainly a Socialist Revolution, and Lenin was certainly correct when in that sense he described it as such. How could a Socialist Revolution be otherwise? If we define the word "revolution" as meaning a complete change, and as a "complete change" such as, say, our present social system from primitive Communism cannot, by any stretch of the imagination be described as a "revolution," but which can rather be described as a complete change brought about through the *evolutionary* processes of the tools and implements of wealth production, in what other way can we describe a complete change in society as constituting a revolution? It appears to me that "J. F." expects to wake up one fine morning at, say, 6 o'clock (preferably Monday, as we are all in the habit of starting fresh on that day) and witness the most agreeable spectacle of the present system of society being transformed by 9 o'clock into the Socialist Co-operative Commonwealth, all ready for him to start work in the new order of things. I have heard a lot of chatter and fine distinctions made concerning "political," "social," and other revolutions, and "J. F." is apparently one of those who indulges in them; but in so far as the existence of classes is a feature of our *social* system, the only thing that can be described as a "*social*" revolution is when a subject class attains to the position of a ruling class, and only in so far as that revolution is led by Socialists, or undertaken by the masses converted to Socialism, can that revolution be described as a "Socialist Revolution." Lenin was, therefore, right when he described the November Revolution as such. That does not mean that he expected "a country in a backward condition economically to establish Socialism." "J. F." in that respect utterly ignores my statement which says that "again and again did Lenin assert the necessity for the economic development of Russia as being requisite

for the establishment of Socialism." Then "J. F.," with a grand flourish of his pen, and, it seems, of trumpets, with all the hilarity and glee that he can muster, proceeds with this revelation: "It is true that later Lenin had to modify his own words, as he has had to do on many other points. But that hits Lenin and Dight—not us."

What words of Lenin did he (Lenin) have to modify? That it (the Russian) was a "Socialist Revolution?" He never "modified" that. That he, with others, established Socialism in Russia, or that he "expected a country in *backward condition economically* to establish Socialism? (Italics mine.) He never said that Socialism was established, and he could never "modify" expectations he never had. It must have been a most inspiring brain wave which "J. F." must have become possessed of when he referred to what he calls the modification of Lenin's "own words" as hitting "Lenin and Dight—not us." This—coupling of my name with Lenin—is deserving of scorn, and, for my part, I can do no more than say that had the coupling been contrived by some other individual intellectually greater than "J. F." and providing that that individual was not indulging in the congenial pastime of "leg-pulling," I *might* have felt highly honoured. As it is, I feel bound to suspect that the methods employed in this respect are calculated to disparage the intellectual qualifications of a man—in the person of Lenin—as compared with whom the greatest "intellectual giant" of the S.P.G.B. can be likened to a jackass. Of course, the "modification" of Lenin's "own words," which, according to "J. F.," mean that the Russian Revolution was not a "Socialist Revolution," does not hit "J. F." or the members of the S.P.G.B. Judging by previous issues of the *Socialist Standard* that is quite true. On the contrary, you do not even regard this fact with any lack of concern or indifference, but rather does it seem to be regarded with gloating joy such as the myrmidons of the capitalist Press might envy. It is quite true that "any elementary school child can answer the question about America." (My italics.) It is likewise quite true that any school child can tell us that the weather is either fine or nasty in accordance with circumstances. But what has all this to do with the question at issue? No one asked any "question" as to what it was that prevented America from

passing through feudalism, except in so far as that an answer was expected in relation to the point at issue. The thing I was concerned with was *the fact* that America adopted capitalism without necessarily going through feudalism. That fact is admitted. And then it wasn't a "question" of America except in so far as that that country served as a means for illustrating my point—a point made quite clear and utterly ignored—and that was *that a country need not go through all the phases of a former system* before another system is adopted, as well as that it need not even go through the system itself—that is, of course, the system which *generally* precedes the system adopted. So far it will be seen by any except those who are afflicted with "blindness" that "J. F." has been indulging in a lot of shuffling and confusion, and where he at all comes to the real question at issue, he uses *four* words, not connected, out of a passage originally quoted by yourselves, comprising no fewer than eighty-two words. It is true that later he uses two sentences torn from their context, and in that way distorting their meaning. Concerning, first of all, the "four words" above referred to, "J. F." says that Marx—

