

THE CLASS STRUGGLE

Devoted to International Socialism

PUBLISHED BY

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

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

Editors: LOUIS C. FRAINA and LUDWIG LORE

VOL. II

DECEMBER, 1918

No. 45

A Letter to American Workingmen

By N. LENIN.

Moscow, August 20, 1918.

Comrades: A Russian Bolshevik who participated in the Revolution of 1905 and for many years afterwards lived in your country has offered to transmit this letter to you. I have grasped this opportunity joyfully for the revolutionary proletariat of America—insofar as it is the enemy of American imperialism—is destined to perform an important task at this time.

The history of modern civilized America opens with one of those really revolutionary wars of liberation of which there have been so few compared with the enormous number of wars of conquest that were caused, like the present imperialistic war, by squabbles among kings, landholders and capitalists over the division of ill-gotten lands and profits. It was a war of the American people against the English who despoiled America of its resources and held in colonial subjection, just as their "civilized" descendants are draining the lifeblood of hundreds of millions of human beings in India, Egypt and all corners and ends of the world to keep them in subjection.

Since that war 150 years have passed. Bourgeois civilization has born its most luxuriant fruit. By developing the produc-

tive forces of organized human labor, by utilizing machines and all the wonders of technique America has taken the first place among free and civilized nations. But at the same time America, like a few other nations, has become characteristic for the depth of the abyss that divide a handful of brutal millionaires who are stagnating in a mire of luxury, and millions of laboring starving men and women who are always staring want in the face.

Four years of imperialistic slaughter have left their trace. Irrefutably and clearly events have shown to the people that both imperialistic groups, the English as well as the German, have been playing false. The four years of war have shown in their effects the great law of capitalism in all wars; that he who is richest and mightiest profits the most, takes the greatest share of the spoils while he who is weakest is exploited, martyred, oppressed and outraged to the utmost.

In the number of its colonial possessions, English imperialism has always been more powerful than any of the other countries. England has lost not a span of its "acquired" land. On the other hand it has acquired control of all German colonies in Africa, has occupied Mesopotamia and Palestine.

German imperialism was stronger because of the wonderful organization and ruthless discipline of "its" armies, but as far as colonies are concerned, is much weaker than its opponent. It has now lost all of its colonies, but has robbed half of Europe and throttled most of the small countries and weaker peoples. What a high conception of "liberation" on either side! How well they have defended their fatherlands, these "gentlemen" of both groups, the Anglo-French and the German capitalists together with their lackeys, the Social-Patriots.

American plutocrats are wealthier than those of any other country partly because they are geographically more favorably situated. They have made the greatest profits. They have made all, even the weakest countries, their debtors. They have amassed gigantic fortunes during the war. And

every dollar is stained with the blood that was shed by millions of murdered and crippled men, shed in the high, honorable and holy war of freedom.

Had the Anglo-French and American bourgeoisie accepted the Soviet invitation to participate in peace negotiations at Brest-Litovsk, instead of leaving Russia to the mercy of brutal Germany a just peace without annexations and indemnities, a peace based upon complete equality could have been forced upon Germany, and millions of lives might have been saved. Because they hoped to reestablish the Eastern Front by once more drawing us into the whirlpool of warfare, they refused to attend peace negotiations and gave Germany a free hand to cram its shameful terms down the throat of the Russian people. It lay in the power of the Allied countries to make the Brest-Litovsk negotiations the forerunner of a general peace. It ill becomes them to throw the blame for the Russo-German peace upon our shoulders!

The workers of the whole world, in whatever country they may live, rejoice with us and sympathize with us, applaud us for having burst the iron ring of imperialistic agreements and treaties, for having dreaded no sacrifice, however great, to free ourselves, for having established ourselves as a socialist republic, even so rent asunder and plundered by German imperialists, for having raised the banner of peace, the banner of Socialism over the world. What wonder that we are hated by the capitalist class the world over. But this hatred of imperialism and the sympathy of the class-conscious workers of all countries give us assurance of the righteousness of our cause.

He is no Socialist who cannot understand that one cannot and must not hesitate to bring even that greatest of sacrifice, the sacrifice of territory, that one must be ready to accept even military defeat at the hands of imperialism in the interests of victory over the bourgeoisie, in the interests of a transfer of power to the working-class. For the sake of "their" cause, that is for the conquest of world-power, the imperialists of

England and Germany have not hesitated to ruin a whole row of nations, from Belgium and Servia to Palestine and Mesopotamia. Shall we then hesitate to act in the name of the liberation of the workers of the world from the yoke of capitalism, in the name of a general honorable peace; shall we wait until we can find a way that entails no sacrifice; shall we be afraid to begin the fight until an easy victory is assured; shall we place the integrity and safety of this "fatherland" created by the bourgeoisie over the interests of the international socialist revolution?

We have been attacked for coming to terms with German militarism. Is there no difference between a pact entered upon by Socialists and a bourgeoisie (native or foreign) against the working-class, against labor, and an agreement that is made between a working-class that has overthrown its own bourgeoisie and a bourgeoisie of one side against a bourgeoisie of another nationality for the protection of the proletariat? Shall we not exploit the antagonism that exists between the various groups of the bourgeoisie. In reality every European understands this difference, and the American people, as I will presently show, have had a very similar experience in its own history. There are agreements and agreements, fagots et fagots, as the Frenchman says.

When the robber-barons of German imperialism threw their armies into defenseless, demobilized Russia in February 1918, when Russia had staked its hopes upon the international solidarity of the proletariat before the international revolution had completely ripened, I did not hesitate for a moment to come to certain agreements with French Monarchists. The French captain Sadoul, who sympathized in words with the Bolshevik while in deeds he was the faithful servant of French imperialism, brought the French officer de Lubersac to me. "I am a Monarchist. My only purpose is the overthrow of Germany," de Lubersac declared to me. "That is self understood (cela va sans dire)," I replied. But this by no means prevented me from coming to an understanding with de Lubersac con-

cerning certain services that French experts in explosives were ready to render in order to hold up the German advance by the destruction of railroad lines. This is an example of the kind of agreement that every class-conscious worker must be ready to adopt, an agreement in the interest of Socialism. We shook hands with the French Monarchists although we knew that each one of us would rather have seen the other hang. But temporarily our interests were identical. To throw back the rapacious advancing German army we made use of the equally greedy interests of their opponents, thereby serving the interests of the Russian and the international socialist revolution.

In this way we furthered the cause of the working-class of Russia and of other countries; in this way we strengthened the proletariat and weakened the bourgeoisie of the world by making use of the usual and absolutely legal practice of manoeuvring, shifting and waiting for the moment the rapidly growing proletarian revolution in the more highly developed nations had ripened.

Long ago the American people used these tactics to the advantage of its revolution. When America waged its great war of liberation against the English oppressors, it likewise entered into negotiations with other oppressors, with the French and the Spaniards who at that time owned a considerable portion of what is now the United States. In its desperate struggle for freedom the American people made "agreements" with one group of oppressors against the other for the purpose of weakening all oppressors and strengthening those who were struggling against tyranny. The American people utilized the antagonism that existed between the English and the French, at times even fighting side by side with the armies of one group of oppressors, the French and the Spanish against the others, the English. Thus it vanquished first the English and then freed itself (partly by purchase) from the dangerous proximity of the French and Spanish possessions.

The great Russian revolutionist Tchernychewski once said: Political activity is not as smooth as the pavement of the

Nevski Prospect. He is no revolutionist who would have the revolution of the proletariat only under the "condition" that it proceed smoothly and in an orderly manner, that guarantees against defeat be given beforehand, that the revolution go forward along the broad, free, straight path to victory, that there shall not be here and there the heaviest sacrifices, that we shall not have to lie in wait in besieged fortresses, shall not have to climb up along the narrowest path, the most impassible, winding, dangerous mountain roads. He is no revolutionist, he has not yet freed himself from the pendency of bourgeois intellectualism, he will fall back, again and again, into the camp of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie.

They are little more than imitators of the bourgeoisie, these gentlemen who delight in holding up to us the "chaos" of revolution, the "destruction" of industry, the unemployment, the lack of food. Can there be anything more hypocritical than such accusations from people who greeted and supported the imperialistic war and made common cause with Kerensky when he continued the war? Is not this imperialistic war the cause of all our misfortune? The revolution that was born by the war must necessarily go on through the terrible difficulties and sufferings that war created, through this heritage of destruction and reactionary mass murder. To accuse us of "destruction" of industries and "terror" is hypocrisy or clumsy pedantry, shows an incapability of understanding the most elemental fundamentals of the raging, climatic force of the class struggle, called Revolution.

In words our accusers "recognize" this kind of class struggle, in deeds they revert again and again to the middle class utopia of "class-harmony" and the mutual "interdependence" of classes upon one another. In reality the class struggle in revolutionary times has always inevitably taken on the form of civil war, and civil war is unthinkable without the worst kind of destruction, without terror and limitations of form of democracy in the interests of the war. One must be a sickly sentimentalist not to be able to see, to understand and

appreciate this necessity. Only the Tchechov type of the lifeless "Man in the Box" can denounce the Revolution for this reason instead of throwing himself into the fight with the whole vehemence and decision of his soul at a moment when history demands that the highest problems of humanity be solved by struggle and war.

The best representatives of the American proletariat—those representatives who have repeatedly given expression to their full solidarity with us, the Bolsheviks, are the expression of this revolutionary tradition in the life of the American people. This tradition originated in the war of liberation against the English in the 18th and the Civil War in the 19th century. Industry and commerce in 1870 were in a much worse position than in 1860. But where can you find an American so pendent, so absolutely idiotic who would deny the revolutionary and progressive significance of the American Civil War of 1860-1865?

The representatives of the bourgeoisie understand very well that the overthrow of slavery was well worth the three years of Civil War, the depth of destruction, devastation and terror that were its accompaniment. But these same gentlemen and the reform socialists who have allowed themselves to be cowed by the bourgeoisie and tremble at the thought of a revolution, cannot, nay will not, see the necessity and righteousness of a civil war in Russia, though it is facing a far greater task, the work of abolishing capitalist wage slavery and overthrowing the rule of the bourgeoisie.

The American working class will not follow the lead of its bourgeoisie. It will go with us against the bourgeoisie. The whole history of the American people gives me this confidence, this conviction. I recall with pride the words of one of the best loved leaders of the American proletariat, Eugene V. Debs, who said in the "Appeal to Reason" at the end of 1915, when it was still a socialist paper, in an article entitled "Why Should I Fight?" that he would rather be shot than vote for war credits to support the present criminal and reactionary war,

that he knows only one war that is sanctified and justified from the standpoint of the proletariat: the war against the capitalist class, the war for the liberation of mankind from wage slavery. I am not surprised that this fearless man was thrown into prison by the American bourgeoisie. Let them brutalize true internationalists, the real representatives of the revolutionary proletariat. The greater the bitterness and brutality they sow, the nearer is the day of the victorious proletarian revolution.

We are accused of having brought devastation upon Russia. Who is it that makes these accusations? The train-bearers of the bourgeoisie, of that same bourgeoisie that almost completely destroyed the culture of Europe, that has dragged the whole continent back to barbarism, that has brought hunger and destruction to the world. This bourgeoisie now demands that we find a different basis for our Revolution than that of destruction, that we shall not build it up upon the ruins of war, with human beings degraded and brutalized by years of warfare. O, how human, how just is this bourgeoisie!

Its servants charge us with the use of terroristic methods.—Have the English forgotten their 1649, the French their 1793? Terror was just and justified when it was employed by the bourgeoisie for its own purposes against feudal domination. But terror becomes criminal when workingmen and poverty stricken peasants dare to use it against the bourgeoisie. Terror was just and justified when it was used to put one exploiting minority in the place of another. But terror becomes horrible and criminal when it is used to abolish all exploiting minorities, when it is employed in the cause of the actual majority, in the cause of the proletariat and the semi-proletariat, of the working-class and the poor peasantry.

The bourgeoisie of international imperialism has succeeded in slaughtering 10 millions, in crippling 20 millions in its war. Should our war, the war of the oppressed and the exploited, against oppressors and exploiters cost a half or a whole million victims in all countries, the bourgeoisie would still maintain

that the victims of the world war died a righteous death, that those of the civil war were sacrificed for a criminal cause.

But the proletariat, even now, in the midst of the horrors of war, is learning the great truth that all revolutions teach, the truth that has been handed down to us by our best teachers, the founders of modern Socialism. From them we have learned that a successful revolution is inconceivable unless it breaks the resistance of the exploiting class. When the workers and the laboring peasants took hold of the powers of state, it became our duty to quell the resistance of the exploiting class. We are proud that we have done it, that we are doing it. We only regret that we did not do it, at the beginning, with sufficient firmness and decision.

We realize that the mad resistance of the bourgeoisie against the socialist revolution in all countries is unavoidable. We know too, that with the development of this revolution, this resistance will grow. But the proletariat will break down this resistance and in the course of its struggle against the bourgeoisie the proletariat will finally become ripe for victory and power.

Let the corrupt bourgeois press trumpet every mistake that is made by our Revolution out into the world. We are not afraid of our mistakes. The beginning of the revolution has not sanctified humanity. It is not to be expected that the working classes who have been exploited and forcibly held down by the clutches of want, of ignorance and degradation for centuries should conduct its revolution without mistakes. The dead body of bourgeois society cannot simply be put into a coffin and buried. It rots in our midst, poisons the air we breathe, pollutes our lives, clings to the new, the fresh, the living with a thousand threads and tendrils of old customs, of death and decay.

But for every hundred of our mistakes that are heralded into the world by the bourgeoisie and its sycophants, there are ten thousand great deeds of heroism, greater and more heroic

because they seem so simple and unpretentious, because they take place in the everyday life of the factory districts or in secluded villages, because they are the deeds of people who are not in the habit of proclaiming their every success to the world, who have no opportunity to do so.

But even if the contrary were true,—I know, of course, that this is not so—but even if we had committed 10,000 mistakes to every 100 wise and righteous deeds, yes, even then our revolution would be great and invincible. And it will go down in the history of the world as unconquerable. For the first time in the history of the world not the minority, not alone the rich and the educated, but the real masses, the huge majority of the working-class itself, are building up a new world, are deciding the most difficult questions of social organization from out of their own experience.

Every mistake that is made in this work, in this honestly conscientious cooperation of ten million plain workingmen and peasants in the re-creation of their entire lives—every such mistake is worth thousands and millions of “faultless” successes of the exploiting minority, in outwitting and taking advantage of the laboring masses. For only through these mistakes can the workers and peasants learn to organize their new existence, to get along without the capitalist class. Only thus will they be able to blaze their way, through thousands of hindrances to victorious socialism.

Mistakes are being made by our peasants who, at one stroke, in the night from October 25 to October 26, (Russian Calendar) 1917, did away with all private ownership of land, and are now struggling, from month to month, under the greatest difficulties, to correct their own mistakes, trying to solve in practice the most difficult problems of organizing a new social state, fighting against profiteers to secure the possession of the land for the worker instead of for the speculator, to carry on agricultural production under a system of communist farming on a large scale.

