



# THE CLASS STRUGGLE

Devoted to International Socialism

---

Vol. II

SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER, 1918

No. 4

---

## **An Open Letter to American Liberals**

By SANTERI NUORTEVA

## **Reconstruction in Russia**

A Lesson in practical Socialism

## **Armed Peace on the Pacific**

By SEN KATAYAMA

## **Laborism and Socialism**

By LOUIS C. FRAINA

Price, 25 Cents

**SOCIALIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY**

431 PULASKI ST., BROOKLYN, N. Y.

# THE CLASS STRUGGLE

Vol. II SEPTEMBER—OCTOBER, 1918 No. 4

## CONTENTS

	Page
The I. W. W. Trial	
By Ludwig Lore . . . . .	377—383
Soviet Russia Speaks to Britain	
By Maxim Litvinoff . . . . .	384—387
Armed Peace on the Pacific	
By Sen Katayama . . . . .	388—404
The Chief Task of Our Day	
By N. Lenin . . . . .	405—409
Laborism and Socialism	
By Louis C. Fraina . . . . .	410—431
An Open Letter to American Liberals	
By Santeri Nuorteva . . . . .	432—454
Reconstruction in Russia . . . . .	455—491
Editorials . . . . .	492—520

The Co-Operative Press  15 Spruce St., New York

# THE CLASS STRUGGLE

Devoted to International Socialism

PUBLISHED BY

The Socialist Publication Society, 431 Pulasky Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Issued Every Two Months—25¢ a Copy; \$1.50 a Year

Editors: LOUIS C. FRAINA and LUDWIG LORE

VOL. II SEPTEMBER-OCTOBER, 1918 No. 4

## The I. W. W. Trial

By LUDWIG LORE

Sixty-five minutes of "deliberation," and the jury brought in a verdict of "guilty" on all four counts against all of the 101 defendants in the courtroom. And at that, this polite pause of one hour and five minutes was nothing more than a matter of form. As soon as Judge Landis had finished his instructions to the jury, the foreman of the jury might have honestly declared: "Will it please the court. The jury agrees to a verdict of guilty on all counts!"

It is this that makes us so furious when we hear from the lips of Haywood and the leading attorney of the defense—not to mention sanctimonious clergymen and subsidized newspaper reporters—statements that are fairly sticky with sweetish sentimentality and sickening in their lying hypocrisy! "We have had a fair trial. The prosecution, the jury, the judge—everybody was fair to the extreme, to the utmost." And yet, the 101, everyone of them, were found guilty, everyone of them is staring a thirty years' prison sentence in the face! It must be said at the outset: These men did not have a fair trial because the possibility of a fair trial, of unquestioning and unbiassed judgment, was, from the very first, out of the question. Judge Landis, with all his sympathetic urbanity and informality, with the best intentions in the world, could not bring

impartiality into that court-room; the twelve men, good and true, may have striven honestly and sincerely to be fair to the defendants, but the air that they breathed, the surroundings in which they lived and had lived, the whole United States were charged with anti-I. W. W. poison. Years of systematic campaigning in the capitalist press, and the spectacular climax of sudden raids upon I. W. W. headquarters all over the country, could not fail to have their effect. That a jury could have come to an agreement in a case involving the fate of 101 men within one short hour shows how fully justified was the confidence placed in the anti-I. W. W. propaganda.

Since the war began the I. W. W. has been accused again and again of working with German money, that its strikes were financed out of German propaganda funds, that their bureaus and their officials, in short, their whole activity, had been supported by the Kaiser's gold. According to the generally accepted opinion, the I. W. W. was one of the central agencies established and still supported by Wilhelm von Hohenzollern for the purpose of hampering the war industries of the United States. Wherever an I. W. W. organization had differences with its particular group of employers, whenever they set out to violate the civil peace that the united efforts of the Gompers machine and Capitalism & Co. have fastened upon the American working-class, we heard it again: German money! The A. F. of L., with the warmest support of officialdom, went into the fight with undivided energy. For to these gentlemen it meant the defeat of an organization that was making itself rather unpleasantly felt as a dangerous competitor. The press took up the cry, and the stories of I. W. W. men who had received money from Germany became as commonplace as those of the corruptibility of the officials of the A. F. of L.—and with a great deal less justification.

Before the famous raid upon I. W. W. headquarters all over the country, public officials declared everywhere with the greatest assurance that the I. W. W. propaganda was being fed with German money. Then, after I. W. W. correspond-

ence, books, pamphlets and literature had been carried off by the wagonloads, the capitalist press was full of "statements from well-informed sources" that overwhelming proof of criminal relations between the I. W. W. national officials and the German government had been found. Strange, in the trial itself, even in the opening speech of the public prosecutor, not a word was said of the whole matter. Obviously, nothing had been found that could by any stretch of imagination justify the shameful suspicions that were so busily spread by the capitalist press and important government officials, who combine an unusual supply of natural stupidity with an extraordinary lack of understanding and knowledge. That there are people who are honestly opposed to the war passes their weak understanding. That there are human beings who know no nations, but only classes, is so inconceivable to their mental make-up, that they naturally look for more "tangible" and to them more comprehensible reasons. These bureaucratic souls cannot believe that there are people left in this wicked world who would be willing, in such critical times, to endanger themselves and their families without financial gain. There are those among them, too, who are not satisfied with the course that events are taking, who are by no means fully in accord with conditions as they are. But they prefer to be "sensible," to remain quietly under cover until the storm has passed over, until danger is past. In their opinion "daredevils" like these I. W. W. men and the equally unspeakable socialists "probably know why they should be willing to take such chances." It is this mental make-up of a cowardly bureaucracy that is more than anything else responsible that this wordy era of "democracy" is so rich in stupid persecution. Or is it possible that the whole dastardly campaign of press lies was nothing more than a conscious preparation of public opinion for the climax that came in the trial of the 101 men in Judge Landis' court in Chicago?

The verdict is a class verdict of the worst sort. The question to be decided by the jury was not the guilt or innocence of each one of the 101 men before the court, not whether any or all of them had been guilty of sabotage, of initiating strikes,

of hindering conscription. They were to prepare the way for the complete destruction of the I. W. W. It was necessary to use the favorable opportunity that presented itself to accomplish something that could not be half so easily done, once peace was declared. The Industrial Workers of the World are no longer only the organization of the migratory workers of the west. They have gained a firm foothold in the industrial centers of the middle and far west where they are a serious menace to the existence of the conservative A. F. of L. organization. Robert Bruere, who has made a thorough study of the theory and practice of the I. W. W., has written considerably on this phase of the question and shown the greatly increased importance of the organization in the economic life of the West and Far West. It is not the "outlaw" worker any longer, the migratory nomad, but the stationary laborer with a permanent home and family who constitutes a goodly part of the I. W. W. membership.

In other words, these outlaw organizations, whose members once sang proudly:

"Hallelujah! I'm a bum!  
Hallelujah! Bum again!  
Hallelujah! Give us a hand-out!  
To revive us again!"

—is in the way of becoming the refuge of all class-conscious, selfrespecting American workingmen. The invasion of the I. W. W. into the fields of labor where once "respectable labor" of the A. F. of L. type held sway has begun. Something of this sort was brought out in the article written by Austin Lewis for the September-October, 1917, issue of *The Class-Struggle*, in which he said:

"A concrete example of its progress I found in the City of Portland, where the organization had long had a hard fight to maintain itself. To my astonishment I saw an entirely different condition of things than ever before in such a headquarters. There was a great hall capable of holding a thousand people comfortably. At one end of the hall was a rail and counter which separated the office from the hall, and in the office were

seven desks, each of which represented a separate industrial union—construction workers, agricultural workers, and so on. The office was well equipped with files and typewriters. Each desk was occupied by a secretary and the work was going on as smoothly and as efficiently as in any corporation office which I ever visited. It was very evident that a complete change had come over the spirit of the group. The organization which I was observing could hardly be identified with its migratory parent which so few years ago had had the same name. This organization now is composed of men who are actually functioning in industry. They are, as the phrase runs, "on the job," they are workmen, not out of work, but practically engaged in industrial labor. And in that fact lies the secret of the recent conflicts throughout the West. Vast masses are feeling the urge of the new idea. The rise in prices, the shutting down of immigration, the fact that for once the job is hunting the man, have put new energy into that portion of the working class which had formerly little hope and has aroused the aspiration that was formerly crushed under the load of unavoidable and hopeless misery. What was happening at Portland was merely typical. As one of the organizers in that city remarked to me, 'If you think this is anything you should see Seattle.'

The I. W. W. is no longer the organization of the unskilled worker only. It is gaining influence everywhere among the upper strata of the proletariat and in consequence is becoming more careful in its tactics and in its attitude. The organization that once prided itself on its refusal to enter into contracts with the capitalist class is today entering upon agreements with its employers, and has thus won adherents in circles that were unapproachable before. But at the same time the idea of the class struggle, the evangel of Socialism, the spirit of rebellion against class rule is penetrating further and further into the American working class, and is gaining a firm foothold everywhere. The Industrial Workers of the world have proven to be a splendid instrument of revolutionary education.

There was a time when the organized capitalist class of America fought the American Federation of Labor as its bitterest enemy, when the National Manufacturers Association and organized labor waged their great and memorable battles upon the field of American industry. Those days have gone forever. The capitalists of this country have realized that



their worst foe is the class-conscious working man, the man who fights his cause with a clear understanding of its aims and its significance. In the countries of Europe the employing class resorted to the organization of "yellow" unions, of so-called labor organizations that were completely under the influence and at the service of their masters. In this country the American Federation is saving them that trouble.

Its national representatives have become the willing tools of the ruling class and the staunchest supporters of its interests. The well-being of the capitalist class demands the extermination of the I. W. W. and of any organization that preaches and practices the doctrine of the uncompromising class struggle; self-preservation demands that the A. F. of L. combat this new and dangerous competitor to the finish. Mutual interests have cemented the spiritual community that already existed between them.

\* \* \*

After an anxious week Judge Landis has made public his sentence. Fifteen of the defendants, including the General Secretary of the I. W. W., Wm. J. Haywood, were condemned to 20 years in jail, and a fine of \$20,000 each. Altogether the penalties inflicted aggregate to 800 years in the penitentiary and three and one half million dollars. The famed clemency and the reputed understanding of Judge Landis has proven too weak to withstand the insistent demands of the ruling class and of public opinion that stood intrenched behind it.

For that is the most tragic feature of this judicial travesty—that it undoubtedly does express the opinion of a large part of the working class population of this country. The sentence was received everywhere so as a matter of course, with such astonishing indifference, with such almost universal satisfaction that it were folly to close ones eyes to the fact that the working class of America with its three million organized men and women are still devoid of any conception of the significance of the aims and aspirations of the class conscious

labor movement, that the Socialist movement has failed in its purpose of revolutionizing the mental outlook of the working class.

This is not essentially the fault of the Socialist Party. No country in the world has so conservative and reactionary a labor movement or labor leaders that are so servile to the interests of the capitalist class, as ours. The intellectual middle class was the first to respond to our appeal, and has naturally given the movement its leaders. This made it still more difficult for our party to gain a hearing in the ranks of organized labor; class consciousness and class struggle are conceptions that have remained foreign to all but a small portion of the American proletariat.

Now that the war has shown so unmistakably the complete domination of Stand-pattism in the Labor Movement, the American Socialist movement must squarely face the situation. It must choose one of two ways—either once more to grapple with the task of organizing a class-conscious labor movement, or it will have to find ways and means of permeating the ranks of labor, organized and unorganized labor, with revolutionary socialism.

## Soviet Russia Speaks to Britain

By MAXIM LITVINOFF

*Plenipotentiary Representative in Great Britain of the Russian  
Federation Socialist Republic of Soviets.*

[At the recent conference of the British Labor Party, A. F. Kerensky appeared, without preliminary announcement, and attacked the Soviet Republic. Although the majority of the delegates apparently approved of Kerensky, there was much opposition. A storm broke loose on the left of the hall, where the greater number of the radical Socialists were sitting. One delegate asked, "Will Mr. Litvinoff be allowed to speak at the same time as Kerensky?" Another delegate: "I want to know whether this conference is going to have it clearly stated what is the reason of Mr. Kerensky's visit, and whether the explanation will be given in the presence of the representatives of the present Russian government?" Another delegate: "We don't want any government plant in this business," to which the chairman indignantly replied: "To say such a thing in the presence of Mr. Kerensky is an outrage." Other delegates amid great turmoil and disorder demanded: "Whom does Kerensky represent?" Brown, of the Bristol Labor Party, was unfaltering against Kerensky, and was "persuaded" to leave the conference after a vote had been taken that he should be asked to withdraw. The whole episode was a deliberate counter-revolutionary manoeuvre.]

The Chairman of the Labor Party Conference has withheld from me the opportunity of conveying to the delegates the greetings of the Russian working classes and their representative body, the Government of the Russian Socialist Republic. He has, moreover, deemed it fair and just to allow Mr. Kerensky to make a calumnious attack on this Republic, without permitting me, as its accredited representative, to reply to his charges, in spite of my own request and that of many delegates. I therefore consider it my duty to endeavor to throw some light on the Russian situation, over which a fresh attempt was made by Mr. Kerensky yesterday to throw an obscuring mist.

Whom does Mr. Kerensky represent? Asked by so many delegates, this was not an idle question, for it is natural to suppose that delegates or visitors, officially invited to Labor Conferences, should represent the interests of Labor. Does Mr. Kerensky now represent these interests? Does he even pretend to represent

them? Mr. Kerensky, in his speech, made no mention of the working classes; he was honest enough not to pretend to speak on their behalf, but appealed on behalf of the intellectuals, on behalf of officers, on behalf of "Russia." It should be remembered that the Russian Revolution was not merely a political revolution—it was, and is, also, a social revolution. And as such it necessarily sharpens the class struggle, which has now reached its extreme point, having divided the country into two opposing completely irreconcilable camps—the factory worker, the impoverished peasant, the unemployed, the disinherited, the despised and rejected—in fact, about 85 per cent. of the population—in one camp; and a small minority—the capitalist, the landlord, the banker, the stockbroker, the general, the bureaucrat of the Czar's regime, the middle-class lawyer, the journalist, etc., in the other. The different shades of political opinions and parties faded into insignificance, leaving on the political arena two parties—supporters and opponents of the Soviets (Councils of Workers' and Peasants' Delegates).

*I maintain that Labor, whether in or out of power, is more than any other class entitled to speak on behalf of its country.* And this is especially true of Russia, where the laboring masses are in full and indisputable control of the State apparatus, themselves forming the local and central government of their country. And when anyone speaks in the name of Russia he must be asked point blank whether he speaks in the name of those who, after eight months of the bitterest struggles, have defeated their enemies, consolidated their power, and are now the only guardians of the political and social gains of the great Russian Revolution, or whether he speaks in the name of those who, having used the foulest means at their disposal to overthrow the authority of the workers, have failed to achieve any success in Russia itself, and are now invoking the aid of foreign Powers, looking for support now to Germany, now to the Allies.

Mr. Kerensky, like our other opponents, makes the bold statement that the Soviet Government does not represent the bulk of the population, but when faced with the pertinent question: "How then has the Government maintained its power if it be

against the will of the people?"—he finds no reply. The continuance of a Government in time of revolution for eight months, without a standing army except voluntary detachments, inconsiderable in proportion to Russia's area, without police, without Press censorship, indeed with a greater liberty of speech and Press than exists in any other country (the repeatedly made, and as repeatedly disproved, allegations to the contrary notwithstanding), struggling against internal and external difficulties greater than any which have ever before confronted a Government in the history of mankind, can only be explained by the unlimited enthusiastic support of the great majority of the people.

To obscure this striking truth, Kerensky was only able to make misty allusions to Germany's desire to tolerate the Soviet regime. This absurd assumption may or may not explain why Germany has not yet overrun the whole of Russia, but it certainly does not explain why the Russians themselves, who could free themselves from the strongly entrenched Czarist regime and from the Kerensky Government with its army, many millions strong, have not yet been able to overthrow the Soviets, if they desire to. As a matter of fact, all attempts to do this have utterly failed—attempts which have been carried out by generals, officers, and so-called "White Guards" formed from the capitalist and middle-class youngsters and some well-to-do Cossacks. Even the capitalist class had to admit that Captain Semenov in Siberia was able to enlist only about 500 Buriats (a primitive Siberian tribe), completing his detachments, General Krasnov is advancing on the Don with the aid of German troops, and on the top of this now comes the latest revolt of the Czecho-Slovaks (Austrian prisoners of war), headed by Russian counter-revolutionary officers. But the most striking reply to Kerensky's false allegation as to the unpopularity of the Soviet regime comes in a message from Russia, telling us that at the elections of this month to the Petrograd Soviet 233 supporters of the Soviets (221 Bolsheviks and 12 Social Revolutionaries of the left wing) and only 5 anti-Soviet candidates were returned. And this in Petrograd, in the most famine stricken city in Russia, where dissatisfaction might have naturally reached its climax.

When Mr. Kerensky promises in exchange for this intervention in Russian internal affairs to re-create a Russian army for the resumption of the war on a large scale, I take it upon myself to declare that *this is the merest political charlatanism*, for he promises what he knows full well that neither he nor any anti-Soviet party can perform. Anyone even slightly acquainted with Russian affairs will understand the emptiness of such promises.

No! The re-creation of the Russian front is not the purpose of the much-talked-of Japanese or Allied intervention. The real object is, of course, the crushing of the Workers' Government and of the Revolution, the spread of whose influence to other countries is a standing menace to International Capitalism. Intervention is advocated by ex-officials and ambassadors of the Czar's regime living abroad and supported by French bankers and international Shylocks who hope thus to be able to extract from the impoverished Russian people their pound of flesh, the interest on the loans contracted by the ex-Czar.

Do not allow yourself to be misled by the presumption that Kerensky pleaded for one Labor Party in Russia against another. The overthrow of the Bolsheviks *cannot* mean that any other Socialist or even Democratic party will take over the power. The Soviet Government, if overthrown at the present juncture, can only be superseded by the most brutal and barbaric military dictatorship, resting on foreign bayonets, with the inevitable subsequent restoration of Czarism. Is British Labor going to be a party to these dark schemes? Is the British proletariat prepared to take upon itself the responsibility before history for the crushing of the great Russian Proletarian Revolution?

## Armed Peace on the Pacific

By SEN KATAYAMA

Peace reigns over the Pacific. For Japan and the United States are allies, now that they have a common enemy: Germany, autocratic, militaristic Germany.

But there is a difference between Japan and the United States in the present world war. Japan has never declared that she is fighting to make the world safe for democracy, while the United States has. Japan is on the side of the allies because of the treaty of alliance with England.

The Japanese form of government is autocratic. The tyranny within, is combined with a cringing foreign policy giving rise to much dissatisfaction among the intelligent classes. The Okuma and Terauchi ministries have been influenced directly or indirectly by England.

This servility led Japan to enter the war not on her own account, but in the interest of England and her colonies, while these same colonies treat the Japanese as a backward race and practically exclude them; I mean to say that Japanese workers are excluded from Australia, New Zealand, Transvaal and other colonies in Africa, and are even treated in Canada as undesirable compared with Chinamen.

The foreign policy of Japan is also illustrated by the "Gentlemen's Agreement" with the United States, which is in reality a Japanese Exclusion Act on the part of the United States. But Japan promised of her own free will not to send any workers to this country, and begged the United States not to enact an exclusion act.

Yet, in spite of the fact that no Japanese workers have been permitted to come here for the past ten years, there has grown

up an anti-Japanese movement along the Pacific coast, carrying on an agitation as if the Japanese were swarming at the very door of America. In reality Japan has not sent any workers to this country for twenty years. The Japanese workers in the west are almost all from the Hawaiian Islands, where they were originally imported by American Sugar kings, as contract labor, under the most enslaving conditions. And when Hawaii was then annexed to the United States, the poor contract laborers left for the Pacific coast because they were now free from the slavery of the former contract arrangement. This migration to the coast continued until it was prohibited by the President under the new immigration law in completion or extension of the Gentlemen's Agreement.

The complement of this weak foreign policy is drastic reaction and brutal suppression at home, for it is always the case that the worst tyrants are the ones who debase themselves before those whom they regard as their superiors, and then compensate themselves by taking it out on those lower down.

The government is powerless before the possessors of wealth, and sacrifices the interests of the people as a whole. The workers are enslaved for the benefit of the rich, and every attempt at organization and emancipation is suppressed with increasing severity by the police.

At the same time nothing was left undone to build up a powerful militarism, and a well organized bureaucracy, as soon as the big interests felt that they were firm in the saddle.

At first, when the old regime was overthrown, fifty-one years ago, the new government was really revolutionary. The tenants took over the land which they had formerly rented from the feudal lords, and the government assessed a tax of 3 per cent. on the land after fixing the valuation on the basis of the productivity of the soil. Castes were abolished, time-honored privileges and licenses such as the right to brew rice wines, were confiscated. Buddhist monks were permitted to marry and to eat fish and animal flesh. The hereditary salary of the old military classes together with their privileges were

taken from them, and they were thrown on the street to earn their own living. All restrictions on trade and industry were done away with.

But as soon as this new capitalist state developed a fairly strong central government, and had gained the confidence of the people, there was added a strong centralized bureaucracy and a powerful army and navy, based on conscription.

At first the constitution was really liberal, comprising five articles which are the Magna Charta of Japan. Everything was to be decided by public opinion, councils and assemblies were created, so that the people should govern themselves and that public sentiment and activity should not become stagnant as formerly. It was to be a new era of universal justice, freedom and enlightenment.

Soon it became clear that these aspirations were not being realized. The interests behind the government, and in it, began to oppress the people and to suppress revolts that sprang up everywhere, with iron and steel.

It was not possible however, to overcome the popular sentiment in favor of a constitutional government based on parliamentary representation and after ten years or more of agitation, the constitution now still in force, was promulgated.

While the new constitution was liberal on paper, it was far from being so in operation. The five articles of the old constitution were acknowledged and accepted, but in the meantime there had grown up a new nobility with ranks, titles, privileges and favoritism to strengthen bureaucratic rule. And over and above all the Emperor was made an absolute ruler by divine right.

The Emperor of Japan is commander in chief of the army and navy, executive head of the national administration, declares war, makes peace, signs every death warrant, has absolute right to pardon for any crime except one committed against himself or his family.

Everything that the Emperor does, however, must be countersigned by one of his responsible ministers. Thus his governing power is limited by those who are legally of his own creation. And the responsibility for all that he says and does rests, not on him, but on the shoulders of the minister who signs. The Emperor is thereby made divine and inviolable.

Thus the real power governing Japan rests with the ministers, but unfortunately they are responsible, not to the people nor even to the Imperial Diet, but to the Emperor only. They say and do what they like in his name, or at any rate there is no way of differentiating his views from theirs, or theirs from his. Everything is done, however behind the authority of his name, and this unique arrangement of the Japanese constitution gives the ministers absolute freedom to use the name of the Emperor to suit themselves.

That is why Japan became so autocratic and imperialistic. Under cover of the divineness and inviolability of the ruler politicians exploit the country for their own self-interest in combination with the capitalists. The people are powerless before the bureaucracy, which has not only the authority of the great power and influence of the Emperor's name, but is very well organized in addition. The bureaucracy has shaped the system of education to suit its own purposes, and has entirely suppressed any liberal tendencies. It is tightening its grip over the people more and more, through police power and militarism.

This state of things stands in apparent contradiction to the weak foreign policy previously described. But the fact is, the Japanese are not diplomats, they are parvenus in this field, and so they either resort to force, or otherwise go to the opposite extreme by following a policy of subservience. Either they adopt the catchword, "Always be ahead of the other fellow," "Strike without a word," or "Be the first to take advantage of every opportunity," such as was the case in the war with China in 1894—1895 and with Russia in 1904—1905, or they observe a cringing policy towards England, and the

other great western powers. And this crude method of the militarists is made feasible by the fact that the force of public opinion has been eliminated, and that the workers have been kept from organizing, so that they are reduced to a condition of cannon-fodder.

The Chinese are the very opposite to the Japanese in these matters. They are entirely at home in the sphere of diplomacy, and are keen and shrewd in the conduct of negotiations. They have not attained political unity and centralization of power, but have learned by long training to use their industrial capacity as a weapon. Their method is the boycott and they maintain it to the point of efficiency, violations sometimes having resulted in instant assassination. Thus even the great Chinese masses are highly developed in the economic field, but politically the country is ruled by the educated classes comprising about 5,000,000. When the whole race awakens to the value of political in addition to economic power, China will assume a new role representing a definite break with the past. The importance of this situation cannot be over-estimated when we take into account that the economic interest of the civilized world after the present war will converge on the Far East, which is the coming sphere of capitalist exploitation.

Meanwhile the Chinese play off one nation against the other in competition, in order to take sides in the end with the strongest as the best means of attaining their purpose. Thus the recent Chinese-Japanese pact shows that the educated classes of China who are ruling the country politically have taken sides with Japan as the best way of satisfying their interests, because Japan appears to them at present as the strongest power in the Far East.

That a situation of this kind is fraught with great possibilities, either for good or for evil, of that there can be little doubt. Is the armed peace of the Pacific to be an intensification of armament opening up the way to a succession of wars? Or is the armed peace to be converted into a lasting peace? The

answer depends on whether the white race is going to build its peace plans on the backs of the yellow peril, or whether it will include the yellow nations in the universal brotherhood. Is the peace to be organized around the Atlantic, and against the Pacific, or is it a lasting world peace to include both Atlantic and Pacific?

As intelligent a man as Bernard Shaw answers this question in a manner somewhat as follows: Speaking on the alliance of nations, he shows the utter impossibility of the white and yellow races understanding each other, referring specifically to the English and the Japanese. "We deal in alliances and in guarantees, and behind it there is always the threat of war." "When we establish an organization which will make us less anxious about the future there will still be the important question of the balance of power between eastern civilization and western civilization, between the white and the yellow nations. The present war has given us reason to be very anxious on this point." In the *New York American* of December 19, 1915, Shaw continues to deal with this subject. He concludes that an effective alliance requires psychological and political homogeneity, that the English and the Japanese cannot understand each other in view of the great difference between races of different color, which extends even to the sense of smell, just as a blood-hound senses a criminal in this respect. Thus Shaw has reached the point where he decides international questions of the future by the odor test.

His socialism and internationalism are narrowed down to the white race. It is necessary to form a strong alliance among the white countries to subjugate the yellow nations. "The time may approach when the white civilization may have to fight for its life against the whole mass of yellow and oriental civilization. We want to produce a combination that will make an attack of that description virtually impossible."

Shaw has also addressed himself directly to the Japanese in a monthly published in Japan "The New East." "The truth is the West was beginning to fear the East. From the moment

when the Japanese in the Manchurian war showed themselves so formidable in conflict with one of the great powers of the world, the West not only began to fear that its old military superiority over the East might be lost and that the white man might have to fight for his liberty, if not for his life, against the yellow man, it also began to concentrate its fears upon the Japanese as "the Prussians of the East." Western America feared for itself, England feared for Australia. That is how the matter stands at present." And further, "We are extremely glad to have the Japanese on our side in the war just as we were extremely glad to have the Russians. But no sooner did the Revolution in Russia set us free to express our real feelings towards the fallen government of the Czar than it was published to all the world that "we had dreaded it even more than we had dreaded the Kaiser." "Now I must not imply that we feel towards the government of the Emperor of Japan as we did towards the government of the Czar, but I do most earnestly warn our Japanese friends that only in so far as Japan makes itself felt in the East as a socially advanced state will it gain the confidence of the Western allies." He urges Japan to avoid the horrors of capitalist imperialism and concludes with the following very good bit of advice: "Much of the prosperity of Japan is due to her power of following western example; but that prosperity will be her ruin if she does not study the fate of Europe for warnings as well as examples."

But let us see how the Japanese themselves look at these matters. Marquis Okuma, the late premier of Japan, in answer to the following question put to him by S. S. McClure: Is the peace of the Pacific better insured with or without a strong navy on the part of the United States? answered thus: "I have always entertained doubts about the principle of armed peace; it has caused the present war in Europe. . . . The idea of keeping peace with armed force seems quite dangerous. If the United States intends to take care of her interests in the Pacific by the use of some naval force, it will be alright but the idea of armed peace has already proved a dan-

gerous thing, and after the war I hope such ideas may change. My impression is that Japan stands for the same idea as the United States. I have no objection to American naval expansion, but such an idea as protecting China with the American navy may cause an uneasy feeling in another country, with the apprehension that if such an idea extends a little further it may be regarded as a sort of menace. The result will be an unnecessary conflict." An old-fashioned diplomat—old Marquis Okuma, and this round about way of opposing armed peace in the Pacific is aimed at any policy of militarism in the United States.