"was dealing with the 'normal development' of societies and how they cannot evade the 'successive phases' of this 'normal development,'"

and that he (Marx) was not dealing, as was my contention, with the "successive phases" and "normal development" of a "revolutionary period." This is clearly a case of "J. F." supposing, to use his own words, that "Marx meant something quite contrary to what he wrote," as I shall show. What is it to which Marx referred when he said that we could not "clear by bold leaps or remove by legal enactments the obstacles offered by the successive phases of its normal development" except a revolutionary period? That it was a revolutionary period to which he referred is clearly proved by the following words from the same passage, to which I drew attention in my letter, and which "J. F." finds it very convenient to ignore: "And even when a society *has got upon the right track* for the discovery of the natural laws of its movement." (My italics.) Then follow the words, some of which "J. F." only uses, which tells us what under the circumstances *cannot* be done; and then Marx says: "*But IT CAN shorten and*

lessen the BIRTH PANGS." Is it necessary to labour the point further? Anyone with little more intelligence than an idiot can understand that there can be no such thing as social "birth pangs" except within a revolutionary period. Your whole point in your original quotation was to prove that "a country in a backward condition economically" (your words) could not establish Socialism without first going through the "successive phases of its normal development" (Marx), and that Marx "expressly denied such a thing possible." (Your words, my italics.) But if we take the thirty-seven words that "J. F." sees fit to use only, from a quotation from the preface to the second Russian edition of the *Communist Manifesto* containing about 300 words, there we shall see that not only is it not true that Marx "expressly denied," etc., but that he, with Engels, asserted the very reverse. Anyone who has read my letter carefully, and closely followed "J. F.'s" "reply," will see that it would be necessary in order that the issue may be cleared to make my original points and quotations, and, as under the circumstances, this task would grow if the matter is pursued further, I think it would be better to terminate this discussion (if such from "J. F.'s" side it can be called), unless some other person takes up the case. It may not even then be necessary to pursue the matter. That depends, of course, upon whether, if after an attempt has been made to meet my case, I consider my position nevertheless established. I had no idea when I wrote in criticism of an editorial that a "reply" was forthcoming from "J. F.," otherwise I doubt if I would have written. I say this as a result of past experience, which is one of abuse, confusion, and shuffle.—Yours faithfully,

HY. DIGHT.

Mr. Dight—to use a phrase popular in the workshop—is unlucky. Along with many other people, whose knowledge of Marx's writings and sociology is small, he was carried away by the upheaval in Russia.

To these people that event was the coming of the promised heaven and Lenin was the "Jesus Christ" of the new Revelation. As sheep-like in their following of Lenin as the Christians were of Jesus they accepted and repeated, without the slightest examination, any statement coming from the new

Messiah. Sometimes this had awkward consequences for the disciples.

Thus in a former communication Mr. Dight tried to use against us a falsification of Marx by Lenin. Our exposure of this piece of fraud was intensely disagreeable for Mr. Dight, as shown by his shuffle of a reply. But it taught him one lesson—namely—that if he wished to quote Marx in controversy with us it was necessary to read Marx himself and not to rely upon Lenin for his quotations. Still even to read Marx does not necessarily guarantee an understanding of what he wrote.

An instance of this was given in Mr. Dight's letter in the May issue of the *Socialist Standard*, where it was easily shown that the quotations given were in direct opposition to the views they were used to support. All Mr. Dight can do, when these facts were pointed out, is to indulge in a long tirade of personalities about "J. F.," to whom he offers the cap and bells. "J. F.," however, has no wish to deprive Mr. Dight of his eminently suitable equipment.

To what a maze of confusion and contradiction hero-worship leads is shown in Mr. Dight's attempt to defend Lenin's false claims of the upheaval in Russia being a "Socialist Revolution." At one part he says:—

"There can be no such thing as a 'Socialist Revolution,' except in so far as that it is 'led by Socialists.'" (Italics ours.)