Mistakes are being made by our workmen in their revolu-

tionary activity, who, in a few short months, have placed practically all of the larger factories and workers under state ownership, and are now learning, from day to day, under the greatest difficulties, to conduct the management of entire industries, to reorganize industries already organized, to overcome the deadly resistance of laziness and middle-class reaction and egotism. Stone upon stone they are building the foundation for a new social community, the self-discipline of labor, the new rule of the labor organizations of the working-class over their members.

Mistakes are being made in their revolutionary activity by the Soviets which were first created in 1905 by the gigantic upheaval of the masses. The Workmen's and Peasant's Soviets are a new type of state, a new highest form of Democracy, a particular form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, a mode of conducting the business of the state without the bourgeoisie and against the bourgeoisie. For the first time democracy is placed at the service of the masses, of the workers, and ceases to be a democracy for the rich, as it is, in the last analysis, in all capitalist, yes, in all democratic republics. For the first time the masses of the people, in a nation of hundreds of millions, are fulfilling the task of realizing the dictatorship of the proletariat and the semi-proletariat, without which socialism is not to be thought of.

Let incurable pedants, crammed full of bourgeois democratic and parliamentary prejudices, shake their heads gravely over our Soviets, let them deplore the fact that we have no direct elections. These people have forgotten nothing, have learned nothing in the great upheaval of 1914-1918. The combination of the dictatorship of the proletariat with the new democracy of the proletariat, of civil war with the widest application of the masses to political problems, such a combination cannot be achieved in a day, cannot be forced into the battered forms of formal parliamentary democratism. In the Soviet Republic there arises before us a new world, the world of Socialism. Such a world cannot be materialized as if by

magic, complete in every detail, as Minerva sprang from Jupiter's head.

While the old bourgeoisie democratic constitutions, for instance, proclaimed formal equality and the right of free assemblage, the constitution of the Soviet Republic repudiates the hypocrisy of a formal equality of all human beings. When the bourgeoisie republicans overturned feudal thrones, they did not recognize the rules of formal equality of monarchists. Since we here are concerned with the task of overthrowing the bourgeoisie, only fools or traitors will insist on the formal equality of the bourgeoisie. The right of free assemblage is not worth an iota to the workman and to the peasant when all better meeting places are in the hands of the bourgeoisie. Our Soviets have taken over all usable buildings in the cities and towns out of the hands of the rich and have placed them at the disposal of the workmen and peasants for meeting and organization purposes. That is how our right of assemblage looks—for the workers. That is the meaning and content of our Soviet, of our socialist constitution.

And for this reason we are all firmly convinced that the Soviet Republic, whatever misfortune may still lie in store for it, is unconquerable.

It is unconquerable because every blow that comes from the powers of madly raging imperialism, every new attack by the international bourgeoisie will bring new, and hitherto unaffected strata of workingmen and peasants into the fight, will educate them at the cost of the greatest sacrifice, making them hard as steel, awakening a new heroism in the masses.

We know that it may take a long time before help can come from you, comrades, American Workingmen, for the development of the revolution in the different countries proceeds along various paths, with varying rapidity (how could it be otherwise!) We know fullwell that the outbreak of the European proletarian revolution may take many weeks to come, quickly as it is ripening in these days. We are counting on the

inevitability of the international revolution. But that does not mean that we count upon its coming at some definite, nearby date. We have experienced two great revolutions in our own country, that of 1905 and that of 1917, and we know that revolutions cannot come neither at a word of command nor according to prearranged plans. We know that circumstances alone have pushed us, the proletariat of Russia, forward, that we have reached this new stage in the social life of the world not because of our superiority but because of the peculiarly reactionary character of Russia. But until the outbreak of the international revolution, revolutions in individual countries may still meet with a number of serious setbacks and overthrows.

And yet we are certain that we are invincible, for if humanity will not emerge from this imperialistic massacre broken in spirit, it will triumph. Ours was the first country to break the chains of imperialistic warfare. We broke them with the greatest sacrifice, but they are broken. We stand outside of imperialistic duties and considerations, we have raised the banner of the fight for the complete overthrow of imperialism for the world.

We are in a beleaguered fortress, so long as no other international socialist revolution comes to our assistance with its armies. But these armies exist, they are stronger than ours, they grow, they strive, they become more invincible the longer imperialism with its brutalities continues. Workingmen the world over are breaking with their betrayers, with their Gompers and their Scheidemanns. Inevitably labor is approaching communistic Bolshevistic tactics, is preparing for the proletarian revolution that alone is capable of preserving culture and humanity from destruction.

We are invincible, for invincible is the Proletarian Revolution.

Bridging the Gap of State Socialism

By WILLIAM J. FIELDING

There has been discussion without end on the question of State Socialism—or State Capitalism, which is a more accurate term for what the *modus operandi* implies—and its relation to the achievement of true democratic Socialism.

The subject has been handled from every side and angle, with all varieties and shades of opposition, and of sympathetic and almost eager anticipation. Some of the discussions have been interesting, others edifying, but most of them might better not have been written, based as they are on supposition, sentimentality, lack of understanding of the scientific Marxian theory, or outright ignorance.

For our part, State Socialism, in itself, can be in no ways desirable, as it presupposes a continuation of the class struggle; in fact, it intensifies it. To the very extent of its thoroughness, to that degree would it eliminate competition among the exploiting class, which must necessarily continue as the entrenched benefactors under its operation. Therefore, it will permit—yes, demand, that the master class—the group of profiteers who control the enormous bond-holdings of the state—devote all its energies to the subjugation of the workers. And it is not difficult to see that they would have some considerable success in this undertaking, through their trained satellites. In this class of mercenaries would be included the personnel of all the mediums and institutions that form and mould so-called “public opinion;” not to mention the armed servants of the state, a possibly well-paid army and police (organized on military lines) to back up with physical persuasion, when necessary, the “moral” lessons and teachings of the chosen mouthpieces.

On the other side, the workers, while being forced by such conditions into class conscious channels of thought, would be more or less divided in many ways. As long as a profit-taking

class controls the mediums of publicity, and the educational institutions,—which will be as long as a class society exists—just so long will the workers be divided. Misunderstandings would be created, suspicions engendered, and jealousies aroused and fostered. Judases would be found to take the dirty pieces of silver for selling out trusting comrades. These things are inevitable in a class conflict. And with almost complete harmony among the masters, due to the practical elimination of competition, their control would reach a maximum of efficiency that we possibly cannot now realize.

So much for the general condition which we believe must exist under a form of “State Socialism.”

But putting aside all personal prejudices and wishes, and looking at the matter from the cold, clear light of scientific reasoning, we must accept the conclusion as inevitable, that unless the workers accept the principles of democratic socialism in sufficient numbers to bring it about, they will be drawn into the vortex of State Socialism.

Industrial evolution drives on unmistakably, unswervingly, toward State Control. The possibility of bringing this condition to a comparatively rapid termination, we shall discuss presently. Meanwhile, evolution works toward the state form of collectivity. If in any given part of the world—Russia, for instance, or some other country or countries later—the workers are sufficiently class-conscious to assume direct control of the industrial processes, that is *Revolution*. It is a manifestation of the Social Revolution, the immediate forerunner of Socialism.

To escape the evolutionary approach of State Socialism to democratic Socialism, there must necessarily be a thoroughly class-conscious proletariat, an uncompromising working class. If Russia, after the death-throes of competitive capitalism have subsided and the chaos of Europe has been reduced to a point that will permit of upbuilding, shall enter an era of democratic Socialism, or as near to it as the industrial development of the country will allow, then it will be due to a revolutionary, class-conscious proletariat. And how we do hope this result will be achieved!

Germany may be cited as the highest development of State Control with, of course, reservations, the nearest approach to "State Socialism," including many of the evils that would go with an efficiently organized society of that form.

There is in Germany the rigid, iron grip of the ruling class on the educational institutions, which tend to miseducate, and with much success, the mass of the people against their class interests. There is the constantly expanding state control of all industrial activities (even when state ownership is absent or only nominal). And there is the benevolent paternalism of the State, which through widely advertised social legislation (the modern counterpart and natural evolution of private charity in *laissez-faire* society) throws a few crumbs to the masses and grants them some protective measures, principally to better prepare them to fill their role as cogs in the industrial and military machine. It makes them better and more contented working animals.

This benevolent paternalism has, in some respects, just as vicious an effect as the mind-warping educational system. At least, it is more pitiable in that it fills the deluded worker with an overpowering gratitude for what the government is doing "for him." As a result, he is the more willing to obediently (even gladly) submit to the will of his masters at all times, with only some minor grumbling, and he will oftentimes willingly fight to the death for the perpetuation of his own servile condition, and of the state which has enchained him.

While we appreciate the danger that lies in this paternalism, bestowed on the workers by a ruling class, we recognize the fact that socialist representatives in capitalist parliamentary bodies must continue to fight for social measures and labor protection. This is not a contradiction, as in the latter case it is an intelligent *demand* by the workers for an ever increasing share of the comforts of life until they finally obtain the full social value of their labor. It is not a self-satisfied end in itself. The workers who make these demands through their political party are not, and do not intend to be, satisfied when they obtain the advantages, if any. They do not ask them as a God—or man-given privilege to be

thankful for, but as only part of their inherent rights. And they intend to increase and continue their demands, which is part of their elaborate program of emancipation, until they eventually achieve the full measure of justice that they are fighting for.

The chief distinction between the German state organization and a system of "State Socialism" as we may preconceive it, is that the former, instead of being fundamentally a capitalist government, for the benefit of the capitalist class as such, is a very highly developed feudalistic bureaucracy—Junkertum in its literal sense. The main beneficiaries are not the industrial and financial capitalists, but the hereditary ruling caste which, backed by a tremendous military machine, dominates even at the expense of the real capitalist class. In the orthodox capitalist nations, on the other hand, the government is subordinated absolutely to the interests of the capitalist class.

"State Socialism," or any other future form of collectivity that bars the ultimate essential of democratic control, can only be a highly concentrated form of state capitalism with its heartlessness partly shielded by the cloak of paternalism.

The war has pushed the belligerent governments, and many of the neutrals headlong into state control of industrial and agricultural production. This has been necessary because of the unparalleled demands of the gigantic modern military machines. They consume and destroy to an extent that hopelessly outdistances the facilities of private production, and that makes the competitive system an anachronism.

The countries that are in the midst of the war had to take over the essential industries, means of transportation, etc., almost immediately, in order to preserve the integrity of the state—that is, the political state, which functions for the interests which dominate it.

Millions of men, women and children in Europe are now working for the state, who had previously worked for private employers. They are producing on a scale that reduces to a fraction their former output. All the innovations of scientific management and super-Taylorized efficiency have been called into prac-

tice to keep the millions of soldiers supplied with food and death-dealing implements, and to furnish the other millions of non-combatants behind the lines with the necessities that the insatiable monster of modern war keeps calling for and must have.

These millions of men, women and children are laboring under different conditions, under a different form of industrial organization, than they labored under previous to August 1914. Naturally, they are thinking different thoughts from those they harbored in the days that are gone, never to return. They have experienced a psychological transformation, even though they hardly realize it themselves. What they are thinking of, no one exactly knows, as the conditions are so complicated by both the spectacular and sordid phases of the war. Furthermore, they have been unable to get together and discuss adequately the situation, present and future, that confronts them. However, efforts are being made by the Socialists to overcome this fault as far as possible.

Furthermore, news coming from Europe is so carefully filtered by censorship that we are not enlightened as to the real state of mind. And most of the news that gets through is pre-digested by various inspired interpretations, which leaves the average reader with a rather insipid morsel for reflection, were he so inclined.

England is the only country that we seem to get any authentic labor news from, and as long as some newspapers, periodicals and pamphlets come through, we cannot be kept altogether in the dark. Without looking for the millennium, or expecting the impossible, there is every reason to believe that much real progress is being made by the English labor movement, and that some sound thinking is being done by the British workers. This conclusion is drawn not only from what the working class is saying and demanding, but from the fears, expressed and implied, of the capitalists themselves.

Before the war, perhaps most of the discontented, radical workers of England were inclined to look to the State for relief from the exploitation to which they were subjected. Nearly four

years of constantly growing State control has shown them the futility of emancipation, or even of moderate improvement, from that direction.

From every side, we hear the English workers protesting against the intolerable master—the State; and they are submitting, begrudgingly, only because they believe it is a lesser will—one that they can more readily overcome—than the danger of possible German domination.

The capitalists, too, are fully alive to this unrest and antagonism on the part of the workers to the tyranny of State control, and to offset the inclination toward industrial democracy, they are trying to buck the irresistible trend of evolution by commanding the great social forces to stand still and reverse themselves. These modern economic Joshuas are as yet apparently unaware of their finite impotence in the majestic presence of evolution.

Walter Runciman, M. P., in an article entitled "The Radical Outlook" in the January issue of *The Contemporary Review*, says: "It (control of the State over industry) has overspread the industrial life of nearly every trade, and has conferred on officials powers intolerable to the Trade Unions, now hated by men who formerly called themselves State Socialists. They have had a surfeit of the State official."

All of this is perfectly true, so Runciman of the shipbuilding family throws in a few tears of sympathy, and hastens to assure the workers that he is perfectly willing (oh, that such good intent should be in vain!) to relieve the State of its unwelcome job as exploiter when the war is over.

For the other side, Arthur Henderson puts in a word. No one can accuse Henderson of being a revolutionist—in his writings he shows his utter dislike for the word—but he states in a paper, "The Outlook for Labour," with apparent conviction, in reference to the newly voiced aims of the Labour Party:

"The whole organized movement . . . can only interpret the present universal catastrophe as the final stage in the disintegration and collapse of the civilization which was founded upon the

individualist system of capitalist production and the social and political subordination of the toiling masses.

"In national affairs the party's broad aim is to secure for the producers by hand or brain the full fruits of their industry, and the most equitable distribution thereof that may be possible, upon the basis of the common ownership, of the means of distribution and the best obtainable system of popular administration and control of each industry or service.

"Our programme of reconstruction starts from the assumption that the industrial system of capitalist production has broken down. It was discredited by its results before the war; it was superseded when war came because it proved to be impossible to adapt it to national needs in time of war. But an economic system which degraded and demoralized its victims in times of peace and was found to be useless in time of war stands totally condemned. To attempt to restore it would be madness. Organized democracy does not want to restore it.

"We want to see industry organized on the *basis of democratic control*, with consequent elimination of "profiteering," whether by individual capitalists or by great interests in more or less open alliance with the state. Neither State Capitalism nor State Socialism is our object, but rather, *industrial democracy*."

This is pretty straight talk, coming from the source it does, and while there may be some trivial inconsistencies, the concluding phrase means everything. And in the last analysis it will not be Henderson, but the mass of English workers who must decide how soon they will have industrial democracy.

Harold Spender, coming to the rescue as "first aid" to capitalism, also tackles the momentous subject, and comments on the Labor Party's after-war programme (which, it is plain, he misinterprets in part) as follows:

"Broadly and roughly speaking, it is not so much a legislative programme as the sketch of a Socialist Utopia. The present control of the state over railways and mines is to be extended to every industrial function of the community. Unhappily for the Labour Party, such new tastes of State control as the country is at present enjoying are proving very bitter in the mouth.

"A recent tour through the South Wales coal fields has revealed to me that the only emotion which assuages the acute and deplorable difference between employers and employees is a growing common hatred of State control.