Japan is really extremely suspicious of the true aim of the present military and naval policy of the United States. In regard to the relations between the two countries, the old Marquis said with his own peculiar sarcasm, "As to Japanese exclusion, it might be an apt suggestion just for a joke, that just like everybody else, so we should send a similar mission to America to preach the same principle of humanity."

There is a champion of the Asiatic Monroe Doctrine in the person of I. Tokutomi, editor of the Kokumin Daily; the late Prince Katsura rewarded him as a faithful supporter of the bureaucracy and of imperialism by making him a life member of the upper branch of the Imperial Diet. He is most conservative, but very intelligent, his work is widely read and exerts a great influence among the people in spite of his prostituted pen. Up to the time of the 90's he was a progressive liberal and had a great following among the Japanese youth, but now he is conservative and imperialistic which may seem strange but is not such a rare occurrence even outside of Japan. Incidentally, he is financially independent on account of his life membership.

Tokutomi said to S. S. McClure: "The mission of the empire of Japan is summed up in the pursuit of the Asiatic Monroe Doctrine. By an Asiatic Monroe Doctrine I mean that the affairs of Asia should be managed by Asiatics." Tokutomi wants to break "the arrogance of the white man's clan." He

is an ideal opponent of Bernard Shaw who wants the domination of the world by the white race. As to Japan's foreign relations Tokutomi says: "Japan has nothing to demand from the world except that she be given equal treatment by European and American countries; that the Japanese be admitted into the circle of mutual friendship and they shall not be treated as an inferior race." His imperialism is garbed in the form of an Asiatic Monroe Doctrine and tacitly claims Japan's special interest in China.

There is yet another type of imperialist quite influential with the younger generation. It is Prof. Nagai, former editor in chief of the "New Japan," a monthly organ of Marquis Okuma. Prof. Nagai's imperialism is based on a broader principle than the Asiatic Monroe Doctrine. "Just as it is wrong to proclaim America for Americans, it is equally so to say Asia for the Asiatics. If we recognize American exclusiveness as criminal, an attempt to monopolize the resources of Asia is self-contradictory." He is in favor of an alliance between Japan and China because it will be mutually beneficial, and "is a fundamental condition by which Japan will accomplish a great mission towards the civilization." China has things which are needed objectively, namely, raw materials, Japan has the subjective, namely a crowded population. He goes on to say that "any Japanese who has travelled in the United States may undergo the experience of entering a restaurant ordering food, but simply because he is Japanese he cannot get a piece of meat or a glass of water. The Americans uphold justice and humanity with their mouths. Their moral attitude toward other races is lower than the Japanese believed it to be. In spite of the fact that they close their own door against another race, they demand an open door to the land of the yellow race. In reality, they consider the earth their property and have the ambition to subjugate the colored races as their slaves. The present world war is at bottom a conflict between the white races among themselves to decide who shall dominate the colored races. If under such conditions a nation of the colored race shall rise up and attempt to

realize its ambition in the interest of world civilization, it will be the object of greater antagonism and oppression that is now directed against Germany.

"The nineteenth century was a period of nationalism. The nations overthrew the autocratic rule of the nobility and established constitutional government. The twentieth century ought to be a period of humanity by co-operation of self-governing countries. This period should witness the breaking down of the autocracy of the white race, and the building up of universal co-operation. Just as it is a crime that the nobility and the rich should monopolize the government of a nation, so it is a crime that any one nation or race should monopolize the whole earth and its wealth. As a country should be a country of the entire people, so the earth must be the earth of entire humanity. The so-called liberty of the white race is not the great liberty of all humanity but is a limited narrow liberty confined to their own borders.

"But just as we cannot expect to find in the nobility the means of overthrowing its own autocracy, so we cannot look for a movement in the white countries to overthrow the domination of the white race. Just as the movement against the nobility of old Japan came from the heimin class whom they had oppressed and trampled under foot so the means of breaking down the autocracy of the white race is sure to come from those whom they oppressed—the yellow race."

The imperialism of Mr. Nagai is altruistic. He wants Japan to dominate not only Asia but to end the white domination of the world. He believes that world co-operation on the basis of self-government is the mission of Japan among the awakened colored races. No doubt he will get many supporters among the intelligent people, especially after the bitter experiences that the Japanese industrial world has met with, such as for instance the recent embargo on gold and steel by the United States against Japan. His facts are irrefutable, however, and many Japanese must think as he does in the matter of foreign relations. Hence he represents a con-



siderable portion of the Japanese people. The recent Chinese-Japanese pact must be looked upon as a result of the popular demand represented by Mr. Shintaro Nagai and his following.

While Mr. Nagai refutes the idea of an Asiatic Monroe Doctrine as a foolish dream that is impracticable, yet the great mission toward the world which he assigns to Japan is to be carried out by the present regime which is militaristic and capitalistic and imperialistic in every way. He does not approve of the present rigid militaristic education, but favors a more free and progressive system. Nevertheless he is an imperialist and supports the expansion of armament.

All these developments have a bearing on the peace of the Pacific, and come to a head concretely, in the form of the relations between Japan and the United States; the entire process in its further course centers on this point.

The attitude and sentiment of the people of the United States towards the Japanese in this country, has not thus far been such as to lead to a favorable solution of this problem. The Japanese over here are subjected to many handicaps and disadvantages because they are denied the rights of citizenship; not that this has ever been tested through court procedure, it is simply an administrative act. To show what this means, a Japanese cannot sell newspapers to make a living on account of the regulations incidental to citizenship. And the California land legislation is the worst thing of all. The Japanese government is satisfied with the Gentleman's Agreement for the time being, but the Japanese people cannot be made to see the justice of the status of inferiority imposed on the members of their race.

Furthermore, the relations between the two countries outside of America should be clearly understood if they are not to lead to shallow jingoistic animosity. Japan is determined to maintain her interest in China by force, at the same time that the United States seeks to maintain the open door policy. This on the face of it looks like a policy of retaliation in which

Japan is saying "hands off" in answer to the anti-Japanese movement in America. But this country itself tore off the mask recently when the embargo on the shipment of steel to Japan showed how completely the latter was dependent on the United States for this basic commodity. This certainly threw a scare into the relations between the two countries.

The fact is that Japan is poor in iron, at the same time that the demand for this article has been increasing at an accelerating pace. Thirteen years ago Japan required 136,000 tons against which she produced 97,000 tons; in 1916 her demand had grown to 671,000 tons of which she produced only 140,000. The deficit was made up by importation from China. In 1917 the production of iron bars was 578,000 tons and the demand 997,000. In May the Japanese government gave out an estimate of iron requirements as follows: (in 000's)

	1918	1919	1920	1921	1922	1923
Iron bars .....	745	1150	1310	1410	1460	1500
Steel .....	1165	1650	1850	2030	2110	2340
Steel products .....	820	1180	1320	1490	1560	1580

While it is true that Japan is pervaded by militarism and imperialism just as a similar tendency took place in the West, it would be a serious mistake to over-estimate this factor to the exclusion of underlying forces. It is true that the Japanese masses are conservative and patient; but they are by no means born slaves. They have from time to time revolted against their oppressors, and although they were never strong enough to achieve their independence they have each time made the yoke less heavy and the conditions less severe. And those who were at the head of the successful revolutions were always upright and able, like the triumvirate of the revolution of 1868, Okubo, Kido, and Saigo, who were statesmen of the first order, and friends of the people. Saigo was imprisoned and then exiled, Okubo was assassinated, and Kido was poisoned on account of his liberal influence.

The revolt of the tenant farmers against the feudal lords in

1868 was a unique sort of mass movement peculiar to Japan. When the tenants have complaints and their demands are not heard by peaceful means such as petitions, they organize a forced appeal under mob rule. They hoist a rice straw mattress on bamboo sticks as a flag, and each carries a sickle in his belt and a bamboo spear on his shoulder. They go from village to village and recruit tenants, destroying the houses of the village mayors, who are hereditary officers, and were mostly rich landlords in feudal times. As the crowd proceeds they are fed by the villagers. When they reach the castle gate they are generally received by a representative of the lord who promises them remedies.

This form of appeal is used even to-day by discontented farmers and tenants against the government. And the old spirit is often displayed in labor strikes. The workers in Japan are not allowed to organize, so where the western workers pursue the method of first demanding an increase of wages, or shorter hours, etc., and strike only after they have failed previously to get a hearing or a satisfactory result, the Japanese workers strike first and negotiate afterwards. Thus a labor strike of this kind often can develop into a riot. Sabotage was used long before it was known under that name from the western world.

Among the city people, the custom of public demonstrations has developed remarkably. It was first started during the Russo-Japanese war when a lantern procession was gotten up to celebrate a victory over the Russian army. In the beginning it was encouraged by the government for the purpose of stirring up jingo spirit but the people discovered in these harmless processions a power that is greater than the power of the police. And this was shown on the 9th of September 1905, when mass demonstrations took place at the conclusion of the treaty of Portsmouth between Russia and Japan. It was interpreted by the foreign press and its agents in Japan as a popular outburst of dissatisfaction against the treaty, but the real truth is that it was a spontaneous popular outburst

against the oppressive war government of the late Prince Katsura. For a few days Tokio, a city of 2,000,000 population, was entirely in the hands of rioters and mobs. They first started to destroy police stations of which most were burnt down, and attacked policemen, so that there was no police in the city for some days. The government called out troops, but they were in sympathy with the crowd and would not shoot at them, so that the demonstration was highly successful.

This same spirit stirred the people of Tokio in 1906 when the Socialist party got up a monster demonstration against raising the carfare on the street cars. Street cars were burnt, car-sheds and company offices attacked. This brought results, for the government did not allow the company to raise the fares. Several socialist comrades who were leaders in the demonstration were caught, tried and imprisoned.

The next popular outbreak was in 1913, at the time of the reactionary ministry of Prince Katsura, who by the trickery of using the army minister as his puppet, forced the resignation of Marquis Saionji. This last Katsura ministry that then followed, was the most hated in the history of Japan. After only thirty days it crumbled under the pressure of popular opposition which developed into angry mobs in the city of Tokio. The crowd first gathered around the parliament building, and proceeded to attack many pro-government dailies and to destroy police stations, fighting the police forces in the streets of the city. The next ministry in 1914 under Count Yamamoto was also forced to resign by popular opposition.

We must not lose faith in the people of Japan, therefore, who after all are the real center of power, and who will yet strike at the right moment against reaction and oppression. Nor are there indications wanting that point to the overthrow of the bureaucracy. Corruption has developed to a sensational extent among those high in position, and unrest among the workers and the farmers is increasing. The imprisonment of a naval general for taking bribes a few years ago caused the

fall of the Yamamoto ministry, and a scandal at the Waka Matsu Steel works resulted in the suicide of the chief engineer, who was at the same time a high military officer.

The masses are beginning to see the light. In the Far Eastern Review of Shanghai of March, 1918, we read under the title "Bolshevism Contagious," "Japanese journals have been remarking with some consternation, others with satisfaction, that the one development of the great European war which has stirred the masses of the Japanese people to intelligent interest has been the rise of the Bolsheviks. The announcement of the ethical tenets and war purposes of France, Great Britain and America has made a painfully small appeal to the Japanese as their journalists have frankly admitted, but the chaotic rise of the illiterate Russian masses has proved to be of engrossing interest. One sees in the liberal Japanese papers more and more comment in recent months upon the limitation of suffrage, upon the autocratic manipulation of public affairs by the militarists, upon the age and conservatism of the members of the Genko, and upon the heavy taxation and misery of the masses who are now said to be anything but patriotic except when under arms. We hear now, that the time has come 'for the second revolution,' that under the bureaucracy no strong young men are being developed, and that strong old men who rose to eminence after the first revolution are not alive to the needs of the age. A radical society has recently been organized among the university students and graduates which announces a program that must look very Bolshevistic to the bureaucrats and which was suppressed by the police at the first meeting at Kanda. There is no reason to look forward to violence and revolution in Japan but there is every reason to believe that there is enough interest and sufficient yearning after a more democratic form of government to force from the bureaucracy some very important concessions, within the next few years. The spokesmen of the old school have been announcing emphatically of late that Japan is not fighting to make the world safe for Democracy, but the keen popular interest which the press and

the people are taking in the collapse of autocracy in Russia would seem to indicate that the rulers and the people are not so much of one mind and thought as the former would sometimes have us believe."

The editor of the Far Eastern Review thinks there is no reason to look for revolution in Japan, but that the government will become more democratic within the next few years. We know better on this point. We know that the bureaucracy has become more and more conservative and reactionary, we know that the present regime cannot develop liberal tendencies or concessions, and that it will not give in to the just demands of the people as provided in the five articles of the constitution.

Nor will the coming peace solve the Eastern question automatically. Even if Prussian militarism is crushed and Siberia is invaded, there will still be left the militarism of several armed nations that have vital interests in the Pacific and that are ready, each, to fight for its own purpose. The end of the war, instead of removing the danger, may bring it closer.

The workers of these countries, however, have no conflicting interests, and therefore have no quarrel with each other by adhering to these interests. They must not leave matters to the capitalists to decide as they think best for themselves. The workers must not accept views which are foreign to their interests such as those of Bernard Shaw, to the effect that the Japanese and the English cannot understand each other, or the views of any one else who construes things so as to split the working class by lines of color, or odor, or some other quality which has nothing to do with the matter.

We do not care in how many ways the workers of one country may differ from another, both can understand that two and two make four, and both can solve scientific problems, the Japanese as well as the English. The domination of the white race will break down, not to be replaced by a new domination, but by the equality of races, by the absence of the dominion

of one over the other. Awakened India will not be dominated by the English, awakened China will not be satisfied with her present status, because no race that has seen the light will submit to domination by another.

This harmony of races and nations, and with it the peace of the Pacific must be founded on the international solidarity of the working class. The workers must understand each other, must be given the facts correctly, and must learn to see that the divergent and diverging interests are not their interests. They must not be split up by considerations of color, odor, instinct or anything else, but must be guided by their economic unity. The armed peace of the Pacific must be converted into a lasting peace based on the harmony of interests, on the international solidarity of the workers. And a lasting peace must be a proletarian peace. Only the solidarity of the working class of the world can avoid future wars, not only in the Pacific, but also in the Atlantic and everywhere else.

## The Chief Task of Our Day

By N. LENIN

Poor thou art, rich thou art,  
Strong thou art and weak thou art,  
Oh Mother Russia!

The history of mankind is at present passing through one of its greatest and most difficult crisis, a crisis with a tremendous—without exaggeration it may be said—with a world-wide liberating significance. From war to peace, from war between beasts of prey, who have sent to the slaughter millions of those toiling and exploited, with the object of securing a redivision among the strongest of the robbers, of the spoils already acquired—to a war of the oppressed against the oppressors for freedom from capitalist oppression; from the abyss of suffering, pain and hunger to the shining communistic society of the future, to general wellbeing and permanent peace;—it is no wonder, at the most acute points of such a tremendous transformation, when round about the old is going to pieces with frightful noise and crash, while in indescribable pains the new is being born, that some men's heads should be turned, that others should be seized by despair, and that others should seek relief from actuality, which is at times too bitter, in the shade of fair, enchanting phrases.

Yet it was necessary to feel vividly what was occurring, to live through, in the most excruciating and painful manner, this sharpest of all the sharp turns of history, lifting us out of imperialism into the communistic revolution. In a few days we destroyed one of the oldest, most powerful, most savage and barbarous monarchies. In a few months we passed through a series of agreements with the bourgeoisie, of living down of *petit bourgeois* illusions, for which other countries have required decades. In a few weeks, after having overthrown the bourgeoisie, we defeated its open opposition in a civil war. In a victorious, triumphal progress of bolshevism we have passed from one end of our

great country to the other. We have raised to liberty and to independent life the lowest sections of the toiling masses that have been oppressed by Czarism and by the bourgeoisie. We have introduced and strengthened the Soviet Republic, a new type of government, immeasurably higher and more democratic than the best of the bourgeois-parliamentary republics. We organized a dictatorship of the proletariat, supported by the poorest peasants, and inaugurated a widely-planned system of socialistic reconstruction. In millions and millions of workers in all countries we have awakened the faith in their powers and kindled the fires of their enthusiasm. We have sent out in all directions the call of the international workers' revolution. We have thrown down the gauntlet to the imperialistic robbers of all countries.

And in a few days an imperialist robber, falling upon us unarmed, has cast us to the ground. He has forced us to sign an incredibly oppressive and humiliating peace—our punishment for having dared, if only for one short moment, to free ourselves from the iron bonds of the imperialistic war. The robber strangles and chokes and dismembers Russia with all the greater fury, the more threateningly he perceives rising before him in his own country the spectre of the impending workers' revolution.

We were forced to sign a "Peace of Tilsit." There is no reason for deceiving ourselves as to that. We must have the courage to look right into the face of this bitter, unembellished truth. We must sound to the depths, completely, the whole abyss of defeat and humiliation into which we have now been cast. The better we understand this, the harder and firmer will become our will to free ourselves, to rise again from slavery to independence, our unbending resolve, at whatever costs, to raise Russia from her present poverty and weakness, to make her rich and powerful in the true sense of the word.

And this she may become, for we still have left enough territory and natural resources, to provide each and every one of us, if not with a superabundance, yet with a sufficient supply of the means of subsistence. We have enough, in natural riches and in labor-power, as well as in the stimulus, which our great revolution

has communicated to our national productive forces—to create a really rich and powerful Russia.

Russia may become such if we cast aside all discouragement and all oratory, if we strain every nerve and tighten every muscle, if we understand that salvation is possible only by the path of international socialist revolution, on which we have entered. To advance on this road, undaunted by defeat, to build up, stone by stone, the firm foundation of the socialist society, to work with untiring hand at the creation of discipline and self-discipline, at strengthening, at all times and in all places, the organization, the orderliness, the efficiency, the harmonious cooperation of the forces of the entire nation, a central supervision and control of the production and distribution of products—such is the path to power, whether it be power in the military sense or power in the socialist sense.

It is unbecoming for a socialist, when he has suffered a defeat, to protest his victory loudly or to droop into despair. It is not true that we have no other alternative than that between an "inglorious" (from the point of view of the *shlakhtzy*) death, which is what this terrible peace amounts to, and a "heroic" death in a hopeless war. It is not true that we have betrayed our ideals and our friends by signing this "Peace of Tilsit." We have betrayed nothing and no one, we have neither sanctioned nor concealed a single falsehood; to no single friend and companion in misfortune have we refused all the aid in our power. A commander-in-chief, who withdraws the remains of his army, defeated, and afflicted with a panic flight, into the interior of the country, who defends this withdrawal, in a case of extremity, with an intolerable and humiliating peace, is not perpetrating treason with regard to those sections of the army which he can no longer assist and which have been cut off by the enemy. Such a commander is doing his duty when he chooses the only way that is open for saving what can still be saved, consenting to no gambles, embellishing no sad truths in the eyes of the people, "giving up territory, in order to gain time," utilizing every breathing-spell, no matter how short, in order to collect his forces, in

order to provide repose and healing for his army, which has become sick with disintegration and demoralization.

We have signed a "Peace of Tilsit." When Napoleon I. forced Prussia in 1807 to make such a peace, he destroyed all the German armies, occupied the capital and all the large cities, introduced his police system, obliged the vanquished to provide an auxiliary army for the conduct of new wars of conquest conducted by the victor, dismembered Germany, and concluded with certain German states alliances against other German states. Yet, in spite of this severe peace, the German people succeeded in maintaining themselves, in gathering their forces, and in attaining for themselves the rights of freedom and independence. To all those who are able and willing to think the example of the Peace of Tilsit—which was only one of the many oppressive and humiliating treaties forced upon the Germans at that time—shows clearly how childishly naive is the thought that under all circumstances a most cruel peace is the depth of degradation, while war is the path of heroism and salvation. Warlike eras have frequently shown that peace may often discharge the function of a breathing-spell for the gathering of forces for new battles. The Peace of Tilsit was the greatest humiliation of Germany and, at the same time, the point of departure for a great national awakening. Historical circumstances at that time provided no other way out than through the bourgeois state; for, a century or more ago, history was created by a small band of noblemen and the cliques of bourgeois intellectuals, while the great masses of workers and peasants lay slumbering and unobserving. History at that time, therefore, moved with frightful slowness.

Capitalism has now considerably raised culture in general, and particularly that of the masses. The war has shaken up the masses, has awakened them with unparalleled terrors and sufferings. The war has accelerated the march of history so that it now flies with the speed of a locomotive. History is now made by the independent action of millions and tens of millions of people. Capitalism has reached the stage of socialism.

And therefore, if Russia now can pass, as she indisputably is passing, from a Peace of Tilsit to a period of national uplift, to a great war of national defence, the result of this transition will not be the bourgeois state, but the international socialist revolution. We have therefore become, since Oct. 25, 1917, "defenders"; we are for the "defence of the fatherland," but the fatherland that we are defending is the socialist fatherland, we are defending our socialism, which is a section of the universal army of socialism.

"Hatred of the Germans; down with the Germans,"—such was the cry and remains the cry of the ordinary (i. e. bourgeois) patriotism. And we say: "Hatred to the imperialistic robbers, hatred to capitalism, death to capitalism," and, together with this: "We must learn from the Germans! Remain faithful to the fraternal union with the German workers. They have been late in coming to our assistance. We shall wait for their coming, we shall gain time; they will come to our assistance."

Yes, learn from the Germans! History moves in zigzags and in roundabout paths. It so happens that the German at present simultaneously personifies, together with savage imperialism, the beginnings of discipline, organization, harmonious cooperation, on the basis of the modern machine industry, and strict accountability and supervision.

And that is precisely what we lack. That is just what we must learn. That is exactly what our revolution must have in order to proceed from a victorious beginning, through a series of difficult trials, to a victorious conclusion. That is exactly what the Russian Soviet Socialist Republic needs in order to cease being poor and weak, and to become, once for all, rich and mighty.

## Laborism and Socialism

*An Analysis of the Inter-Allied Socialist and Labor Program on Peace, and the British Labor Party Program on Reconstruction after the War.*

By LOUIS C. FRAINA

### I.

Socialist activity, activity that is dynamic and prepares the Révolution, consists in expressing fundamental Socialism by means of clear, uncompromising analysis of facts and tendencies as the basis of action, in relating fundamental theory to fundamental practice. If Socialism is in accord with the development of Capitalism, then the realistic policy, the policy of adapting our theory and action to *fundamental* facts and tendencies, is the policy that promotes the Revolution. But the facts and tendencies of Capitalism are multifarious; and revolutionary Socialism, accordingly, consists in appraising and relating itself to those facts and tendencies that are fundamental to Capitalism and the coming of Socialism.

There is a peculiarly naive conception of Socialist activity, which adheres to the slogan, "Teach Socialism!" Under the banner of this slogan two extremes meet—the doctrinaire revolutionist of the Socialist Labor Party, and the pervasive opportunist of the Socialist Party. This attitude evades all actual problems of Socialism: the one, by agitating sterile dogmas; the other, by refusing to deal with decisive problems of action, indulging in all sorts of *petit bourgeois* illusions and reforms. The test of the war has proven the ineptitude of these two extremes. The Socialist Labor Party has played a miserable role during the great crisis, unable to adapt its revolutionary aspirations to immediate problems and practice, evading completely the problems of war and peace; while the Socialist Party opportunists, where they did choose action, chose the action largely of bourgeois pacifism,

which, since the collapse of pacifism, has resolved itself into the theory: War, after all is only an incident in our program; teach Socialism! But what sort of Socialism is it that breaks down under the test of war, that abandons the most important task of relating Socialism to war and formulating an independent, revolutionary policy on war and peace? Teach Socialism—and abandon reality, abandon action, abandon the immediate struggle; teach Socialism—and preach your sterile dogmas which have become perverted into a negation of life, or castrate Socialism by a *petit bourgeois* policy of confusion and compromise, of adopting a multiplicity of "issues" that are wholly alien to fundamental Socialism. One element of the opportunist "teachers of Socialism" evades the problems of the war; while the other accepts the war and its policy of "making the world safe for democracy." In this miserable manner, they reject reality, they reject the determining circumstance that war means a climacteric expression of the fundamental facts and tendencies of Capitalism, on the basis of which alone Socialism may act and conquer.

Precisely the opportunistic attitude is responsible for the enthusiastic acceptance, in some Socialist quarters, of the Inter-Allied Labor and Socialist program on peace and the British Labor Party's program on reconstruction after the war. Uncritical comparisons are made between the proletarian revolution in Russia and these two programs; indeed, many an opportunist in his enthusiasm stresses the labor programs as against the proletarian revolution, implying that the former is immeasurably the more important,—as did Scott Nearing and Algernon Lee at the Radical, Socialist and Labor Conference in April. Now this is sheer nonsense. However important, however revolutionary the Labor programs might be, they are, after all, simply paper programs; they cannot, surely, be as important as an actual proletarian revolution, the assumption of power by the revolutionary proletariat, the development of the *modus operandi* of the Social Revolution. Moreover, the two events are mutually exclusive: the British Labor Party programs and the proletarian revolution in Russia are not comparable except as expressions of fundamentally differing policy. The British Labor Party programs are

the final, if finest, formulation of the moderate, *petit bourgeois* policy that has dominated the Labor and Socialist movement; the proletarian revolution in Russia is the initial, magnificent expression in action of revolutionary Socialism, of the new revolutionary epoch and requirements of Imperialism. The one is a policy for the preservation of Capitalism; the other a policy that means the end of Capitalism.

It is precisely the moderate Socialist who enthuses over the war and reconstruction programs of British Laborism: and they are an expression of the policy of moderate Socialism. This characterizes adequately and blisteringly the policy of moderate Socialism; and it determines the attitude of revolutionary Socialism.

## II.

Of the two programs under consideration, the Inter-Allied Labor and Socialist program on peace has made the most noise; although the British Labor Party's program on reconstruction after the war is the most important, most adequately pictures the tendency and policy of the program on peace. As in considering the program on reconstruction the determining factor is the social significance of the tendency it expresses, so a determining factor in considering the Inter-Allied program is the conditions under which it was adopted, and the groups that constituted the Conference.

The important fact is that the Labor and Socialist delegates constituting the Conference represented the pro-war groups of France, Belgium, and Great Britain. (Italy was represented, but its Socialist delegates agreed to the program, after disavowing its pro-war declaration, on the ground that it marked progress for the other organizations—which I consider a tactical error.) These organizations have accepted the war, and participated in the cabinets of capitalist governments; they have through four years of war abandoned the policy of international Socialism, the policy on war and peace formulated by the resolution of the Basel Congress in 1912. In other words, the very Socialist organizations

and Socialist policy that were responsible for the calamitous collapse of Socialism under the impact of war, participated in the Inter-Allied Conference and formulated its program.

Upon the declaration of war, and during the war, these organizations unconditionally capitulated to the governments, justifying an imperialistic war and manufacturing its ideology. The Belgian party, the French party, the British Labor Party, accepted ministerial responsibility, and participated in the formulation of the governments' policy on war and peace—a reactionary policy. They acquiesced in the governments' brutal acts of repression; they justified the arrest and imprisonment of Socialists and pacifists; they imposed fetters upon the proletariat, and delivered it to the mercy of the bourgeois governments; they abandoned the class struggle, abandoned fundamental Socialism in the period of a universal crisis, when Capitalism was on the verge of collapse, when Imperialism had issued a challenge to revolutionary Socialism and the proletariat. In this great, historic upheaval, the imperative necessity was an independent class policy, the inflexible adherence to Socialism; and these organizations accepted the government policy and repudiated Socialism.

The capitulation to the governments of French and Belgian Socialism, of British Laborism, was not a mere fortuitous circumstance: it was the inexorable consequence of their general attitude, of their *petit bourgeois* policy. The complex character of the war might obscure this; it is clear, incontrovertibly apparent, from the attitude of these organizations toward the Russian Revolution. Arthur Henderson, Albert Thomas, Emile Vandervelde went to Russia, during the first period of the Revolution, to urge upon the revolutionary democracy a social-patriotic policy, urge it to neglect the Revolution in favor of the war. They urged upon the Russian Revolution the prior claims of France—the Capitalism of which assisted in strangling the Revolution of 1905 by means of the great loans; and the claims of Great Britain—which favored Milyukov and Kornilov, and engineered a counter-revolutionary campaign against the Soviet Republic and the Revolution. These men, these organizations, seduced by the war and Imperialism, wished to degrade the Revolution to their own petty



nationalistic purposes. A subtle, insidious, counter-revolutionary propaganda emanated from these organizations, even during the early stages of the Revolution, when they didn't have the alibi of the "pro-German" Bolsheviki: and so apparent and infamous was this propaganda, particularly from French Socialist sources, that even the Mensheviki in April, 1917, sternly protested against "the so-called majorities of the English and French Socialists" which "have undertaken a systematic campaign for the purpose of exerting pressure on the Russian Socialist proletariat in the sense that it should discontinue all efforts for peace and should waive any independent political policy founded on International Solidarity and the Class Struggle." The protest stigmatizes these Socialists' "complete willingness to sacrifice the freedom of the Russian people and the Revolution on the altar of narrow nationalist interests"; and asserts that "they wish to force on the Russian workers a civil peace together with the imperialistic war aims of the bourgeois liberals, the same as that which demoralized the proletarian movement in England and France"; that "Jules Guesde demanded quite openly in his telegram: first victory, and only then the republic"; and moans: *"never has the revolutionary uprising of a people been so betrayed by those very elements from which it was justified in expecting sympathy and support."* All this refers to the same individuals, groups and tendency that were represented at the Inter-Allied Socialist and Labor Conference (with the exception of the Italian Socialist Party).