This phrase displays an appalling ignorance of the first elements of Socialism and an entire lack of knowledge of social evolution, which is further emphasized by his remarks a little further on when he states:—

"A 'complete change,' such as, say, our present social system from Primitive Communism cannot by any stretch of the imagination be described as a 'revolution.'"

No! it can better be described as the product of a particularly uninstructed mind, for even the school books provided by the capitalist class for workers' children admit the existence of two other systems—chattel slavery and feudalism—between primitive Communism and Capitalism!

Before a Socialist revolution can take place a majority of the working class must understand and accept the essentials of Socialism and organise to establish it. This understanding not only renders "leaders"

unnecessary, it forbids their existence. The working class will keep control in its own hands and administrators will have to carry out the workers' instructions. To talk of a "Socialist Revolution" as being "led by Socialists" is at once to proclaim one's entire ignorance of even the elements of Socialism. It is therefore not so surprising to find Mr. Dight is unable to see the glaring contradictions of his attempted defence of Lenin when he states:—

"Lenin was, therefore, right when he described the November Revolution as such" [i.e., as a Socialist Revolution] and then says:—"Again and again did Lenin assert the necessity for the economic development of Russia as being requisite for the establishment of Socialism."

When is a Socialist Revolution not a Socialist Revolution? When it occurs in Russia!

If it was a "Socialist Revolution" how was it that it failed to establish Socialism? And if it failed to establish Socialism how could it be a "Socialist" Revolution? Such is the result of following "leaders."

Mr. Dight agrees that any school child could answer his question on America—though he was unable to answer it—but now states that he did not put the question "except in relation to the point at issue"—which was exactly why we dealt with it. So to clarify the issue he puts the question again, because we "utterly ignored" it before—by answering it. He repeats his previous point as follows:—

"A country need not go through all the phases of a former system before another system is adopted."

As "evidence" for this entirely inaccurate assertion he pointed to America. We showed how ridiculous this illustration was and Mr. Dight admitted our point, and then repeats his stupid assertion. He has not yet learnt the difference between a country in the geographical sense and the people who inhabit such a territory. A *society* is formed of the people in a particular country or countries. As pointed out in our previous reply the *people* of America did *not* adopt Capitalism. They were exterminated by the people of another country who had adopted Capitalism after passing through Feudalism, and who merely extended their own system into the new area. To put the point more fully—there is no race or nation of people who have passed from either Barbarism or Chattel-slavery

into Capitalism without developing through Feudalism. There is no race or nation of people that have passed from Feudalism to fully developed Capitalism without going through the essential phases of Capitalist development.

On the matter of the quotations from the preface to "Capital," Mr. Dight adopts the well-worn subterfuge of using emphasis for argument. First he put certain phrases in italics. Then, after it was shown that the phrases contradicted his assertions, he tries to make a show of a case by repeating the phrases in capital letters. Unfortunately for Mr. Dight the truth of a statement does not depend upon the type used to print it, but we are inclined to agree with his remark that:—

"Anyone with little more intelligence than an idiot can understand that there can be no such thing as social 'birth pangs,' except within a revolutionary period."

for even he appears to understand the phrase. Where his understanding fails is in not seeing that the "successive phases of its normal development" of any society *precedes* the "birth pangs" of a new order and is not, as he imagines, contemporary with it.

We also agree that the words Mr. Dight italicised in his quotation from the preface to the 2nd Russian edition of the Communist Manifesto completely knocked out the interpretation he tried to place upon them, and flatly contradicts his present statement that Marx and Engels "asserted the very reverse." Perhaps he was wise not to restate this quotation, seeing that those he has requoted have merely exposed further his mental confusion and lack of knowledge. Nor would we deny that his past experience has been one of abuse, confusion and shuffle in face of the strong corroboration of these points to be found in his letters.

J. F.

"Systematization is the essence and the general expression of the aggregate of science. The practical result of all theory is to acquaint us with the system and method of its practice and thus to enable us to act in the world with a reasonable certainty of success.