"The working classes are drifting even perilously away from their old ideals of State Socialism. The cry of the South Wales miners, for instance, is no longer, "*the mines for the State*," but "*the mines for the miners*."

Spender cites these instances to bring his class to a realization of the danger that confronts it, and then proceeds, to his own satisfaction, at least, to prove that somehow the calamity will be averted.

The increasing revulsion on the part of the workers to State control, seems to be the decisive factor that will bridge the gap over what would otherwise be a long arduous and painful era of "State Socialism."

There are many other examples that could be given to show, (1) that European labor, especially English, with which we are more in touch, is rapidly being disillusioned in regard to the desirability of State control, and that it will make a concentrated fight against it, or for the accompaniment of democratic management, with the termination of the war; (2) that the general idea is becoming more and more in favor of industrial democracy as the one and only solution for working class emancipation.

As for the agencies that work most effectively toward this end, all the evidence goes to show that the *class conscious spirit* is the most important, even more so than a labor movement well versed in the academics of Socialism, as desirable as this might be, and as necessary as the principles are.

The former has been the bedrock of the Russian Revolution. The theoretical foundation was always considered the strength of the German movement, and without underestimating the conditions it faced and had to contend with, we at least know that it takes something in addition to a theoretical policy to fight and win in the Class Struggle.

The spirit—class spirit—uncompromising and invincible, must be there.

In British Captivity

By LEON TROTSKY.

I consider it at this time a matter of political necessity to publish the documents bearing upon my imprisonment by the British for the period of one month. The bourgeois press—the same press which has been spreading defamatory statements of the worst black-hundred type against political emigrants who were forced to return to Russia by way of Germany—appeared to be deaf and dumb the moment it came in contact with the lawless attack by England upon the Russian emigrants who were returning home by way of the Atlantic ocean. The servile Social-patriotic, now the ministerial press is not acting more decently, and this press has no urgent motives to explain the ticklish circumstances why the brand new Socialist ministers who are at this time still professing to be so highly respectful to the emigrants, their “teachers,” are in fact the nearest and most immediate allies of Lloyd George, who is grabbing by the collars those same “teachers” upon the great Atlantic highway. In this tragicomical episode is revealed with sufficient convincingness the relation of England’s ruling class towards the Russian revolution, as well as the general meaning of the sacred alliance into whose service citizens Tseretelli, Tchernoff and Skobeleff have entered.

For whatever assertions may be made by the left ministerial groups and parties, the ministerial socialists are fully responsible for the government of which they appear to be a part. The government of Lvov-Tereshtchenko is in alliance not with the English revolutionary socialists, MacLean, Askew and others, whom the ruling imperialists of England are keeping in prisons, but with their jailers Lloyd George and Henderson.

The first two years of the war I spent in France. There I had the opportunity of closely observing the experiment of

socialists in the ministry during the epoch of the “liberating” war. Guesde and Sembat, of course, justified their acts by alleging the unprecedented nature of the circumstances which compelled them to enter the war cabinet: the fatherland was in danger, the Germans were at the gates of Paris, general devastation, the necessity of defending the republic and the traditions of the revolution, in short, they have advanced the same arguments which are now being used in a more naive form by Tseretelli and Tchernoff in order to prove that their ministerialism is distinguishable from that of Guesde and Sembat as is heaven from earth.

With the kind participation of the French “comrade” ministers I was expelled from France for my work on the daily Russian international paper “Nashe Slovo” (Our Word) and for taking part in the “Zimmerwald” movement. The Swiss government, in obedience to the order of the Czar’s diplomats, refused to admit me. French gendarmes, who have donned civilian clothes—to keep up the honor of the republic—have taken me to the Spanish frontier. Three days later the Prefect of Paris, Lorane, telegraphed to the police of Madrid about the dangerous agitator who had crossed the Spanish frontier. The Spanish guardians of peace could think of nothing better than to arrest me. Having freed me, after an inquiry in Parliament from their “model” prison at Madrid, the Spanish government escorted me under convoy to the extreme southwest of the Iberian peninsula, Cadiz. From here the officials wanted to send me immediately to Havana, and it was after I threatened to resist and after the intervention by Spanish socialists and republicans, that I was permitted to leave with my family for New York.

After a stay of two months, we got the news of the Russian revolution. A group of Russian exiles, among them the writer of these lines, made an attempt to start for Russia on the first steamer. But the Russian Socialist proposes and Lloyd George disposes. At Halifax the English officers took us off and interned us in a camp for war prisoners. Regarding

the circumstances of this arrest and the conditions of our confinement, see the letter addressed to the Russian Minister for Foreign Affairs, printed herein below. This letter I wrote on a Danish steamer after my release from British captivity, intending it for Mr. Milukoff. But the leader of the Cadet party fell beneath the burden of his loyalty to the London Stock Exchange before the Finnish train brought us to Beloostrov. Mr. Tereshtchenko with his colleagues, however, had taken over in full the heritage of Mr. Milukoff, just as the latter took over in its entirety the heritage of the Czar's diplomacy. Therefore, I am fully justified in addressing to Mr. Tereshtchenko the letter which was intended for Mr. Milukoff.

The original of this letter was forwarded to him through the medium of the chairman of the Petrograd Council of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, H. S. Cheidze.

I wish to say a few words about the German war prisoners with whom I have spent a month. There were 800 of them; about 500 sailors from German Naval vessels sunk by the British; about 200 workingmen who were caught in Canada when the war broke out, and about 100 officers and civilian prisoners coming from bourgeois circles. Our relations took shape from the first day, or more correctly, from the moment the bulk of the war prisoners found that we were arrested as revolutionary socialists. The officers and non-commissioned Naval officers who had separate quarters, at once beheld in us their hated enemies.

The rank and file, however, surrounded us with a tight ring of sympathy. This month's life in the camp resembled one continuous meeting. We told the prisoners about the Russian revolution, about the causes of the breaking up of the second International, of the groupings within socialism. . . The relations between the democratic rank and file and the officers, some of whom kept tabs on their sailors, became very acute. The German officers finally addressed to the Commandant of the camp, Colonel Morris, a complaint against our anti-patriotic propaganda. The British Colonel, of course, imme-

diately sided with Hohenzollern patriotism and prohibited my further public appearances. This, however, occurred during the last days of our stay in the camp, and made our relations with the German sailors and workingmen more intimate who replied to the Colonel's prohibition with a protest bearing 530 signatures.

When they were taking us away from the camp, the prisoners gave us a send-off which will always remain in our memory. The officers and non-commissioned officers, in general a patriotic minority, locked themselves in their quarters; but "our" internationalists stood in two lines along the entire camp, the orchestra played the socialist march, and hands were stretched out to us from all sides. . . . One of the prisoners delivered a speech in which he expressed his delight with the Russian revolution, emitted a sincere curse against the German government, and asked us to give his fraternal greeting to the Russian Proletariat. That's the way we fraternized with the German sailors at Amherst. It is true at that time we didn't know yet that Prince Lvov's own Zimmerwaldists, Tseretellis and Tchernoffs looked upon fraternizing as contradicting the fundamentals of International Socialism. In this they agree with the Hohenzollern government, which has also forbidden fraternizing with a less hypocritical reasoning, however.

It is superfluous to say that the American-Canadian press has explained our imprisonment as being due to Germanism. Our own fatherland's yellow Cadet papers have taken of course, the same road.

This charge of Pro-Germanism I had occasion to hear during the War, not for the first time. When the French chauvinists were preparing for my exile from France, they spread a rumor about my Pro-German tendencies, but the same French press informed its readers before that of having sentenced me in Germany to imprisonment for the German pamphlet, "Der Krieg und die Internationale," which was directed against German imperialism and against the policy of the official ma-

jority of the German social democracy. Having been published in Zurich at the beginning of the War, this pamphlet was smuggled by Swiss Socialists into Germany and there it was spread by the same socialists of the left wing, the friends of Liebknecht, whom the German yellow press has been hounding as the agents of the Czar and of the London Stock Exchange. In the denunciations of us by Milukoff and his Hessians, there was nothing original. They were literal translations from the German language. Sir Buchanan, the English Ambassador at Petrograd, went further. He directly stated in his letter intended for the press that we were returning to Russia with a plan subsidized by the German Government to overthrow the Provisional Government. In "informed" circles, as we are told, even the amount of the subsidy was named in round figures, 10,000 marks. It seems that the German government must have appraised at this modest sum the stability of Guchkoff-Milukoff's government.

English diplomacy, generally speaking, is not devoid either of carefulness, nor of a decorous surface gentlemanliness. But the assertion made by the British Ambassador that we were subsidized by Germany is obviously devoid of both said qualities; it is both ungentlemanly and stupid. This is explained by the fact that British politicians and diplomats possess two kinds of manners: one kind for "civilized countries"; the other kind—for the colonies. Sir Buchanan, who was the best friend of the Czar's monarchy and has now transferred himself to the friends of the republic, feels just the same way in Russia, as in India and in Egypt, and therefore does not find it necessary to be discreet. British officers consider they have the right to take Russian citizens off neutral steamers and imprison them in camps for war prisoners; the British Ambassador thinks it possible to hurl outrageous defamations against active Russian revolutionaries. It is about time to put an end to this. And the object of this pamphlet is to help to accelerate the moment when democratic Russia will say to Mr. Buchanan and his masters: "Please take your feet off the table."

To the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

Dear Sir:—

In this letter I have the honor to direct your attention to a wholly irresponsible, piratical attack, to which I was subjected together with my family and several Russian citizens, on the part of agents of the British government, which is as far as it is known, an ally of that government of which you are the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

On the 25th of March, relying upon the amnesty published by your government, I appeared at the General Consulate in New York, from which by that time they had removed the portrait of Nicholas the Second, but where the atmosphere of the old regime of a Russian Police Station was still retained. After unavoidable discussions the Consul-General decided to issue to me a document to be used for admission to Russia. At the British Consulate in New York, where I had to fill out some blanks, I was told that the British authorities would put no obstacle in the way of my return to Russia. From the office of the British Consulate, in the presence of one of its officials, I have telephoned to the Russian Consulate which assured me that I had complied with all formalities and could make my journey without any difficulties.

On the 27th of March, with my family I sailed on the Norwegian Steamer Christianiafjord. At Halifax (Canada) where the steamer was undergoing an inspection by the British naval authorities, the police officers, who looked through the papers of Americans, Norwegians, Danes, etc., with only perfunctory formality, subjected us Russians to a direct examination, in the style of old Russian gendarmes, regarding our convictions, political plans, etc. In conformity with good old Russian tradition, I declined to enter into any conversation with them about such matters, having explained to them that I was ready to give them all necessary information establishing my identity, but that my relations to internal Russian politics were not at present under the control of British naval po-

lice. But this did not prevent the investigating officers McCann and Westwood from gathering information about us among other passengers, for instance, from Mr. Fundaminsky, these officers insisting at the same time that I was a "terrible socialist." The entire investigation generally was of such undignified nature and put the former Russian emigrants in such an exceptional position as compared with other passengers who did not have the misfortune to belong to a nation allied with England, that some of us deemed it their duty to enter, through the ship's captain, an energetic protest to the British authorities against the conduct of their police agents. At that time we had not foreseen the further development of events. On April 3rd, British officers appeared on board the *Christianiafjord*, accompanied by armed sailors, who demanded in the name of the local admiral, that I, my family and five other passengers, Messrs. Tchudnovsky, Melnitchansky, Frisheleff, Muchin and Romantchenko, leave the steamer. When asked as to the causes of this demand, they promised to "explain" the entire incident at Halifax.

The British authorities, according to the admission of their own officers had not the slightest doubts about my identity nor of the identity of the others whom they detained. It was clear, that we were detained as socialists, imaginary or real ones, that is, as opponents to war. We declared the demand to leave the steamer to be illegal, and refused to comply. Then the armed sailors, with the cry of "shame" from a considerable portion of the passengers, carried us down to a military cutter which, convoyed by a cruiser, brought us to Halifax. When the sailors were carrying me in their arms, my older boy ran to my rescue and cried: "Shall I hit him, father?" He is 11 years old, Mr. Minister, and I think, he will retain for the rest of his life a clear idea of some of the peculiarities of the dominant British democracy and of the British-Russian alliance. At Halifax not only was nothing "explained" to us, but they even refused to call the local Russian Consul, assuring us that there was a Russian Consul at the place to which we were

brought. This assurance proved to be false as well as all the other assurances of the British secret police, who in their methods and morals stand entirely on the same level as the old Russian "Okhrana." Indeed, they brought us by rail to Amherst, a camp for German prisoners. Here we were subjected to a search such as I did not have to go through even in my confinement in the fortress of Peter and Paul. For the stripping and feeling of our bodies by gendarmes was done at the fortress in private, with no one else present, but here, our democratic allies subjected us to this impudent horseplay in the presence of a dozen men. And those commanding scoundrels who were in charge of this procedure, well knew that we were Russian socialists who are returning to their country that was set free by revolution. Only the following morning did the commandant of the camp, Colonel Morris, tell us officially that the cause of our arrest was "that we were dangerous to the present Russian government." And upon calling his attention to the fact that the agents of the Russian Provisional government had issued to us passports to go to Russia and that this matter should be left to the Russian government, Colonel Morris replied, that "we were dangerous to the allies in general." They never handed us any written documents about our detention. The Colonel added a personal remark that, as political emigrants, who had been obliged to leave their own country for some reason, we should not be surprised at what was happening to us now. The Russian revolution did not exist for this man. We tried to explain to him that the Czar's ministers, who made political emigrants of us, were themselves in prison now, but this was too complex for the commandant, who had made his career in the British colonies and in the Boer War. For characterizing this worthy representative of ruling Britain it is sufficient to state, that one of his favorite expressions addressed to disobedient or disrespectful prisoners was: "If I only had you on the South African coast". . . . If it can be said that style is the man, then it can be said that this style—that is, this system, is the British colonial system. . . . For Colonel Morris we were political

emigrants, rebels against legal authorities and therefore a camp for war prisoners was the most natural place for us to live in.

On April 5th we made an attempt to wire to the Russian government. Our telegrams were not passed. During the entire period of a month's captivity by the British, the Halifax authorities systematically refused us the right to communicate with the Russian ministers. We made an attempt to complain of this prohibition to the British Prime Minister. But this telegram was also refused to pass. We then thought with gratitude of the Czar's prisons, at least, complaints against prison officials were not held up by such officials. All they allowed us to do was to communicate with the Russian Consul-General at Montreal, Mr. Lichatchoff. We received a reply from Mr. Lichatchoff that he had already telegraphed to the Russian Ambassador in London and that he was doing all he could. All our further attempts to communicate with the Consul were unsuccessful. Not one of the telegrams was allowed to pass. The British-Canadian authorities used every means to cut us off from the Russian government and its agents. More than that: When the camp's commandant was about to permit me to see my wife he imposed the impossible condition that I should deliver no messages through her to the Russian Consul. I refused to see my wife under those conditions. This was two days before they put us on the steamer. In this way the British authorities thought it necessary to conceal the facts even from the local agents of the Consular service.