But, it may be argued, that is ancient history. It isn't. These crimes against Socialism are not ancient history; they are crimes that must be remembered, that must be held against the perpetrators, that must become an active factor in the coming reconstruction of Socialism. They are crimes that indict for all time the perpetrators and the tendency they represent.

There is a more conclusive answer. The British Labor Party's memorandum on War Aims, subsequently the Inter-Allied Socialist and Labor Program, was adopted December 28, 1917, at a time when revolutionary Russia was proposing to the belligerent nations an armistice on all fronts and general peace negotiations—the Labor Party completely ignored the proposals. While the

Inter-Allied Conference was holding its sessions, revolutionary Russia, desperately and in isolation, was waging a struggle for a general, democratic workers' peace. It had sent its appeal to the proletariat and Socialism of the world, particularly of the belligerent nations. The Conference completely ignored the struggle and the appeal for solidarity; all the more reprehensible because at the time a million or more Austrian and German workers were on strike, protesting against the governments' peace policy and affirming solidarity with the Bolsheviki; its organizations repudiated revolutionary Russia, betrayed it; more, they slandered the proletarian revolution and its representatives steered their governments' determination to ignore the proposals for peace, and to crush the Soviet Republic at the first opportunity. To-day, the Allies are waging war upon the proletarian Soviet Republic, rallying the counter-revolutionary forces, preparing to crush the proletarian revolution; and the British Labor Party, the dominant French and Belgian Socialism, do not repudiate their governments, do not break with the imperialistic bourgeoisie. The French Socialist Party protested recently against intervention in Russia, but its majority (which is steadily losing strength, however) still clings to tactics that necessarily encourage its government to pursue an imperialistic policy—the tactics of abandoning the independent class policy and action of Socialism.

These general considerations might dispose of the Inter-Allied Labor and Socialist program on peace: a reactionary tendency can produce only a reactionary policy. A fuller analysis is necessary, however, to appreciate its relation to the fundamental facts and tendencies of Imperialism and of Socialism: this is the determinant consideration.

### III.

The Inter-Allied program on peace accepts the formula of no annexations, no indemnities, and the self-determination of nations. It declares that "the problem of Alsace and Lorraine is not one of territorial adjustment, but one of right." (This is a petty bourgeois conception of the problem. The clash over Alsace-Lorraine, notwithstanding its ideologic and moral forms, is precisely the

same as that over Morocco—the vast resources of mineral wealth, particularly iron: Alsace-Lorraine produces about 80 per cent. of the iron ore in the whole German Empire. Iron is the basis of the modern industrial technology, and its monopolistic possession is one of the objectives of Imperialism.) The Inter-Allied program proposes a plebiscite to decide the destiny of Alsace-Lorraine. An international fund is proposed as the means of restoring devastated areas, except Belgium, reparation to whom is to be made by Germany. All occupied territory is to be evacuated; Italy is to have the Italian provinces of Austria restored, but the program “condemns the aims of conquest of Italian Imperialism”; Armenia, Mesopotamia and Arabia are not to be returned to Turkey, but, if they cannot set up their own governments, are to be administered by “a commission acting under the Supernational Authority or League of Nations”; the Balkans are to become a federated state; colonies are not to be exploited by Imperialism, the natives to be given “effective protection against the excesses (!) of capitalist colonialism,” and the African colonies (not dependencies, such as Egypt) are to be given a system of control under the League of Nations, “which, while respecting national sovereignty, would be alike inspired by broad conceptions of economic freedom and concerned to safeguard the rights of the natives under the best conditions possible for them.”

The Inter-Allied Program, accordingly, is a systematic consideration of problems involved in the war, and an attempt at their democratic solution. The only difficulty is that this solution is to be introduced by bourgeois governments; and this conception is possible only through a complete misunderstanding of the character of Imperialism.

This program strikes a blow at German Imperialism, but scarcely touches the Imperialism of Great Britain, France and Italy. Morocco, Tunis, Algiers, Egypt, are not considered at all. It means, in the final analysis, the weakening of German Imperialism in favor of its competing Imperialism, since Anglo-French Imperialism is already established, and Germany's is not. Anglo-French Imperialism can be victorious without new annexations; German Imperialism must have annexations in order to emerge

victorious out of the war. The acquisition of new territory, which may provide raw materials and absorb surplus capital, is an indispensable requirement of modern Capitalism; no territorial and other arrangements can dispose of this requirement and the antagonisms that it develops. The attempt to end the antagonisms of Imperialism on the basis of Imperialism itself is doomed to benefit one or another competing Imperialism: The struggle must be directed against Imperialism itself.

Imperialism is not an accidental or transitory phase of Capitalism; it is a new stage of Capitalism. It means that Capitalism must either conquer and renew itself through Imperialism, or stagnate; and stagnation means unavoidable death. The problems of Imperialism are fundamental to the perpetuation of Capitalism; they are not problems that can be mediated as between competing imperialistic nations, or that can be evaded or solved by means of a vague “democratic pressure” upon the governments, on the basis of the capitalist economy. All nations at the stage of modern capitalist production are imperialistic; capitalist technology is absolutely dependent upon the import of raw materials and the export of capital. New territory must be developed, raw materials secured; and as these are limited, implacable competition develops; and this competition cannot be either evaded or disposed of on the basis of Imperialism.

The Socialist attitude on war and peace, accordingly, relies upon a struggle against Imperialism itself. Our objective, the center of our activity, is not the struggle against annexations, preventing annexations or reducing them to a minimum, since annexations are not the cause of Imperialism, but simply its result. A nation at war, as this war proves, may fight relentlessly without any purpose to annex territory, and still victory will promote its Imperialism. The “democratic” disposition of problems of territory and markets will only provoke imperialistic antagonisms in a new form, not solve them. The struggle against annexations must be a Socialist, proletarian struggle against Imperialism itself. On this basis alone can Socialism conquer.

Many of the Inter-Allied proposals for the solution of terri-

torial problems might be put into effect, temporarily; but its demand for no economic war after the war is utterly incompatible with the requirements of Imperialism. Economic war, waged to the point where it flares up into the military struggle, is of the essence of Imperialism. Raw materials, particularly iron and other metals, are limited, and they are the basis of modern technology; the monopolistic control of these raw materials is one of the objectives of the imperialistic nation. Investment markets for the absorption of surplus capital are equally limited, and each imperialistic nation strives for the monopolistic control of these investment markets. Each nation, by broadening its own economic opportunity through Imperialism, necessarily and inevitably narrows the opportunity of a competing nation. To expect each nation, on the basis of Imperialism, to yield this struggle is to expect that all nations, as capitalist systems, are willing to commit suicide—either by perishing, or by allowing Socialism, without a struggle, to establish its system of communist production. The great fact, the determining consideration, is that the modern productive problems of Capitalism must either mean Imperialism and war; industrial stagnation and a rotting death of Capitalism; or Socialism. Capitalism will not allow itself to rot away, neither will it yield to the coming of Socialism.

The crown of the structure reared by the Inter-Allied Conference is the League of Nations. The *petit bourgeois* character of the Conference is most clearly expressed in its acceptance of the proposal for a League of Nations—under the aegis of Imperialism. "Of all the conditions of peace," says the Inter-Allied program, "none is so important to the peoples of the world as that there should be henceforth on earth no more war." The means proposed consist of a "supernational authority," that "can be no other than the League of Nations, in which not only all the present belligerents but every other independent state should be pressed to join." The use of "independent state" implies that dependent states would be excluded from participation—being amply represented by their imperialistic masters! "The constitution of such a league of nations," proceeds the program, "implies the immediate establishment of an international high court, not

only for the settlement of all disputes between states that are of a justiciable nature, but also for prompt and effective mediation between states in other issues that vitally interest the power or honor of such states." And should a nation or nations resist the mediation of "non-justiciable issues"?—"Refusal to accept arbitration or to submit to the settlement will imply deliberate aggression, and all other nations will necessarily have to make common cause, by using every means at their disposal, either economical or military, against any state or states refusing to submit to the arbitration award or attempting to break the world's covenant of peace." This is the crux of the whole problem: the proposal is not for a League of Nations, but for a League to Enforce Peace, a League that will force peace by means of economic and military war. The ultimate arbitrament is to be the arbitrament of the sword. This is the way to peace!

Nationalism, the inevitable concomitant of the capitalist system of society, is fatedly incompatible with any effective international action to preserve the world's peace, since Capitalism and nationalism are necessarily and fundamentally predatory. The internationalism that is produced by Capitalism, particularly in the imperialistic epoch, and upon which liberals and many a moderate Socialist depend for the automatic, mechanical ending of war, is an internationalism that functions nationally, an internationalism used to maintain Capitalism and the supremacy of the imperialistic nation. It is an economic internationalism that cannot become political because its animating objectives and causes are national in scope and predatory in purpose. Ultimately, it is preparing the world-state only in the sense that its objective conditions may develop the subjective factor of proletarian action for the establishment of Socialism; immediately, it is reactionary. This internationalism, which culminates in Imperialism, instead of bringing peace measurably nearer, has multiplied the horrors and scope of war, has made war an inescapable necessity of Capitalism, is increasing the antagonism out of which wars arise. The fundamental disputes of Imperialism, masquerading as "issues of national honor," are not justiciable, because of the national purpose behind their international aspect; and because these dis-

putes are vital to the existence of Capitalism. The nation is vital to Capitalism, and this acts against a "supernational authority" that could actually function.

The fundamental error of the Pacifist-Socialist, of the Socialist who imagines that war may be "modified" away, is that they completely misunderstand the relation of Imperialism to Capitalism. The underlying assumption is that Imperialism is not fundamental to Capitalism, that Imperialism and its antagonisms might be abolished while retaining Capitalism. But Capitalism and Imperialism are one and indivisible; the death of Imperialism means the death of Capitalism. Imperialism is the manifestation of a relentless capitalist necessity; it is the synthetic expression of the whole of Capitalism; it is the climax of Capitalism, Capitalism in its decadent and final stage, verging either on collapse or the introduction of Socialism.

The tendency expressed in the Inter-Allied Program is, fundamentally, the tendency of the pacifist-liberal, which is precisely the tendency of moderate Socialism. The pacifist-liberal of the *petite bourgeoisie* yearns to abolish war while preserving the causes of war; to abolish the "evils" of Capitalism while retaining Capitalism; to "modify," and ultimately destroy, the antagonisms of Imperialism while refraining to break the relations that produce these antagonisms; to "democratize" the nation and the world while Imperialism systematically suppresses democracy. The pacifist-liberal tendency, which is counter-revolutionary, is an expression of the *petite bourgeoisie*, its insecurity and weakness, and which, wholly dependent upon Imperialism, yet struggles—in words—against the "excesses" of Imperialism; and it is equally an expression of the aristocracy of skilled labor, which has been seduced by Imperialism, profits from Imperialism, willingly accepting the spoils of Imperialism while being unwilling to pay the price in the blood and agony of a world war. The pacifist-liberal tendency of moderate Socialism repudiates fundamental Socialism; it breaks down the Socialist struggle equally during war and peace; it is the great enemy of Socialism.

## IV.

The theory of modifying national antagonism as the means to peace, and the theory of modifying class antagonism as the means to fundamental social reconstruction, are an inseparable expression of one tendency,—the *petit bourgeois* tendency of avoiding the dynamic struggle of class against class as the mechanics of progress. This tendency assumes an identity of interests that does not exist; it assumes the supremacy of reason and intelligence in the reconstruction of society, and forgets that reason and intelligence are determined by class alignments, are instruments in the struggle of class against class. Arthur Henderson, in *The Aims of Labor*, adequately pictures this tendency: "Reasoned, intelligent and scientific attempt to construct international machinery to administer justice between nations . . . non-justiciable disputes, *i. e.*, disputes which cannot be settled by international jurisprudence, but which can be settled by moral law, provided the nations concerned are disposed to accept moral law as being on at least as high a plane as law made by man." The moralist, and not the revolutionist, is to make the world anew! But moral law, statutory law, reason and intelligence all break down under the impact of the violent antagonisms of Imperialism, the implacable antagonisms of the class struggle.

International reconstruction must base itself upon national, upon social reconstruction; and this means the abolition through Socialism of the antagonisms of imperialistic Capitalism, of the class system of society. Proposals of procedure for a League of Nations are inevitably wrecked upon the rock of the social system that prevails in each nation. The Inter-Allied Program recognizes the necessity of social reconstruction, but it is a reconstruction on the basis of democracy, by means of the modification of antagonism; it says:

"But the sincere acceptance of the rules and decisions of the supernational authority implies the complete democratization in all countries; the removal of all arbitrary powers who, until now, have assumed the right of choosing between peace and war; the maintenance or creation of Legislatures elected by and on behalf

of the sovereign right of the people; the suppression of secret diplomacy, to be replaced by the conduct of foreign policy under the control of popular Legislatures, and the publication of all treaties, which must never be in contravention of the stipulation of the League of Nations, with the absolute responsibility of the government, and more particularly of the Foreign Minister of each country to its legislature. Only such a policy will enforce the frank abandonment of every form of Imperialism."

The fatal error in this program is that the abandonment of Imperialism is predicated upon democracy, instead of democracy being predicated upon the abandonment, or rather the overthrow of Imperialism. All the measures of democracy proposed would not in any way alter the imperialistic character of Capitalism, nor impose the abandonment of Imperialism.

This fatal error is implicit in the British Labor Party's program for reconstruction after the war, "Labor and the New Social Order."

The series of legislative measures, proposed as a means of immediate improvement and ultimate transformation of the conditions of society, constitutes a program that depends upon democracy as the instrument of action. It assumes a limiting of the forces of Capitalism on the basis of Capitalism itself, the "penetration" of Socialism into Capitalism. It is a bureaucratic program, to be introduced by bureaucrats. Reconstruction is conceived as a problem of experts, meeting in conference and proposing their plans, introduced by means of the democratization of the state and Capitalism, the co-operation of classes, understanding between the classes, and the "unity of democracy" for the conquest of parliament and the state. Compromise, and not revolution, is to be the instrument for the transformation of society; "all the classes," and not the proletariat, are to bring "Socialism." British Laborism is becoming more vocal, more aggressive, perhaps, but its policy is still the policy, in tendency, of yesteryear. It is the Fabian policy, expressing itself through an independent political party. It is the old British trades unionism, emphasizing its *petit bourgeois* character by trying to "unite democracy" through an alliance with the middle class.

The program, it is true, abounds in radical phraseology: "What has to be reconstructed after the war is not this or that Government Department, or this or that piece of social machinery, but, so far as Britain is concerned, society itself . . . (The war is) the culmination of a distinctive industrial civilization, which the workers will not seek to reconstruct. . . . The individual system of capitalist production, based on the private ownership and competitive administration of land and capital . . . may, we hope, indeed, have received a death-blow." This sounds well; but the tendency of the plans proposed is of a character to promote Capitalism, to intrench Capitalism. These proposals would injure the interests of this or that particular capitalist group of capitalists, but this would in no sense be calamitous, since under Imperialism the individual capitalist is subordinate to the interests of Capitalism as a whole.

The British Labor Party program represents a tendency that is characteristic of imperialistic State Capitalism,—the unity of ruling class interests, and the placating of labor by means of minor reforms and by making the aristocracy of labor through Laborism a part of the governing system of things. Capitalists may suffer, but Capitalism thrives. Capitalism has nothing to fear from the struggle for the "national minimum," unemployed insurance, "the progressive abolition of the private capitalist," etc. It is, moreover, a policy of reconstruction on the basis of Capitalism that postpones fundamental reconstruction and strengthens Capitalism. Reconstruction is to be a process of parliamentary struggles, of enlarging the functions of the state, of striving for that collectivism which is the ideal of the liberal middle class and the aristocracy of labor,—all of which may easily be absorbed by imperialistic State Capitalism, and, in fact, promotes Capitalism and Imperialism.

Fundamental reconstruction can proceed only after the conquest of power by the revolutionary proletariat. Specific reforms cannot accomplish much because the problems of reconstruction are integral in scope. International peace is made insecure by national antagonisms; national antagonisms prevail because of capitalist rivalry; capitalist rivalry multiplies antagonisms through

Imperialism, and Imperialism is necessary to the existence of Capitalism; the state is repressive and undemocratic because that is essential to Capitalism, as are all the other evils of Capitalism. The "democratization of the state" depends upon the democratization of industry; and the democratization of industry is conceivable only through the industrial self-government of Communist Socialism. The attack must be made upon Capitalism itself; the supremacy of capital must be annihilated; with the annihilation of the bourgeois state and its bureaucratic machinery, with the conquest of power by the proletariat, reconstruction may proceed in a way that is immediately advantageous and ultimately realizes Socialism. Arthur Henderson, in an appeal to the intelligence of the ruling class, warns them of this impending evolution, and suggests that compromise (through accepting the Labor Party program) is the alternative to revolution. This is a policy of conciliation with the bourgeois state and Capitalism, away from Socialism. Capitalism can be overthrown only by the revolutionary proletariat; fundamental reconstruction is a *class*, and not a social process, a process initiated and developed by the proletariat. If reconstruction is a class process, then the supreme consideration of Socialism is the conquest of power by the proletariat as the starting point of reconstruction. Conquest of power by the proletariat means its mastery of the bourgeois state, the annihilation of this state by the new proletarian state of the organized producers. The supreme task of revolutionary Socialism is the conquest of power by the proletariat; all other measures are an expression of petty bourgeois Socialism, and counter-revolutionary,—which is precisely the official character of British Laborism, of the German Social-Democracy, of moderate Socialism everywhere.

The British Labor Party program proposes a systematic plan of intensive social reform. The realization of this program would necessarily depend, considering prevailing conditions and the fact that it is to be introduced upon the basis of Capitalism, upon the prosperity and aggrandizement of British Imperialism. Social reforms are realizable only through a prosperous Imperialism, since Capitalism depends wholly upon Imperial-

ism; and, accordingly, these reforms would be introduced by the oppression of colonial peoples, since this oppression is the mechanism of Imperialism. But, you may say, the Labor Party program declares that its proposed new social order must not be based "on an enforced dominion over subject nations, subject races, subject colonies, subject classes, or a subject sex." This is a lofty ideal; but its realization depends wholly upon the realization of Socialism. The strength of Imperialism, and its danger, lies precisely in the possibility of improving the conditions of its own workers by an intensive exploitation of subject peoples: the spoils of Imperialism are not only distributed among the cliques of the ruling class, but among a portion of the workers. The objective of Imperialism is a "prosperous" nation of a few millions based upon the oppression of hundreds of millions of an alien race. Out of the prosperity of Imperialism, and out of that alone, can come the sinews for an intensive social reform program introduced on the basis of the bourgeois state.

It means not only that: it means the creation of a privileged caste of workers within the nation, who profit not only from the exploitation of foreign workers, but from the exploitation of the great mass of the industrial proletariat of unskilled labor. Under the historical conditions and limitations of Capitalism, the prosperity of the ruling class means the oppression of the bulk of the people; and better conditions for a section of the workers means the oppression of the great bulk of the workers constituting the industrial proletariat of unskilled labor.

There are sections of British Labor which realize this aspect of Imperialism, this inseparable connection between social reform and Imperialism, much more adequately than the official British Labor Party. The London *Nation* recently indicated this tendency very acutely:

"But there is still one element which has been omitted from this ingenious calculation of party interest. The workman (or his head-men) will get something out of the new speculation in empire. . . Hence the new labor party. We say new labor party,

for if the war has almost abolished Liberalism and changed the face of Toryism, it has split the old Labor Party into fragments. A portion Mr. George has seduced. Another part has been honestly absorbed into the work of war administration. A third has had a mysterious origin in the war itself. The British Workers' League is a nominal offshoot of Socialism. But its second birth is of dubious parentage. What is its financial basis? Who finds the funds for its ample propaganda? The trade unions? Hardly. And what explains the ready hospitality of the *Times* and the support which the league clearly obtains in powerful circles of Capitalism? The motive is avowed. The British Workers' league is regarded as a counter-revolutionary body. Its merit in the eyes of the powerful men who watch and would mould the new order in the interests of capital is that it rejects free trade and adopts the program of the Paris conference (economic war after the war). A further reason for treating it as a friend is that it proposes to replace the class war by a minimum wage and the abolition of restriction of output. Here, then, the driving power of the new Capitalism has been found. In exchange for a guarantee of high wages the workmen's leaders are expected to take their hands off the regulator. . . . Conscription is the basis of such a society; the soldier-statesman, the master organizer, is its natural head, and slavery to Capitalism and its own fears its form and doom."

The program of the British Labor Party will not determine its coming action, but the struggle of factions within the party each against the other. The party is not a unity. It has the aristocracy of labor, and it proposes, by its invitation to the "workers of the brain," to absorb the middle class: if this combination dominates, its policy will become definitely and implacably the policy of Social-Imperialism. If, on the contrary,, the workers of the character of the miners and dock-workers, the unskilled, prevail, then it must inevitably accept the policy of revolutionary Socialism. After all, the significance of the Labor Party program lies not in the official attitude of its representatives, but in the surge of radical feeling in the membership which compelled an alteration in the official attitude. On this up-surging of radical aspira-

tions and action, which during the war has repeatedly repudiated the compromises of the official representatives, depends the future character of the British Labor movement. In any event, unless the bulk of the workers remain dormant, which is unthinkable, the great industrial proletariat will express itself through its own aggressive action in mass action, will acquire the consciousness and action of revolutionary Socialism; while the skilled workers, the aristocracy of labor, will in one form or another become an integral part of State Capitalism, an appendage of "British Imperialism, which is the coming party, with Mr. Lloyd George as its inevitable head."

## V.

The theory that class antagonisms are being modified is not altogether a wrong one. Under the conditions of Imperialism, and the necessity for unity in the ruling class, the old inter-class antagonisms become blurred and disappear. The industrial *petite bourgeoisie*, which formerly struggled relentlessly against Big Capital, has been either wiped out or has been compelled to accept the domination of Big Capital. The formerly actively struggling groups within the capitalist class have, on the whole, made peace with each other, seeking compensations for their compromises in the fabulous profits of Imperialism. The new middle class, an income and not an industrial class, is the product of concentrated, imperialistic capital, and is wholly dependent upon finance-capital and Imperialism. The interests of the individual capitalist or capitalist groups are subordinated to the interests of Capitalism as a whole; the policy is to unite the ruling class, the form of expression of this unity being imperialistic State Capitalism.

The dominant Socialism has in fact accepted this modification of class antagonisms as the basis of its immediate policy. It has accepted this modification of antagonisms because it represents, on the whole, the interests of the remnants of the old *petite bourgeoisie*, the new middle class, and the skilled workers organized largely in the dominant unions. The history of the Socialist movement during the past twenty years, the epoch of Imperialism,

has been one of adapting itself to the new conditions, of working on the basis of the modification of class antagonisms, of subtly, but none the less actually, becoming part and parcel of imperialistic State Capitalism.

The epoch of Imperialism is characterized by a multiplication of the contradictions of Capitalism, proof that Capitalism is on the verge of collapse. Simultaneously with the appearance of the tendency of modifying class antagonisms, has appeared a new series of violent class struggles—the struggles of the industrial proletariat of unskilled labor against Capitalism. The significance of Imperialism, from the proletarian standpoint, is the awakening to consciousness and action of the typical proletariat, the machine proletariat, the proletariat of average labor. A study of labor history for the past twenty years will show that the great labor struggles have been an expression of this unskilled proletariat, the proletariat massed into regiments and battalions by concentrated industry. The concentration of industry, the perfection of the technological process, expropriates the worker of his skill, as it expropriates the industrial *petit bourgeois* of his importance in industry. The necessity of skill in the worker becomes progressively superfluous, skill being now the monopoly of a small layer of the workers, technicians, engineers, etc.; the mass of the workers become the typical proletariat in the Marxian sense, appendages of the machine. Ideologically, at first, this proletariat is a part of the dominant unionism and Socialism; but gradually it initiates its own independent action. The characteristic of its struggles, decisive as to the character of the new alignment, is that they are frequently directed as much against the dominant unionism and Socialism as against Capitalism itself.

Laborism and the dominant moderate Socialism may become absorbed in imperialistic State Capitalism, representing as they do the dominant unionism and the *petite bourgeoisie*, now integral parts of Imperialism. But imperialistic State Capitalism cannot absorb the great industrial proletariat of average labor, since that would mean the capitulation of the capitalists as a ruling class. Laborism and moderate Socialism approach a conciliation with

Capitalism, which means a conciliation with Imperialism; they express and affirm the necessity for the modification of class antagonisms; they act on the policy of the co-operation of classes: but this co-operation means the co-operation of the ruling elements, excluding the industrial proletariat. This proletariat of average labor accepts the theory of conciliation only at the risk of being used to promote the interests of the aristocracy of labor and the *petite bourgeoisie*. There is no part in State Capitalism for the proletariat of average labor, the controlling factor in industry; this proletariat must struggle against the whole *bloc* of the ruling system of things, including Laborism and the dominant Socialism.

The character of the Socialist struggle after the war will be determined by whether Socialism accepts the conciliatory, *petit bourgeois* tendency of Laborism, or whether it accepts the revolutionary tendency of the industrial proletariat of machine labor, which is the tendency of fundamental Socialism and the proletarian class struggle.

The machine proletariat, organized by the mechanism of concentrated industry itself, not divided by distinctions of craft skill, massed in the basic industries of Capitalism, and subjectively absorbing the objective industrial facts of unity and integration—the machine proletariat instinctively turns to industrial unionism and mass action. Laborism, on the contrary, turns to parliamentary action as decisive; and this because neither the aristocracy of labor nor the middle class, which Laborism represents, are a controlling factor in industry. The machine proletariat is belligerent, Laborism conciliatory; Laborism proceeds on the basis of Capitalism, the machine proletariat is compelled, immediately or ultimately, to organize a general attack upon Capitalism as the only instrument of its emancipation. Revolutionary Socialism, basing itself upon the dominant proletariat, accepts political action only as a phase of the general, dynamic and creative mass action of the industrial proletariat.

Mass action is the synthesis of the tactics of revolutionary Socialism, the mechanism of the proletarian class struggle; its acceptance or rejection will determine the success or failure of the



Socialist struggle after the war. Imperialism is the expression of concentrated industry; the industrial proletariat of machine labor is the expression of concentrated industry; and mass action is the expression of this proletariat. Mass action, potentially and actually, immediately and ultimately, is the process of revolution, the animating factor in the action of the proletariat. The proletarian revolution has been objectively introduced by Imperialism, and subjectively initiated by the proletarian revolution in Russia. The decisive factor in the Russian Revolution has been the appearance upon the stage of events of the distinctive proletariat, acting through mass action, determined in a struggle equally against Capitalism and moderate Socialism. As Laborism acted against the industrial proletariat in Australia, as Laborism in England assumed a policy against the class struggle, as moderate Socialism everywhere has become overtly or covertly the ally of State Capitalism and Imperialism—so in Russia moderate, *petit bourgeois* Socialism and the ideology of Laborism were actively, directly counter-revolutionary.

The epoch of Imperialism, its altering of class relations and the expression of class interests, forces the inescapable necessity for an irrevocable formulation of the fundamental differences between *petit bourgeois* Socialism and Laborism, and the fundamental, class-struggle Socialism of the revolutionary proletariat.

Conditions after the war must be used for an uncompromising struggle against Imperialism as the unity of all the forces of Capitalism. The immediate objective must be the conquest of power by the revolutionary proletariat, the establishment of the proletarian state upon the basis of which alone social reconstruction may emerge into the society of communist Socialism. The immediate task of Socialism, the irreducible minimum, is to adapt itself to the tendency of the industrial proletariat of average labor, to awaken the consciousness and action of the proletariat for the conquest of power. This is the immediate program of action of Socialism.