"JOSEPH DIETZGEN."

HELP TO SAVE.

We have frequently drawn the attention of members of the working class, through our literature and from the platform, that, with the introduction of new machinery, the capitalist class are able to extract more wealth from the workers. The latest device of this character which the capitalist has obtained a monopoly of, is called a "Flapper." It is an attractive looking machine, and has become very popular amongst members of the working class. So whenever the capitalists want to "Raise the wind" for the purpose of maintaining some of those institutions which are necessary under capitalism, such as Hospitals, Orphan Homes, Churches or Famine Funds, they have only to set a few "Flappers" in motion and the trick is done.

At the present time the SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain is in URGENT NEED of FUNDS for the purpose of carrying on our propaganda, including the publication of the "SOCIALIST STANDARD" (which is being sold at a loss) and some new pamphlets which we are anxious to publish as soon as we can obtain the needful. Having no "Flappers" at our disposal, we have to fall back upon the goodwill and intelligence of our readers and also those sympathisers who wish us to carry on the work for SOCIALISM. WE THEREFORE APPEAL to ALL THOSE PERSONS WHO DESIRE TO SEE THE KNOWLEDGE OF SOCIALISM SPREAD FAR and WIDE, to assist us by sending a DONATION (however small or large) to 17, Mount Pleasant, W.C.1.

£1,000 FUND.

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Already Acknowledged	810	13	3½
Donations:—						
W. Ham Branch	..	5	0	0		
Hackney (2)	..	4	0	0		
"C.W.P.," San Francisco	..	10	0			
"J.D.," Burton-on-Trent	..	2	3			
"D.F.,"	..	5	0	0		
F. G., New Zealand	..	4	6			
				14	16	9
Stamp Books:—						
N.W.L. (14)	..	1	0	0		
Tottenham (10)	..	4	0			
" (11)	..	2	6			
Battersea (49)	..	10	0			
Watford (28)	..	10	0			
				2	6	6
				<u>£827</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>6½</u>

19:6:22/A.S.C.

SOME SHODDY THOUGHTS OF A SUPERFICIAL MIND.

It is G. K. Chesterton's opinion that Mr. A. J. Penty is "one of the two or three truly original minds of the modern world." When therefore Penty applies himself to criticism of Marx one expects something brilliant. It turns out however to be as shallow as any of the stuff written by numbers of critics who make no claim to genius, and the original mind appears to be just like an ordinary one.

Writing on "Christian Communists" in the "Crusader" (26 May, 1922) he begins well with the confident assertion that "there is nothing in common between the Communism of Christianity and the Communism of Marx but a name which conceals differences that are fundamental." This is a refreshing change from the attitude of the discontented religionists who "sympathise with the Labour movement" on the one hand, and from the fogginess of the half-converted Communists on the other. The former fancy they see in the working class movement a blind groping heavenwards, and encourage the view, very useful to the capitalist class, that a little more soulfulness and a little less grasping after material things will right all wrongs, and incidentally make the movement fit for Christians to live on.

Just as the churches are learning that it does not pay to drive away its congregation by too forcible opposition to trade unionism, and safe enough to give benediction to sane Labour Leaders, so also may self-styled Communists recognise the advisability of turning a blind eye on the implications of their own teaching when applied to religious superstitions. Thus we have the "Workers Dreadnought" (4th June, 1921) agreeing with the Rev. Conrad Noel that the true interpretation of "the teaching of the Nazarene is Communism" and that Christ, if he really did exist, "was a Communist without doubt." Again, Francis Meynell, as Editor of the "Communist," while admitting in a letter to an enquirer (2nd June, 1921) that the "materialist conception of History . . . cannot be reconciled with any form of supernatural belief" had to excuse the unsound and illogical attitude of the Communist Party with the evasive remark that the logical proletarian "is even more rare than a white

blackbird"; the specious apology of every purveyor of quack nostrums. If the public doesn't know and doesn't like what is good then give them what they like even though it is bad. If the workers don't like the correct attitude toward religion, suppress it; if they don't like Communism give them something else. In what other way can a "mass" party be built up?