What Mr. Lichatchoff really did is unknown to us. At any rate, he did not take the trouble to call on us at the camp to see with his own eyes how the British government was treating Russian citizens.

The military camp of Amherst is located in an old building of a foundry. The bunks for sleeping are put up in three tiers, and two rows deep on each side. Under these conditions there lived 800 men.

You can imagine, Mr. Minister, the atmosphere in this sleeping place at night. Among the prisoners, in spite of the heroic efforts they made for their physical and moral self-preservation, there were five insane men. We slept and ate in the same room with those insane men, Mr. Minister. There is no doubt that if the Russian Consul had made the slightest effort, he could have obtained for us, at least, less revolting conditions during our confinement, until the decision of our fate.

But Russian consuls have been brought up to feel the deepest contempt for the dignity of Russian citizens who did not belong to the ruling class, and only hatred for political emigrants. They have stricken out from their envelopes the word "Imperial," and believed with this to have exhausted their obligations towards the Russian revolution.

The exact time the British authorities made up their minds to liberate us is unknown to us. At any rate, they held us over without the slightest change in our condition for about ten days after Captain McCann, who had charge of our case, told my wife that we were "free," but they were waiting for the proper steamer for us. Colonel Morris, the same one, who made his career in the Boer war and in suppressing Hindu rebellions, until the very last moment, i. e. to April 29th, talked to us as criminals. We were never told, either that we should be freed, or whither we were to be sent. We were simply "ordered" to pack up our belongings and to start, under convoy, to Halifax. We demanded to know whither, and why we were sent away. They refused to give us any information. We demanded that they communicate with the nearest Russian consul. They again refused. You will admit, Mr. Minister, that we had sufficient grounds for distrusting the good intentions of the masters of the ocean highway. We declared categorically that we should not go voluntarily until they told us the object of our removal. The escorting soldiers carried out our baggage. And only when they were confronted with the task of carrying us out on their arms as they had had to do from the steamer the month before, did the commandant call one of us

into his office and, with his usual Anglo-African style, told him, that we were to be put on a Danish steamer to be sent to Russia. From this you will see, Mr. Minister, how our allies "liberated" us after a month's confinement.

If England seized us as political emigrants (a lot of political refugees, as Colonel Morris expressed himself) then there was even no apparent sign of "criminality" as to one of our number. Konstantin Alexandrowitch Romantchenko came from Tchernigoff to New York with perfectly legal papers, was never engaged in political agitation and belonged to no party. He was returning home with a passport issued to him by a Czarist governor. This did not hinder the British authorities from arresting Mr. Romantchenko together with us, and keeping him for a month in confinement, obviously as a result of a false denunciation, or simply as the result of an error; it is quite difficult for Englishmen to decipher Russian names, and to trouble themselves with a more careful treatment of Russian citizens these gentlemen have not learned as yet.

More emphatically was this shown in the treatment of my family by the British officials. Notwithstanding the fact that my wife was never a political emigrant, that she left Russia upon a legal passport, that she has never appeared abroad upon the political arena, she also was arrested with my two boys, 11 and 9 years of age, respectively. The term "arresting" applied to my boys, is not merely a figure of speech. At first the authorities tried to separate the boys from their mother by placing them in an asylum. But as a result of a determined protest on my wife's part, the boys were placed together with their mother in the house of a British-Russian police agent, Horowitz, who, fearing the "illegal" sending of letters or telegrams, would not let the children out on the street, even without their mother, except under a strict watch. And only after eleven days after their arrest, were my wife and children removed to a hotel and compelled to report daily to the police. They were also put on the steamer Hellig Olav together with us, without first consulting either my wife or

myself as to whether we thought such a journey sufficiently safe for the lives of our children in view of the changed conditions created during our imprisonment by the entry of the United States into the war with Germany. Captain McCann, or his admiral, did not hesitate, without our knowledge or consent, to dispose of our fate and of the fate of our children, after they saw themselves compelled to free us from the "allied" noose. In reply to my question as to the real and formal grounds of the piratical attack upon me, my family and my fellow passengers, he said with that frankness so common among secret service men, that he himself was only an executive officer, and that he acted upon orders from London, and that I was exaggerating things in general: "Now in this time of a world war, when whole countries were being crushed, when Belgians," etc., etc., the style is the system, Mr. Minister. I could only point out to the unselfish defender of weak nations, that if some one had grabbed him by the throat and pulled out his purse, and would have justified his act with the unhappy fate of Belgium this would hardly be a satisfactory solution of the incident.

Meanwhile the question which was not answered by the secret service captain, remains in full force: Who arrested us, and on what grounds? That the general order to detain those Russian citizens who happened to hold views not acceptable to the British Government really emanated from the British Government, is without any doubt, for Mr. Lloyd George could not miss the happily offered opportunity, to reveal, at last, that titanic energy, in the name of which he came to power. There is one more question, namely, who pointed us out to the British-Canadian authorities as persons who should be detained? Who furnished Halifax in the short space of three or four days the information as to our views. A line of circumstances points to the fact that this allied service was rendered by the renovated Russian consulate, the same consulate which had removed Nicholas' portrait from its reception room and has stricken the word "Imperial" from its title.

Handing out to us with one hand the papers entitling us to a safe conduct to Russia and demonstrating thereby its loyalty towards the amnesty which to them appeared so unreliable, the consulate could with its other hand furnish its secret information to the British authorities, hoping that its activity in this direction would prove to be at any rate more reliable.

Whether or not this supposition is correct, to verify this, you, Mr. Minister, at the present time are possessed of better facilities than I am. But, apart from its correctness, apart from the entire mysteriousness of this matter, the fact remains in all its force, that British authorities, on a neutral vessel, arrested seven Russian citizens and two children, who were on their way to Russia with documents issued by the Russian consulate, kept these Russian citizens for a month under conditions which could not be termed as other than shameful, and "liberated" them from captivity under conditions which cannot be called anything but a mockery of those whom they released, and of the government at whose request they were freed. These facts are undeniable. And there is left to me, without going into the region of general political considerations and, therefore, without going beyond my official communication to you, to formulate the following queries:

Don't you, Mr. Minister, consider it necessary, to take immediate steps to make the British government and its agents in the future treat the elementary rights of Russian citizens who appear to get into the zone threatened by English authorities, if not with respect, then, at least, with care?

Don't you consider it necessary to accomplish the following: (a) To cause the British government to apologize to the sufferers for the lawlessness and indignities perpetrated upon them; (b) to insist upon the punishment of the agents of the British government who are guilty of those indignities irrespective of the offices they hold; (c) to obtain from the British government compensation for damages sustained by us by reason of loss and theft of property belonging to us, during the

searches and transportation, and for our unlawful arrest for the period of one month?

Upon my arrival in Petrograd I acquainted myself with the official communication of the British Ambassador regarding our arrest at Halifax. Mr. Buchanan stated that we, who were detained, were going in pursuance of a plan, fully arranged and subsidized by the German government, to overthrow the Provisional Government (as it was at first constituted).

This information about money received by me from the German Government caps the climax of the conduct of the British Government towards Russian emigrants, a conduct made up of violence, sneaking falsehood and cynical slander. Do you consider it, Mr. Minister, as perfectly proper that England should be represented by a person who has stained himself with such shameless denunciation, and who has not moved a finger to rehabilitate himself?

Expecting your reply, I have the honor to remain,

Very respectfully yours,

L. TROTSKY.

A Finnish Document

By Z. HÖGLUND (Stockholm)

The Finnish Social-Democrats recently held a congress at Moscow, in which the program and guiding lines of the party were revised in a Bolshevik direction and the name of the party also was changed. It is now called, as are also the Bolsheviks, the *Communist Party*, for they do not wish to be called Social-Democrats after this name has been so disgraced by the treason of the Majority Socialists in all countries to the cause of the proletariat in the war. As in 1848, when the name of Socialist had been similarly compromised by all sorts of dubious characters, Marx and Engels began using the word *Communist*, so these men now prefer the word *Communist* also.

The thus reconstituted Finnish Communist Party sent an open letter to Lenin, which is a document of the very first importance, not only for us revolutionary socialists, but for all workers, for they may learn much from the experience of the Finnish revolution as described in it, and may thus be better equipped for their own struggle. Not a little could be learned by such socialists of the right as the merry revolution-killer, Gustav Möller, who seeks support in the destinies of the Finnish Revolution for his childlike faith in the method of "democratic penetration" toward socialism, as opposed to that of the Social Revolution, a pleasant and amusing reminder of the happy days of revisionism twenty years ago. For him it must be of particular interest to learn that the men who stood at the head of the Finnish Revolution, far from accepting the teachings of the right and approaching an attitude of reformism, have, on the contrary, after a mature testing of all the teachings of the revolution, assumed an outright and open advocacy of the left, in favor of Bolshevik Communism.

The letter has been printed in full in "Politiken"* and is

* Organ of the Left Wing Socialists of Sweden.

also to be issued in pamphlet form; we therefore limit ourselves here to presenting only its main points.

Our Finnish comrades assert that it was a historical mistake not to place political power in the hands of the organized workers as early as November (1917), as Lenin advised at the time. The situation then was in fact much more favorable than it has become since. The mistake lay, however, in the fact that the Social-Democratic Party had not prepared itself for such an eventuality. The party, following the German model, had become suited for a peaceable class struggle through parliamentarism and the labor organizations, and socialism figured only as an adornment of their program, which was directed rather toward avoiding the proletarian revolution than toward a preparation and acceleration of this great historical task of the working class. They did not believe in the possibilities of a revolution, and did not wish to expose their organizations and the gains acquired by the democratic method to the danger of destruction. Therefore, action in November was limited to a general strike demonstration. To be sure, when the provocations of the bourgeoisie increased, the Social-Democracy did begin to prepare itself for self-defense. "But," as the letter says, "it was done without energy, zeal or thoroughness. We were not preparing for a battle that was the realization of our hopes, but for a battle that we had been glad to avoid hitherto."

And when the inevitable revolution came, its leading men sought rather to restrain than to further the spontaneous revolutionary tendencies toward a dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism. They were still living in democratic illusions and therefore hesitated to introduce the class domination of the workers and to proceed at once to destroy the bourgeois state. The consequence was a certain inconsistency and half-heartedness in the revolutionary struggle, which might have become very dangerous if the movement had not been crushed by German imperialism. In this connection the letter condemns the former standpoint of the Finnish Social-Democracy in the question of Finland's independence, which it had so ardently advocated and

finally caused the Bolshevik Government to recognize. Finland's bourgeoisie sold this independence to German Imperialism at the price of the blood of the Finnish proletariat, but by this act it tore out social-patriotism by the roots from the minds of the Finnish Social-Democrats.

Their own hard experiences, as well as those of the Russian proletariat, and the writings of Lenin, according to the authors, have made revolutionary socialism stand out in a clear light before them. In enthusiastic and eloquent words, they describe the tremendous impression made upon them, particularly by the course of the Russian Revolution: "Amid the fragments of the exploiting bourgeois state there is growing a noble flower, so fair, that we could not even have dreamt of it before: we have seen struggling Russia, in its sufferings, produce and give birth to the fairest dream of the proletariat for thousands of years, namely, *Socialism*. Now we understand that this dream cannot be made real in any other way, that it can never arise from the corrupt swamp of Democracy, as we in Finland believed it might, but only from the actuality of devastation, danger, suffering and conflict." The new society must be formed through a proletarian dictatorship. And the mere fact that the Russian Soviet Republic has stood firm for a full year is in itself a striking indication of how completely the capitalistic world has already matured in the direction of the socialistic revolution—of *Communism*.

The letter furthermore expresses the confidence that the great sacrifice which the struggle has required from the working class of Finland, particularly because of the unparalleled, bestial orgies of revenge practised by the bourgeoisie, have not been in vain, but will redound to the advantage of the international agitation. The Finnish proletariat will arise again. Like torches of light the winged thoughts of communism shall illuminate the blackest night of oppression. It will loosen the chains of doubt and put the hard steel of a certainty of victory into the ejected spirits of the fighters. The day when the call shall resound to all the ends of the earth: "Arise for the last contest!", when the international red army marches into battle, that day shall also

see the Finnish proletariat serry its ranks and rush forward for retribution and victory.

It will be admitted that this letter is a manfully open and honest self-criticism, an arraignment of the political standpoint assumed by its authors in the period preceding the Finnish Revolution. They do not hesitate,—in the interest of the truth and of the proletariat—to recognize errors they made then, and weaknesses, but what is most remarkable is that according to their criticism, the Finnish Revolution, far from erring in the direction of being a "crime against democracy," as the socialists of the right term it in this country, was, on the contrary, far too deeply involved in democratic ideology when it should have been resolutely raising the banner of the dictatorship of the proletarian class. It is, therefore, possible, even probable, that a pursuing of purely Bolshevik tactics would have considerably strengthened the Finnish proletariat in its struggle. For all of us who understand the insufficiency of democracy to assure a victorious issue of the class struggle, who know that the social revolution will not be brought about through parliamentary decisions, the letter addressed by the Finnish comrades to Lenin is a document worthy of the most careful attention, since it expresses wisdom actually acquired through life.

The Awakening of Austria

VICTOR ADLER'S Last Speech

(Delivered in the Austrian Parliament, October 4, 1918.)

The debate which we are conducting cannot be viewed in the proper light unless we always keep in mind the background on which it is based. The people of all the states and territories, without distinction, are exhausted and starved, and have but one thought, "Let us stop! We have had enough."

I am not of the opinion that it is a wise thing to make political considerations depend on the war map. But it seems that the political leaders, of other nationalities, are addicted to the same error that those of the German nation have these five years been making, the error of jingoism at the time when the war map looks to be in their favor. Even from a purely selfish point of view it is not wise to permit a given moment to be decisive with respect to our sentiments, and thereupon to make our political attitude an outgrowth of these sentiments. There have been times when the Slav gentlemen were in a different mood, and the Germans too. Neither the hysteria of invincibility nor of despair is the way to arrive at a sane, clear political course. The gentlemen of the German National Association can not take offense if we recall only with bitterness, the time when they led the people of Vienna to the monument of the Teutonic Knights and entered the war with joy and ecstasy, when the song of Prince Eugene alternated with the Austrian national hymn, whereas we who kept our heads were regarded as guilty of high treason; and if the gentlemen had had their way, we would have been treated the same as the Bosnians, the Italians, the Ruthenians, the Poles, the Czechs, the way all the world was treated. They did not scare us. We stuck to our guns.

Neither do we now hang our flag at half-mast or become broken in spirit. It merely serves to revive the memory of the

old song which we used to sing in the 90's, beginning with the words: "The state is in danger, it never was anywhere else," and ending with the line: "To h— — with all the states; the people will survive anyway." To-day that is perhaps a very great consolation to some, but the knowledge that it is so has made it possible for us to bear our lot in this Austria of ours. It does not require any skill today, to speak disrespectfully of Austria. It goes against my grain to do so just at this particular time when it is open and evident that the bankruptcy of this old state is a fact.

It is not my place to moralize just now. We can readily understand the bitterness that emanates from the speeches, but it is our duty in this solemn hour to restrain bitter sentiments, and to ask: What is to be done? You can readily appreciate that I do not intend to propose to you to rally around the black-yellow flag, forget all our differences, etc., etc. That was what the war was to have accomplished. First it was to be a cure to harden us, then it was to be a fountain of youth. The outside world was to be deluded into believing that in the first years of the war the peoples had discovered their common destiny and the old Austria was being regenerated by war. We were not even permitted to laugh audibly for in place of sarcastic laughter there was to be found a blank space.