The epoch of Imperialism appears to strengthen Capitalism, but this appearance of strength is fictitious and deceptive. Im-

perialism means Capitalism on the verge of collapse, Capitalism being strangled by its own contradictions. History abounds with illustrations of a system apparently supreme at the moment when internal conditions and contradictions were about to destroy it. The struggle of revolutionary Socialism against Imperialism is a necessary struggle and a struggle latent with rapid success. The struggle of revolutionary Socialism against Laborism and moderate Socialism is an equally necessary struggle; and as with Imperialism, Laborism and moderate Socialism appear most imposing, apparently impregnable, at the moment when their own contradictions and the awakening consciousness and action of the revolutionary proletariat are about to overwhelm them. Life itself is the supreme factor making for revolutionary Socialism.

## An Open Letter To American Liberals

By SANTERI NUORTEVA

Representative of the Finnish Workers' Republic.

**T**HE letter that follows has been sent to a number of prominent American liberals with whom Comrade Nuorteva, as official representative of the People's Republic of Finland, has repeatedly had occasion to discuss the general situation in Russia and in Finland.

They have shown interest in and appreciation of the importance and difficulty of the problems which the peoples of the countries in question were called upon to solve.

Comrade Nuorteva addressed these gentlemen not purely and solely as a personal matter, but as exponents and representatives of a group that has preserved and embodies the best American traditions, without having become contaminated by the sordidness of machine politics—the liberals of America.

They must accept the responsibility that goes with their station as well as with their historical antecedents—either protest against what they cannot justify or become responsible as fully as if they had themselves done that which they failed to oppose.

Sir:

So it did happen after all. America, the "sponsor of the new freedom," America, the "founder of world democracy," is in Russia to-day, together with the Japanese, British, French and Italians, Colonel Semenov, General Horvath and other Russian reactionaries, to destroy the Bolshevik revolution. That is what the intervention amounts to, all reassurances notwithstanding.

I don't know that I have any business to write to you about Russia. I don't know that you have any time or interest to spare to consider the world drama which is being played in the far East. I don't know whether your patriotic efforts at bringing about class harmony in America will leave you time enough to see how your government and other governments are trying their utmost to prove to the world in Russia that conflicting class interests never can be conciliated.

Yet, somehow, I cannot refrain from writing you these lines. The greatest crime the history of the world ever has witnessed is being perpetrated against the Russian people—under the guise of "helping Russia,"—a crime as much blacker than that of the German imperialists, as is a stab in the back from a man pretending to be a friend more repugnant than a blow in the face from a confessed enemy. The Germans were at least frank in their indecency. They never pretended "helping Russia." And in Germany even the despicable Scheidemanns had enough moral stamina to raise their voices in the German Reichstag against the brigand terms imposed upon Russia by the Brest-Litovsk "peace" treaty. German papers printed vigorous criticism of Germany's policy in Russia. Here nobody dares to say anything,—least of all you, the so-called liberals, who have been trying to persuade us, the "dogmatic Socialists," that class interests are not the paramount issue in the world war and that there is some guarantee to the democracy of the world in the idealistic aims of great individuals.

What are you doing in Russia, sir? I am saying you, because as long as you have not raised your voice in protest, you are responsible for it along with all the others.

Why did you go to Russia, and what do you expect to get out of it? You went there to "help the Czecho-Slovaks," of course! That is what the diplomatic declarations said. To help the Czecho-Slovaks to get out of Russia to fight on the western front. But aside from the fact that these declarations speak of the westward movement of the Czecho-Slovaks,—and nobody certainly imagines that the Czecho-Slovaks can go to the western front by moving westward from Siberia—you will remember that the intervention plans regarding Russia were laid long before the editors of the American papers learned how to spell the name of Czecho-Slovaks, or before they knew whether the Czecho-Slovaks were inhabitants of Africa or Australia.

Some time ago I saw a plan of Russian intervention, which was submitted to the State Department by some great defenders of American business and democracy. It was submitted last March, and it openly spoke of the necessity of finding a pretext for intervention in Russia. Very frankly it contemplated the possibility of inducing somebody to invite an Allied intervention. The Cadet Party was expected to do the inviting—but even the Cadets did not dare openly to invite foreign intervention in Russia. The statement purporting to come from the Cadet Party, inviting Allied intervention, was fabricated in Paris by former Russian ambassadors and other adventurers who represented nobody but themselves. Even Kerensky could not be induced to plead for an armed intervention in Russia, and now he, who was your hero two months ago, is ostracised by "respectable society." And so the interventionists had to resort to political trickery, which would be comical if its consequences were not so tragic. "The population on the Murman coast" has invited you to take Archangel! The population on the Murman coast, forsooth! Some illiterate Lapp fishermen and a handful of intellectuals—truly true representatives of Russia! Later the interventionists succeeded in bringing to Archangel old man Tchaikovsky and a few other members of the dissolved Constitutional Assembly, which forthwith was proclaimed as the "legitimate government" of Russia in the declaration issued by Allied representatives at Archangel. But in Vladivostok not even that much could have been accomplished, as far

as the local population is concerned. In the face of an Allied armed occupation, Vladivostok in the municipal elections gave an overwhelming majority to the Bolsheviks. The workers struck in protest against Allied occupation in Vladivostok, and your papers triumphantly declare,—after having said for many days that the strike would not materialize, as most of the workers would not strike,—that the strike is a fizzle, *as the Allies have been successful in replacing the strikers with Chinese workingmen*. "Fighting for democracy"—by arraying coolie labor against Russia! "Not interfering in internal affairs of Russia,"—yet arraying one group of people against another!

What are you doing in Russia, sir? Don't you think that people have eyes to see and ears to hear with? Who invited you to Vladivostok? Was it Colonel Semenov, a discredited Czar official, and General Horvath, a notorious swindler and adventurer at the head of a few thousand troops composed of Chinese riff-raff, saloon keepers, gamblers and other adventurers of the "wild east," who valiantly rose "in defense of civilization" because the workers' rule in Siberia was putting an end to the unspeakable social conditions in the towns of the far "wild east"?

If your purpose is to get the Czecho-Slovaks out of Russia so that they may fight Germany, why don't you send them to Finland to fight the Germans there? Why are you not similarly interested in aiding the Finnish workers, who are now in Russia, in an attack upon the German masters of Finland? The British Government gave assurances a few days ago to the Finnish pro-German White Guard Government that it would not encourage "any groups or factions in Finland." Did this declaration mean, if anything, that the British Government under no circumstances would encourage the anti-German workers of Finland to fight against their masters? But when in Southern Russia the Cossack General Krassnoff, armed and supported by German troops, makes an attack against the Soviet Russia, his activities are being hailed in the press as a part of the "work of liberation in Russia." How can you explain that paradox? We are told over and over again that this is a war for democracy and against German militarism, yet it seems that in Finland the blackest reaction,

and German reaction at that, is being encouraged and the democratic anti-German masses discouraged, while in Russia the workers' republic, which is anti-German and democratic, is attacked, and any one is encouraged who is against the Soviets, whether he be an anarchist, a monarchist, a reactionary pro-German junker or a so-called liberal.

All this is of course clear and understandable if you judge it from the point of view of the philosophy of the class struggle. Socialism is a greater enemy to the existing order than German militarism. But you will not admit that, or at least you have not openly admitted it. But if you do not admit it, then the policy you advocate in Russia is the most chaotic, irresponsible and ridiculous the world ever saw.

The truth about Russia does not reach us to-day; you do not realize what the Soviets are accomplishing. When the work of the Soviet Government does become known it will most likely result in bitter criticism of interference. But the present policy of making criticism punishable cannot last forever. The war will end; and then will come a time when uncensored speech once more is a fact. There will be years and centuries of human life after the war is over, during which the historian will be permitted to judge the events of to-day without the prejudice of passion and without the will to distort, due to economic interests.

*What, then, will be the verdict on your present Russian policy?*

Even now many facts are becoming known which cannot be explained away. We have been told that the antipathy of the Allied nations toward the Soviet Government is due to its "subservience to German occupation" and to the "betrayal at Brest-Litovsk." But do you know, sir, or do you not, that some time before the ratification of the Brest-Litovsk peace treaty by the Soviet Government, the Government of the People's Commissars showed concrete willingness to continue the war against Germany and wanted to know to what extent it could expect co-operation from the Allies in the task of the reorganization of the Russian army? How will you explain the absence of an answer to this proposition of the Soviet Government? Do you know that last

winter, just before the German advance in Russia, Trotzky earnestly requested co-operation in taking away big guns from the Russian front so that they should not fall into the hands of the Germans? In spite of Trotzky's efforts the Germans took the guns and transported them to the western front. About the same time the Russian Government requested aid in the form of a few hundred British naval officers to take charge of the Black Sea Fleet so that a plot engineered by Russian reactionary officers aiming to deliver the Black Sea Fleet to the Germans should not materialize. They were not successful in obtaining the requested help and a large part of the Black Sea Fleet was delivered to the Germans by Russian reactionaries. And the crowning madness of all this is that the press accused the Bolsheviki of having delivered those guns and that fleet to the Germans!

I have knowledge of scores of similar incidents which all prove that the Soviet Government was extremely eager to co-operate with the Allies in every possible way against Germany, but without success.

Why?!!

In order to be as fair as possible and to give the benefit of the doubt to the Allied representatives I shall admit as a possible reason for their action that they never expected the Soviet Government to stay. The above related incident regarding the guns on the eastern front took place at a time when the Allied representatives, misled by Russian counter-revolutionists, were sure that the Soviet Government would be overthrown in a few days. They apparently hoped that a new eastern front could be established by the Cadets, which would require the presence and use of the big guns. But if that was the reason for their otherwise inexplicable action in the matter, it only shows their utter lack of understanding of the real relations between the political forces in Russia. The same will be the historic verdict in all other cases where there was no attempt made to use the Soviets against Germany.

Another excuse may also be advanced. Starting out with the theory that the Bolsheviki were paid agents of Germany, the

Allies naturally suspected every approach on the part of the Bolsheviks as an "effort to obtain information for the German army"! But even that is no excuse at all. For more than a year the press has been shouting that Lenin and Trotsky are paid agents of Germany—but *never has a shred of real evidence* been offered in this respect. Certain "documents," I understand, were printed in "Le Petit Parisienne." The actual fact, however, is that these so-called documents are *proven forgeries*, which were in the hands of the bitterest enemies of the Bolsheviks during the Kerensky regime, and could not be used because of their obvious forgery and falseness.

On the other hand there are innumerable proofs of a willingness to co-operate with elements whose only "merit" is their opposition to the Soviets but who otherwise are openly co-operating with the Germans. Much in this respect has been shown in the attitude toward the Finnish White Guard, toward the pro-German Ukrainian bourgeoisie and toward the Milyukov faction, which is co-operating with Germany and now has squarely declared itself for the restoration of monarchy in Russia. Much more could be shown if all the facts were known. Above I already referred to the assurances given by the British Government to the White Guard Government of Finland, who have sold themselves body and soul to the Germans—that the British Government never would support any rebellious faction in Finland against the present Government.

How in the name of common sense can you then expect that any sane person, who is acquainted with the facts as they are, could for a moment believe that the main reason for intervention in Russia is to recreate opposition to Germany? The story about the Germans in Siberia, who are fighting the Czechoslovaks, is altogether a product of hysteria or a deliberate misrepresentation. Last April, at the request of Trotsky, Allied representatives went all through Siberia to confirm rumors circulated already at that time about armed German prisoners in Siberia acting on behalf of the German government. The Allied representatives did not find anything of that kind, and their findings must be known to the Allied Governments.

Why all that talk about the necessity of liberating the valiant Czechoslovaks and permitting them to proceed to the western front? The facts about their case are that the Soviet Government was doing all in its power to allow the Czechoslovaks to get away from Russia. Trotsky offered them passage by way of Archangel. For some reason that offer was not accepted. The stories about their having been attacked in Siberia while on their way to Vladivostok may be easily interpreted otherwise than as an attempt to prevent their leaving Russia. The eastward moving Czechoslovaks of course obstructed the transportation of foodstuffs along the Siberian railroad to Russia. It is easy to understand that the necessity of feeding Russia came in conflict with the desire of the Czechoslovaks for unhindered passage. Yet I am sure that whatever difficulties arose in that respect, they could have been straightened out between the Soviets and the Czechoslovaks, if they had been left to settle it themselves. It is obvious that the local population was incited against the Czechoslovaks by Germans as well as by Russian reactionaries, who saw in the conflict between the Czechoslovaks and the Soviets a potential nucleus of an interventionist adventure.

And so we have been compelled to witness a tragedy, which the historian of the future will regard as one of the most pathetic events in the history of revolutions. The Czechoslovaks,—themselves rebels,—most of them originally in sympathy with the Russian revolution, most of them Socialists, desiring to establish their international independence by revolutionary means,—are being used by those who promised them national independence, and who profess adherence to the principle of self-determination of nations, as the hangmen of the Russian Revolutionists. Never has a rebellious people, striving for independence, been asked to pay a more horrible price. If the present plan of reactionaries in Russia is to materialize for the moment, if the Czechoslovaks meet with success in putting down the Russian revolution and in establishing there a bloody reactionary monarchy, and if they as the Judas-pay for this work are to receive the independence of Bohemia, can't you see that future generations will haunt that "independent Bohemia," built on the corpses

of the greatest revolution in the world, down to the deepest hell as betrayers and traitors to liberty and progress? But still more possible is another outcome. Either the Czecho-Slovaks will successfully perform the work they are asked to do to-day, and, having re-established reactionary monarchy in Russia, will find reaction and monarchism strengthened in Austria as well—and never will get the price anticipated by them, or—they will not be successful in their plan and will be cast aside just as you are ready to cast aside Kerensky to-day.

Recent dispatches from Washington are that the Czecho-Slovaks have been recognized by the United States as an independent nation and that they will be given all possible aid in their struggle against Germany. Nothing is said in that declaration about the war between the Czecho-Slovaks and the Russian Soviets. So far the Czecho-Slovaks, with the exception of a few regiments on the western and on the Italian fronts, are mainly fighting Russia.

Every friend of independence of small nations will rejoice in the recognition given the Czecho-Slovaks. But you must admit that this recognition, given at a time when it mainly will tend still more to complicate the Russian situation and serve as an excuse for actual war against Russia, thereby loses much of its altruistic color. And again I cannot refrain from comparing this act with the attitude of the Allies toward the revolutionary Finnish workers. They are actually fighting the Germans. Some of them are actually co-operating with the Allies on the Murman coast. They represent not only a national aspiration, but an actual popular majority, which was the Government of Finland, and would be to-day, if it were not for the German occupation in Finland, which is directly and indirectly encouraged by the Allies through the encouragement given to the pro-German "White Guard."

But let us consider the present situation without any regard to its political side. What do you expect to accomplish in Russia? You certainly cannot imagine that the present forces in Vladivostok can accomplish anything in the way of a military occupation of Russia. By sending a few hundred thousand troops more,

—and in this respect you will have to depend on the Japanese,—you may accomplish as much as an occupation of the region between Vladivostok and Irkutsk—a distance as long as from New York to Utah. But even that is scarcely one-third of the distance from Vladivostok to the Ural mountains, and Irkutsk is still about six thousand miles away from Moscow. And when you have accomplished that, what then? The Baikal tunnels are blown up and without them it will be impossible under even the most favorable conditions to penetrate the vast region of almost insurmountable mountains around the Lake of Baikal, and by the time you get your hundreds of thousands of troops to Siberia the winter will set in and things drag on till next May.

You are counting, of course, on the possibility of a popular uprising of the population in Siberia against the Bolsheviks. But is it really necessary to indulge in such futile hopes, now that you know better? The Allied intervention has been a fact in Siberia for more than a month. Nothing in the way of a popular uprising has taken place.

A dispatch in the daily press reports the joyful reception accorded the Allies in Archangel. It tells that the people came out to meet them and that the Americans parading through the streets were cheered. In accordance with an old tradition the hospitality of the city was offered them by the peasants who brought bread and salt. A high mass was celebrated in thanksgiving of their arrival. But these stories, especially that of the celebrating of the high mass, just as well prove that the joy was all on the side of a small minority, as it is a well-known fact that the Russian workers have lost their interest in high mass. Has there been any intimation of a *popular* welcome to the Allies in Russia? Every Russian peasant and workman feels that whatever "government" you may succeed in establishing in Russia, in the place of the Soviets, at once will proceed to deprive the Russian peasants of the land and liberties they have acquired.

There can be no more chance for a popular uprising in Russia against the program of the Soviet Government than there would be a chance in America of a popular uprising of farmers against an increase in the price of corn and milk.

It is true, of course, that the action of the Allies in Russia, encouraging every faction which is against the Soviets, may in the long run produce a state of complete anarchy. Enemies of the Russian Soviet Government do not hesitate to employ the most desperate methods, thereby provoking desperate action on the other side. With what savage joy did not the newspapers receive the reports of the attempt to assassinate Lenine! The wildest anarchist newspapers have nothing on the New York Times, the Tribune, the World, the Globe, and the whole long line of papers, which, as by agreement, now speak of the "Russian tyranny, tempered by assassination." If the capitalist press sees fit to-day to degrade itself to the moral standard of thugs and bandits in their futile rage against the Russian Labor Republic, it is not for me to bewail it. But is there no one among you—"the intellectual leaders,"—sane enough to raise your voice against this mad orgy, which, as you well may understand, may in the end prove an unexpected boomerang? The policy of assassination in Russia is led by Boris Savinkov, the minister of war in the Kerensky Cabinet, one of the "pets" of the press. I am not intimating that the Allied representatives in Russia are employing such horrible methods. But in view of the attitude of the Allied press you cannot prevent the Russian people from drawing conclusions of their own. We had recently the ultimatum of the British Government to the Soviets because of an alleged attack against the British representatives. The British Government threatens to hold the Soviet leaders personally responsible for any violence against Allied citizens in Russia. Is it not conceivable that the mind of the Russian masses, victimized by constant attacks upon their liberty, and upon their chosen leaders, may react in the same way?

I do not defend violence on the part of the Russian Soviets. But, pray, have you ever witnessed another instance of revolutionary history, where the revolutionary government was more deliberately provoked to commit violence? And have you ever witnessed another instance where the outside world published more lies and exaggerations about the acts of the revolutionary government—not to speak of the complete unwillingness to understand

the exasperating conditions under which the Russian government works?

Carlyle, recording the protests of the French nobility against the policies of the French revolutionaries, remarks that the Revolutionists showed more political tactfulness and constructive ability than the nobility itself ever was able to show. They asked the Sans-culottes to practise the principle of "noblesse oblige" which the nobility itself never had practised towards anyone except those belonging to their own class. Do we not see something similar in the Russian situation to-day? You in America, who in spite of your tremendous resources of order and stability, cannot prevent mobs in Illinois, in Oklahoma, in Minnesota and in the southern states from committing unspeakable outrages against innocent people,—you demand from the Russian people, who have been kept for 300 years in a state of ignorance, who to-day are living through the most stupendous revolution the world ever has witnessed, and who are attacked from every conceivable source, you ask them to show more coolness than you are capable of yourself!

The same may be said in regard to the attacks on the Russian people because of their alleged social disorder and anarchy. It took ten years for you in America to establish a stable government and orderly efficient rule, after you had signed the Declaration of Independence. At that your revolution was mainly a political one, involving the change from one Government to another, without any considerable changes in the social structure. Your revolution occurred at a time when the social problems confronting you were a mere bagatelle compared with those that the Russian people are asked to solve. Your revolution took place among a homogeneous nation of three millions, who had behind them a century of self-government and experience at individual as well as co-operative action. You were allowed to settle your problems not only without any interference from the outside after you had accomplished your immediate aims, but you received real help and encouragement from other nations. Even then it took you ten years to bring about social order. And now you are angry and impatient at the Russian workers and peasants, because they

lack the strength to perform in a year a task a thousandfold more difficult than that which you could not perform in less than ten years, and under immensely more favorable circumstances.

Where is your reputed fairness, you Americans? Where is your sense of fair play?

Russia, a country of 180 millions of people, belonging to about 40 different nationalities, representing every conceivable stage of economic evolution, starting with savage Samoyeds on the Arctic coast of Siberia, and nomadic tribes of Trans-Caspia, up to the educated intellectuals of Russia, a country where the natural economic progress has been deliberately hampered by 300 years of abominable autocratic rule, which necessitates to-day a relatively longer step in the way of social reorganization than any country has been asked to take at once, a country where the so-called intellectual classes, to their eternal disgrace, are deliberately sabotaging the serious efforts of the working people to restore order and progress, a country where the Government, although consciously supported by a greater percentage of the people than is the case in any other country in the world, is attacked by all reactionaries the whole world over, a Government which is not being helped, but whose actions are deliberately interfered with in every instance,—this country, in spite of all this, has been able within less than a year to bring about more order than there has been in Russia for the past three years. But instead of expressing even the faintest commendation of the almost supernatural organizing ability of the Soviets, you, without protest, allow your papers deliberately to withhold all news favorable to the Russian workers and to circulate deliberate lies tending to bring the Russian workers into disgrace and to justify attacks on their Government. If the Soviet Government had received even a small part of the encouragement and help which you are to-day willing to give any Russian adventurer who promises you to deliver Russia into your hands, or even if you would have let Russia alone and had not encouraged the Russian reactionaries in their fight against the Soviets, Russia to-day would be a shining example of an orderly society and an everlasting proof of the constructive ability of the laboring masses.

Russian, Swedish, and even British newspapers received in this country contain highly interesting reports of the constructive work which is being done by the Soviets. In the face of tremendous obstacles they have been able quite satisfactorily, considering the circumstances, to organize the Russian agriculture on the basis of the new conditions. They have conducted a tremendous educational work all around Russia. They have rehabilitated the means of communication. Every fair observer admits that in those parts of Russia, where the Soviets work unhampered by the German autocracy and the various brands of counter-revolutionists, the life has rapidly returned into normal channels.

Some time ago I sent you a copy of a speech held by Premier Lenine at the All-Russian Congress of Soviets. This speech, which has been commended by the New Republic, convincingly proves that the Russian Soviet statesmen seriously and in a conservative and responsible manner are solving the great problems of economic rehabilitation of Russia, and that they are eager to bring about an acceptable "modus vivendi" in their economic international relations. It may interest you to know, if you have not had this information before, that even on the question of repudiation of debt, which is perhaps one of the greatest obstacles to an understanding with the Allies, the Russian Soviet Government was willing to compromise with the Allies. The decision to repudiate the foreign debt was held up by Lenine and Trotzky for almost a month, while they waited for some response from the Allies in regard to co-operation. No response was ever received.

But, is it not true, that it is *that very thing which the reactionaries of the world fear more than anything else?* The Russian workers' revolution *must* go down in defeat. There *must* be chaos—because if there were not, it would be a bad example to the workers of the rest of the world. Otherwise your papers could not say that Socialism has been weighed and found wanting.

But why not call a spade a spade? If you are bent on pursuing your present policy in Russia, would it not be much better for all parties concerned plainly to admit the facts and express their readiness to take the consequences? What you



want in Russia is the crushing of the Soviet Government as such, regardless of the fact that it is anti-German and regardless of all proofs of its constructive ability. As the Soviet Government obviously is supported by the great majority of the people, you will have to suppress that majority. In order to do that you must send to Russia not a small army which could accomplish nothing but bring evidence of your hostile attitude toward the Russian proletariat, but send there millions,—to the great detriment of your military plans on the western front. Or otherwise you must allow the Japanese to send an army,—and leave as a heritage of your Russian adventure an absolute Japanese domination in the East, a strengthening of Japanese imperialistic ambitions. To overcome the popular support of the Soviet Government you must in addition to that prepare yourself for a *permanent* occupation of the vast area of Russia, because as soon as you should withdraw your troops from any region, you would have on your hands new rebellions followed up with blind revenge taken on those Russians who have supported you in the accomplishment of the coup d'etat. You have the example of the Ukraine before your eyes. Do you not see that the bloody rule established by the Germans in the Ukraine, although it is partly due to the peculiarities of Prussian militarism, mostly is an inevitable natural consequence of the fact that the poorer Ukrainian peasantry,—and in Ukraine there is a larger percentage of rich and conservative peasants than in any other parts of Russia,—blindly revolts against attempts to deprive them of their newly won land and freedom?

I have many times pointed out that most of the program of the Soviets which you object to, including the repudiation of the debt, is a logical result of the expropriation of land by the peasants. To put an end to the policy of the Soviets you will have to repudiate the expropriation of land, and then you at once will find yourself in the same position as the Germans found themselves in the Ukraine.

And is there no lesson for you in the dispatches from

Samara? The first dispatches from that city about a month ago were that the Czecho-Slovaks had occupied the city, disarmed the Red Guard and deposed the local Soviet, with the result that the local bourgeoisie at once proceeded to take a bloody revenge upon the workers, killing hundreds of Soviet members, the armed presence of the Czecho-Slovaks making this revenge possible, although they themselves did not participate in the execution. After a few weeks the Red Guard took possession of the city once more, and one hundred Czecho-Slovaks were publicly hanged in retaliation of the execution of the Soviet members. That story will repeat itself over and over again. And for what use,—as at the end of it all, sooner or later, there must be, and *there will be*, the ultimate victory of the social principles represented by the Soviets to-day?!

I am not a pacifist nor do I shudder at civil war, if such must befall. But I would gladly give my life if thereby I could prevent unnecessary slaughter of people. Yet the experience of the past two years plainly shows, that however much the workers would like to avoid bloodshed and civil war, they will not be allowed to do so by their opponents, who do not seem able peacefully to admit the inevitable trend of the social evolution. The workers in Russia and in Finland today are the *conscious* majority, just as the "third estate" became the conscious majority against feudalism 150 years ago. You can not expect the workers in Russia and in Finland voluntarily to renounce their supremacy in favor of the retention of old forms of society, which have brought them nothing, and can bring them nothing but misery.

Is it then possible at all that the former ruling classes in Russia by sheer reasoning power should admit this fact and thus avoid unnecessary struggles and bloodshed? And if it is not possible for the Russian bourgeoisie to see it, as they personally have been deprived of all the privileges so dear to their hearts,—is it not possible that *you*, their intellectual class brethren, who are not *personally* as closely interested in

the situation, and, therefore, should be more able to retain your faculty of clear judgment, would advise them, or at least not encourage them in their blind class rebellion against forces that are unsurmountable?

But nothing at all is heard from you, nor from other "liberals." A most curious situation has developed. America, which was expected to be the country to bring democracy into the world, is today politically more sterile than any other country in the whole world. Even from Japan we hear rumors and news of revolt, which cannot be without relation to the Russian adventure. In England liberal thought is using valiantly all avenues of expression. The English liberal papers are intelligently and radically criticizing the Russian policy. I am enclosing with this letter for your information, if you have not happened to see it yourself, copies of articles in the London Nation and the Manchester Guardian, which well deserve your consideration. Here we hear nothing. One or two faint-hearted whisperings in small editorials in the "New Republic" and in "The Nation" only serve as the exception which proves the rule. Not only are you not contributing anything of liberal thought to save the world from the tremendous danger of a rejuvenation of the blackest imperialism through the Russian adventure, but the "liberal" elements in America today are doing their best to squelch whatever liberal thought there is in Europe. Today your emissaries are in Europe on a special mission to extinguish liberalism. The presence of American troops in Siberia is used by the reactionaries to throw sand in the eyes of liberals in Europe and to whitewash anything that may be undertaken there by the imperialists.

Some time ago I wrote to a person belonging to the Administration as follows:

"A comparative detachedness of the United States from European politics, which you call the principle of the Monroe Doctrine, has been one of your peculiarities up to the present time, as long as you economically were more or less inde-

pendent of Europe and Europe was independent of you. When the world war revalued all former international values, and America became a part of the world family not only in words, but in action as well, and your Monroe Doctrine became more or less a relic of the past, all lovers of international democracy rejoiced in the fact, principally, because they hoped that this would mean *not America's subjugation to outworn European diplomacy, but Europe's becoming inoculated with the young virus of all that which is real in the democracy of America.*

"Now I am asking myself and I would ask you: Shall America, now that she has the greatest opportunity ever given a country to bring new forms and new, clean views into world diplomacy and international relations, shall she submit to stale shopkeeper considerations of European diplomacy and not utilize the tremendous reservoir of democracy in Russia in order to strengthen America's historical mission of bringing democracy into European policies?"

America, it seems, has not availed herself of that opportunity. Instead of that she has been induced, it seems, not only to serve reactionism, but, unwittingly, I hope, to deceive the liberal thought in the world, or at least in America, into support of that reactionism, by giving it her indorsement,—and the result of all this has been that we are now witnessing the paradox of the defenders of "law and order" and of a "new freedom" engaged in an interventionist adventure against the only force in Russia which is capable of bringing about order and the new freedom.