But although Penty recognises the impossibility of reconciling Christianity with Marxism, he soon shows that his knowledge of the latter is hardly sufficient to support the emphatic opinion he expresses.

He says of Marxians that "in practice, as the Bolshevik régime demonstrated, they are Industrial Conscriptors; for there is no avoiding the conclusion that Marxism leads as inevitably to the servile state as Fabianism." He assumes that his conclusion is so obvious as not to need proof: but is it? If the Bolsheviks made the mistake of thinking that Russian conditions would permit the establishment of Socialism, does this make Marxists responsible for policies imposed on the Bolsheviks by economic necessity? If the Bolshevik Government, acting at the outset with insufficient knowledge of the world situation, were compelled by the failure of their hopes and the critical position in which they found themselves to adopt emergency measures, does this make Marxists Industrial Conscriptors?

To hold Marxists responsible for the Russian Government's actions is absurd: the Bolsheviks themselves are hardly responsible. They are only taking Hobson's choice.

Penty goes on in similar strain to accuse Marxists of objecting not to capitalism but to the "private ownership" of capital. For proof he refers to, but does not quote, Lenin's speeches. That Marx advocated state ownership is untrue and the suggestion from one who could so easily find out what he did advocate somewhat childish. It is doubtful too, whether Penty could produce evidence from Lenin's speeches. That Lenin states as a fact that Russia cannot escape the capitalist stage of development is not a sufficient reason for the assumption that he desires nothing else.

It may be said in his defence by those who have high opinions of Mr. Penty that the "original mind" does not have to trouble about evidence for charges made, but those who don't know Mr. Penty will only notice that this particular controversial

trick is played by so many ordinary people—dishonest people.

I would certainly like to know one thing from Mr. Penty: that is, from what source he learned that Marx "did not propose to abolish capitalism but to superimpose communism over it."

Mr. Penty evidently extends his originality to his use of the King's English, for we are told that Marxians "do not quarrel with modernism as a conception of life, but only with the fact that it is limited to the few." I can only speak for myself but I cannot imagine Marxists quarreling with anybody because "Modernism as a conception of life" is "limited to the few." I don't know what it means but I should be prepared to take the risk and let the few keep it and wish them jolly good luck as well.

Mr. Penty next tells us that Marxians quarrel with the implications of materialism, but not with materialism itself. He omits however to say what the implications are and again leaves me in the dark as to his meaning.

He attempts to state the Marxian theory of social revolution and succeeds well enough while closely following the original, but once he leaves the book and begins to comment, his failure to understand becomes apparent.

He says that "if the forms of social organisation were nothing more than the reflex action of the forces of production, then the millenium ought to arrive by an automatic process without any conscious effort on the part of man." I don't know how "the forms of social organisation" can be the "reflex action" of anything, but assuming Mr. Penty meant something else, I am at a loss to understand where he obtained this notion of Marxism. He then pretends that this difficulty of his own creation was likewise discovered by Marx. "But Marx felt instinctively that such could not be the case." This is another quite common trick.

Penty foists on Marx something he did not say and then argues that because Marx really did say something different that he was either contradicting himself or had changed his mind.

Now having initially misrepresented Marx and started him out on a course which has existence only in Penty's fertile brain, this has somehow or other to be sustained.

He pretends that Marx had to find some driving force, and having cut out love, "he was driven to make use of the power of hatred. Hence the advocacy of the Class War by which he hoped to generate a force capable of overthrowing the existing order of society."

This is sheer nonsense. Marx did not and Marxists do not "advocate class war." Marx from a careful study of the capitalist organisation of society made certain generalisations as to its structure and the lines of its growth and decay. He gave the explanation of its origin and of its position in the chain of social systems, and it is the aim of Marxists to spread this knowledge among the workers in order that it may be the means of hastening the overthrow of capitalist domination. Foremost in this is the recognition of the fact that capitalist society takes its form from the fundamental division into the owners of the means of production, and the wage earners who work but do not own. The Socialist no more advocates class war than does a doctor spread disease who asks that its existence shall be recognised and its nature studied as a prelude to its removal. While disease, physical and mental, was regarded as a punishment for sins, no headway could be expected in the treatment of lunacy or epidemics; while the criminal is regarded as a conscious and deliberate enemy of society instead of a product of the system no headway will be made in the removal of crime. While the class nature of capitalism is unrecognised by the workers, its abolition cannot be hoped for.