We knew that it was otherwise. It would have doubtless been one of the worst consequences of the war if it had led to the preservation of the old Austria-Hungary, it would have meant a world-historical calamity. We knew: neither victory nor defeat can bring this about. The old Austria is gone. But what we are concerned with first of all, what everyone of us must recognize as his task, our opponents included, is this: First and foremost the path to peace must be sought. That is the most important thing that all the nationalities without distinction expect from us. Not a peace at any price; that is to say, not a peace in any form, i. e. a peace without any future. We want to let the past rest in peace, but we want to get away from the present. Now that is naturally more than

a mere question of foreign policy. For to Austria foreign policy has become a question of internal policy, and the internal policy is to a very considerable degree external. They are no longer separable quantities. Austria as it is constituted today, cannot get peace. And even if the fortunes of war should change once again, even under cover of the German bayonets, we cannot live any longer the way we have been living. Unfortunately there are still people who imagine such a thing possible, who only become accessible to reason as far as they are forced from day to day, and who are subject to relapse. But even if the fortunes of war should change once more, the old Austria could not be saved. The disintegration, or rather, the revelation of the disintegration, that has transpired, does not date from the military defeats, which the Central powers have met with recently in the war, not even from the disastrous Piave adventure, with all its consequences. It was inherent in the nation, and this war has only made manifest what has long been the fact—the real inner life of this Austria. Therefore if we want peace, we must first be prepared to confess: That the old Austria cannot get us peace.

The whole world knows that; it cannot be confiscated and cannot be edited out of existence. If we wish to make it possible to secure peace, to secure a peace concluded with us and not a peace of which we are a passive object, we must transform ourselves into a condition of fitness for negotiation. This is the purpose of our motion. A few days ago, we heard a very finely chiseled speech of the prime minister. How good that would have sounded ten years ago, and how useful it would have been then. Perhaps even four years ago, even one year ago. But that we should hear such a speech just at the moment when it can no longer appear the product of a disinterested judgment of things, but as a product of fear, makes it somewhat less effective, or rather, gives it a different effect than was intended.

That the Austrian government is gradually beginning to consider ways and means of giving autonomy to the national-

ities as well as other beautiful things, is real nice, but it comes rather at the eleventh hour. We cannot find fault with people for saying "too late"!

History has already made it an anachronism. This war is verily a melting pot of history. The changes are so rapid that we do not know if a reference made today will have any meaning tomorrow or any foundation in fact, unless we adhere to principles. The prime minister has told us as a matter of course that the situation brought about by the Bulgarian "occurrence" is indeed serious, but surely not critical. The period of crisis comprised a fleeting moment, but it has passed. Nothing is critical now any more, it has been decided. Whoever is in touch with the masses, knows that among the people of every nationality there is not that same feeling of indignation as was the case when Italy entered the *melée*, which act was branded as treachery. The sentiment that animates the masses today, in connection with the Bulgarian occurrence, is not indignation over an act of betrayal, but rather is envy. The Bulgarians are out of it—that is how people feel about it.

How are we now to get peace? Austria is ready for peace, we Social-democrats fully recognized that from the time of the first utterances of Count Czernin. Furthermore, we consider that the political course pursued by Austria rendered a service by exerting a moderating influence on Berlin. But no one can exert an influence greater than his force and power and if our Czernins and their successors can claim any mitigating circumstances, they would lie in the fact that we cannot extract more influence and power from Austria that it contains. Naturally it is an aggravating circumstance, but in spite of this the peace efforts, which have again been repeatedly emanating from Austria of late, should be accorded recognition, even though we must add that this is a minimum of atonement and penance in view of the fact that those same elements that are to-day writing peace notes, flung out the lighted torch in the year 1914. The pens which at that time wrote the first declaration of war are tainted by the guilt of

blood; awful and immeasurable is the guilt that taints those who wrote the Serbian note, which was hailed as a "salvation." At last! a real word well spoken, it was said. And not only by Christian—Conservative groups, but by nearly all the liberals, in fact by the whole Bourgeoisie. And the more capitalistic, the more pot-bellied they were, the more they figured: War, that will be good business.

And they may not have been entirely mistaken, even though we cannot judge the day before evening, and do not know what the things are worth that they have gathered in, through the accelerated bank-note activity (laughter). Even here—no recriminations! But it is impossible to speak without thinking of the year 1914 without hoping that the day will arrive—and it is steadily approaching when we can settle accounts with all those who held the reins of government in their hands, and with open eyes, in joy and even ecstasy, drove the people into this awful sea of blood, who led an entire generation of the humanity of Europe to the field of slaughter. What do we look like to-day physically, all layers and classes except for a few foot pads? We do not know how many generations it will take to make good the damage. It is no consolation to us to know that our opponents are no better off than ourselves. That a great noble people like the French have been so ruined, so exsanguinated by this Moloch, must make the heart of everyone bleed who knows what the French nation is.

The thing must end. How? In Germany necessity has made strange bed fellows. The most remarkable event, if we except the Russian Revolution, is the formation in Germany of a ministry with a prince at the head, but with the admixture of a half dozen Social Democrats. The German Social Democrats, in doing this, have made an enormous sacrifice. They had no desire to enter the ministry, but believed it their duty to assist to swing the rudder in a different direction, so that in the moment of distress they might steer in the direction

of sanity, justice, and peace. This is a clear sign of democratization in Germany.

What is taking place there is not to be compared with the childish experiments that have been tried in Austria for a year or more to create coalition and combination ministries, in which people of different parties participate, without ever being asked whether they wish to do so. They are merely to be in the same ministry in order to sign their names together to the laws and ordinances. In Germany they have passed beyond this stage of child's play. When we, in this country, have spoken of Germany, of the German people and German politics in a spirit of presumption and conceit, it is an extravagance for which we may make allowance in such excited times. The German people are not beyond the range of such attacks, but in this case they simply do not strike home. But it is a misfortune that people should take advantage of the first opportunity to commit wrong themselves. The more their feelings were hurt by Prussian conceit, and by the tone of those here at home, who believed in carrying through everything with the aid of Prussian bayonets, the more they should realize how improper and harmful it is to perpetuate this same sort of conduct. We cannot make progress in this way.

Neither can we get anywhere by making charges of high treason. Some of the gentlemen of the German National Association have given this matter much attention. But Mommson has said: "History knows no high treason."

All forms of treason are to be despised, save only high treason. For that is a thing which is done not in the interest of the individual himself, it is the revolt of a person or people in obedience to their conviction. It must not be made a profession by anyone. And if none can make a living out of treason, it is still more difficult to do so out of the treason of others. Yet this was attempted here for a long period. Simply to make capital out of the fact that others are bad Austrians does not qualify anyone to lead Austria or to do construc-

tive work. That unfortunately, has been a great mistake in German political policy, that has caused much of the bitterness which we now feel. Just consider that the charge of high treason is supported in word and deed by the gallows, by court martial, and by reactionary tribunals, which extend over all of Austria, and you will judge more mildly, the things that you hear. And in the end, we submit to such a condition only because everyone feels instinctively that the manifestations of to-day represent not alone the convictions of other people, but the guilt of those who have ruled in Austria and still rule. Austria must become a different country.

But how are we to get peace? Count Burian in his note invites consultation. Such an exchange would be very useful. That it has been rejected by the Entente in the first place doesn't prove anything and the objection that we are opposed to secret diplomacy is no objection because nothing is to be settled in that way. However the proposal has been rejected for the time being, but this rejection implies not alone a disinclination to talk about peace so long as the destined course of events has not yet made clear the status of power, but it is also a verdict on the unpractical methods that we employ. We would probably have saved much blood and misery if the German government had been wise enough two years ago to have spoken frankly and seriously about Belgium. I recollect having said here, myself, that it was of no use to talk in generalities, that it was necessary to talk in such a way that first of all not only diplomats but the people understand. You must put the arms in to the hands of the people who want peace, in the hands of the classes that are gaining in power and influence, and in the intensity of their efforts from day to day, in order to show what is intended, it is necessary to give evidence of a desire for peace in such a way that it will be believed and understood. The dickering about Belgium, the severity of the pan-Germans in Germany, and of those holding the same views here has cost us very much blood. The Siegfried-meetings, even though they did not attract broad masses,

have injured us severely, and we must do penance (and who knows how much longer) by blood and hunger, for the dream that we can run the whole earth.

We don't want victory. I fear that the peoples of Austria have as much to fear from a great victory as from a victory of the other side; but I also fear that the victory of the other side will not bring the fruits to those other nationalities of Austria that they anticipate. What we need is not victory, but the end of the war, peace. Peace will mean sacrifices, but not nearly the sacrifices that the peoples of this nation have long been making and are being forced to make. We must convince our opponents—not Lloyd George, and not Clemenceau, but the French and the English peoples. There is already evidence of development among the English workers, which is becoming more distinct from day to day, and among the French, where what was formerly the minority among the Socialists has already become the majority. Progress is being made, convictions are changing, but we must help along. We cannot do this by talking generalities, nor by simply letting the government do the talking. The government must speak plainly, but the representatives of the people must speak too. The presence of delegates of the people at the peace negotiations, which is demanded in certain quarters, is a complicated technical question, which I do not wish to enter into.

But now the people must speak, the house must declare that the people want peace, and outline the minimum that we must concede. The sacrifices that we must bring will be the atonement for the fact that we—let us put it mildly—were fated to be the incendiaries.

We are prepared to make these sacrifices because what we are suffering today is a much heavier sacrifice.

That is why we have made this motion. We demand that the minimum conditions be submitted to the committee that is to be chosen. We have formulated the conditions on the basis of which we believe peace is possible. We have formu-

lated these conditions very carefully, we perhaps for our part would go somewhat further, but as we wish that the parliament and the other parties should join us, we only included what we believed that every deputy in this house could vote for without violating his convictions.

First and foremost as a basis of peace must be the acknowledgement of a new Europe, of a new world-order, of a new international law, an acknowledgment that has been voiced repeatedly by Czernin and Count Burian, but that would sound quite different if those who ridiculed Count Czernin as a dreamer if not as something worse, should have to speak themselves. The Social-Democrats demand that a league of nations be created, that disarmament follow, as we have demanded at all times. We want to have courts of arbitration and to avoid future wars. The times in which the affairs of the people were disposed of by kings and diplomats are gone, not because Wilson or the Entente wills it, but because the people will no longer submit to the old management along these lines. We do not know how we will emerge from this war, just as we do not know how we got into it. We do not know what experiences we shall still undergo, but this much we do know: never again would the peoples of Austria submit to the control of this old Austrian skeleton, entirely aside from what the Entente wants or does not want. We want a new international law, the avoidance of all economic war, labor legislation, reconstruction of all occupied lands. Our violation of Serbia did not end when we forced war upon that country. What has happened down in Serbia from the time of the occupation is by no means above criticism. We did not so manage things down there in a way to win the affections of the Serbs, nor to convince them that the Hapsburg regime is more agreeable than the regime of that gentleman of rather doubtful character that of recent years has occupied the Serbian throne. I don't know whether the people down there have a strong preference, but in any event it must hurt them to make a choice. Insofar as reparation is possible therefore,

it must be made. We must not ask any contributions, it may even be necessary here and there to return sums. I now come to consider two clauses which one of the gentlemen crossed out because he could not accept the responsibility for them. That we do accept it, doesn't seem to occur to him. He just crossed out these clauses when nobody was supposed to be looking, and would like us to forget about them.

We want a new order of things in Austria and, must want it, for otherwise Austria cannot be recognized as a state that is qualified to conduct peace negotiations, not even if it accepted the whole Wilsonian programme. Austria must come forward as a living state, and declare that it has abolished the old order, that it has given autonomy to all its nationalities, economic and political. The Social Democrats demand this not only for those who with a certain pride call themselves the oppressed nationalities. Czechs, Poles, and Slovenes are not the only ones that are oppressed, the Germans are not less so. The German people are not composed exclusively of the National Association and the bureaucrats. The German people too, wish to be the masters of their own destiny, not only socially but also nationally. The German people have not gained anything by their domination over others, and do not feel like continuing it. But neither do they desire to be oppressed by others. I cannot help smiling when I hear mention of the Slav empire from Danzig to the Adriatic, for between Danzig and the Adriatic there are also a few million Germans. If the Slavs don't want to be oppressed, the Germans are certainly no worse than the Slavs, and the German Social-Democrats and whole German working class do not want to be trampled upon.

We too wish to constitute ourselves a nation, and we will see to it that the newly constituted German people of Austria, shall not drift into the false, narrow, unfortunate channels, that have heretofore been taken for granted as German. The German people do not care to be the bailiffs of the Hapsburgs.

And if those other gentlemen who have been doing such good business, think that what they receive from Austria, is exactly proportionate to the pressure they transmit and exert downward, I for my part think that one people cannot live from the rule and exploitation of another, and if there is a classic example, it is German-Austria. We German-Austrians are highly gifted, but all our talents are being directed outward, being converted into downward pressure—it is our chief article of export; here we are rotting and going to ruin because of the obsession that we are pre-destined to rule in Austria.

In the question of the southern Slavs, let us not for heaven's sake fall back into the old policy of playing off the Croats against the Serbs. It might suit the Hungarians and the Magyar junker Count Tisza to play off the Croats against the Serbs, but we forget that the Croats too are becoming wiser, and will no longer let themselves to be used as the instruments of their own oppression as they have been doing since 1848. The Croats are today where the Serbs once were. If the Christlich-Sozialen tell us that the house of Hapsburg still rules there with an iron hand, and will find there rock-solid support, I think it is rather the voice of the past than the future that speaks. One thing is certain: upon the solution of the south-slavic problem and the regulation of affairs in the south of the Monarchy, depends not only the peace of Austria, but of all Europe.

In the case of Italy we will have it easier. We could have gotten off more cheaply, if Italy had been more reasonable. The Italians have paid a bloody price for it, and it makes one sick at heart to think that in places, where anyone who has some culture and knows something of the past, must tread respectfully with bared head, bombs are now being dropped from flying machines, so that men are being killed where the highest phase of human culture was honored by us all for centuries.

The Poles! Daszynski has opposed the Austro-German so-

lution. But let him bear in mind that the Austro-Polish adventure was first opposed, to the utmost, by the Social Democrats who did find among the Polish representatives that unanimity of agreement that might have been desired. Let the Poles learn this much from the experience of the Germans: The Ukrainians will not rest content with the mere promise that they will be well treated. But the Ukrainians must also admit that they will have to show moderation. One thing we all know: What is taking place in the East, must be swept away. It was a crime, committed perhaps as a last resort. I am pleased to be able to confirm that the Social Democrats in the German Reichstag have specifically included this question among the conditions under which they will participate in the Government, and hope that they will not moderate these conditions, but will make them more emphatic. Not only must the peace of Brest-Litovsk not hamper universal peace, as the German Social Democrats state,—I would like to add that this also holds true of the peace of Bucharest—but as the Social Democrats of Austria state, it must be obliterated. The German people are too good to be made to serve as guardians of all these petty potentates that have been bred in German cities, and to spill their blood and accept the responsibility for such a purpose. No people can justify even their own dynasty, much less that of others.