It is not less paradoxical that I, representing the ideas and aims of those revolutionaries whom your press is branding as the craziest fanatics, impracticals and visionaries, should talk to you urging practical and sane policies, orderliness, and political honesty, as against chaos and disorder.

For more than six months I have been among you as a voice crying in the wilderness trying to hope against hope that rational thinking and common sense might mean some-

thing to your society, even when the greatest class issues are involved. I have been trying to do a work of persuasion, employing all possible tactfulness and consideration of the peculiarities of the situation and of your psychology. I have been doing it in the face of sneers and suspicion among my perhaps less polite, but surely more experienced proletarian comrades, who over and over again told me that it is entirely out of the question to try to make a bourgeois understand the justice and the necessity of anything which means the lessening of the class supremacy of capitalism, and who for that reason regarded as useless on the part of the workers everything except the most merciless struggle in every possible manner against those who rule the world. You are doing, I fear, all you can to encourage such views.

As the representative of the Finnish Workers' Republic I tried patiently, and using language as considerate as possible, to make your Government understand at least something about our situation over there. I offered you cooperation in return for concrete helpfulness. I proved to you that if the democratic professions of America count for anything in America, in the struggle of the workers in Finland, America has a cause worthy of unconditional support. We had there on our side not only the majority of the people, but we had that majority expressed in our favor by legal parliamentary proceedings, unequivocally proving that the cause of the Finnish workers is the cause of democracy. We had a case where the Finnish workers not only were opposed to German autocracy, but were fighting it bitterly, directly aiding the cause of the Allies, in so far as that cause involves the crushing of German militarism. We have on the side of our enemies in Finland representatives not only of the minority of the people, but of a parliamentary minority, openly hostile to even such democratic principles as are a matter of fact in America today,—as equal suffrage, social legislation and theoretical equality of opportunity. In Finland there was not even a question of the "dictatorship of the proletariat" such as in Russia. The Finnish workers expressly

wanted to call together a Constitutional Assembly on the basis of equal suffrage for all inhabitants of Finland. The other side not only temporarily allied itself with the Germans, but was for three years criminally plotting with the German imperialists and in every way was an accessory to the most abominable crimes of Prussianism. Yet that other side was the one which received all the encouragement and still is receiving it from you. I was never given a fair and a serious hearing.

Some time ago I made a formal proposition to the United States Government about cooperation between the Finnish Red Guard and the Allies on the Murman Coast, and I never received even an acknowledgment of that proposition. And, please, do not tell me that the reason for this slighting attitude was that it is not proper to confer with the representatives of unrecognized factions. Three years ago the representatives of the State Department had all kinds of negotiations with all kinds of Mexican factions not excluding Villa. You have had no scruples in officially dealing with and recognizing Professor Masaryk, representing the Bohemian National Council, although his status certainly is not as official even as mine, he being the self-appointed President of some National Council, which some time may become the Government of Bohemia or may not, but nevertheless at this time represents only an aspiration. I represent a *de jure* Government, supported by the Parliamentary majority of the people, a Government which, although it is driven out from its home-land today, has not renounced its claims and never will renounce them, and with which you *will have to deal* bye and bye, as it surely will once more come into its right.

But there was really a difference between Professor Masaryk and me. *I made it a point, and still make a point of all our cooperation with the Allies, that they should recognize the Russian Soviets.* Professor Masaryk offered to crush the Russian Soviet government with his Czechs and thus put an end to Socialist rule in Russia. There lies, perhaps, the reason for the difference in the treatment we have received.

Again I ask you, how in the name of common sense can you expect any one of us who has gone through the experiences which I have had in these six months of modest attempts at proletarian diplomacy not to see, that every political move is made on the basis of economic interests and that if we, the Finnish Socialists or the Russian Socialists, were the very arch-angels of orderliness, constructive political ability and common sanity we would be still branded as brigands as long as we did not renounce our social aims which are the natural next step in the social progress of the world?

However, I did not write this letter in order to criticize only. I have lived in America long enough to become an admirer of your tremendous resourcefulness, your ability of initiative, your youthful social vigor, unhampered by centuries of feudal tradition, and I have dreamed, as many others have dreamed, that America, because of these her assets, will be able to bring common sense into a world, which is now paying a horrible price for the inability of its ruling classes to admit that the twentieth century is a century of labor democracy. And heaven knows that I, and almost everyone of us who believe in the Russian Revolution and in the ultimate victory of Socialism, from the very outset of the world war have been partisans of the Allies. Not that we for a moment renounced our convictions that class interests are the paramount issue in every capitalist state. Yet we are no such fools as not to see that modern industrial evolution, which inevitably leads to Socialism, is less hampered,—at least normally has been—by the so-called western democracy than by the rigid system of Prussianism. Also the sentimental traditions of liberal and revolutionary opportunity in France, in Belgium, in England, in Italy and in America as well as our whole-hearted disgust with those peculiarities of modern capitalistic materialism which more pronouncedly than anywhere else are expressed in the Prussian system, have kept us distinctly in favor of an Allied victory—if this war is to end in the victory of the one or the other side. I only wish that the Allies, including the United States, would not have done

everything in their power to make it as difficult as possible for any real radical to stick to those hopes!

But if the world war is to end in an alliance of imperialistic Germany and the Allies against radicalism and socialism all over the world,—if the Russian venture is pressed to its logical conclusion,—then there of course is no choice for an honest radical between the present belligerent groups. I do not know that I can hope that this may be avoided. Writing to you about these things, although I myself am pretty much losing any hope of response, *we still leave an opportunity to you to prove in some concrete fashion that a capitalist state, confronted with the problem of a rising working class, has other channels to offer for the evolution than that of a brutal class war.*

Your experience in Russia up till today has, perhaps even to your satisfaction, proven to you that the best outcome of the situation would be to put an end to the intervention, as long as it is not too late. I met a Government official not long ago who told me frankly that the best hope he entertained in regard to the Russian situation was that the Americans might be able to end the adventure at least as easily as you ended your Mexican intervention. I am afraid that that optimistic hope is not likely to become a fact—if something is not done at once. You were able to get away from Mexico “with honor.” You were the masters of the situation there, as far as your own actions were concerned. In Russia, especially in Vladivostok, you are not,—your financial influence with the Allies notwithstanding. You may expect to do anything you want, but you *will have to do that*, into which the Japanese and Russian reactionaries will draw you,—and they know more about how to complicate the Russian situation than your representatives know how to avoid a complication.

If there is any hope of an honest ending of the present situation, it can be achieved only on the basis of actual negotiations with the Soviet Government. Today, I, as the rep-

representative of the Finnish Workers' Republic, am officially sending your Government a proposition of mediation between America and the Russian Soviets. Not that I for a moment believe that such a proposition will be entertained, nor even acknowledged, but for the sake of historic record I will put myself and our cause down as having done everything imaginable and consistent with our principles to avoid the calamity of a general war between the Russian people and the Allies.

It may seem preposterous to some of your officials, and perhaps to you as well, that we, the unrecognized and uncouth representatives of the aspirations of the masses in the East, shall even expect a consideration of our propositions. *But the history of what we are doing today, and of what you are doing or not doing, will be recorded a few decenniums from now by historians of a period when the idea we represent today will have become the basis of the structure of the world, and it will be our classless society of to-morrow, which will pass judgment on your class of to-day.*

## Reconstruction in Russia

The central feature of reconstruction in Russia is that it proceeds upon the basis of a proletarian state, functioning through a temporary dictatorship of the proletariat. The policy of the Bolsheviks, in complete harmony with Marxism, is that the first requirement of Socialism in action is the conquest of power by the proletariat, after which accomplishment reconstruction becomes fundamental reconstruction and assumes the tendency of making for Socialism, instead of promoting Capitalism.

The dictatorship of the proletariat, the dynamic mechanism of the introduction of Socialism, may be described as having three functions:

1. The annihilation of the political power of the bourgeoisie in all its ramifications. The assumption of state power by the revolutionary proletariat disposes of the bourgeoisie temporarily as a political force; the bourgeoisie must be disposed of permanently. This is accomplished in two ways: the economic expropriation of the bourgeoisie, and its complete exclusion from participation in politics and government. In the measure that the process of reconstruction absorbs the bourgeoisie into the ranks of the useful producers, will they again be allowed—as *workers*—to participate in politics and government.

2. The introduction of measures of temporary reconstruction. The transition from Capitalism to Socialism is not accomplished in a day: it is a process. But while the moderate and the revolutionary Socialist agree that the transition to Socialism is a process, there is violent disagreement as to the *character* of the process. The moderate Socialist assumes that it is a process operating upon the basis of Capitalism and the bourgeois state; a gradual penetration of Socialism into Capitalism; but this is a process that cannot and never will emerge into Socialism, being the process of *petit bourgeois* collectivism, and making for State

Capitalism. The revolutionary Socialist assumes that the process must be a revolutionary process operating upon the basis of the proletarian state—a process of reconstruction which alone annihilates Capitalism and introduces Socialism. Moreover, the transition, the overthrow of the political power of the bourgeoisie, necessarily disorganizes industry, and creates a measure of demoralization; many of the measures of the dictatorship of the proletariat, accordingly, must be of a temporary nature in order to overcome this demoralization, and increase productive capacity. The rapid increase of production, a vital task of the proletarian state, is accomplished also by all the measures of reconstruction, by means of a dictatorial regulation of production.

3. But these temporary measures must be, and are, in accord with the fundamental tendency making for Socialism. Measures of reconstruction to solve immediate problems of disorganization may assume a capitalist or a Socialist character, dominantly; and these measures of the dictatorship of the proletariat are decisively of a Socialist character. This, accordingly, is the fundamental task of the proletarian dictatorship: to initiate the tendency towards the complete transformation of Capitalism into communist Socialism. The forms of this tendency assume a character that logically and inevitably emerge into the definite forms of a Socialist society.

The Soviet government annihilated the political power of the bourgeoisie by completely excluding it from participation in politics and government, denying the bourgeoisie either the right to vote or become candidates. The Soviet state is a state of the organized producers, representing exclusively the interests of the proletariat and proletarian peasantry. The political expropriation of the bourgeoisie was complete; but its economic expropriation was not pushed to the final point. This temporary cessation of the economic expropriation of capital is based upon a number of factors, chief among them being the incomplete industrial development of Russia, but most important the necessity of emphasizing temporary measures in order to solve the pressing immediate problems of the resumption of economic activity.

These temporary measures assumed a much more important character in Russia than is typical of the transition toward Socialism upon the basis of a dictatorship of the proletariat. The Soviet regime inherited chaos, a chaos produced by Czarism and intensified by the bourgeois republic of the Provisional Government, of Kerensky. The war, the cutting off of communications with the outside world (the Allies completely isolated the Soviet Republic), the pressing starvation, the encroachments of Germany and other nations, determined to crush the proletarian revolution—all these factors, and more, emphasized the importance of temporary measures out of all proportion to the general tendency of a dictatorship of the proletariat.

But the chief, the all-determining problem was met, and met adequately: the participation in the government, dominantly and dynamically, of the lowest section of the proletariat and proletarian peasantry, the emergence upon the stage of government of the masses of the people, the initiation definitely of the tendency toward the complete socialization of industry and society. The conscious activity of the masses, the development of its capacity for self-government and administrative control of industry and society, determine the rapidity of the measures toward complete Socialism introduced by the dictatorship of the proletariat—and these requirements were swiftly developed.

The unifying characteristic of all measures, temporary and permanent, introduced by the Soviet government, is that they started from the bottom, and not from the top; that the center of reconstruction was the activity of the organized producers, and not the activity of the state. The local initiative and self-government of the producers had to be developed as the only basis for the fundamental industrial democracy of communist Socialism. This initiative, this self-government, and not the bureaucratic state, is the dominant factor in the process of reconstruction. The proletarian state constituted a unifying expression and acceleration of the activity of the masses. The old state, equally the bourgeois parliamentary state and the Czarist state, has been completely overthrown, with all its machinery of repres-

sion of the masses, its bureaucracy, and its anti-proletarian character. The new state is the state of the organized producers; as the old state was an instrument for the coercion of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie, so the new state is an instrument for the coercion of the bourgeoisie by the proletariat—with this fundamental difference: that where the old state considered itself sacrosanct and eternal, the new state considers itself a temporary necessity that will gradually become superfluous in the measure that the process of reconstruction emerges definitely into the Socialist communist society of the organized producers.

As an historical category, the Soviets are not peculiarly Russian products, but class organizations characteristic of the proletarian revolution. They constitute a dictatorship in relation to the bourgeoisie, but a democracy in relation to the workers and peasants—the real, the fundamental democracy of oncoming Socialism.

The agrarian problem in revolutionary Russia plays a much more important part than would obtain in a proletarian revolution in a nation where industrialization has proceeded further. The peasantry, the mass of agricultural workers and expropriated peasants as against the peasant bourgeoisie, has accepted, at least for the present, the tutelage of the proletarian dictatorship, as a phase of this dictatorship. Private ownership of land has been abolished, the land being nationalized and distributed to the peasants with provision for periodical re-distribution. Local land committees take charge of production and distribution of agricultural products, inventory the land in a particular district, allot land to the villages, regulate agricultural labor, control forests, etc., and receive the rental for the use of the land, which is turned over to the central government. The land committees of the rural districts are unified into the county committees, which in turn elect delegates to a provincial committee, the provincial land committees being organized into the Main Land Committee acting for all Russia. On this central agricultural body are represented the All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Peasants and Workers, the Commissaire of Agriculture, etc. The

abolition of private ownership in land includes city real estate and buildings, which are declared public property.

Industry has not been completely socialized, although a drastic workers' control has been established over all industry. Not all capitalists have been expropriated, the employer or owner in many cases being retained as a director, but his rights *as owner* have been abrogated and his "profits" rigidly limited. Workers' control of industry starts with factory and works committees, elected by the employees and the technical staffs, and having almost complete jurisdiction over internal questions, wages, hours, etc. In each important industrial district, town or province, is instituted a local workmen's organ of control, acting in accord with the local Soviet, and comprised of representatives of the factory and works committees, labor unions and workmen's co-operative societies. This control of industry is centralized in the All-Russian Workmen's Council of Control, acting for the whole of Russia.

The supreme factor in the control and regulation of economic activity is the Superior Council of Public Economy, which unifies and directs industrial and agricultural production, and to which the specific agricultural and industrial councils are subsidiary, all in turn being responsible to the central organ of government, the Council of People's Commissaires. The Council of Public Economy regulates the state finances, has authority to confiscate, requisition, sequester and syndicate any industrial establishments, the right to reform and re-organize all other existing institutions for the regulation of production, and supervises and directs the work of all economic departments of the Soviets. The Council of Public Economy is composed of representatives of the All-Russian Workmen's Council of Control, each commissariat of the Soviet government, and specially selected persons. The Council is divided into several sections, each of which deals with a particular phase of economy; and it must submit all bills and important measures to the Council of People's Commissaires.

In these measures for workers' control of industry temporary requirements are fused with ultimate purposes: the forms are not

in any sense final, although latent in the general tendency of the measures. While the representation on the local and district organs of control is industrial, the whole system functions territorially and is not yet wholly and integrally industrial. The ultimate form of organization is the unification of all the separate parts of a particular industry in all Russia into one integrated industrial department, having immediate and particular direction of its industry; and the unification of all industrial departments into one central and inclusive industrial administration—as provided in the theory of industrial unionisms and the facts of production. This is precisely what should emerge from the present incomplete forms of workers' control, together with the complete expropriation of capital. Proletarian Russia is constructing the industrial state, preparing the conditions for the final abolition of the state and the institution of Engels' "administration of things." Two circumstances determined the temporarily incomplete forms of workers' control of industry: the immediate necessity to resume production and crush the industrial sabotage practised by the bourgeoisie, which had to be done immediately even if functioning through incomplete forms; and the fact that Russia is not as completely industrialized as other nations, consequently much of the material for an integrated industrial administration is missing. But the tendency has been initiated out of which inevitably emerge the higher forms, as the dictatorship of the proletariat completes its task of annihilating the bourgeoisie and increasing the totality of the productive forces. The tendency, moreover, is wholly in accord with the ultimate purposes of communist Socialism.

The nationalization of the banks was a crucial measure. It was, perhaps, the most difficult and adventurous of all the measures introduced by the Soviet state, but inescapable. Monopolistic finance is the heart of Capitalism and Imperialism, and to strike at this heart is to deal a mortal blow at the bourgeoisie. The expropriation of the banks, accordingly, is necessarily one of the first measures of the proletarian revolution. This measure is a most difficult and dangerous one, and latent with infinite complications, since it is the most definite step toward the aboli-

tion of Capitalism, and financial administration is highly technical in scope. By means of the nationalization of the banks, finance becomes exclusively a means for the development of industry, and not dominantly a means of exploitation as under the bourgeois regime. The control of finance, moreover, is an irresistible instrument for the complete annihilation of the economic and social relations of Capitalism, the complete achievement of which means the end of finance and money in their expression as relations of private property.

Together with these general and fundamental measures, more temporary measures were introduced, such as unemployment insurance, obligatory labor (directed particularly at the bourgeois classes), and systematic and intensive labor legislation, to improve the workers' conditions at the expense of the bourgeoisie and complete the expropriation of capital. Labor legislation, introduced during the transition period from Capitalism to Socialism and on the basis of the proletarian state, becomes a means for the expropriation of capital, not a means to strengthen the domination of capital.

Through all the reconstruction activity of the Soviet Republic runs the thread of developing a sense of discipline and responsibility in the masses. There was the tremendous industrial and social disorganization; the conscious efforts of the bourgeois hirelings to create confusion and disorder; the intoxicating effect among the workers of the newly-won freedom; and the psychology of irresponsibility in the workers inherited from the old regime. All these factors necessarily produced a certain amount of license. An intense struggle had to be waged against the ideology implanted in the minds of the workers by the bourgeois order. It is not sufficient that the administrative norms of the new order shall be introduced; there must develop a new ideology, the ideology of self-mastery and social discipline, of responsibility to one's self and to one's associates, of administrative competency and management among the workers,—the ideology of the joy of work, since one now works for himself, and not for a master. The development of this ideology was a task stressed



by the Soviet officials; and it is a task, international complications aside, upon the success of which depends the immediate success of the proletarian revolution and the Socialist Republic in Russia.

The proletarian revolution in Russia initiates the epoch of the international Social Revolution. Not alone in the tactics and policy used in the conquest of power by the proletariat are the Bolsheviks the masters of the revolution, the symbol of the emerging revolutionary Socialism of the international proletariat; in their measures and tendency of action *after* the conquest of power, the Bolsheviks are teaching the international proletariat how to use power after its acquisition, developing the administrative norms of the oncoming Socialist Republic.

\* \* \*

# I.

## INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE

*Decree of the Council of People's Commissaires establishing organs for Workers' Control of Industries.*

(1) In order to put the economic life of the country on an orderly basis, control by the workers is instituted over all industrial, commercial, and agricultural undertakings and societies; and those connected with banking and transport, as well as over productive co-operative societies which employ labor or put out work to be done at home or in connection with the production, purchase, and sale of commodities and of raw materials, and with conservation of such commodities as well as regards the financial aspect of such undertakings.

(2) Control is exercised by all the workers of a given enterprise through the medium of their elected organs, such as factories and works committees, councils of workmen's delegates, etc., such organs equally comprising representatives of the employees and of the technical staff.

(3) In each important industrial town, province, or district, is set up a local workmen's organ of control, which, being the organ of the soldiers, workmen's and peasants' council, will comprise the representatives of the labor unions, workmen's committees, and of any other factories, as well as of workmen's co-operative societies.

(4) Until such time as workmen's organs of control hold a congress, the All-Russian Workmen's Council of Control is to be set up

in Petrograd, on which will sit representatives of the following organizations. Five delegates of the E. C. (executive committee) of the Council (Soviet) of Workmen's and Soldiers' delegates of Russia; five delegates of the E. C. of the Peasants' Council of Russia; five delegates of the Labor Unions of Russia; two delegates of the Central Committee of the Workingmen's Co-operative Societies of Russia; five delegates of the Factory and Works Committee of Russia; five delegates of the Engineers' and Technical Agents' Union of Russia; two delegates of the Agrarian Union of Russia; one delegate from each Workmen's Union in Russia having not less than 100,000 members, two delegates from any union having a membership of over 100,000, two delegates from the E. C. of the Labor Unions.

(5) Side by side with the Workmen's Supreme Council of the Labor Unions, committees of inspection comprising technical specialists, accountants, etc. These committees, both on their own initiative or at the request of local workmen's organs of control, proceed to a given locality to study the financial and technical side of any enterprise.

(6) The Workmen's Organs of Control have the right to supervise production, to fix a minimum wage in any undertaking, and to take steps to fix the prices at which manufactured articles are to be sold.

(7) The Workmen's Organs of Control have the right to control all correspondence passing in connection with the business of an undertaking being held responsible before a court of justice for diverting their correspondence. Commercial secrets are abolished. The owners are called upon to produce to the Workmen's Organs of Control all books and moneys in hand, both relating to the current year and to any previous transactions.

(8) The decisions of the Workmen's Organs of Control are binding upon the owners of undertakings, and can not be nullified save by the decision of a Workmen's Superior Organ of Control.

(9) Three days are given to the owners, or the administrators of a business, to appeal to a Workmen's Superior Court of Control against the decisions filed by any of the lower organs of Workmen's Control.

(10) In all undertakings, the owners and the representatives of workmen and of employees delegated to exercise control on behalf of the workmen, are responsible to the Government for the maintenance of strict order and discipline, and for the conservation of property (goods). Those guilty of misappropriating materials and products, of not keeping books properly, and of similar offences, are liable to prosecution.

(11) Workmen's District Councils of Control settle all disputes and conflicts between the lower Organs of Control, as well as all complaints made by the owners of undertakings, taking into consideration any peculiar conditions under which production is carried on, and local conditions. They will issue instructions within the limits prescribed by the All-Russian Workmen's Council of Control and supervise the activities of the lower organs of control.

(12) The All-Russian Workmen's Council of Control shall work out a general plan for control to be exercised by the workmen, and to issue instructions and regulations, and to systematize the reports of the various Workmen's Councils of Control; and constitute the supreme authority for dealing with all matters connected with the control exercised by workmen.

(13) The All-Russian Workmen's Council of Control co-ordinates the activities of the Workmen's Organs of Control and of those institutions which direct the organization of the economic life of the country.

A regulation concerning the relations between the All-Russian Workmen's Council of Control and the other institutions which organize and put in order the economic life of the country will be issued later.

(14) All laws and circulars which impede the proper working of the factory, works, and other committees, and that of workmen's and employees' councils, are abrogated.

*Decree of the Council of People's Commissaires establishing a Supreme Council of National Economy, for the regulation of economic activity.*

1.—The Council of People's Commissaires establishes a Supreme Council of National Economy.

2.—The functions of the Supreme Council of National Economy are—the organization of the public ownership of utilities and of the state finances. With this as its aim, the Supreme Council of National Economy will make general rules and plans regulating the economic life of the country; will co-ordinate and unify the central and local activities of the governing bodies, including the All-Russian Council of Workmen's Control and also the activities of the professional and manufacturing organizations of the working class.

3.—The Supreme Council of National Economy is granted the right to confiscate, requisition, sequester and syndicate different branches of industry and commerce, and the right to introduce other measures in the field of production, distribution and state finance.

4.—All existing institutions for the regulation of economy are subject to the Supreme Council of National Economy, which is granted the right to reform them.

5.—The Supreme Council of National Economy shall consist of (a) the All-Russian Council of Workmen's Control, the character of which was defined in the decree of November 27, 1917; (b) representatives of all the People's Commissaires; (c) accredited specialists and well-informed persons, invited by conference.

6.—The Supreme Council of National Economy will be divided into sections and departments (for fuel, mines, demobilization, finances, etc.), the number and the sphere of activity of these departments to be decided by a general meeting of the Supreme Council of National Economy.

7.—The departments of the Supreme Council of National Economy will regulate the separate sections of public economy; and prepare measures agreeable to the People's Commissaires.

8.—The Supreme Council of National Economy will apportion from its midst fifteen persons to form a bureau for the co-ordination of the current work of the sections and departments, and the consideration of problems demanding immediate solution.

9.—All bills and important measures concerning the regulation of public economy are to be brought in full before the Council of People's Commissaires, over and above the Supreme Council of National Economy.

10.—The Supreme Council of National Economy unifies and directs the work of the local economic departments of the Soviet of Workmen's, Soldiers' and Peasants' Delegates, including local organs of workmen's control, as well as local commissaires of labor, commerce, industries and supplies.

In the absence of suitable economic departments, the Supreme Council of National Economy will form its own local organs.

All economic departments of local Soviets representing local organs of the Supreme Council of National Economy are responsible for the decrees of the Supreme Council of National Economy.

*Decree of the Council of People's Commissaires, nationalizing Foreign Trade.*

Article 1. All foreign trade is to be nationalized. Commercial transactions relative to purchase and sale of products (raw materials, manufactures, agriculture, etc.) with foreign countries and private foreign commercial organizations are controlled directly by the Rus-

sian republic through specially organized organs. All foreign transactions not known to these organs are prohibited. (Note—Regulations governing exports and imports by parcel post and of personal baggage will be issued separately.)

Article 2. The People's Commissariat of Trade and Industry is being instituted. Representatives of the following organizations will be members of this council: (1) Military, marine, agricultural, food supply, communication, foreign affairs and finance departments; (2) central organizations managing branches of industry, such as tea, sugar, textiles, etc., including representatives of all branches of the Supreme Council of National Economy; (3) central organizations of cooperative societies; (4) central organizations of professional unions, tradesmen and commercial enterprises; (5) central organs of commercial enterprises dealing in exports and imports of important goods. (Note—The People's Commissariat of Trade and Industry has the right to choose members of this organization from other organizations not herein mentioned.

Article 3. The Council of Foreign Trade is arranging a plan of exchange of goods with foreign countries, which is being worked out by the Commissariat of Trade and Industry. The duties of the Council of Foreign Trade are the following: Keeping a register of the demand and supply of exported and imported goods; organizing foreign purchase through the government against (requisitions by) cooperative societies and firms; regulating the prices of imported and exported goods.

Article 4. The Council of Foreign Trade is divided according to the different branches of manufacture and the important groups of exports and imports. The chairmen of these branches are representatives of the People's Commissariat of Trade and Industry. The chairman of the whole is also a representative of this commissariat. (Note—Regulations, duties, etc., of the Council of Foreign Trade will be given further special attention. All decisions of the council are submitted to the Commissariat of Trade and Industry for approval.)

Article 5. This decree is in force from the day of publication.

*Decree of the Council of People's-Commissaires creating a Department against the Counter revolutionary Propaganda.*

In the difficult and decisive hour of change and in the days immediately following, the Temporary Revolutionary Committee was compelled to undertake a whole series of measures against all sorts of counter-revolutionary publications.

Immediately from all sides issued cries that the new Socialist

authority violated the fundamental principle of its program with threats against the freedom of the press.

The Workers' and Peasants' Government wishes to call the attention of the people to the fact that behind the screen of liberty lurks, in fact, freedom for the propertied classes to usurp unto themselves the power, without hindrance, poison and bring confusion into the minds of the masses.

Everyone knows that the press of the bourgeoisie is one of the most powerful weapons of the bourgeoisie. Especially in a critical moment, when our power, the power of the workers and peasants, is only being strengthened, it is impossible to leave these weapons entirely in the hands of the enemy, at a time when they are not less dangerous than bombs and bullets. This is the reason why temporary and extraordinary measures were taken to cut off the stream of mud and slander of the yellow press which threatened to submerge the young victory of the people.

Just as soon as the new order is strengthened, all administrative measures against the press will cease. Complete freedom will be established within limits answerable to courts of justice and in accord with a broad and progressive law for the purpose.

Taking into consideration, however, that the suppression of the press even in critical times is allowable only within absolutely indispensable limits, the Council of People's Commissaires decrees:

1. The following organs of the press are subject to suppression:

- (a) Those calling for open opposition to and disobedience of the Workers' and Peasants' Government.
- (b) Those creating confusion by means of an open and slanderous distortion of facts.
- (c) Those calling for acts clearly criminal.

2. Suppression of organs of the press, temporary or permanent, is to be dealt with through regulations of the Council of People's Commissaires.

3. The present situation has a temporary character, and these measures will be changed upon the introduction of normal conditions of life.

1. The printing of advertisements in periodicals and posters, as well as the issuing of advertisements to kiosks, offices, etc., is now a monopoly of the state.

2. Only publications of the present government in Petrograd,

and of the local Soviets, have the right to publish advertisements. Other newspapers printing advertisements will be suppressed.

3. Directors of advertising offices, as well as all their employees, must continue working until the business is delivered up to the state. They are responsible for preserving the sequence of their work and for delivering to the Soviet newspapers all private advertisements, all sums paid for such and full accounts thereof.