Those who endeavour to gain recognition for the fact that class struggle exists, are accused by Penty of fermenting hatred just as those who urged the development of medical and sanitary sciences were accused of encouraging immorality, and those who urged the study of criminology, of fostering crime.

Those who have knowledge of the structure of capitalism based as it is on exploitation, and of the possibility of its replacement by a society in which class divisions shall no longer hamper the use by all of the natural resources and the highly developed means of wealth production, have no need of hatred as a motive force. Knowledge is a much more potent weapon in the hands of the organised working class.

Since therefore Marx did not advocate class war and did not expect that he through

class hatred would generate a force capable of "overthrowing the existing social order" (by the way Mr. Penty has just told us that Marx did *not* aim at overthrowing capitalism) it is hard to see how Marxians could be disappointed because "it does not work out as expected." Again, "working class solidarity" has never been a reality and could not therefore, owing to the alleged instruction of the workers in suspicion have become a "myth."

It would finally be interesting to know the identity of the "middle class socialists" who, through suspicion of their genuineness, have been lost to the working class movement to the latter's detriment. I know of none. I have heard of people who have made the workers stepping stones to their own advancement, and then to conceal their own meanness when they deserted those who had provided means to their ascent, had to make pretence of being martyrs to suspicion. Penty may mean these, but their value is open to doubt anyway. Their contempt for the workers appears to have been developed more or less consciously, but Penty's judging by the careless and misleading views he gives to his Crusader readers seems to be real; doubtless another attribute of the original mind.

In view of Penty's rather miserable show it would be helpful if G. K. Chesterton would give us the identity of the *third* original mind so that we may know his calibre too.

Chesterton we know. He finds his vocation in writing excellent drinking songs; Penty, with his fine vein of imagination, and his lofty disregard for mere commonplace accuracy should transfer his talent to new fields. He might try Romantic Ballads on other historical figures, preferably those legendary ones about whom no awkward records exist. Anyway he might leave Marx alone.

H.

ATTENTION!

Will those interested in the work of the Edinburgh Branch of the Party communicate with :—

ANDREW PORTER,
12a, Kings Road,
Portobello.

SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain**BRANCH DIRECTORY.**

BATTERSEA.—Communications to A. Jones, 3 Matthew-st., Letchmere Estate, Battersea, S.W. Branch meets Mondays, 8.30, at 16 Creek-st., York-rd.

BIRMINGHAM.—Communications to L. Vinetsky, 11 Upper Dean-st., Birmingham. Branch meets A.E.U. Institute, Spiceal-st., every Saturday.

CENTRAL.—Membership obtained only through the Ex. Committee. Applications to General Sec.

DEPTFORD.—Sec., J. Veasey, 24, Marlton-st., E. Greenwich, S.E. 10. Branch meets 1st and 3rd Wednesdays in month, at 8 o'clock, at 435, New Cross-rd., S.E. Discussion after Branch business. Public invited.

EAST LONDON.—Communications to A. Jacobs, Sec., 78 Eric-st., Mile-end, E.3. Branch meets first and third Mondays in month at 141 Bow-rd.

EDINBURGH.—Communications to Andrew Porter, 12a, Kings-rd., Portobello.

HACKNEY.—Communications to the Sec., 78 Greenwood-rd., E.8. Branch meets Fridays, 7.30, at The Arcadians, 42, Amhurst-rd., Hackney Stn.

HANLEY.—Branch meets Mondays, Working Men's Club, Glass-st. Communications to Sec., T. Travis, 27, Arthur Street, Cobridge, Staffs.