The proposal of the Social Democrats seeks to enable the parliament to express itself on these questions involving the future existence of the state, and to make this expression count. We are not inclined to leave this solely to those who now rule nor to Count Tisza, the master of Austria-Hungary. Whoever it may be that Count Tisza represents in confidential or executive matters, he doesn't represent us. He is not the man to whom the peoples of Austria-Hungary would entrust even the smallest fraction of their affairs for even the smallest fraction of time. Insofar as it is possible for a single individual to be guilty historically, we regard him as one of those who bear the most guilt for the blood that has been shed.

Most of them have died, rotted, vanished, dropped out of sight, but Tisza survives. We wish to state this emphatically, even if Count Burian should ever come to think of speaking to the parliament delegations some day. We are ashamed, when we come to a foreign country and hear people say that there is not a country on earth where the representatives of the people have not spoken in recent months. We wish the Austrian house of representatives to maintain the dignity of the peoples of Austria, and to deliberate on the destiny of these peoples, and, above all else on the way to get peace. That will not be easy. I earnestly implore all the delegates, even those who find it hard to join in consultation with their political and national opponents, not to relegate this subject to a passive role in their programme. They owe this to the masses whom they represent. They must do everything that offers even the slightest possibility to come nearer to peace. And there is a possibility: if Austria will give evidence that it is a country with whom peace can be concluded.

If the peoples of Austria shall be constituted on the basis of national sovereign independence and the autonomy of each nationality is established, then the time will come when it will become clear to everyone, that the claim to freedom and independence includes the duty of solidarity with other nations. That will furnish a foundation on which to erect a new structure.

The motion of Social Democrats aims to open up the way to peace. Help us and vote for it!

A Letter to the Polish Socialists

By KARL MARX, FRIEDRICH ENGELS, PAUL LAFARGUE,
F. LESSNER

Translated from the Polish by Dr. John J. Kallen

As an historical document indicating the views of Marx and Engels towards a nation with a glorious past, the letter sent to the Polish Socialists, November 27, 1880, is interesting in the light of present conditions.

The letter was read at a meeting of a radical organization in Geneva in commemoration of the Polish Revolution. It represents an answer by Marx and his co-signers to an invitation extended the International to send a delegation for the occasion. Under the title "Rebuilding of Poland," the Polish Socialists published in 1910 the views of Marx, Engels, Liebknecht. Among the newspaper articles and speeches of these leaders is the letter we offer. It should set some comrades straight about the charge of "Nationalism" in the Polish movement. In another issue I shall present Engels' view on this "charge" of nationalism from the same "Odbudowanie Polski." Although both were translated into Polish and now from Polish into English, the thoughts received no harm from the roundabout procedure made necessary by the impossibility of getting the original manuscripts.

Comrades!

Poles, thrown out of the fatherland after the first partition of their country, cross the Atlantic, coming to the defense of the American Commonwealth arising at that time. Kosciuszko fights alongside of Washington. In 1794, when the French Revolution with difficulty fought the powers of the Coalition, full of glory, the Polish Uprising liberates it. Poland lost her independence but the Revolution was rescued. The conquered Poles volunteered for the ranks of the sansculotte army and helped them to destroy feudal Europe. Finally in 1830 Czar Nicholas and the King of Prussia were to execute their plot of another invasion of France, with the aim of returning the rightful monarchy; but the Polish Revolution whose memory you celebrate today, arose as a barrier. "Order was restored in Warsaw." The cry, "Long

live Poland," which arose at that time throughout entire Western Europe, was not only an expression of sympathy and respect for the patriotic warriors, crushed by brute force; with this cry it still joyously welcomes a nation all the uprisings of which—so unfortunate for itself—always dammed the counter-revolutionary current, and her bravest sons everlastingly conducted the war of counter-attacks, fighting everywhere under the banner of the people's revolutions. On the other hand the dismemberment of Poland established the Holy Alliance which acted as a mantle for the ascendancy of the czar over all the governments of Europe. For that reason, therefore, the cry, "Long live Poland" indicated: death to the Holy Alliance, death to the supporters of militarized Russia, Prussia and Austria, death to the Mongolian rule over contemporary society.

From 1830, when the bourgeoisie took hold more or less of the political power in France and England, the proletarian movement commenced to make itself prominent. From 1840 the possessing classes in England were forced to seek military intervention in order to support themselves against the party of Chartists, that first militant organization of the working class. In the last asylum of Independent Poland, in Cracow, there burst, in 1848, the first political revolution which sets forth the declaration of social rights. From that moment Poland loses all the false sympathies of entire Europe.

In 1847 the first international proletarian congress secretly takes place in London. It gives out the Communist Manifesto which ends with the new revolutionary shibboleth: "Proletarians of all countries, unite." Poland had its representatives at this congress, whose resolutions, at a public meeting in Brussels, the famed Lelewel and his supporters, accepted. The revolutionary armies of 1848-9, German, Italian, Hungarian, Rumanian, were full of Poles who distinguished themselves as soldiers and commanders. Although socialistic tendencies of the epoch were drowned in the blood of the June days, it must not be forgotten that the revolution of 1848, in sweeping the whole of Europe, created for the moment one polity of all the nations and in this way prepared the ground for the International Workers' Asso-

ciation. The Polish uprising of 1863, giving cause for a common protest of English and French workers against the perfidious international actions of their governments, caused the formation of the International which arose with the co-operation of the Polish emigrants. And, finally, among them the Paris Commune found its true leaders; after its fall, before the Versailles Court Martial, it sufficed to call one's self a Pole to be shot.

And so, the Poles played outside the boundaries of their own country a great role in the struggle for proletarian emancipation; they were in the full sense of the word its international champions. Let that struggle extend itself today within the Polish nation itself, let her be upheld by the emigrant press and propaganda, let her go arm in arm with her Russian brethren with their unequalled efforts, and then will be found one more reason for the repetition of the old cry, "Long live Poland."

Greetings and Fraternity,

(Signed) Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, Paul Lafargue,
F. Lessner, London, 27th September, 1880.

New Germany

By LUDWIG LORE.

Suddenly as the war began it has ended. And the military rulers of Germany, whose insane lust for power thrust a world that was tottering on the brink of war for years into its horrible maelstrom, have fled from the wrath of their own revolutionary proletariat. The immediate causes of the sudden collapse of a seemingly invincible nation are obvious enough. The German people were suffering untold misery. They were starved and freezing. Their men and their boys were dying like flies on the battlefield. Their autocratic rulers, drunk with power, were showing with brutal frankness how utterly they despised the men and women who had given all they had to satisfy the insatiable greed of their capitalist classes. After four years of war Prussia still had its odious election laws, the Kaiser still ruled as the all-powerful lord over the German people. The great enthusiasm of the first period had given place to dumb, helpless apathy. The army at the front was fighting its last desperate battle. They, too, were sick to death of the endless slaughter. And the signs of misery at home, that crept into their letters and seeped through into the ranks at the front in spite of the stern measures adopted by the government broke the spirit of men who had gone without flinching through the bloodiest battles. The Allied forces found an army that had only one wish, to end it all, to be done with this fearful misery. The military power of Germany was broken. A victory of the Allied armies was inevitable. The horrors of warfare on their own soil stared the German people in the face. Their unbounded faith in the war-lords was shattered.

And yet, to-day Germany is not a nation of vanquished people. In spite of hunger and military defeat, the morale of the German people is not broken. Its working class has emerged from this war in spite of the awful price it paid in blood and suffering, the victor. It has suffered complete mili-

tary defeat, but it has gained the mastery over its own destiny.

Defeat was turned into victory, because, for generations, men and women of the working class have been preaching to their brothers and sisters the power of the proletariat. Defeat became victory because, through the days of darkest reaction, a small handful of men and women nursed the weak flame of revolutionary understanding in the hearts and minds of the people, because they sowed the seed of the revolution in the stony soil of a victorious nation, and waited for the fruit to ripen, with boundless faith in the ultimate awakening of the working class. Defeat became victory, because the splendid example of the Russian working class had shown them that nothing can crush a proletariat that believes in itself.

It would be difficult to overestimate the part that the Russian Revolution played in the revolution of the German working class. The appeals of the Russian leaders at Brest-Litovsk, and the shameful role played by the German war party, left an uneasy sense of shame in the hearts of men who had almost forgotten the meaning of internationalism. The soldiers that were sent to hold the conquered Russian provinces in subjection, came back filled with the new spirit of their vanquished captives. Russian aeroplanes dropped appeals and messages down upon the German soldiers. Newspapers in the German language were printed in Russia and smuggled over the border for distribution among the German people. The Russian embassy in Berlin became the hotbed of anti-monarchial and proletarian revolutionary agitation; from the tower of the building that only a few years ago was the horror of every social-democrat because it personified the regime of the bloody Tsar, fluttered the red flag of brotherhood, stirring long forgotten hopes and memories in the breasts of the German workers. Great printing presses turned out tons of literature, in the halls once sacred to the interests of the Russian Black Hundred, leaflets and appeals that were distributed everywhere by the adherents of the radical socialist movement. German Junkers had taken possession of

Russian land and Russian resources. The Russian people had won the very soul of the German nation.

To-day the political fortunes of the German nation lie completely in the hands of the Social Democratic movement. The capitalist system of production in Germany was so absolutely and completely subordinated to the war interests of the nation that the sudden coming of peace has left the bourgeoisie utterly helpless and demoralized. In Germany all industries not directly necessary for military purposes were stopped at the very beginning of the war. The effective blockade of the English fleet wiped out even such private enterprise as flourished in the Allied nations notwithstanding the rigid demands made by the war upon the capitalist resources of these nations. This isolation of German capital was completed by the stringent guarantees demanded by America from the Neutrals to prevent the importation of supplies into the Central Empire. Even a victorious Germany would have passed through a terrible crisis before a return of its industries to a peace basis could have been effected. Defeat and the overthrow of the political and military oligarchy that had made Ludendorff the virtual ruler of the nation left the bourgeoisie powerless to resist its working class. After a few half-hearted attempts to safeguard their own political interests, the German liberal bourgeoisie, that was always notorious for its cowardliness and its servile toadying to the monarchical rulers gave up the struggle. The attempt to save the tottering throne by the appointment of the popular liberal Prince Maximilian to the Chancellorship, with the appointment of the three government Socialists to the ministry, and a liberal political program providing for the responsibility of the government to parliament, the right of the Reichstag to dissolve the ministry by a simple vote of disapproval and the reorganization of the monarchy after the pattern of that of Great Britain came too late to save the situation. The release of the political prisoners, chief among them Liebknecht and Dittmann, hastened the revolution that these measures were intended to prevent.

In spite of the honest and sincere efforts of Scheidemann, Gustav Bauer and Dr. David, these first socialist ministers of Germany, the revolution grew and spread. In a last desperate appeal directed by Scheidemann to Dr. Solf, then Secretary of Foreign Affairs, the former "requests" that the Emperor be "requested" to abdicate. And in order to leave no doubt as to the purpose of this appeal the "Vorwärts" at the same time published an article, obviously written by Scheidemann, in which he says: "Minorities must not be permitted to make the whole situation a tool by means of which they may accomplish their purposes, or everything will fall to pieces. . . . The German people must show that it can accomplish the greatest steps toward progress without exposing itself to the nameless terrors of civil war." As late as the 27th of October, hardly two weeks before the outbreak of the revolution, the majority socialist organ "Dresdener Volkszeitung" published the following:

"Out of the ranks of the Independents in these days are sounding exstastic cries for a revolution. It may be that some of these shouters know not what they do. They are calling for a revolution for the sake of a fanatic principle. They want the revolution for the sake of the revolution. They want a revolution according to their conception, with barricades and the blood of citizens without knowing what for. If they could read the history of the past, present and coming weeks in the light of the history of half a century, perhaps they could be made to realize that of which now they seem to have not even a conception, that we are living in the midst of a revolution, as bloodless, but at the same time as effective as any the world has ever seen, a revolution that has swept away hindrances that yesterday seemed insurmountable, that has overthrown, over night, the rule of those powers that yesterday believed themselves invincible."

On the 5th and 6th of November there were revolutionary outbreaks in Berlin, Kiel and other places. On the 7th Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils were being formed all over the

country. On the 9th the Emperor fled from German soil and Prince Maximilian was proclaimed Regent. On Monday, the 11th, Scheidemann and Ebert demanded his resignation in the name of the German people, and Ebert was proclaimed Chancellor of the German Socialist Republic. The Council of Plenipotentiaries (People's Commissariat), composed exclusively of Socialists, was formed in which all groups of the socialist movement were represented, Scheidemann, Ebert and Landsberg of the majority, Haase and Dittmann of the Independents, and Barth of the Spartacus group. This de-facto government of Germany is still in control but its status has already undergone radical changes. On the 25th of November the Government officially announced that an agreement had been reached with the Workmen's and Soldiers' Council with the following provisions:

1. All political power shall rest in the hands of the German Social Republic and the Workmen's and Soldiers' Council.
2. Its aim shall be the defense and development of the achievements of the Revolution, and the suppression of all counter-revolutionary activity.
3. Until the election of an Executive Council of the Soldiers' and Workmen's Council of the German Republic, the Executive Council in Berlin shall carry out the functions of this body.
4. The appointment and dismissal of members of all legislative bodies of the Republic, and of Prussia, until a final constitution has been adopted, shall be in the hands of the Central Executive Council, which shall also have the right to supervise their activity.
5. The Cabinet shall not appoint assistant ministers without previously consulting the Executive Council.
6. A convention of representatives of the Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils shall be called as soon as possible.

To understand the events that are taking place in Ger-

many to-day and their significance for the course that the Revolution in Germany will take, one must be familiar with the various socialist divisions existing and the history of their origin. The differences that divide the Social Democratic Party, the Independent Social Democratic Party and the Spartacus Group, are not new. They were not even caused directly by the war, although the war first brought these differences to a crisis that made a split in the forces of the German socialist movement inevitable. The opposition of these three groups to one another has its foundation not in their attitude to the war alone. In fact the position that the members of the different groups took when the war broke out was the direct outcome of their fundamental conception of the aims and purposes of the socialist movement. The act of the party majority in voting for the first war credit on the 4th of August, 1914, though it came as a shock to the socialist movement all over the world, was, in the last analysis, the logical consequence of the attitude into which the working class had been allowed to drift. The Social Democratic Party of Germany was an example, par excellence, of that period in the international movement that saw the growth of the socialist movement as a political party. The fall of the Paris Commune and the death of the first International marked the end of the first stormy period of stress and struggle of a poorly organized and powerless proletariat. The second International was built upon a new conception of the duty of the socialist movement and, under the leadership of the German socialist movement, laid particular emphasis upon the winning of political power on the national field. When the anti-socialist law had fallen and the Party entered once more stronger than ever upon the political field, it grew in leaps and bounds. It organized powerful labor unions which, after a comparatively short period of stormy battling against capital on the industrial field, became so powerful and so well organized that strikes and other forcible measures were the exception rather than the rule. On the political field the party progressed with stupendous rapidity. In a short time every Landtag had its Socialist delegation; large cities elected first

one, then numerous Socialists to their city councils. In the national, state and municipal legislative assemblages they forced the adoption of social legislation, and the German protective factory legislation, German old-age pension laws, unemployment laws and maternity protection laws have been models for Liberals and Socialists all over the world. The socialist movement grew in power and influence, and in growing moved further and further from revolutionary measures. Not that the German movement had become a mere reform party. In no other country were the members, the rank and file, so thoroughly familiar with the theories and revolutionary ideals of Marx and Engels. The German Socialist still believed implicitly in the necessity of overthrowing the capitalist state of society. The revolutionary foundation was there, but the radical spirit, the readiness to act had given way to a feeling that amounted almost to a conviction, that society would gradually develop into the socialist state, that it would be possible to bring about a socialist commonwealth, at least in Germany, peaceably, by a gradual evolution into a system of social ownership.