4. All directors and employees of advertising offices must immediately organize Town Unions and All-Russian Unions to facilitate the reprinting of private advertisements in the Soviet publications.

5. The property of persons found guilty of concealing dossiers or funds, or of sabotage, as mentioned in Paragraphs 3 and 4, will be confiscated, and the owners will be imprisoned for a period not exceeding three years.

6. Insertion of advertisements in private publications and in bulletins is also punishable.

7. All advertising offices will be confiscated by the government, and their proprietors will receive a temporary remuneration. To shareholders and proprietors of small advertising offices funds paid in by them will be returned in full.

All firms publishing advertisements must send full particulars to the Soviet, under the risk of punishment, as stated in Paragraph 5.

\* \* \*

## II.

### CONTROL OF FINANCES

*Decree issued by the Council of People's Commissaires, on the requisition of safe deposit boxes in banks.*

1. All moneys kept in safe deposit boxes of banks must be paid into the current account of the holder in the National Bank. Note: Gold, in money and ingots, will be confiscated and added to the gold fund of the entire nation.

2. All holders of safe deposit boxes are obliged, immediately on being summoned, to appear at the bank with their keys in order to witness the audit of the safe deposit boxes.

3. All holders not appearing within three days after summons will be considered ill-disposed in their opposition to the audit.

4. Boxes belonging to persons thus opposing the audit are subject to opening by the investigating commissions, appointed by the

commissioners of the National Bank, and all holdings found in them will be confiscated by the National Bank as the property of the people. Note: The investigating commissions may, for weighty reasons, postpone the above liquidation.

This decree was passed by the Central Executive Committee, all voting in favor except five, who refrained from voting.

*Decree issued by the Council of People's Commissaires, repudiating national debts.*

1. All state debts contracted by the regime of the Russian landowners and Russian bourgeoisie, enumerated in a document relating to this matter, are annulled as of December 1, 1917. December coupons of the loans mentioned are not liable to payment.

2. In the same manner are annulled all the guarantees given by the officials of the old regime concerning debts of various enterprises and institutions.

3. All foreign debts are repudiated absolutely and without exceptions.

4. Short-term bonds and state treasury series remain intact. Interest on them will not be paid; but obligations to them shall be binding in the same way as credit notes.

5. Small propertied (poor) citizens possessing repudiated state notes of internal loans which are not in excess of 10,000 rubles (nominal worth) will receive annually, from the state, compensation equal to the interest on their notes.

6. Citizens possessing repudiated notes in excess of 10,000 rubles will receive no compensation for the repudiation of their papers.

7. Deposits in state savings banks and interest on them are inviolable. All obligations on repudiated debts belonging to savings banks are convertible into debts (obligations) of the Russian Workers' and Peasants' Republic.

8. Co-operative societies, local self-governing and other benefit or democratic institutions which have holdings in repudiated debts will continue to be indemnified, in accordance with rules worked out by the Supreme Council of Public Economy, together with representatives of such institutions, providing it is proven that these obligations were acquired prior to the publication of this decree.

9. The general regulation of the liquidation of state loans is entrusted to the Supreme Council of National Economy.

10. All the work of liquidating these loans is entrusted to the

National Bank, to which is also given the duty of proceeding at once with the registration of all owners of holdings in state loans, and also other papers bearing interest, whether or not subject to annulment.

11. Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Delegates will organize commissions, with the consent of the local councils of public economy, for the purpose of determining which citizens belong to the class of small property owners.

These commissions have the right to annul completely those savings which were not obtained through actual labor, even if these savings do not exceed 5,000 rubles.

This decree will be brought for discussion before the Central Executive Committee.

*Decree of the Council of People's Commissaires, concerning action against an industrial company refusing to carry out the instructions of the Soviet Government.*

In view of the declaration of the management of the Russo-Belgian Metallurgical Company concerning the liquidation of its affairs on January 5, and of their outright refusal to subject themselves to the decrees of the Council of People's Commissaires concerning the introduction of workmen's control over production, the Central Executive Committee makes the following judgment:

The shafts, works, mines, all living and immovable property, on the lands of the Petrovsky Metallurgical Works, the mines at Sofisk, Vyerovsk, Bungovsk, Narnevisk, also in Petrograd, as well as all other property of whatsoever description, regardless of its nature and present location in Russia or abroad, belonging to the Russo-Belgian Metallurgical Company, shall be confiscated, and declared the property of the Russian Republic.

All office and technical assistants are obliged to remain at work for the discharge of their customary obligations.

For irresponsible desertion from their positions or for sabotage, the guilty parties will be handed over to the revolutionary tribunals.

The conduct of the affairs of the Company in Petrograd and the conditions for handing over the various works, operations and branches, to the temporary control of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Delegates, the Factory and Works Committees and similar organizations, will be determined by a special ordinance of the People's Commissaire of Commerce and Industry.

*Circular of the People's Commissaire of Provisions, concerning the supply of textiles, leather and foot-wear.*

In order to empty the shops and stores, all provision organizations and committees, together with the local Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Delegates, are ordered to requisition, in the warehouses and piers, all textiles and footwear arriving at the place of destination, and, for whatever cause, remaining unsold by the shops after forty-eight hours have elapsed.

All goods requisitioned are to be turned over to the provincial provisional authorities and committees for distribution among the inhabitants at fixed prices.

For goods thus requisitioned, the provision authorities and committees who place them on sale shall pay to the owners a sum that is 10 per cent. less than the fixed prices at which the goods were sold to the consumers.

The present ordinance is to be communicated to the inhabitants by publication.

\* \* \*

### III

## MISCELLANEOUS

*Ordinance of the People's Commissaire of Internal Affairs, establishing a Workers' Militia.*

1. All Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Delegates shall establish a Workers' Militia.
2. The workers' militia shall be wholly and exclusively under the control of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Delegates.
3. Military and civil authorities are in duty bound to co-operate in the arming of the workers' militia, and in supplying them with the technical aids, including also the delivery of government weapons.
4. This law is to go into force by telegraphic communication.

*Summary of a decree issued by the Council of People's Commissaires municipalizing real estate.*

Real estate situated within the confines of a city and subject to the collection of the city real estate tax, is municipalized.

Supervision over houses is established, and is incumbent on the house committees, under the direction of the housing commissions.

The entire income from each property that yields more than 750 rubles per month is immediately to be paid into the city treasury.

Pay for the rent of quarters, and other forms of income from real estate, is to be made to the house committees. The latter, after subtracting all expenses for management and upkeep, shall pay the balance into the city treasury.

This law is to go into force at once.

*Summary of a series of legal measures for proposed new courts, being worked out by Commissaire of Justice Stutchka.*

A local court shall be organized with final jurisdiction applicable to justice in peace times, and with jurisdiction in suits involving not more than 3,000 rubles. Such local courts will be organized on the type of the present revolutionary courts in the Viborg districts.

In the future shall be undertaken the establishment of higher courts in place of district courts.

In all these courts chairmen shall be appointed by revolutionary organizations, and temporary members chosen on the basis of general election rules. For local courts these will be chosen by the whole population.

For higher courts, members shall be chosen by the population in the district. At first, the general election will be replaced by the election of judges as in the case of the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Delegates.

*Decree on divorce issued by the Council of People's Commissaires.*

1. Divorce shall be granted upon application made by either party or both parties.

2. Divorce applications shall be filed with the local courts. When application is made by mutual consent of both parties divorce shall be granted immediately by the registry office where marriage records are kept, and said office shall deliver to both parties a certificate, testifying thereto.

3. On the day set for the examination of the case the local judge shall summon both parties to appear in person or by attorney.

4. When the residence of one of the parties summoned to appear shall be unknown, notice of the application shall be delivered at the last known residence of the absent party or at the plaintiff's residence.

5. When the residence of the defendant shall be unknown, the date for the trial of the case shall be set not earlier than two months from the date of the publication of the summons in the local official paper.

6. Having ascertained personally the bona fide character of the application filed either by one party, or by both parties, the judge shall render a divorce decree, of which he shall give both parties a certificate. He shall also file a copy of the decree in the office where divorce records shall be kept.

7. When divorce is granted to parties declaring mutual consent, the two parties shall file a statement declaring the names by which they and their children, if any, shall be known in the future. When divorce is granted upon application by one party only, the divorced parties shall, provided they agree thereto, bear the names they bore before contracting marriage, and the judge shall decide what name the children shall bear. In case of disagreement, the final decision shall rest with the local jury.

8. When the divorced parties agree thereto, the judge shall, upon issuing the divorce decree, state which of the parties shall receive the guardianship over the minor children, and which shall bear the expense of their support and education, and also the amount of alimony, if any, which the divorced husband shall pay to the divorced wife.

9. If the parties fail to agree thereto, the local jury shall decide what sums the divorced husband shall contribute toward the support of his divorced wife, when said divorced wife has no personal property or is unable to earn a livelihood; also which of the parties shall be appointed guardian of the minor children. Until an agreement has been reached, or a decision rendered by the jury, the local judge shall issue a provisional order stating the amount of support due by the divorced husband to the divorced wife and her children.

10. Local juries shall render decisions as to the validation of unlawful or nonconsummated marriages.

11. The present decree shall be applicable to every citizen of the Russian republic, regardless of the faith which he shall profess.

12. All the religious organizations, orthodox and otherwise, and all the constituted bodies hitherto competent to pass upon divorce applications, are hereby ordered to turn over to the relevant local court a complete record of all the divorces they have granted and of all the applications they have been considering. Persons having filed applications under the former statute are not allowed to file a

new application under the present statute; neither shall the publications of summons provided for in paragraphs 4 and 5 be required if publication was made under the former statute.

\* \* \*

#### IV.

### UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

*Ordinance issued by the Council of People's Commissaires, concerning Unemployment Insurance.*

1. The jurisdiction of this ordinance extends over all the territory of the Russian Republic and over all persons without distinction of sex, age, faith, nationality or race, working for pay in any branch of industry, such as: factories and shops, mines, transportation, small trade, construction, commerce, agriculture, forestry, fishery, domestic industry, private service, liberal professions, etc.

All persons working for pay are subject to insurance in case of unemployment, without regard to the character or length of their employment, or to the nature of the employer, whether a government, private, or social institution or a private individual.

2. To persons occupying the highest positions in enterprises (such as managers, administrators, engineers, jurists, etc.), as well as to persons practising the liberal professions, this ordinance shall not apply if their regular earnings are more than thrice the average worker's pay in the given locality, as determined by the local or provincial Soviets of Trade Organizations.

3. Unemployment in the sense of the present ordinance is understood to mean the condition of any person capable of performing work, whose chief source of sustenance is work for pay, and who cannot find work at the rate of compensation fixed by the Trade Organization concerned, and who is registered with the Labor Exchanges or Trade Organizations.

*Special Note.*—Persons deprived of gainful occupation because of lockouts, shall be considered unemployed.

4. The following persons shall not be considered unemployed in the sense of this ordinance: a) Those deprived of work but not losing their earnings; b) those deprived of earnings because of strikes, during the duration of the strike.

*Special Note.*—Strikes brought forth by a lowering of the rate of compensation or a lengthening of the working day do not deprive

the persons insured of the right to receive assistance from the unemployment funds.

5. The amount, and the duration of unemployment shall be determined by the Unemployment Funds and audited by the local Labor Exchanges and Trade Organizations.

6. The means for assuring to the insured their insurance allotments shall be raised from payments by the employers.

7. These payments shall be made by the employers to the Unemployment Funds and shall together constitute a single *All-Russian Unemployment Fund*.

8. The All-Russian Unemployment Fund shall be housed, safeguarded, and disbursed in accordance with rules drawn up by the Insurance Soviet.

9. The size of the payments made by employers to the Unemployment Fund shall be determined in a fixed percentage of the total payroll, and shall be fixed at a uniform figure for all Russia, *not less than three per cent.*, according to data presented by the All-Russian Soviet of Trade Organizations.

The minimum contributions to be made by employers for seasonal workers shall be five per cent. of the total pay.

*Special Note.*—After the introduction of a uniform progressive tax on capital, income, and inheritance, it will be incumbent upon the government to pay a portion of the contributions of the *entrepreneurs* for the insurance of the unemployed, out of this tax.

10. On the decision of the Fund Committee, instead of calculating the amount of the payment on the basis of a percentage of the earnings of each single member, payments in bulk may be inaugurated.

11. The payments shall be made to the Funds by the employers at weekly intervals, on pay-day. Sums not paid at the time indicated shall be collected from the employers by order of the Commissaire of Labor, in accordance with rules drawn up for the collection of undisputed government demands (see Laws, Vol. XVI, Pt. 2, Ordin. Collection Undisputed, ed. of 1910, p. 2), in addition to which there shall be collected from the employer a fine, for the benefit of the Unemployment Fund, amounting to ten per cent. a month on the sum remaining unpaid during that period, fractional parts of a month being regarded as full months.

12. Obligations of Employers to the Unemployment Fund:

a) To report within three days the name of every person entering

or leaving their employ; b) to furnish detailed reports, on forms prepared by the Insurance Soviet, on the work done in their establishments, on the sum paid as wages to each and every person separately, on each receipt, weekly, from the day of pay; c) to keep books and records covering the above information; and d) to submit to the persons empowered to carry on this work, by the committees of the fund, in corroboration of the above data, the necessary documents, checks, books and records.

13. Earnings or expenditures in the sense of this ordinance shall cover:

a) the sum earned in the course of a year or of another interval of time, in the form of salary or wages, including also overtime pay (without regard to the form of compensation: day-wages, monthly salary, piece-work, etc.); and

b) the cost of the natural (physical) supplies during the same period (rent, fuel, etc.), if such are at the disposal of the employer; in this connection, the cost of supplies, etc., to be figured at actual cost; the cost of supplies in kind to be fixed within indicated limits by the Office for Workers' Insurance Matters on the data of the local Trade Organization or their collective organization.

In the amount of the earnings is to be included also the share of each person in the profits.

14. Assistance will be given to unemployed to the full amount of their earnings, but not more than the average daily pay for the given locality.

*Special Note.*—The average earnings for a given locality shall be determined by the local or provincial Soviets of Trade Organizations.

15. Unemployment covering from one to three days shall not receive any compensation. Unemployment covering more than three days shall receive compensation from the first day of unemployment.

16. In the case the unemployed individual is ill, the Unemployment Fund will grant him financial aid and free medical assistance, according to the practice of the Sick Funds, and in co-operation with them.

17. Unemployment Funds shall be established for cities as a whole, in the cities, and for counties as a whole, in the county.

18. The Unemployment Funds may organize into Unions and may operate in alliance with one another as well as with other organizations and institutions.

19. Unemployment Funds may in their own name acquire prop-

erty, with property rights and other title to moveable possessions, and undertake obligations, as well as the prosecution and defense of litigation.

20. The business of the fund shall be administered by the Fund Committee, consisting of representatives of the Trade Organizations, the Factory and Works Committees, and the Sick Funds, all three having an equal number of representatives.

The number of representatives shall be determined by mutual agreement of these organizations.

21. The Fund Committee shall appoint from its own number: a) an Executive Committee; b) an Auditing Committee.

*Special Note.*—After the introduction of permanent forms of insurance and the formation of universal insurance funds, the direction of the affairs of the Unemployment Fund shall pass into the hands of the latter for execution.

22. The decisions of the Unemployment Fund Committee, in accordance with this Ordinance, may be contested in the Insurance Office within a period of two weeks, and the decisions of the Office similarly within two weeks before the Insurance Soviet. Such protest shall not delay the enforcement of the decisions.

23. Previous to the reorganization of the Insurance Offices and Soviet on the basis of a predominant representation from the workers, the functions of the Offices and Soviet in the terms of this Ordinance shall be incumbent on the Local and Central Committees for matters of Unemployment Insurance.

24. Local (and provincial) Committees for Matters of Unemployment Insurance shall be formed at the Insurance Offices and shall consist of 21 persons: 5 representatives from the Trade Organizations or groups of such organizations, 5 from the Factory and Works Committees, 4 from the Sick Fund, 1 from the Labor Commissariat of Commerce and Industry, 2 from the city administration and 1 from the zemstvo administration.

25. The Central Committee for Unemployment Insurance shall be formed under the Insurance Soviet and consist of 27 persons; of these, 18 shall be representatives of the All-Russian Trade Organization Soviet, of the Central Soviet of Factory and Works Committees, and Workers' Insurance Groups under the Insurance Soviet, all represented in equal number, 2 from the Labor Commission, 1 from the Commissariat of Commerce and Industry, 1 from the zemstvo administration, 1 from the city administrations, and 4 from the *entrepreneurs*.

26. The preparatory work for the initial establishment of the Unemployment Fund shall devolve upon the local soviets of Trade Organizations, the Factory and Works Committees and the Sick Funds.



27. In case the organization provided for in paragraph 25 should not accomplish, within a period of one month, the establishment of Unemployment Funds, such shall be established by order of the Labor Commissaires.

28. Infractions of the above shall be punished by a sentence of one year's imprisonment.

\* \* \*

## V.

### AGRARIAN MEASURES

*Decree on confiscation and nationalization of land, adopted by the All-Russian Congress of Soviets, November 8, 1917.*

1. The landlord's property in all land is herewith abolished without compensation.

2. The estates of the landlords, as well as the appanage lands and lands belonging to the monasteries, churches, with all their live and dead inventories, manor buildings, and implements, pass into the control of rural Land Committees and District Councils of Peasants' Delegates, until the Constituent Assembly.

3. Any damage wilfully caused to the confiscated property, belonging from now on to the whole people, constitutes a grave crime, punishable by the Revolutionary Tribunals. The District Councils of Peasants' Delegates are to take all the measures required for the preservation of strict order while carrying out the confiscation of the estates of the landlords, for recording the size of the estates to be confiscated, for preparing a detailed specification of the whole confiscated property, and for the most stringent revolutionary protection of all the agricultural estates passing now into the hands of the people, with all the buildings, machinery, cattle, stores, etc., appertaining to them.

4. Until the Constituent Assembly will have finally decided the lines of the great land reform, the following instructions, embodying 242 resolutions of a meeting of peasants, and drafted by the Editorial Committee of the "Bulletins of the All-Russian Council of Peasants' Delegates," shall serve for the guidance of the authorities carrying out the work at present:

"The land question in its entirety can be solved only by the Constituent Assembly. The most just solution of the land question must be as follows:

"1. The right of private ownership in land is abolished forever; land can neither be sold, nor bought, nor leased, nor mortgaged, nor appropriated in any other way. The whole of the land of the State, of the appanages, of the Crown, of the monasteries, of the churches, as well as

majorats, lands in conditional possession, or endowed to persons, or concerns, privately owned land and land belonging to public bodies, and to peasants, and so on, is herewith expropriated without any compensation whatever, and it becomes the property of the whole people and is transferred for use to all who till it.

"Those who have suffered from this expropriation are entitled to public relief, but only for the time which may be necessary to allow them to adapt themselves to the new conditions of existence.

"2. All the interior of the earth, ores, naphta, coal, salt, etc., as well as forests and waterways, having an all-national importance, pass into the exclusive possession of the State. Small rivers, lakes, and forests, pass into the possession of the local communities, subject to the control of the local authorities.

"3. Highly cultivated estates, orchards, plantations, nurseries, hot-houses, etc., are not to be subjected to division, but are to remain as model estates, and they pass into the possession either of the State or of the local communities, in accordance with their size and importance.

"Land appertaining to manor houses, or belonging to towns, or villages, as well as orchards and market gardens appertaining to households, remain in the possession of their present owners, the size of such land and the rate of the tax to be paid by the owners for their use to be fixed by law.

"4. All kinds of breeding stations, of horses, cattle, poultry, etc., whether belonging to the Crown or to private persons, are confiscated and they become the property of the whole people and pass either into the exclusive possession of the State, or of the communities in accordance with their size and importance. The question of compensation to be decided by the Constituent Assembly.

"5. The whole of the inventory of the confiscated estates, both live and dead, passes into the exclusive possession of the State or the local communities, in accordance with their size or importance. The confiscation of the inventory is not extended to small peasants.

"6. All Russian citizens, irrespective of sex, willing to till the soil with their own labor, or with the assistance of their families, or in company with other peasants, are entitled to receive land for use, and for the duration of time they are able to till it. No hired labor is allowed.

"In case of any member of the village community becoming an invalid the community must come to his assistance, by cultivating his land till the time of his recovery, but not longer than during two years. Persons, who, either from old age or illness, have lost the ability to till the soil, lose their right to use land and receive instead a pension from the State.

"7. The possession of the land is to be equal, i. e., the land is distributed amongst the tillers, in accordance with local conditions, in equal plots, the standard share being either a plot to a man capable of working it with his own labor, or a plot required to feed himself and his family. The forms of land tenure are to be decided freely by the local community, whether individual, communal, cooperative, or any other.

"8. The whole of the land, after its expropriation, forms a National Land Reserve. The distribution of this reserve amongst the tillers is effected by the local authorities, beginning with democratically elected rural and urban municipalities and ending with the central provincial institutions. The re-allotment of the whole of the Land Reserve is carried out periodically, in accordance with the growth of the population and the rise in the productiveness of land cultivation. During the re-allotments the main portion of an original allotment must remain unchanged. The land which belonged to persons, who for one reason or another, have lost, or given up possession, reverts to the Land Reserve.

"The cost of manuring or improvements (in so far as the latter are of a fundamental nature), are to be refunded to the owner, if not fully utilized at the time of delivery of possession of the plot.

"9. In case the available Land Reserve in any given locality is not sufficient to provide for the local population, the excess population is provided for by emigration organized by the State, and the latter bears all the cost of the emigration and settlement of the new land.

"10. The contents of this instruction as representing the firm will of the great majority of the conscious peasants of the whole Russia is declared a temporary law, to be carried into effect forthwith, either in full or in part, as determined by the District Councils of Peasants' Delegates. Land belonging to peasants and Cossacks below a certain standard size is not to be confiscated."

*Decree issued by the Council of People's Commissaires,  
establishing a state monopoly in agricultural implements.*

The Council of People's Commissaires, in the name of the Republic, decrees:

1. All agricultural machinery and implements, whether manufactured in the country or imported, used to provide the agricultural economy with means of production and to meet the needs of the toiling agricultural population, are hereby declared a state monopoly, as of the date of the publication of this decree.

2. The distribution of these implements and machinery is to be conducted in accordance with regulations that shall be issued especially for

this purpose by the organs of the Soviet government, land committees and other democratic organizations.

\* \* \*

## VI.

### ACCOMPLISHMENTS

*Report on the accomplishments of the government of the Soviet Republic.*

Comrade Larin, a member of the Soviet Commission that was recently sent to Berlin to revise the Brest-Litovsk Treaty, a member of the Executive Committee of the Supreme Council of National Economy, published the following review of the accomplishments of the Soviet Government in the German Party Press, showing that the revolutionary government of the Russian proletariat has already put a large part of its theoretical program into actual practice:

1. The complete assimilation of all banks into one unit, and the liquidation of current transactions has already been carried out in the larger centers.

2. State monopoly of export trade has already been endorsed. An organization has been created (the Soviet for export trade), which has created subdivisions for the more important products: for leather, brushes of all kinds, naphta, pharmaceutical articles, flax, cotton, wool, wood, butter, paper, smoked goods, musical instruments, scientific instruments, scientific accessories.

3. The statistical forces of Russia have been collected (there is a bureau of statistics in every government), and active preparations are under way for a census of Russian industry to be taken this fall (the first industrial census that was ever taken in Russia in the thousand years of its existence).

4. The nationalization of steamship traffic on all inland lakes and rivers, with the absolute exclusion of private capital; has been accomplished. The railroad system was already, *de facto*, in the hands of the state. The Naphta industry, the transportation of coal, and the lumber industry have also been taken over by the government.

Thus the government has taken systematic control of those industries that must serve as the foundation of the inner economic reconstruction of the nation.

5. A net of radio-telegraph stations has been established. Several thousand post-offices have been set up in European Russia where there were none before. The organization of an aeroplane postal service is already under way.

6. Through the creation of Government and district soviets for the regulation of public affairs an organization for conducting the business of the people has been secured. These soviets are elected by the organizations of the workmen and employees and are supplemented by specialists (men with managerial or technical training) who may not, however, exceed one fourth of the membership in number. These soviets are already functioning in 37 governments (Russia consist, *de jure*, of 68 governments, if the following territories are included: Esthonia, Livonia, Krim, the Don regions, Georgia, Siberia and White Russia). The Supreme Council of National Economy which is at the head of these soviets became active on the 21st of December, 1917.

7. More than 20 Central State Bureaus have been created, each one of which functions as organ of the Council of National Economy supervising the activity of its provincial subdivisions in the provincial soviets. Each one of these Central Bureaus controls one industry with a view to preparing it for complete nationalization. Legally, all medium and large industries have been declared public property. (In accordance with Section 8 of the Decrees of the Soviets.) In most cases, however, the former owners have been left in control pending the establishment of state administration. Actually under the exclusive control of the proletarian national administration are not only the banks, transportation lines and fuel production, but also the sugar industry, the production of platinum, of railroads, locomotives, tracks, and about 400 individual large plants of different industries.

8. A systematic control of production has likewise been introduced. Thus, for instance, instead of 40 different types of plows that were formerly manufactured under a system of individual enterprise, the number has been reduced to 7 normal types.

9. The proposed system of financing industry is already in operation. The administration of each nationalized enterprise may use the credits allotted to it by appropriation for other purposes than those defined in the budget. The administration will, in such cases, be held responsible.

The administration of nationalized industries is conducted along the following lines: One third of the members of the administrative board are elected by the workmen and employees, one third by the All-Russian Federation of Labor Unions of the industry in question and one third by the national Industrial Department. To these the management is responsible.

10. The system of state buying and state contracting is already beginning to take root. Among others, 500 million rubles have been voted for the purchase (for sale) of cotton. The purchase was made in Turkestan (where the Bolsheviki are still enjoying an untroubled existence

and which has remained in communication with Russia by way of the Caspian Sea). 250 million rubles were used for the purchase of wool, 400 million rubles for the purchase of farming implements, almost a billion rubles for textiles. (These purchases must, of course, be understood as book transactions.) The number of cooperative stores has multiplied remarkably. (There are over 30,000.) Thanks to these and other measures private commercial enterprise is gradually completely dying out. This expropriation of private buying and selling which will, in all probability, be completed by the end of next year, will put an end to the evil of speculation, under which Russia is suffering even more poignantly than other nations.

11. For the first time in the last two years an accurate budget has been adopted. Neither the Czar in the last period of his rule nor Kerensky published a budget. The proletarian regime has cleared up the finances of the country and has remarkably reduced the unproductive expenditures, particularly the expenditures for military purposes. The following enterprises for the increase of the productive forces of the nation have been undertaken: the irrigation of the "Hunger Steppes" in Turkestan for the purpose of increasing cotton lands (over 500,000 hectares), the building of two overland power stations on the rivers Sveiri and Volkhoff, for the supply of electric power to Petrograd, for industrial purposes as well as for the railroad terminus; the amelioration of almost a million dessyatines in the Moscow region for the increase of territory for the raising of grain; the building of a canal from the Volga to the Don.

12. A system of employment bureaus, such as never before existed in Russia, has been created, under the management of workingmen. Unemployment insurance is already actually established. The Labor Union Federations have worked out a number of disciplinary regulations. Compulsory reassignment of dwellings is under way; spacious dwellings of the bourgeoisie are being turned over to workingmen's families that formerly lived in narrow hovels. An annual vacation with full pay has been provided for all workers, etc. And in spite of this social legislation farmers' plows from Russia are being sold in the Ukraine more cheaply than the same kind of plows from Germany. There are no compulsory employment regulations, but, according to the Russian laws, every worker in Petrograd and Moscow is entitled to two and one half times as much food and clothing as the bourgeois.

13. In the spring and at the beginning of the summer the provisional distribution of the lands confiscated from the large landholders was made effective. All lands came under government control, and about a thousand collective agricultural establishments were organized. Universal education of the peasants has actually been provided for. For the first time in the history of Russia the expenditures for education exceed the expenditure for the army. Planting was done this year to almost the normal extent.

The separation of church and state was carried out all over Russia without any upheaval; the peasants have adopted civil marriage without much ado.

14. The class struggle was carried into the villages, the question of furnishing the inhabitants of the cities with means of life being made the point of contact. Instead of the usual method of increased prices that obtains in other countries, instead of paying premiums for prompt delivery and other bribes for the wealthy farmer, the most oppressed elements in the towns were mobilized against the wealthy farmers, supported by armed divisions from the cities. The more bread the poor farmers of a given country district were able to get out of the rich farmers for the urban population, the greater the supply of manufactured and industrial products that were assigned to the district. Only in this way was it possible to save the cities and manufacturing towns of Russia from actual starvation, although the Czecho-Slavs had cut them off from the grain supplies in Siberia and German troops closed the North Caucasus by their conquest of Rostov.