ISLINGTON.—Branch meets Wednesdays, 8.30, at 144 Seven Sisters-rd., Holloway, N. Communications to W. Baker, 35 Alma-st., Kentish Town, N.W.

SOUTHEND-ON-SEA.—Communications to Sec., J. Bird, 5 Wellington-avenue, Westcliffe-on-Sea.

TOOTING.—Communications to Sec., 3, Lyveden-rd., Tooting, S.W.17. Branch meets Fridays, at Parochial Hall, Church-lane, Tooting, at 8 p.m.

TOTTENHAM.—Sec., F. W. Godfrey, 19, Beechfield-rd., Finsbury Pk., N.4. Branch meets Fridays, The Trades Hall, 7, Bruce-grove, Tottenham. Discussion after branch business. Public invited.

WALTHAMSTOW.—Communications to Sec., 11 Carlton-rd., Walthamstow, E.17. Branch meets at Workmen's Hall, High-st., every Monday.

WATFORD.—A. Lawson, Sec., 107 Kensington-avenue, Watford.

WEST HAM.—Branch meets Thursdays at 8 p.m. at 167 Romford rd., Stratford. Communications to P. Hallard, 22 Colegrave-rd., Stratford, E.

WOOD GREEN. Branch meets Fridays at 8.30 at Brook Hall, Brook-rd., Mayes-rd., N.22.

S.P.G.B. PROPAGANDA MEETINGS**LONDON DISTRICT.****Sundays:**

Clapham Common, 6 p.m.
Finsbury Park, 6.30 p.m.
Manor Park, Earl of Essex, 7.30 p.m.
Tooting Broadway, Garrett-lane, 11.30 p.m.
Tottenham, West Green Corner, 7.30 p.m.
Victoria Park, 3.30 p.m.
Walthamstow, Hoe Street Station, 7.30 p.m.

Mondays:

Highbury Corner, 8 p.m.

Tuesdays:

Tooting, Church-lane, 8 p.m.

Thursdays:

Dalston, Queen's-road, 8.30 p.m.
Tottenham, Junction Clyde-road and Phillip-lane, 8 p.m.

Saturdays:

Wood Green, Jolly Butcher's-hill, 8 p.m.

THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF GREAT BRITAIN.**OBJECT.**

The establishment of a system of society based upon the common ownership and democratic control of the means and instruments for producing and distributing wealth by and in the interest of the whole community.

Declaration of Principles.**THE SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain****HOLDS—**

That society as at present constituted is based upon the ownership of the means of living (i.e., land, factories, railways, etc.) by the capitalist or master class, and the consequent enslavement of the working class by whose labour alone wealth is produced.

That in society, therefore, there is an antagonism of interests, manifesting itself as a class struggle, between those who possess but do not produce and those who produce but do not possess.

That this antagonism can be abolished only by the emancipation of the working class from the domination of the master class, by the conversion into the common property of society of the means of production and distribution, and their democratic control by the whole people.

That as in the order of social evolution the working class is the last class to achieve its freedom, the emancipation of the working class will involve the emancipation of all mankind, without distinction of race or sex.

That this emancipation must be the work of the working class itself.

That as the machinery of government, including the armed forces of the nation, exists only to conserve the monopoly by the capitalist class of the wealth taken from the workers, the working class must organise consciously and politically for the conquest of the powers of government, national and local, in order that this machinery, including these forces, may be converted from an instrument of oppression into the agent of emancipation and the overthrow of privilege, aristocratic and plutocratic.

That as political parties are but the expression of class interests, and as the interest of the working class is diametrically opposed to the interests of all sections of the master class, the party seeking working-class emancipation must be hostile to every other party.

The SOCIALIST PARTY of Great Britain, therefore, enters the field of political action determined to wage war against all other political parties, whether alleged labour or avowedly capitalist, and calls upon the members of the working class of this country to muster under its banner to the end that a speedy termination may be wrought to the system which deprives them of the fruits of their labour, and that poverty may give place to comfort, privilege to equality, and slavery to freedom.

Those agreeing with the above principles and desiring enrolment in the Party should apply for membership form to secretary of nearest branch or at Head Office.