Long before the war broke out, an opposition group had come into existence in the Social-Democratic Party which, under the spiritual leadership of Karl Liebknecht, Klara Zetkin, Rosa Luxemburg and Franz Mehring opposed the tactics pursued by the great majority of the party. The National Congresses of the party for years had been the scene of stormy contention between the revisionist reform wing and the majority on the one hand, between the radicals and the majority on the other. The recognized leaders spoke of Liebknecht and his radical supporters with ill-concealed contempt, and regarded their demands for more radical and more revolutionary methods as the products of unripe, foolish propagandists.

When the war began this fundamental difference assumed gigantic importance. Where it had formerly been limited largely to theoretical discussion it now assumed a practical significance that determined the stand that was taken

by the members of the Reichstag group and by the membership at large on the question of war and government support. The majority felt that the socialist movement of Germany, in view of its achievements on the national field, was interested in the defense of what they termed "German Culture" against foreign attack. Their whole past made it inevitable that they should feel themselves the protectors, above all, of the German proletariat, and that they should regard the interests of that proletariat as inseparably bound up in the existence and immunity from attack on the German nation. The Liebknecht wing, on the other hand, maintained that the workingman has no country to defend, and that the only real self-defense of the proletariat lies in the revolution against its own capitalist class. In the caucus that preceded the vote in the Reichstag on the first war loan, only 13 out of 110 members protested against a favorable vote. But they were bound by the unit rule that obtains everywhere in the socialist movement, and voted unanimously in favor of the first war loan, while Haase, himself bitterly opposed to the attitude the party had adopted, as chairman of the socialist delegation, delivered the address explaining the vote of his party. When the vote on the second war loan was taken Karl Liebknecht alone voted against it; at a later vote he was joined by Otto Ruehle. On December 15, 1915, twenty socialist deputies voted against the new war loan and at the same time officially severed their connection with the official group, sitting in the Reichstag under the name "Arbeiter-Gemeinschaft." Around this nucleus the Independent Social Democratic Party was soon afterward founded.

From the very beginning, however, this new party displayed no unity of purpose or standpoint. There were two distinct groups, the so-called Moderates, Haase, Kautsky, Ledebour and Bernstein, on the one hand, and the radicals, or "Spartacus Gruppe," Liebknecht, Luxemburg, Zetkin and Mehring, on the other. The latter, from the beginning, insisted upon the complete reorganization of the international movement. It recognized that the socialist movement of the

whole world was headed in the wrong direction, not only in the question of militarism and war, but in its whole fundamental conception of the class struggle. They proclaimed the death of the second International, and, together with radical Socialists of other nations, at the famous Zimmerwald and Kienthal conferences, demanded the organization of the Third International on an international and anti-national basis. The Moderates as firmly believed that the party had only taken a misstep, that it would right itself after the war was over, and tenaciously adhered to the old methods of the Social Democratic Party, concentrating their efforts on the gaining of political power, whenever elections were held. They had joined with the Spartacus group, not so much because of the community of interests between them, but as a protest against the methods that were being used by the majority Socialists, and the complete submission of the latter to the dictates of the government. Nevertheless the Scheidemann, David, Ebert, Suedekum wing, who had signed away the political liberties of the working class, and Legien, the German Gompers, under whose leadership the labor movement became a faultlessly functioning part of the war machine, held the masses behind them. After a few months of sporadic growth the Independent Social Democracy languished, and finally lost their hold in some of the very strongholds of the radical movement.

The differences that divided the groups of the Social-Democracy are reflected clearly in their attitude toward the proletarian revolution in Russia. Kautsky and Bernstein were sharply critical, not to say oppositional in their position, Ledebour and Haase were sympathetic, while the Spartacus group at once enthusiastically supported and defended the measures adopted by the Soviet government. After his liberation, Liebknecht was the honorary chairman of the All-Russian Congress of Soviets held in Moscow on the 15th November, 1918. At this same congress Rosa Luxemburg and Franz Mehring were accorded an enthusiastic ovation. The whole-souled opposition which the majority Socialists evidenced, at all times, to the measures and tactics of the Bolsheviki and the Soviet Government, were only natural in

men who looked forward to a revolution in their own country with misgiving and fear. True to their old faith in the power of the Social Democracy to "evolve" its ideal by a gradual system of development, through the various political and economic stages, they could see in the radical and aggressive measures of the Russian proletariat only ruin and destruction and regarded Lenin and Trotzky as wild-eyed fanatics who were endangering the cause of the Russian working class.

Thus it was logical that these men, when in spite of their honest efforts, the revolution broke out in Germany, should strain every effort to win control of the new government in order to save it from the hands of those radical elements in the labor movement who had been chiefly responsible for its outbreak. Scheidemann, Ebert, David and Suedekum are prepared to establish order in Germany, to reorganize the demoralized industries of the country, while safeguarding the interests of the working class, to call a constitutional assembly and to conclude peace negotiations as early as possible, under the most favorable conditions that may be procured from the Allied governments under existing conditions. They are absolutely satisfied with the establishment of a political democracy under the control of the Social Democracy, and are convinced that the time has not yet come in Germany for the social revolution. The Independent Social Democratic Party, under Haase and Kautsky, pursue, as usual, the middle course. While they are opposed to the extremely opportunistic view of the Ebert group, and are prepared to place the power of the Government, within certain reasonable limits, into the hands of the Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils, while they seem to be opposed to the policy of the Ebert group in retaining in office the entire bureaucracy of the old imperial regime, they, too, fear that radical measures will foment counter-revolutionary activity at home, and that a radical reorganization of the economic system of Germany might influence unfavorably the settlement of peace terms with the Allied nations. For these reasons the Haase-Kautsky group is opposed to radical measures on the industrial field. They have joined the Ebert group in assuring the German people of the absolute safety of their bank

deposits and of their readiness to meet all obligations incurred by the monarchy in the shape of war loans. They believe that the time is ripe for a social revolution in Germany, but desire that it be introduced gradually, without skipping what they believe to be the necessary steps in evolution.

One of the interesting figures of this group is Kurt Eisner, the leader of the Independent Social Democrats of Bavaria. The extraordinary conditions that confront Bavaria and South Germany as a whole have made this strong and energetic personality the storm center in the revived fight between the North and the South. As is well known, Germany became a federation of States in 1870. The South—Bavaria, Wuerttemberg, Hessen, Baden and a number of other smaller states—had more democratic forms in its social and political life than Prussia. The caste system had not become as marked there because the class interests had not been able to divide the people of the South as they had the more industrially developed North. Soon after the federalization of Germany, therefore, a strongly particularist movement grew up in the South, against everything that was Prussian. The Prussian was more hated in the South, and especially in Bavaria, up to the late 90's than any foreigner. Then it died out to reappear again in the latter part of the war. During the first years of the war, the South was as belligerent and just as imperialistic as the North. In fact, the King of Bavaria sent a special envoy to the Peace Conference at Brest Litovsk because it was feared that Prussia would deal too leniently with free Russia. For this he was loudly acclaimed by the Bavarian capitalist press. But the misery and starvation of the last twenty months has made the Bavarians forget their own part in the war, and Prussia became the butt of their fury.

When Kurt Eisner, in October of this year, became the candidate of the Independent Social Democrats in the by-election made necessary by the severe illness of the majority Social Democrat, von Vollmar, he strongly fought this tendency, which had found some degree of support in the official Social-Democratic movement and its candidate, Auer. But the queer logic of events

has made him—at least to the uninformed outsider—the expression of the separatist, particularist movement. He belongs to that wing of the Independents which insistently demands that all remnants of the old regime must be thrown into the discard, and with commendable directness he applies this not only to the Erzbergers and the Solfs but also to the Suedekums and the Davids who have been just as thoroughly discredited by their imperialist activities. He demands that a government of Socialists be established for Germany that is free from the domination of any one state. As this demand is naturally directed against the leading personages in Prussia he has been supported by the particularist element in his own state who fail to understand the real motives that prompt his demands.

Reports that have come from Germany in the last weeks have been so clouded, and show such incredible ignorance of persons and conditions, that we here must judge rather by what we know of the most recent past of Eisner from German socialist papers than from the badly garbled reports that appear in the capitalist press by correspondents who attribute to him statements and opinions expressed by his supporters among the particularists. Thus, for instance, we take the following from a campaign speech made on October 23, after his release from prison where he had been held for ten months on account of his activity in favor of a political mass strike against the war:

“When I took up the fight against the pan-Germans at the beginning of the war, I was ridiculed. Scheidemann and Auer took up the fight against the pan-Germans only when they became their competitors for political office. To-day, under the new (Maximilian) government we are still living in a sea of lies. To call upon the people to-day to defend their fatherland, as has been done in the last appeal issued by the National Executive Committee of the Social Democratic Party, is to mislead them. We are facing to-day not the destruction of Germany, but the destruction of those who bear the responsibility for the war. When the majority Socialists demand to-day the abolition of the monarchy they are only putting up a big front to cover

up the defeat of their entire policy during the war. The new era under Maximilian, based as it is upon fraud, is not a new era.... Germany, that has permitted its rulers to commit the big crime of war in its name, must be prepared to pay the price. We will have to be ready to give up Alsace-Lorraine as well as Prussian Poland and Polish territory. Danzig must become the new harbor of the Polish Republic. The damage done in Belgium and in Northern France must be at least partially repaired."

This extract shows that his whole line of thinking is in sympathy with the Haase-Ledebour rather than with the more conservative Kautsky and Bernstein, with a strong leaning toward the position of the Spartacus Group. This explains the phenomenon that the Independent Social Democracy as well as the radical wing seem to be with him in his fight, even in the contradictory reports of the American correspondents.

In open opposition to the attitude of the two main groups is the Spartacus group, that, under the leadership of Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, is conducting a feverish agitation all over the country in favor of a government under the exclusive and absolute control of the proletariat. They are opposed to the calling of a constituent assembly and demand the political supremacy of the Soldiers' and Workmen's Councils. They favor immediate social ownership of the means of production and the repudiation of the debts incurred by the old regime for the conduct of the war. They are bitterly caustic concerning the peace-at-any-price position of men who, during the entire course of the war, belonged to the most consistent supporters of the war machine, and are the only element in Germany that openly opposes the terms of the armistice.

These last two questions, the question of peace and that of the payment of war debts are of no mean significance for the future development of the German Republic. In Russia, the Mil-yukoff and the Kerensky governments were overthrown because they were not prepared to carry out the peace demands of the people, while the Soviet Government owes its strength and its

hold upon the people of Russia to the fact that it stands ready, at all times, to carry out their demands. In Germany it is possible that the same conditions may bring about exactly the opposite effect. The soldiers and the working class, according to all indications at the present time, will probably support the Moderates of the Independent Social Democratic Party against the radical wing because they fear, and as the experience of Russia has shown, not without cause, that they may hope for but little mercy at the hands of the Allies should Germany establish a dictatorship of the proletariat. The fact that even the poorest classes of the country were made partners to the war by the clever policy of the monarchial regime of practically forcing all classes of society to buy war bonds—and the socialist press gave its columns freely for this purpose—may also prejudice a considerable portion of the population against a wholesale repudiation of the war debt of the nation.

While this struggle for supremacy among the three socialist groups is occupying the minds and thoughts of the world, the capitalist class of Germany is rallying its disorganized forces. Already the call has gone forth to unite the liberal bourgeois elements, and all non-socialist elements in Germany to-day belong to the "liberal" bourgeoisie, into one great organization, whose aim is the re-establishment of "order" in Germany and the fight against anarchism and Bolshevism. Already the leaders of this movement have appealed to Washington for aid, and in spite of the open sympathy that is shown in these quarters for Ebert and Scheidemann at the present time, the time will come, and it is probably not far distant, when the Russian Bakmetieff will be joined by some equally representative ambassador of the German Republic, to safeguard the interests of the German "people." In Germany the capitalist class is by no means the negligible factor that it was in the Russian revolution. It is a powerful body, that will be as brutal and unscrupulous in its methods and its warfare upon its own people as it was in its treatment of the unfortunate peoples that stood in the way of its determination for world power. The capitalist class of Germany, with its enormous wealth and its manifold international business relations that the

war may have disturbed but has not broken, is a formidable enemy, an enemy that will fight without mercy and without quarter, once it feels that it has again gained a foothold in the country.

The demands of this capitalist class cannot be met with compromises and concessions on the part of a socialist government. No capitalist class can or will consent to exist under the rule of a working-class party, no matter how moderate. The class war that has produced the Social Democracy will go on until classes have ceased to exist, until the proletariat has assumed control over the economic as well as the political forces of the nation.

The revolutionary uprising of the proletariat of Germany and Russia has not put an end to class war. But the class struggle in Europe has entered upon the last and the most bitter stage of its existence. It has grown beyond the national boundaries within which it has hitherto fought its battles. To the struggle between the classes within the nation has come the struggle between nations, between the nations controlled by the capitalist, and those controlled by the working class. Instead of wars for national aims there will come the great class wars, waged on an international basis. Whenever the working class of one country has succeeded in overthrowing its bourgeoisie, this counter-revolutionary class will appeal to its brother capitalists in other nations, and in self-defense these will have to come to their assistance. There can be no harmony between the opposing classes of one country. There can be no peace and understanding between capitalist and socialist nations. The war now being waged against Russia, directly or indirectly, by the Allied as well as by the Neutral nations, is an outstanding confirmation of this new phase of the world-wide class struggle.

Upon this rock the ship of opportunism will founder. The theory that the Russian and the German Revolutions can be saved only by supporting the moderates against their radical opponents is based upon a misunderstanding of the fundamental class character of society. The capitalist class, nationally as well as internationally, will compromise with the workers only so long as it

feels itself at the mercy of the proletariat, just as the class-conscious Socialist will submit to the rule of a capitalist government only so long as he is powerless to overthrow it.

The international class war has reached its critical stage. And whether we live in Germany or Great Britain, in Russia or in America, we will have to take sides. Their war is our war, their problems are ours. And we will have to pay just as dearly as they themselves for the mistakes they make. We have profited by the glorious achievements of the Soviets; our comrades everywhere will gain from our revolutionary understanding.

In the Torrent of the Revolution

By MAXIM GORKI.*

December, 1917.