\* \* \*

## VII.

### DECLARATION OF RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF TOILING HUMANITY

We, the laboring people of Russia, workmen, peasants, Cossacks, soldiers and sailors, united in the councils of the Workmen's Soldiers', Peasants' and Cossacks' Delegates, declare in the persons of our plenipotentiary representatives, who have assembled at the All-Russian Congress of Soviets, the following rights and duties of the working and despoiled people:

The economic subjection of the laboring classes by the possessors of the means and instruments of production, of the soil, machines, factories, railways and raw materials—those basic sources of life—appears as the cause of all sorts of political oppression, economic spoliation, intellectual and moral enslavement of the laboring masses.

The economic liberation of the working classes from the yoke of Capitalism represents therefore the greatest task of our time and must be accomplished at all cost.

The liberation of the working classes must and can be the work of those classes themselves, who must unite for that purpose in the Soviets of the Workmen's, Soldiers', Peasants' and Cossacks' Delegates.

In order to put an end to every ill that oppresses humanity and in order to secure to labor all the rights belonging to it, we recognize

that it is necessary to destroy the existing social structure, which rests upon private property in the soil and the means of production, in the spoliation and oppression of the laboring masses, and to substitute for it a socialistic structure. Then the whole earth, its surface and its depths, and all the means and instruments of production, created by the toil of the laboring classes, will belong by right of common property to the whole people, who are united in a fraternal association of laborers.

Only by giving society a socialistic structure can the division of it into hostile classes be destroyed, only so can we put an end to the spoliation and oppression of men by men, of class by class; and all men—placed upon an equality as to rights and duties—will contribute to the welfare of society according to their strength and capacities, and will receive from society according to their requirements.

The complete liberation of the laboring classes from spoliation and oppression appears as a problem not locally or nationally limited, but as a world problem, and it can be carried out to its end only through the united exertions of workingmen of all lands. Therefore, the sacred duty rests upon the working class of every country to come to the assistance of the workingmen of other countries who have risen against the capitalistic structure of society.

The working class of Russia, true to the legacy of the International, overthrew their bourgeoisie in November, 1917, and, with the help of the poorest peasantry, seized the powers of government. In establishing a dictatorship of the proletariat and the poorest peasantry the working class resolved to wrest capital from the hands of the bourgeoisie, to unite all the means of production in the hands of the socialistic state and thus to increase as rapidly as possible the mass of productive forces.

The first steps in that direction were:

1. Abolition of property in land, declaration of the entire soil as national property, and the distribution of it to the workmen without purchase money, upon the principle of equality in utilizing it.
2. Declaration as national property of all forests, treasures of the earth and waters of general public utility, and all the belongings, whether animals or things, of the model farms and agricultural undertakings.
3. Introduction of a law for workmen's control of industry, and for the nationalization of a number of branches of industry.
4. Nationalization of the banks, which heretofore were one of the mightiest instruments for the spoliation of society by capital.

5. Repudiation of the loans which were contracted by the Czar's government upon account of the Russian people, thereby to deal a blow to international capital as one of the factors chiefly responsible for the war.

6. Arming of the laborers and peasants and disarming of the propertied classes.

7. Besides all this, the introduction of a universal obligation to work, for the purpose of eliminating the parasitic strata of society, is planned.

As soon as production shall have been consolidated in the hands of the working masses, united in a gigantic association, in which the development of every single individual will appear as the condition for the development of all men; as soon as the old bourgeois state, with its classes and class hatred, is definitely superseded by a firmly established socialistic society, which rests upon universal labor, upon the application and distribution of all productive forces according to plan, and upon the solidarity of all its members, then, along with the disappearance of class differences, will disappear also the necessity for the dictatorship of the working classes, and for state power as the instrument of class domination.

These are the immediate internal problems of the Soviet Republic.

In its relations to other nations the Soviet Republic stands upon the principles of the first International, which recognized truth, justice and morality as the foundation of its relations to all humanity, independent of race, religion or nationality.

The Socialistic Soviet Republic recognizes that wherever one member of the family of humanity is oppressed all humanity is oppressed, and for that reason it proclaims and defends to the utmost the right of all nations to self-determination, and thereby to the free choice of their destiny.

It accords that right to all nations without exception, even to the hundreds of millions of laborers in Asia, Africa, in all colonies and the small countries who, down to the present day, have been oppressed and despoiled without pity by the ruling classes, by the so-called civilized nations.

The Soviet Republic has transformed into deeds the principles proclaimed before its existence. The right of Poland to self-determination having been recognized in the first days of the March revolution, after the overturn in November the Soviet Republic proclaimed the full independence of Finland and the right of the Ukraine, of Ar-

menia, of all the peoples populating the territory of the former Russian Empire, to their full self-determination.

In its efforts to create a league—free and voluntary, and for that reason all the more complete and secure—of the working classes of all the peoples of Russia, the Soviet Republic declared itself a federal republic and offered to the laborers and peasants of every nation the opportunity to enter as members with equal rights into the fraternal family of the Republic of Soviets (through action taken) independently in the plenipotentiary sessions of their Soviets, to any extent and in whatever form they might wish.

The Soviet Republic has declared war upon war, not only in words but also in deeds; and in doing so it formally and in the name of the working masses of Russia announced its complete renunciation of all efforts at conquest and annexation, as well as all thought of oppressing small nations. At the same time the Soviet Republic, to prove the sincerity of its purposes, broke openly with the policy of secret diplomacy and secret treaties, and it proposed to all belligerent nations to conclude a general democratic peace without annexations or indemnities, upon the basis of the free self-determination of peoples. That standpoint is still firmly adhered to by the Soviet Republic.

Compelled by the policy of violence practised by the Imperialisms of all the world, the Soviet Republic is marshalling its forces for resistance against the growing demands of the robber packs of international capital, and it looks to the inevitable rebellion of the working classes for the solution of the question of how the nations can live peacefully together. The international Socialist revolution alone, in which the laboring people of each state overthrow their own imperialists, puts an end to war once for all and creates the conditions for the full realization of the solidarity of the working people of the entire world.

Taking its stand upon the principles of the International, the Soviet Republic recognizes that there can be no rights without duties and no duties without rights, and therefore proclaims at the same time with the rights of the working classes in a rejuvenated society the following outline of their duties:

1. To fight everywhere and without sparing their strength for the complete power of the working classes, and to stamp out all attempts to restore the dominion of the despoilers and oppressors.

2. To assist with all their strength in overcoming the depression caused by the war and the opposition of the bourgeoisie, and to cooperate in bringing about as speedy a recovery as possible of production in all branches of economy.

3. To subordinate their personal and group interests to the interests of all the working people of Russia and the whole world.

4. To defend the Republic of the Soviets, the only socialistic bulwark in the capitalistic world, from the attacks of international Imperialism without sparing their own strength and even their own lives.

5. To keep in mind always and everywhere the sacred duty of liberating labor from the domination of capital, and to strive for the establishment of a world-embracing fraternal league of working people.

In proclaiming these rights and duties the Russian Socialist Republic of the Soviets calls upon the working classes of the entire world to accomplish their task to the very end, and in the faith that the Socialist ideal will soon be achieved to write upon their flags the old battle cry of the working people:

Proletarians of all lands, unite!

Long live the socialistic world revolution!

## II

### GENERAL PROVISIONS OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE RUSSIAN SOCIALISTIC FEDERAL REPUBLIC

The fundamental problem of the constitution of the Russian Socialistic Federal Republic involves, in view of the present transition period, the establishment of a dictatorship of the urban and rural proletariat and the poorest peasantry, the power of the All-Russian Soviet authority, the crushing of the bourgeoisie, the abolition of the spoliation of men by men and the introduction of Socialism in which there will be neither a division into classes nor a state authority.

1. The Russian Republic is the free socialistic society of all the working people of Russia, united in the urban and rural Soviets.

2. The Soviets of those regions which differentiate themselves by a special form of existence and national character will be united into autonomous regional associations ruled by the sessions of the Soviets of those regions and their executive organs.

3. The Soviet associations of the regions participate in the Russian Socialistic Republic upon the basis of federation, at the head of which stand the Pan-Russian session of the Soviets and, in periods between the sessions, the Pan-Russian Central Executive Committee.

## II

### CONCERNING THE RUSSIAN SOVIETS

#### Section first: Concerning the Suffrage.

I. The right to vote and to be elected to the Soviets is enjoyed by the following citizens of the Russian Socialistic Soviet Republic of both sexes who shall have completed their eighteenth year by the day of the election:

1. All who have acquired the means of living through labor that is productive and useful to society and are members of the trades associations, namely:

(a) Laborers and employes of all classes who are employed in industry, trade and agriculture.

(b) Peasants and Cossack agricultural laborers who hire no labor.

(c) Employes and laborers in the offices of the Soviet government.

2. Soldiers of the army and navy of the Soviets.

3. Citizens of the two previous categories who have to any degree lost their capacity to work.

II. The following persons enjoy neither the right to vote nor to be voted for, even though they belong to one of the categories enumerated above, namely:

(1) Persons who employ hired labor in order to obtain from it an increase in profits.

(2) Persons who have an income without doing any work, such as interest from capital, receipts from property, and so on.

(3) Private merchants, trade and commercial intermediaries.

(4) Employes of communities for religious worship.

(5) Employes and agents of the former police, the gendarmerie corps and the Okhrana; also members of the dynasty that formerly ruled in Russia.

(6) Persons who have in legal form been declared demented or mentally deficient, and also deaf and dumb persons.

(7) Persons who have been punished for selfish or dishonorable misdemeanors.

## II—VII

**PRINCIPLES FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE  
RUSSIAN STATE**

The government is based upon the smallest settlements (villages and hamlets), the inhabitants of which may elect one representative to each 100 persons.

The rural Soviets are under the authority of the Soviets of the Volosts (districts), and these latter under the Soviets of the Uyezd (larger regions).

The urban and Uyezd Soviets elect delegates to sessions of the government or Oblast Soviets. Each of these bodies chooses independently its own executive committee.

The keystone to the whole constitution is embraced in:

## VIII

**CONCERNING THE PAN-RUSSIAN CONGRESS OF THE  
SOVIETS**

(1) The Pan-Russian Congress of the Soviets consists of representatives of the urban Soviets (one delegate for each 25,000 voters) and representatives of the government congresses (one delegate for each 125,000 voters).

(2) The All-Russian Congress of Soviets will be called together by the All-Russian Central Executive Committee at least twice a year.

3. The extraordinary All-Russian Congress will be called together by the All-Russian Central Executive Committee upon its own initiative or upon the demand of the Soviets of districts embracing at least one-third of the entire population of the republic.

4. The All-Russian Congress of Soviets elects the Central Executive Committee of not more than 200 members.

5. The All-Russian Executive Committee is responsible to the All-Russian Congress of Soviets.

6. The All-Russian Congress of Soviets is the highest power in the republic. In the periods between its sessions that power is represented by the All-Russian Central Executive Committee.

It is further provided that the Central Executive Committee shall be divided into eleven colleges for administrative functions. These are:

1. Foreign policies.

2. Defense of the country (army and navy).

3. Social order and security (militia), census of the people, registration of societies and associations, fire department, insurance, organization of the Soviets.

4. Justice.

5. Public economy (with sub-sections for agriculture, industry and trade, finances, railways, food supply, state property and construction.)

6. Labor and social welfare.

7. Education and enlightenment of the people.

8. Public health.

9. Post, telegraph and telephone.

10. Federal and national affairs.

11. Control and auditing.

## EDITORIALS\*

### The Prospects of Peace

The test of an army is in defeat and retreat. Defeat, much more than victory, reveals an army's morale and capacity. This is equally true of the international army of the Socialist proletariat, which wages war upon Capitalism and Imperialism. And now that this army has met an overwhelming defeat (but not disaster) in its campaign for an immediate, general peace, now that the prospects of an early peace are apparently more hopeless than during any period of the four years' immemorial agony, it is precisely at this moment, in the midst of defeat and retreat, that our morale and capacity are being tested, that we should face the facts, however uncomfortable. Reality, after all, is the supreme factor in the coming of peace—and of Socialism; and adherence to fundamental principles is as much a part of reality as are "facts."

It is the tragic feature of this war, emphasized again and again, that it should have produced and shattered so many illusions concerning an early peace. These illusions are indispensable in the waging of a great world war, in maintaining the morale of the people, in preventing discontent coming to a focus. Journalists, in characterizing German offers of peace as "peace offensives," as "peace traps," convey the impression that these manoeuvres are to trap the Allies, split them asunder, etc. They are only incidentally that: the major purpose of these "peace offensives" is to bolster the German people's will to fight: in general, peace manoeuvres are part of government propaganda to satisfy the people, persuade them to "carry on." Peace, accordingly, becomes increasingly active—in promises; while the war multiplies its intensity and peace recedes into the crimson future. The

\* Comrade L. B. Boudin has resigned from the Editorial Board of the Class Struggle and as a member of the Socialist Publication Society because of differences concerning the policy of the magazine.

collapse of these peace promises is equally characteristic of an imperialistic war, because the stakes are too vast to allow the making of an "inconclusive peace," that is, a peace not in absolute accord with the world interests of an imperialistic nation. An "inconclusive peace," a peace without victory, is conceivable only in the event of mutual exhaustion. Unless the proletariat drastically intervenes, in accord with its independent class policy and action, peace, an imperialistic peace, negative or positive in character, will come, by means of decisive victory of one or the other, or by means of their mutual exhaustion.

Every defeat, every victory, has prolonged the war. The peace disappointments have been most acute in that nation which has secured victory after victory in four years of unparalleled carnage. Germany was promised peace in three months, in six months; each offensive was preceded by the promise of an early peace: each promise was followed by a more sanguinary struggle. The most bitter disappointment of all was the brutal peace forced upon revolutionary Russia: this separate peace, which in one form or another was a vital phase of German military and political strategy, was the signal for the flaring up on the western front of the most intense struggle of the whole war—and peace more than ever a thing of the future.

The Imperial German Government's attitude toward peace is clear. It wants a peace on the basis of the war map, an imperialistic peace. German Imperialism repudiates a democratic peace; it will adhere to imperialistic peace purposes until either crushed by its revolutionary proletariat or by a military defeat.

But does the attitude of the Entente governments promise an early, democratic peace? The secret treaty agreements, of a predatory character, have not been repudiated. On June 20, the British Minister of Foreign Affairs said: "These treaties were entered into by this country with other members of the Allies, and to these treaties we stand. The national honor is bound up with them." In spite of assertions to the contrary, the Entente has not accepted President Wilson's peace proposals: these proposals are considered simply as excellent material to bolster up the war spirit



creating an appropriate ideology to "carry on." Great Britain, France and Italy are not offering their own people, and the world, a definite program on peace, because they, as much as Germany, realize that the final terms will be determined on a military basis. No real attitude of the governments of Great Britain, France and Italy toward President Wilson's aspirations on peace may be said to have been expressed recently by Lord Lansdowne. Speaking particularly of the president's July 4th address, Lord Lansdowne said: "It is a picture drawn by a great master of the golden age. . . . The speech is, however, not an outline of peace terms, but a very nobly worded description of 'the things for which the associated people of the world are fighting for.'" Great Britain, France and Italy may easily accept the ideology of the president, since they realize that ideology will not determine the conditions of peace, and that it commits them in practice to nothing. Definite terms openly declared now, might prove very inconvenient at the final settlement.

The Russian Revolution was the test of the peace policy of the Allies—not the proletarian revolution alone, since that may be considered much too bitter a medicine to swallow, but the bourgeois revolution expressed in the bourgeois republic of the Provisional Government, of Kerensky. The relations of this republic and the Allies were of bourgeois government to bourgeois government. This republic repeatedly, and often imploringly, asked that war aims and peace terms be revised and re-stated. This was brusquely refused, since it meant actual concessions to democracy, the abandonment of cherished, if secret, imperialistic aims. The New York *Tribune*, in an editorial in its issue of August 4, touches upon this very point. The performance of the two representatives of British labor who went to Russia "to explain that the English and Russians were meant to be great friends, and that the Russians therefore must go on with the war," the *Tribune* characterizes as "naive and profitless," and continues:

"Next went Arthur Henderson, a member of the War Cabinet, who was to straighten them out. He saw that to postpone the de-

lude it would be necessary to save Kerensky, and that to save Kerensky it would be necessary for the Allies to *make certain difficult political adjustments* to sentiments then rising and about to become uncontrollable in Russia. But his own government treated his proposals as if they had emanated from an irresponsible mind, whereupon he returned and resigned from the War Cabinet and viewed from his retirement the fall of Kerensky and the rise of Lenine-and-Trotsky Bolshevism.

"On the report of Great Britain's plenipotentiary it would have been possible for the Allies to have evolved a policy. Not only was there never any Allied policy, but the first question was never even proposed. That question was: 'Shall we pay what Arthur Henderson finds it will cost to sustain Kerensky and keep Russia in the war?' The price might have been thought prohibitive. It would have *included the abandonment of certain territorial intentions*; it would have included, perhaps, the Stockholm conference. Nevertheless, it was a question to be answered. If answered in the negative, then another immediately presented itself, namely, 'When we refuse what will happen, and what line of policy shall we pursue?' But, the first being unasked, the second was never suggested." (My italics.)

The opportunity for peace, or at least peace negotiations, during 1917 was not offered simply by revolutionary Russia, although that was the finest of all; and it would have been used if Allied practice had been in accord with Allied claims. There was the opportunity offered by Austria, the Emperor's letter to President Poincare forwarded through Prince Sixtus. The offer was rejected because Poincare and Premier Ribot insisted upon France annexing the west bank of the Rhine. There were during this year, according to Mr. Robert Dell, Paris correspondent of the Manchester *Guardian*, three more opportunities that the Allies might have used for opening peace discussions. Each and every opportunity was unceremoniously rejected. This is Mr. Dell's story, in the London *Nation*:

While Russia was pleading for a revision of war aims, trying to impose the formula of a democratic peace upon the Allies,

Great Britain, France and Italy were pursuing an imperialistic policy: France wanted the Rhine; Italy answered Russia with the practical annexation of Albania. The *Tribune* is right, acceptance of the Russian peace formula "would have included the abandonment of certain territorial intentions." Carry on! The world may perish, but the "territorial intentions" of Imperialism must not be jeopardized.

The great opportunity for peace was the Soviet Government's proposal for an armistice and general peace negotiations. The Allies, naturally, rejected the proposal: if they made no concessions to Kerensky, concession to Lenin could not be considered. This refusal is clear to the Socialist who recognizes, in war and in peace, the fundamental character of Capitalism. One fact, if no other, determined the attitude of the Allies: if they had accepted the proposal of the Soviet Republic, and the negotiations had produced a democratic peace, the proletarian revolution would have secured the credit: imagine the influence upon the proletariat of the world! The states that determined the abstention of the Entente were not alone their "territorial intentions," but the social supremacy of Capitalism itself. The abstention of the Allies was natural and necessary; only Socialist and proletarian pressure could have forced their participation. But the dominant Socialism adopted the policy of the governments; it repudiated the Soviet proposals as brusquely as did the governments; it betrayed the cause of the proletariat and of Socialism.

Never, in spite of all the turpitude manifested during the war by the dominant Socialism in Europe—never was it imaginable that the "Socialism" of Germany and Austria would degrade the opportunity to promote Imperialism, while the "Socialism" of Great Britain and France would contemptuously reject the opportunity. It is this defeat and retreat of the proletariat that will test the capacity of international Socialism: we are confident that that Socialism and the proletariat possess the moral and physical reserves to transform this defeat into victory.

The peace concluded by Russia prolongs the war. The struggle becomes more intense, more desperate, more agonizing. The

collapse of the proletarian struggle for peace determines the character of the prospects of peace. There is no coming of peace—yet. One year more, two years more, perhaps three years more of war—that is the consequence of the inactivity of the proletariat of the shameful betrayal of trust perpetrated by moderate Socialism. Three years more of war—and then an imperialistic peace, concluded by bourgeois governments. The prospect is not at all pleasing, but that is the prospect as determined by the facts. Perhaps a victory, and an imperialistic peace; perhaps mutual exhaustion, and an "inconclusive peace," which means a negatively imperialistic peace. Nor is there any magic in the words "peace negotiations." The Allies during 1917 rejected proposals for starting peace negotiations, and prolonged the war: but the acceptance of the proposals might equally have prolonged the war, by each group pressing its own terms and the negotiations coming to naught: the intervention of the Socialist proletariat is necessary. The abstention of the Allies from the Brest-Litovsk negotiations prolonged the war: but their participation might have equally prolonged the war, because of Germany's insistence on an imperialistic peace: the intervention of the proletariat is necessary. The "negotiated peace" of bourgeois governments inevitably means a peace of compromise, a traders' peace, a reactionary peace. Socialism alone can bring a real peace, a peace of understanding, a peace that will solve justly the problems of this war. The alternative to Socialism is Imperialism—and that means reaction, death.

We must not indulge in the propaganda of bourgeois pacifism. We must not rely upon phrases. We must not see magic where deceit prevails. The policy of Socialism consists in a class characterization of war and peace, and in promoting the class activity of the proletariat. We must stress this policy, out of defeat we must grasp the energy and opportunity for a new struggle. In spite of all and everything! F.

#### POSTSCRIPT

President Wilson, on August 3, announced the American policy on intervention. It is a policy that completely repudiates his

other policy on making the world safe for democracy and the self-determination of nations. The president has completely reversed his previous policy on Russia—as he did on other occasions, on Mexico and on the war.

The statement announcing this new policy, issued by Acting Secretary of State Polk, but prepared, it is said, by President Wilson, opens:

“In the judgment of the government of the United States—a judgment arrived at after repeated and very searching consideration of the whole situation—military intervention in Russia would be more likely to add to the present sad confusion there than to cure it and would injure Russia rather than help her out of her distress. Such military intervention as has been most frequently proposed, even supposing it to be efficacious in its immediate object of delivering an attack upon Germany from the east, would, in its judgment, be more likely to turn out to be merely a method of making use of Russia than to be a method of serving her. Her people, if they profited by it at all, could not profit by it in time to deliver them from their present desperate difficulties, and their substance would meanwhile be used to maintain foreign armies, not to reconstruct their own or to feed their own men, women and children.”

This is excellent, a complete statement of the case against intervention. It is President Wilson at his loftiest. But the statement proceeds:

“As the government of the United States sees the present circumstances, therefore, military actions is admissible in Russia now only to render such protection and help as is possible to the Czecho-Slovaks against the armed Austrian and German prisoners who are attacking them, and to steady efforts at self-government or self-defence in which the Russians themselves may be willing to accept assistance.”

The United States will send a detachment of troops to Vladivostok, together with Japan, “with the purpose of co-operating as a single force in the occupation of Vladivostok and in safe-guard-

ing, so far as it may, the country to the rear of the westward moving Czecho-Slovaks.”

The Czecho-Slovaks “*moving westward?*” That means *away* from Vladivostok, into European Russia, *to wage war against the Soviets and the Russian people*. The Czecho-Slovaks wish to leave Russia for the western front; instead, they are to be kept in Russia, to make war against the Revolution. The plan is this: the Czecho-Slovaks will be amply munitioned; they will continue their guerilla war against the Soviets, with the hope that Cossacks, military adventurers, and counter-revolutionary forces generally will rally around the Czecho-Slovaks, crush the Soviets, and force Russia into the war by means of a military dictatorship. And yet the statement declares that the government of the United States contemplates “no intervention in her (Russia’s) internal affairs!”

The statement, moreover, adds insult to injury by mention of “armed Austrian and German prisoners who are attacking the Czecho-Slovaks: Proof conclusive, indeed, of the pro-German duplicity of the Bolsheviki! But is it? Are not the Czecho-Slovaks *former Austrian soldiers*, captured by the Russians? If these former Austrian soldiers are willing to fight for the allies, why should not other former Austrian soldiers—yes, and German too!—be willing to fight for the proletarian revolution?

This is the culmination of the policy of the allies toward Russia, a counter-revolutionary policy. “Only the blind,” says the New York *Novy Mir*, “could not perceive that the Allies have been waging war against the Russian Soviet Republic by all means at their disposal, and that they have bent their efforts to crush the republic. . . . This is a policy of intervention in the internal affairs of Russia, a policy of imposing an alien will upon the people.”

F.

## Spargo, Simons and Private Kopelin

One of the American export industries that were created by the war is the sending of missions to Europe. Formerly it was American "Dollar-diplomacy," the extravagances of our millionaire diplomats, that made the U. S. famous. Today all Europe is speaking of the activity of those ambassadors of the American people who are being chosen from the unshaken and absolutely reliable labor leaders and renegade Socialists. There was first of all the Russian mission with the A. F. of L. Lennon and the Ex-Socialist Russel as the representatives of American labor. To be sure, this was an official mission and therefore of a somewhat different character than those that were to follow. Then came the Mission to France, England and Italy, led by the A. F. of L. patternmaker Wilson, which was followed in June by a delegation of the Social Democratic League of America consisting of A. M. Simons, John Spargo, Charles Edward Russel, Louis Kopelin, Professor Herron and the mine worker Howat. In August, Gompers with two other missions bearing the label of the A. F. of L. started for Europe, the one to visit England and France, the other to visit Italy. Furthermore the one "socialist" and the two openly anti-socialist deputations will then visit the "Inter-allied Labor Conference" that is scheduled to take place on the 17th, 18th, and 19th of September, in London.

Among all of these subsidized missions we are mainly interested in the one that does business under the firm name of the "Social Democratic League." This League which has its headquarters in Girard, Kansas, in the New Appeal (formerly the super-revolutionary Appeal to Reason) the official organ of this baker's dozen of commanding generals, is not a new organization. It came into being last summer when the still-born, National Party, a pure and simple middle class reform party, was first ushered into the world, because these gentlemen felt the necessity of some kind of an organization that would give them some sort of standing within the Socialist International. Beyond a few

abortive meetings on the lower East Side of New York and in Brownsville we here in America heard very little of this new creation. Statements and declarations, to be sure, were published en masse, here and abroad. It need hardly be emphasized therefore, that this league cannot finance this mission, which, if we may judge from its personnel, is a pretty expensive one, from its own treasury. Somewhere there must be a rich uncle.

According to its own statements, the work of this commission consists in the task of "holding the European Socialist Parties in line for the war." In other words, it is to convert to its own point of view, the British Labor Party which stands for a peace by negotiations with an overwhelming majority, the majority of the French party expressed the same sentiment in the adoption of a resolution by Lorriot with 1544 against 1172 votes; the Italian Socialist Party that stands, as it has always stood since the very first day of the war, most decidedly for a speedy peace. We fear, John Spargo will be little more successful in Europe than he was in St. Louis, where, in spite of absolute freedom of speech and movement, in spite of his then unimpaired standing in the party, he finally succeeded in uniting *five* whole votes upon his resolution, his own included. The only harm that these gentlemen could possibly do in Europe is the transmission of falsified news and the creation of wrong impressions. And much as we regret to say it, we do not doubt for a moment that this will be done. For what else can be the purpose when Spargo says, according to a cable from the London Times, that "his party" will not disturb the Allies in their fight against autocracy, "until victory has been gained by the Allies"? What and where is this party of which John Spargo speaks? The National Party concerning which they maintain such a peculiar silence in Europe? Or perhaps the Social Democratic League that paper organization with William Engilsh Walling as National and Emanuel Halde-man-Julius as Acting Assistant Secretary? This commission, conceived in fraud, and dedicated to a lie, can have but one purpose—the deception of the European proletariat. But in this it will fail, for the French and English and Italian Socialists of the International groups are no more to be deceived as to the char-

acter of these groups than were the Russian Socialists when Root and Russel brought their message to the Russian proletariat.

But this conception of the work of the committee became even more broadly defined when it reached the European shores. According to a cable from Paris, August 5, by Louis Kopelin, that staunch patriot who sadly but dutifully relinquished the glorious opportunities of the battle-field for the so much more essential war-work in the editor's chair of the *New Appeal*—in uniform—John Spargo issued a statement that, "We are trying to arrange the organization of a pro-war Socialist League of the Allied Countries. We wish that when the International is mentioned it will not convey the meaning of pacifism, but will signify was to a victorious conclusion for democracy." It will be a select company that will rally around this war-international: men and women most of them who call themselves socialist so long as the present favorable situation lasts, to return penitently to capitalist flesh-pots when there is no longer a chance to do business in the socialist garb. Then they will need permanent jobs.

Our government, which is heartily supporting each and every one of these missions, is making a sad mistake in repeating the error it committed when it sent the Root Commission to the provisional government of Russia. Evidently Washington is under the impression that the European labor movement and its leaders know as little of American conditions as our labor leaders know of the labor movement in Europe. We are convinced that there are not five people among those prominent in the A. F. of L. who really know the European labor movement. But in the old world every intelligent member of the labor movement is well informed on the position of the A. F. of L. and its influential men on all important questions. Every man and woman of any importance in the European socialist movement is well informed of the relations between John Spargo, Russel, Simons and the Socialist Party. In England, France and Italy they know the relative strength of the Socialist Party and the Social Democratic League. What then are these missions to accomplish? Do these American delegates really believe that they are intellectually and mentally

so inordinately superior that they will be able with their eloquence, to overthrow the convictions and views of whole national movements? Is it not more reasonable to believe that Simons, Spargo and Russel, who are after all only vest-pocket editions of the English, French and Italian Labor war prophets who have tried in vain to turn the sentiment of the European labor movement into different channels will be listened to in a spirit of ordinary politeness, to be then definitely pushed aside.

What, for instance, are our European Socialists to think when they see the following report of the preparations made by the President of the A. F. of L. before he left this country, as reported in the *N. Y. "Sun"*:

"Samuel Gompers is going to England for the British Trades Union congress in September to aid in holding labor to faith in the cause of the Allies. His efforts will be directed against pacifism and Socialism.

"Mr. Gompers recently presided at a conference of labor leaders, jurists, business men, bankers, representatives of the American Alliance for Labor and Democracy and the National Civic Federation. No report of the discussion was made public, but it is understood that the best means of counteracting Bolshevism—in the United States and the allied countries—was discussed.

"The Conference was held at the headquarters of the National Civic Federation for the purpose of obtaining a representative statement of American opinion on the problems that will come before the London labor meeting, which will be held September 17, 18 and 19, with delegates present from all allied countries. The mission from America, headed by Mr. Gompers, will later visit France and Italy.

"Among those present were Lawrence F. Abbott of the Outlook; Major August H. Belmont, banker and subway magnate; Otto H. Kahn, multi-millionaire banker; Henry Morgenthau, millionaire and former ambassador to Turkey; Alfred S. Smith, regional director of railroads; Mrs. Emmeline Pankhurst, the militant suffragette from England; Rodman Wanamaker, the son of John Wanamaker, owner of department stores in New York and Philadelphia, and of several daily papers in Philadelphia; Grosvenor B. Clarkson of the Council of National Defense; Henry Moskowitz of the Submarine Boat Corporation; Mrs. Coffin Van Rensselaer and Miss Elizabeth Marbury.

"At the meeting resolution were adopted advocating aid for Rus-

sia, but only for the uprooting of Bolshevism. Confidence was expressed in Mr. Gompers and in the power of labor to stand with the allied cause.

"The hearing of the conference on the British labor situation lies in the fact as stated by William English Walling that of the 300 Parliamentary candidates of the Labor Party in England 225 so far chosen belong to the Socialist Independent Labor Party (let by MacDonald and Snowden) and are pacifists.

"In France two-thirds of the Socialist Party, led by Jean Longuet, the grandson of Karl Marx, and most of the trade unions, are pacifist."

In the Socialist movement of Europe, and there is no other labor movement in Europe worthy of the name, Samuel Gompers, whose "efforts will be directed against pacifism and socialism," will be sure of a hearty and understanding reception. And with him Spargo, Russel, Simons and Private Kopelin, who are under the same instructions as he and his colleagues.

For the same conductor directs the whole orchestra.

L.

## The A. F. of L. Labor Mission

The utter incompetency and reactionary character of the A. F. of L. mission to Britain, France and Italy has left a bad taste in the mouth of Anglo-French-Italian labor, which, in spite of its conservative attitude, is immeasurably in advance of the petrified bureaucracy of American "Organized Labor."

In its issue of August 10, *Collier's* says editorially:

"A friend of ours, at Paris, saw a letter from a member of the French High Commission at Washington in regard to the American 'Labor Mission'; it said, in effect: 'Send them to the Folies Bergères and dine them at the Café des Ambassadeurs, and show them something of the front, and introduce them to a few hand-picked French labor men—BUT don't let 'em meet the French Socialists!' This might lead one to infer that the French Government doesn't want American labor to get in touch and sympathy with French labor, or it might mean that the French representatives at Washington suspected that the aforesaid 'Labor Mission' was better adapted to *hors d'oeuvres* and pony ballets and patriotic speeches on the steps of the Hôtel de Ville than to discussion of war-labor problems with the Frenchmen who specialize in such matters."

The A. F. of L. Mission might be disposed of with this blistering characterization, were it not for the purposes animating the Mission and those who invited the Mission to Europe.

The invitation was extended by the British Government, and the Mission in England was practically a personally-conducted government tour. The members saw what they were wanted to see. They adopted an attitude that was not only self-pillorying, but that outraged French and British labor, which has suffered so much and so intensely in the war. The fact is that the A. F. of Labor Mission was used by Premier Lloyd George and Premier Clemenceau as an instrument in the offensive against labor and the Socialists, who are surely, if slowly, awak-

ening to a more independent attitude on war and peace. The A. F. of L. delegates were not interested in the terms of peace, or in problems of reconstruction; they betrayed a pitiful lack of understanding of things in general and the war in particular; they seemed unaware of, or brutally ignored the terrible agony that has come to Europe in four years of unparalleled carnage; their whole contribution was of the fire-eating variety—carry on, war to the finish! Brutality and stupidity, crowned by an assumption of superiority and complacent impudence, characterized the A. F. of L. Mission.

French and British and Italian labor, even the "patriotic" elements thereof, is beginning to realize that the governments' policy of asking labor to carry on, while the governments determine when and how the war shall end, and upon what terms, is a reactionary procedure, calculated to promote the very interests that provoked the war. European labor, hesitatingly, gropingly, unintelligently, perhaps, but none the less actually, is making up its mind that it shall not simply be cannon-fodder, but an independent force in the making of peace. This is the spirit that Lloyd and Clemenceau are afraid of, not so much because of what it is now, but because of what it may become; and so Lloyd George sends a British "Labor Mission" to this country, consisting of the most reactionary elements of British unionism; and the A. F. of L., being recognized for the reactionary force it is, is asked to send a mission to France and England, to become an instrument against awakening labor and for reaction.

The A. F. of L., in its official expression at least, is to-day precisely where European labor was during the first year of the war—supine, carried away by the impetus of the war, dickering for small advantages to be secured out of Armageddon, and accepting a General Staff ideology. The eloquent arguments of war itself have convinced labor of the stupidity of this attitude; and labor in Europe is awakening, has awakened to the point where the governments must import American reactionary labor officials in the struggle against the developing consciousness of

class. The A. F. of L. may yet become convinced of the reactionary character of its attitude by the arguments of war itself.

A most interesting and characteristic feature of this world war is the conscious use governments must make of labor and "Socialism" in order to create the psychology of "carry on!" It is simultaneously a necessary and a dangerous procedure. Necessary, since war to-day affects the whole people, must mobilize all the social, industrial and psychological forces of a nation for the prosecution of the war; dangerous, since it subtly inculcates labor with the consciousness of its necessity and power. In spite of the reactionary A. F. of L. bureaucracy, and under the dynamic impulse of the war itself, European labor will appreciate its power more and more; it will march onward toward the ideology and action of revolutionary Socialism, not retreat to the reactionary positions of the A. F. of L.

F.

\* \* \*

## PROGRESS BACKWARD

Ten years ago socialist sentiment within the A. F. of L. promised to become an influential factor in the life of the organization. A number of great international unions were undeniably under socialist influence, unions whose membership was largely composed of the so-called American element were electing socialist national officials and socialist delegates to A. F. of L. conventions with increasing frequency. To be sure, the delegates who held definitely socialistic views were still in the minority, a minority that could not hope for years to become a majority.

The "United Mine Workers of America," numerically the strongest of the A. F. of L. Internationals was typical of the mental upheaval of that time. More than fifty per cent. of its membership showed marked socialistic tendencies. In 1908 its convention adopted a declaration of war against the "National Civic Federation," that was essentially an attack upon Samuel Gompers and John Mitchell, the erstwhile idol of the miners. The same convention emphasized its anti-militaristic sentiment by the passage of a constitutional amendment providing for the

automatic exclusion of any member who joined the militia or any other military organization, and instructed its delegates to call upon all other organizations affiliated with the A. F. of L. to take the same stand. Those who participated in the sessions of this Indianapolis convention will not so soon forget the splendid enthusiasm that inspired this assemblage of over 1,000 delegates, 400 of them the proud possessors of red party cards. Adolph Germer, who led the fight against the "National Civic Federation" and Duncan McDonald, the sponsor of the anti-Militia resolution, were the heroes of the day, and had the solid backing of a powerful majority of the delegates. Mitchell, on the other hand, was so unmistakably defeated that he left the convention before the close of the session. It was years before he again appeared at a mine workers' convention.

At this time the "International Association of Machinists," too, was undergoing a process of radicalization. O'Connell was still president, but his power was so obviously on the wane that he was forced again and again to compromise with the socialist element under Van Lear and Johnston. Even then his efforts were fruitless. A few years later he joined the ranks of those "deserving veterans" of the A. F. of L. and the Metal Trades Department was established for his support. The Socialist Johnston was elected in his place.

During this period the "Western Federation of Miners" which had just joined the Federation for the second time was making its influence strongly felt. Its representatives had not yet developed their statesmanly faculties to their present perfection, and spoke in plain and unmistakable language. Elections in the "International Cigarmakers Union" brought an increasing number of socialist votes, Gompers and Perkins notwithstanding. Its delegates to the conventions were about equally divided into adherents and opponents of the machine. The same year saw, in the "Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners," the first radical ticket, causing Huber and his ilk more than one sleepless night—to judge from the rough-shod methods that were used by the powers that be. There were, moreover, the socialist delegates of

the Brewery and the Bakery workers who at that time still dared to stand by their colors. The representatives of the needle industry also reflected the marked trend to the left that characterized their organizations, to the ill concealed fury of Rickert and Larger of the "United Garment Workers," then the allpowerful leaders of this industry. The dismissal of Lennon as General-Secretary of the "Tailors' Union," a small International of highly skilled workers, and in consequence more conservative than the others, and the substitution of a Socialist, was another indication of the mighty mental upheaval that seemed to be reshaping the American Labor Movement. To these were added the socialist minorities that adorned the safely conservative delegations that came from the printing trades, the painters, and from several other more or less socialistically inclined local central bodies and radical State Federations. All these various elements were definitely united in their opposition to the A. F. of L. machine and its policies and assumed a threatening significance to its leaders, and likewise therefore to the capitalist interests entrenched behind them.

Obviously something had to be done to stem this tide of socialist, anti-capitalist sentiment. The question was only under whose leadership the fight was to be waged, under which flag the forces of the reaction should rally. It was felt that Samuel Gompers was hardly the right man for the job. There was an undercurrent of dissatisfaction over the election of a "Dutch Jew" to the head of the American Labor Movement. Duncan, the First Vice-President of the A. F. of L., a dyed-in-the-wool reactionary and a devout Catholic, was first choice for the leadership of this anti-socialist movement. But the sly fox refused to compromise himself with the Gompers machine, and John Mitchell, who, as a staunch Republican had always run counter to the democratic policies practiced by Gompers, was selected. The capitalist press at that time printed the "rumor" that Mitchell was an avowed candidate for president of the A. F. of L. with persistent regularity. These "rumors" were as regularly denied, yet everyone familiar with conditions knew, with Sam. Gompers, that there was very much truth behind these "speculations."



The anti-Socialists were united into the "Militia of Christ," an organization of catholic trade unionists, that was founded in connection with an American catholic conference. With the active support of Archbishop Farley and the blessing of Cardinal Gibbons this union of the reactionary elements within the A. F. of L. was perfected. In this connection it should be remembered that it was the German Centrist (the Catholic Party of Germany) Reichstag deputy Giesberts, at that time the leader of the "Christliche Gewerkschaften" (Catholic Trade Unions) who first suggested this "inner circle" of the Catholics in the A. F. of L. In his interviews and in his speeches during his American lecture tour, this gentleman persistently expressed the opinion that the time would come in the U. S. when the Christian workingman would be forced into separate organizations. The growing influence of the Socialists in the A. F. of L. would soon make united action impossible. He urged that the present was the time to prepare and suggested the organization of social-political study classes and the inauguration of a systematic anti-socialist campaign.

At first no particular importance was attributed to the "Militia of Christ." Very little of its activity became public. Only now and again a circular would reach the hands of an outsider, telling of the quiet undermining work of these devout Christians. It was only in 1917 that the existence of this organization made itself more generally felt. At that time it carried out a well prepared attack upon the Gompers machine by springing the candidacy of the teamster Tobin in an executive council election. Lennon, the staunch Gompersite, who held the position of Treasurer for many years, was defeated; the machine met its first great defeat.

But these ten years have brought great changes in the A. F. of L. The socialist flood of 1908 has ebbed away, the "United Mine Workers of America" have sworn off every radical tendency, Duncan McDonald and Germer have lost their former influence, the radicalism of Frank J. Hays, the "socialist Vice-President," has long since ceased to merit serious consideration, the anti-mili-

tia paragraph has been removed from the constitution. The "International Association of Machinists" is fattening on munition jobs and has forgotten every last remnant of opposition. The Brewery workers have been made tractable out of fear of prohibition. The Bakery workers have become subservient in order to obtain favorable executive board decisions in pending jurisdiction squabbles. The needle industries have made all other considerations subservient to a series of interunion jurisdiction fights that were regularly turned over to the Executive Council for final settlement. In fact these miserable competitive fights, the inevitable accompaniment of a craft union movement were a godsend to the ruling spirits in the A. F. of L. The power to decide these disputes has given them the whiphand over the quarreling, dicker-ing international unions.

The pitiful collapse of the socialist opposition and the complete fiasco of the policy of "boring from within," seemed to rob the "Militia of Christ" of every reason for existence. But the gentlemen found a way out of the difficulty. Where the fight against the Reds had hitherto been their chief aim and the fight against Gompers only an incidental issue, the former was now relegated to the rear. The struggle for supremacy against the Gompers Camarilla, now began in all earnest. The crafty Jesuits knew that the time had not yet come for an open attack upon Gompers. His position must be undermined, his control hollowed out from within; and they know this still. The "Militia of Christ," therefore, became the "Indianapolis Movement." The headquarters of the most important of the A. F. of L. Internationals, it must be remembered, are located in Indianapolis, among them the United Mine Workers, the Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, the International Typographical Union, the Teamsters and others whose leaders have become affiliated with the "Militia of Christ." A reorientation became necessary, for it was essential, for practical purposes, that adherents be won in non-catholic, not absolutely reactionary, circles. Your devout Catholic will take even the Devil's vote, if he can get it, and here votes count. "New Men" has become their slogan, because the old incumbents are dried up from the stagnation and political corruption in the na-

tional capital. The strong influence exerted by the Wilson Administration upon the direction of A. F. of L. policies is being held out as bait to catch the remains of the radicals, while the promise of soft jobs in the form of general organizerships, etc., has drawn some of Gompers' personal followers into the enemy's camp.

That was the secret of the first "Indianapolis" victory last year in Buffalo and explains the ease with which Fischer and Ricker defeated the Gompers men. In Buffalo as well as in Minneapolis the "official" representatives pleaded for the reelection of the old candidates as a vote of confidence for the "most worthy president." Even the "welfare of the nation" was used as an argument for their continuation. And yet the others were victorious. Three of the eleven members of the Executive Council of the A. F. of L. are avowed opponents of the old regime, and before long Indianapolis will have full control, will be strong enough to aim directly at Gompers himself.

The socialist movement, of course, has as little to gain from the clericalized Indianapolis movement as from Gompers and Company under the direction of the White House. But it may offer one advantage. The slight liberal coating that Gompers, with his oily eloquence, gave to the A. F. of L. when occasion warranted, will completely disappear under the strictly conservative influence of the Indianapolis Militia of Christ. Their victory may serve to expose the danger that lurks behind the malicious policies of the A. F. of L. with its anti-labor position in all labor questions in all their hideous and repulsive nakedness. L.

\* \* \*

## IMPERIALISM IN ACTION

The institution of the Federal Reserve System during the first administration of Woodrow Wilson was an important development in the amalgamation of Capitalism and Imperialism. It realized, if not wholly, at least sufficiently for all purposes, the dream of finance-capital for a central bank. The older dream had been

a central bank completely dominated by Big Capital, an expression of the epoch when a few financial magnates maintained supremacy, often to the injury of Capitalism as a whole. But with the amalgamation of Capitalism and Imperialism into State Capitalism, with the disappearance of America's splendid isolation, and the recognition of the necessity of a united capitalist class in the struggles of Imperialism and to secure world power, the older conception of a central bank had to be modified. It could no longer be simply an instrument of Big Capital; dominantly and necessarily an instrument of finance-capital, the central bank under the new conditions had to make ample provisions for the lesser groups and interests of Capitalism, become the instrument of a larger Capitalism. The Federal Reserve System met these requirements adequately. It unified the banking system of the country, solved minor antagonisms and amalgamated Capitalism, and freed finance-capital for the struggle to secure the financial supremacy of the world.

The war offered a splendid opportunity for financial supremacy, and the Federal Reserve System, centralized in the Federal Reserve Board, responded successfully to the opportunity. Upon his resignation on August 9 as a member of the Federal Reserve Board, Paul M. Warburg, an active factor in the organization and operation of the Federal Reserve System, summarized its achievements in one sentence: "Nothing but mismanagement could wrest the financial premiership of the world from us." American capitalism has definitely emerged into the epoch of international Imperialism.

The financial supremacy of the United States in world affairs is a direct consequence of its developing Imperialism. The centralization of the banking system, itself an expression of the amalgamation of Capitalism and Imperialism in State Capitalism, was a decisive instrument of action, the war accelerating the process by means of an unusual opportunity. Mr. Warburg, in an interview in the *New York Times* of August 18, pictures the process in excellent terms. Speaking of the form of the Federal Reserve System, he says:

"From a technical and banking standpoint, it might have been a better system to have one central bank with branches. Centralization is always an economy of power and makes for greater efficiency. For political and other reasons it was essential to have the system as it is, and the proof of its wisdom lies in its success. With political economic and social conditions what they are, a central bank would be likely to become the target of constant political attacks. There would always be suspicion of too extended a concentration of control either by capital or 'politics.' The present form offers a better protection in this regard, and the present system ought therefore to be better protected and to have better chance for untrammelled development than a full-fledged central bank."

The "political, economic and social conditions" mean the epoch of Imperialism, wherein finance-capital becomes the instrument of the whole of Capitalism, and not simply of a few dominant groups; wherein the process of expropriation takes a new form, being no longer dominantly the expropriation of one capitalist by another capitalist within the nation, but the expropriation of one national Capitalism by another; and the unifying of the national forces of Capitalism for the struggle to acquire world-power. Describing the achievements of the Federal Reserve System, Mr. Warburg says:

"We have brought into effective co-ordination a large portion of the country's banking reserves. We have regulated and brought about a general understanding of modern methods of re-discounting. We have created a world-wide market for bankers' acceptances, so that American trade is now largely financed by our own acceptances instead of by foreign ones, and at the same time our member banks now have an easy means of recourse to the Federal Reserve banks in case they wish to replenish their reserves.

"We have established fiscal agency relations with the Government and perfected an instrument which has proved of the greatest value in placing our issues of Government securities. . . I believe I may say the world marvels at the ease with which we are constantly transferring hundreds of millions of dollars without creating any disturbance. Without the Federal Reserve machinery of clearing through the gold clearing fund and without the redeposit organization developed by them, acting as agents for the Government, that would have been entirely impossible.

"The Federal Reserve clearings per day amount now to over \$400,000,000. For the first time in our history American banks have gone into foreign countries and opened branches—in Asia, Central and South America—as adjuncts to our growing trade."

Mr. Warburg realizes that these problems of finance are not simply problems of the banks, but of the whole of Capitalism. He

realizes, moreover, the tendency toward the amalgamation of Capitalism and Imperialism into State Capitalism:

"In Europe after the war, the most efficient Government promotion of industries in many lines will be held to exist in actual Government ownership and operation. More than ever will states become solid industrial and financial unions effectively organized for world competition, driven by the necessity of perfecting a system of the greatest efficiency, economy and thrift in order to be able to meet the incredible burdens created by the war.

"In this world of the future we shall have to maintain our own position, and it requires on our part thorough organization and steady leadership. Under our democratic system this cannot be furnished by changing party governments, but can only be provided by fairly permanent, non-partisan and expert bodies. These bodies must combine the judicial point of view with that of active and constructive business minds. They must be able to act as expert advisers to Congress and to the industries concerned. They must break down the suspicion and prejudice of Government against business and business against Government. They must stand for the interest of all against the exaction or aggression of any single individual or group, be it called labor or capital, carrier or shipper, lender or borrower, Republican or Democrat.

"Our ability to handle effectually the great economic problems of the future will depend upon developing boards and commissions of sufficient expert knowledge and independence of character. This will be possible only if both Government and people fully appreciate the importance of such bodies, so that the country may find its ablest sons willing to render public service worthy of the personal sacrifice it entails. . . .

"It appears inevitable that America will be one of the dominating financial powers in the coming era of peace. Indeed, if we play our cards right and if the war ends within a reasonable time, we should be the dominating financial power of the world. When peace comes we should command the three essentials that would assure us an unassailable strategic commercial position—the raw materials, the ships and the gold.

"The world at large is indebted to us. Nothing but mismanagement could wrest the financial premiership of the world from us."

This is an excellent description, by a dominant actor on the stage of finance-capital, of the characteristics of Imperialism. "More than ever will states become solid industrial and financial unions effectively organized for world competition"; boards of experts are to become the real governing factor in State Capitalism, since the problems are complex and technical, and continuity of policy, (which the laggard bourgeoisie of Finland wish to secure by means of a Prussianized monarchy), is indispensable to

Imperialism; "organization and steady leadership" are prime requirements, and "under our democratic system this cannot be furnished by changing party governments." This is precisely the important characteristic of Imperialism,—the reaction against democracy and the parliamentary system. "Changing party governments" are fundamental to bourgeois democracy and the parliamentary system; the abrogation of their function, by centralizing actual power in an administrative dictatorship and administrative boards, means the end of the parliamentary regime. Imperialism requires a unified Capitalism, a centralized banking system acting through finance-capital, and a centralized administrative control, parliaments being degraded to an "advisory" capacity.

The acquisition by American Capitalism of "the financial premiership of the world" necessarily means a transformation of its foreign policy. The indications of this transformation have been many, and are multiplying.

In 1913, the Administration declined to support American participation in the Six-Power Loan to China, President Wilson declaring that the terms of the loan "touch very nearly the administrative independence of China." At the time this action was considered a fundamental departure from accepted policy in foreign affairs, and the initiation of a new democratic era in international diplomacy. But in July of this year the government approved the proposed loan of \$50,000,000 to China by an American financial group, agreeing "to make prompt and vigorous representations and to take every possible step" to insure China's fulfilling its financial obligations. Moreover, the bankers are throughout to be guided by "the policies outlined by the Department of State." This is a unity of government and finance-capital characteristic of Imperialism.

The Six-Power Loan was to be secured by China's pledge of the salt tax, an internal levy, as security; its administration was to be reorganized under foreign auspices, and if this proved unsatisfactory, representatives of the powers making the loan might assume entire control of the tax—terms which, in the words of

President Wilson, "touch very nearly the administrative independence of China." But this was not the crux of the issue; the decisive feature was the political character of the loan, the governments of the bankers becoming its guarantors. The new American loan to China is based on no security at all, and in that it differs from the Six-Power Loan; but is identical in its political character, the American government becoming its guarantor. This is a political transaction; and political loans have been a fruitful source of international antagonisms. In these financial transactions of Imperialism, a government pledges all the resources of diplomacy, and as a final resort its military might, to assure the security of loans and investments in undeveloped nations.

This transformation in foreign policy is in accord with the new position of the United States as a financial world-power, and is latent with dangerous international complications.

Recent negotiations with Mexico are another indication of the policy of Imperialism. The Mexican government's most difficult problem is to limit the power of foreign capital, which secured a strangle hold upon the country's resources (and politics) through the concessions of the Diaz regime. The new constitution, accordingly, declares that "all contracts and concessions made by the former government from and after 1876, which shall have resulted in the monopoly of land, waters and natural resources of the nation by a single individual or corporation, are declared subject to revision, and the executive is authorized to declare those null and void which seriously prejudice the public interest." Ownership in lands or waters may be acquired only by Mexicans "by birth or naturalization," and in Mexican companies subject to the sovereign authority and laws of Mexico; ownership may be acquired by foreigners "provided they agree before the department of foreign affairs to be considered Mexicans in respect to such property, and accordingly not to invoke the protection of their government in respect to the same, under penalty, in case of breach, of forfeiture to the nation of property so acquired." All this is simply the assertion of the sovereignty inherent in a

nation, and undisputably recognized by the law of nations. The problem of foreign capital is a crucial problem in Mexico, the prevailing conditions making it practically an appanage of international Imperialism. The raw materials and natural wealth of Mexico are to become factors in the promotion of Mexican capitalism and national supremacy, not the means of exploitation of international finance-capital and Imperialism—this is the policy of the new Mexico.

Early this year the Mexican government promulgated a law imposing a heavy tax upon the development of oil, a very important industry, the foreign owners of which having been one of the most reactionary and brutal factors under the Diaz regime, and counter-revolutionary. American and British interests have more than \$300,000,000 invested in the oil production of Mexico, and they unanimously declared that the new tax was confiscatory. They appealed to Ambassador Fletcher, who discussed their grievances with the American department of state. In April, Ambassador Fletcher transmitted a note to the Mexican government, declaring the tax law to be "confiscatory," that it was "taking property without due process of law," and that "it became the function of the government of the United States most earnestly and respectfully to call the attention of the Mexican government to the necessity which may arise to impel it to protect the property of its citizens in Mexico divested or injuriously affected by the decree above cited. If Mexico insists upon the execution of the law, there can be only one result."

This interference in the sovereign affairs of a nation is in accord with the finest traditions of imperialistic diplomacy. The power to tax is supreme, and cannot be abridged by any foreign power except through conquest. According to the Constitution of Mexico, the fundamental law of the land, the government has the power to impose this tax; if foreign investors consider the tax illegal, they should have recourse to the Mexican courts for redress, if any. That is the procedure in all strong and independent nations. Instead, these investors adopt the imperialistic means of asking their government to bring political pressure to

bear upon the Mexican government—to violate its own constitution, and act as if it was the fundamental law only when it wasn't abrogated by the power of a foreign government.

This attitude of the investors was emphasized by an interview recently in the *New York Times*, in which a representative of oil interests in Mexico brazenly and unashamed proposed a conspiracy to compel the American and British governments to intervene in Mexico. This was the plan of the conspiracy: the Allied navies require a vast amount of oil, and most of it now comes from Mexico; if the Mexican government insists upon imposing the tax, the foreign oil interests will cease production, the Allied navies will be irreparably injured; and the Allied governments will be compelled, as a war measure, to intervene in Mexico. The tactics of highwaymen are mild in comparison with this proposed conspiracy. These investors are out to secure rights not accorded Mexican citizens, to acquire a privileged status above the law, and to use the military might of their governments as an instrument to promote their rapacious plans of plunder.

Using governments as instruments of finance-capital is an essential procedure of Imperialism. Accepted as a policy, it becomes an implacable producer of antagonisms latent with the threat of war.

Imperialism necessarily abrogates the sovereignty of a nation upon which it would prey. The Lansing-Ishii Agreement concluded between the United States and Japan last year, is of a character to impair the sovereignty of China. The heart of the Agreement is this: "The Governments of the United States and Japan recognize that territorial propinquity creates special relations between countries, and, consequently, the Government of the United States recognizes that Japan has special interests in China, particularly in the part to which her possessions are contiguous." The Chinese government, very rightly, complained of an agreement concerning China about which China was not consulted, and declared it would not recognize the Agreement. Special rights based upon "territorial propinquity"—this is a

policy of Imperialism. True enough, the Agreement declares: "The Governments of the United States and Japan deny that they have any purpose to infringe in any way on the independence or territorial integrity of China." But since Japan voluntarily accepted the policy of the "open door," formulated by John Hay, Japan has fought an imperialistic war against Russia concerning control of Chinese territory, and has closed the doors, and double-bolted them, in Eastern Inner Mongolia, South Manchuria, Fukien, Shantung, and lesser places.

The whole of Capitalism is now in the orbit of Imperialism. Imperialism molds the destiny of the nations. In the days to come, Imperialism will determine all things and rend the world in the savagery of its struggles—unless revolutionary Socialism directs the hosts of the proletariat to the conquest of Capitalism and Imperialism.

F.