Christmas! We are living in a storm of the darkest passions. The past has opened wide its gaping jaws and reveals mankind in all its horrible disfigurement. Greed, hatred and revenge reign everywhere, the beast in the human breast, goaded to madness by years of imprisonment, martyred by centuries of untold suffering has torn wide its vengeful jaws, is roaring triumphantly, viciously, seeking whom it may devour. But all that is sordid and hideous on earth is the work of man. Beauty and reason toward which we are striving live within us.

Even the slave will learn to know the joy of life. Life is not worth living to him who has no faith in the brotherhood of mankind; there is no meaning in life to him who is not convinced of the victory of love.

Though we be buried in blood and filth up to our necks, though thick clouds of vile and disgusting vapors envelope our heads and blind our eyes, though it seems, at times, as if vulgarity had killed the beautiful dream we bore in agony and suffering, though all the torches that we once lit on the path that was to lead us to a new and better world seems to have been extinguished, humanity will win. For that is the great meaning of life in this world. Life has no other meaning.

But perhaps, after all, we are doomed to destruction! Were it not better then to be burned up in the fierce fire of the revolution than to rot slowly on the dungheap of monarchy, as we have been rotting till the revolution came?

Clearly, the time has come when we Russians must shake

* Maxim Gorki joined the Soviet Government in July, 1918, and is now its Commissioner of Education.

the thralldom of the past from our souls, when we must cleanse the filth of centuries from our lives, must kill our slavish laziness, must review our habits and opinions, our lives and our ideals. Let us gird our loins and go forth, like self-confident and capable workmen, to meet the great human task of reconstructing our planet.

Our lot today is tragic. Aye but in tragedy man is at his best and highest!

It is not easy to live. So much mean hatred has come to the surface of life, that the holy wrath that could kill all these small meannesses was drowned beneath them.

Sinesius, the Bishop of Ptolemy once said:

The philosopher must have peace and quiet, but the clever helmsman is trained in storms.

Let us believe that those who do not go down in the storm and chaos of our times will become strong and sure, that they will be hardened to an invincible resistance against the ancient bestial principles of life.

Today is the day when Christ was born. His birth has been to suffering humanity one of the two great symbols that man has created in his age-long striving for right and beauty.

Christ is the eternal ideal of mercy and humanity; Prometheus is the enemy of the Gods, the first rebel against fate. Humanity has nowhere created anything more sublime than these two embodiments of its own desires.

The day will come when these two symbols of mercy and goodness, of high faith and mad courage will merge in the soul of man into one great wonderful sentiment, when mankind will recognize its own worth, the beauty of its aspirations and the bonds of blood that bind men to each other.

In these days that are filled with horror for so many of us, in these days that are so terribly filled with rebellion and blood and hatred we must never forget that we are striking upon a journey of great travail and well-nigh unbearable trials to achieve the liberation of life from the heavy, rusty chains of the past.

Let us believe in ourselves, let us be stubborn and unyielding in our battles. Everything is in our power, and in all creation there is no law but our reason and our will.

You who feel in the storm of events; you whose hearts are torn by evil doubts, whose minds are oppressed by black sorrow—my greetings.

My greetings to you, too, who are innocently languishing in prison.

Not We Have Desecrated the World!

Three years of cruel senseless butchery; three years the blood of the best peoples of the world has been spilled, the best brain of the cultured races of Europe has been destroyed.

France, "the leader of mankind," is bleeding to death, Italy, "the most beautiful gift the Gods have given to this mournful earth," is facing annihilation; England who "with calm pride shows to the world the wonders of labor," is putting forth its last desperate effort, the "busy folk of Germania" are being throttled in the iron clutches of war.

Belgium, Rumania, Servia and Poland are ruined, dreamy, spineless Russia, the land that has never lived, that has never had a chance to show the world its hidden strength, is economically and spiritually rent asunder.

For nineteen centuries Europe has preached humanity, in the churches it is now destroying with bombs, in books that its soldiers are using for fire wood. And in the twentieth century humanism is forgotten and scorned. What the unselfish work of science created, has been confiscated by shameless murderers and utilized for the destruction of mankind.

What are all the Thirty Years Wars and the Hundred Years Wars of the past compared with these fantastic three years of butchery? Where can we find a justification for this unexampled crime against the culture of our planet?

There can be no justification for this horrible self-destruction. Whatever hypocrites may say of the "great" aims of the war, their lies cannot cover up the shameful truth: that

this war was born of greed, the only goddess that is recognized and worshipped by these murderers who trade in the lives of humanity.

In every nation these scoundrels are branding those who believe in the ultimate victory of the ideal of world brotherhood as insane, as dangerous and heartless, as phantasts who know no love of fatherland.

They have forgotten that Christ, John of Damascus, Francis of Assisi, Leo Tolstoi, and all the other demigods and supermen that are the pride and worship of mankind were also such phantasts. They who are ready to destroy millions of lives for a few kilometers of foreign soil, have neither God nor Devil. To them the lives of their fellowmen are worth less than a stone, their love of fatherland is nothing more than an acquired mental habit. They demand to live as they have been accustomed to live, though the whole world be torn into fragments.

For three years they have been living up to their necks in the blood of millions of men that is being shed because they will it.

But when once the strength of the masses is spent, when once there flares up within them the determination to live, a purer, a more human life, and puts an end to this bloody delirium,—then they who have destroyed will cry out:

We are not to blame! Not we have devastated the world, not we have destroyed and plundered Europe.

But when that time comes, we hope that the "voice of the people" will be "the voice of God," sounding more loudly than the most blatant lie. Let all those who believe in victory over shamelessness and madness unite their forces.

For after all, in the end reason must always conquer.

New Conditions—New People

What will the New Year bring. All that we are able to command from it.

To become capable men and women we must believe that

these mad blood and filth stained days are the great birthdays of a new Russia.

It is a painful birth, amid the crashing overthrow of old forms of life, under the rotting ruins of the dirty caverns in which the people have been struggling for breath for three hundred years, in which they became hateful, and unhappy, in the midst of this outburst of all the degradation and vileness that were stored up within us under the leaden weight of monarchism in this eruption of a whole volcano of defilement the old Russian people, the self-satisfied idler and dreamer is dying. And in his place the bold, healthy workman, the creator of a new life has come.

The new Russian is not attractive, less attractive than ever before. Still fearful for the permanence of his victory, still unable to fully enjoy the fruits of his liberation, he sheathes himself with an armor of petty hatreds to assure himself, over and over again of the incredible truth, that he is really free. How dearly he himself, and the objects of his experiments are paying for this assurance!

But life, that severe and merciless teacher, will soon bind him once more with necessity's chain, will force him to work, and in united labor, he will forget all the small, slavish and shameful instincts that still hold him in their power.

New men and women will be created by new conditions—new conditions create new men and women.

And out of the sorrow of today will come new men and women, who know not the misery of slavery, no longer disfigured by oppression, men and women whose own freedom makes them incapable of oppressing their fellow men.

Let us meet the new year with the confidence that man will learn to love work and to understand its meaning. Work that is done with love, is not slavery, but creation.

When man has once learned to love work for its own sake, the world and all its glories will be his.

Letters from Women

The most interesting letters that I receive come from women. These letters, concerned with the impressions of the stormy present, are filled with anguish, resentment and wrath, but they are not apathetic like those of men, in every woman's letter is the cry of a living soul, tortured by the countless woes of the horrible times in which we live.

They produce the impression of having been written by one woman, by the Mother of Life, by her, who has given the world all races and peoples, by her, who has borne and who will bear in her womb all genius, by her who has helped man to convert coarse animal instinct into the tender ecstasy of love.

These letters are the cry of a being which has called poetry into life, which has inspired art, and which is continually tortured by the unquenchable desire for beauty, life and joy.

The letters to which I refer are full of the wails of mothers over the corruption of mankind, over the fact that it is becoming cruel, savage, vulgar and dishonorable, and that morality is being coarsened. These letters are full of curses against the Bolsheviks, the peasants and the workers, invoking all punishment, all horrors, all tortures upon them.

"Hang them all, shoot them all, annihilate them all," demand the women, mothers and nurses of all heroes and saints, all geniuses, all criminals, all rogues and all honorable men, the mother of a Christ as well as of a Judas, of Ivan the Terrible as well as of the shameless Machiavelli, of the gentle, affectionate Francis of Assisi, of the gloomy enemy of every joy, Savonarola, the mother of Philip II., who laughed but once in his life when he heard the news of the Bartholemew massacre, the greatest crime of Catharine de Medici, who also was a woman and a mother and in her way was concerned with the welfare of many men.

Hating death, annihilation and atrocities, the mother, the object of man's greatest reverence, she who leads him to high and

beautiful things, she, the source of Life and Poetry, cries, "Kill! Hang! Shoot!"

We are here face to face with a fearful and gloomy contradiction, that may well destroy the aureole with which History has surrounded woman. Can it be that women do not fully understand their great cultural function, do not feel their creative power, that they abandon themselves too much to the despair that is awakened in their maternal souls by the chaos of revolutionary days?

I will not go into this question any further, I will just make the following remarks.

You women know that birth is always accompanied by labor pains, *that the new being is born in blood*—the malicious irony of blind Nature wills it so. In the moment of delivery you cry out like animals, and smile the blissful smile of the Madonna when you press the new born child to your breast.

I will not reproach you for your animal cries, I understand the unendurable torture which causes them, for I myself nearly faint at the sight of such tortures, although I am not a woman. And I hope with my whole soul that soon, smiling the smile of the Madonna, you will press to your hearts *the new born child of Russia*.

One must remember that revolution brings out not only many cruelties and crimes, but also many heroic deeds of bravery, of honor, of unselfishness, and of disinterestedness. Do you not see that? Is it perhaps because you are blinded by hatred and hostility?

The forty years of civil war of the eighteenth century caused a disgusting brutality in France, an arrogant cruelty, but think what a benign influence a Julie Recamier exercised! There are many such examples of the influence of women on the development of human feelings and ideas in history. It is fitting that you mothers be excessive in your love of humanity, but cautious in your hatred.

The Bolsheviks? Yes, just think they are human beings like the rest of us, born of mothers, and there is no more of the ani-

mal in them than in us. *The best of them are remarkable persons of whom the future history of Russia will be proud*, while our children and grandchildren will admire their energy. Their deeds are subject to violent criticism, even to malicious scorn—this has fallen to the lot of the Bolsheviks in perhaps greater measure than they have deserved. They are surrounded by their enemies with a stifling atmosphere of hatred and, what is perhaps more dangerous for them, by the hypocritical, servile friendship of those who, like foxes, prowl about those in power, in order to use them like wolves, and who, we hope, will die like dogs.

Am I defending the Bolsheviks? *No, I am working against them*—but I defend *the men* whose honest convictions I know, whose personal honor is known to me, just as I know the honesty of their devotion to the well-being of the people. I know that they are conducting *a most cruel scientific experiment on the living body of Russia*. I understand how to hate, but I prefer to be just. Oh, yes, they have made many very grave, serious mistakes—God also made a mistake when he made us more stupid than we should be—Nature has made mistakes in many things—shall we judge them from the standpoint of our wishes, which may contradict their objects, or their imperfections? Without knowing to what political results their activities will finally lead, I assert, that from a psychological standpoint, the Bolsheviks have already done the Russian people a great *service* in that they have called forth in the masses an interest in present events, without which interest our country would have been destroyed.

Now it will not be destroyed, for the people have awakened out of their apathy to a new life, and new forces are ripening in them, which fear neither the madness of political innovators nor the greed of foreign robbers who are altogether too certain of their invincibility. Russia struggles convulsively with the dreadful labor pains of delivery—do you wish, that as soon as possible *a new, beautiful, good, human Russia* shall be born?

Let me tell you, Oh mothers, that rage and hatred are bad midwives.

A Japanese Interpretation of the Recent Food Riots

By SEN KATAYAMA

Our brief sketch of the popular movement in Japan, its mobs and its riots, that appeared in the Sept.-Oct. issue of the *Class Struggle* under the title of "Armed Peace on the Pacific," will be the best introduction to a description of the recent riots that shook Japan. Riots are not new in Japan. During the last three centuries of feudal regime there have been hundreds of riots among the farmers, tenants and even among the city people, uprisings against their oppressing rulers and their exploiting rich. In the cities these riots were usually directed against the wealthy rice merchants, the peasant uprisings against feudal chieftains, directly against land-tax collectors, and indirectly against the rich in the villages. But they rarely were of more than local significance. Under the ancient feudal system the peasant had no political rights; they were meek and passive in their relations with the feudal officers. But when conditions became unbearable, they had no means of redress, and their dissatisfaction found violent expression in riots, burning and destruction. The vengeance of the authorities, when once the disturbance was passed, was terrible. The leaders were brutally punished, and only too often their wives and children as well. They were crucified and exposed to the public gaze as a warning. But the demands made by the mobs were usually at least partially met. Rents were reduced and rice prices lowered; an oppressive ruler deposed, an unbearable tax collector removed.

The recent riots, in their outward appearance, showed little variation from this general character. But for the first time in the history of revolutionary movements in Japan, they were not centered upon small territories. They extended over three prefectures, Tokyo, Osaka and Kyoto, over thirty

provinces, and in Hokkaido, the northern part of Japan. Altogether this uprising affected over two-thirds of the Japanese Empire. The *Oriental Economist* reports that there were destructive riots in 142 different localities; that in 38 places they could be put down only by armed troops. In Osaka the rioting continued for three full days and nights, and it is roughly estimated that at its height a force of over thirty thousand soldiers, including cavalry were necessary to control the infuriated masses. The press reports that have just reached us extend over the 13th of August and contain detailed reports of the revolts in Osaka and in a few of the principal cities of the Empire. After this date all reports suddenly cease. The Government had forbidden the publication of further news concerning these uprisings, fearing, not without cause, their extremely contagious character. Even later, when the press was again permitted to print reports of the riots that were spreading rapidly all over the country, these news items were strictly controlled and censored, and only news furnished by the government was allowed to appear in print. From all indications, however, rioting in Tokyo, Nagoya, Sendai and in other large cities must have been even more frightful than that in the cities previously reported. In Kure, where the chief Navy Yard of the Empire is located, the marines were called out in full strength to quell the desperate mobs, while all thoroughfares and important crossings were armed with machine guns. But in spite of the rigid military discipline that obtains in the Japanese army, it was found that a number of marines had made common cause with the rioting masses. The police authorities, realizing from the start their impotence in dealing with the rioters sent plain clothes men into the crowds who marked the backs of the ringleaders with chalk, to arrest them later when the fury of the mob had spent itself. Trickery of this sort, however, only served to inflame the popular fury. In Tokyo an uprising was led by women, girls and children, and spread within a week all over the country. The time was ripe for a revolt against the autocratic government. There were riots

in the mines, and many millions of dollars worth of property were destroyed, before the wage increase demanded by the workers was granted. In Kobe the populace burnt down stores, offices, and even the residences of the wealthy rice speculators. The rioters were joined in a sympathetic movement of the 8,000 workers in the Mitsubiti shipbuilding yards, whose effective sabotage so desperately threatened the interests of the ship builders that they begged the men to enter upon negotiations with them, promising to raise their wages, asking them not to leave the factory, while promising to pay 70 per cent of the day's wages for the day's work of destruction. In its anger the mob in Kobe burnt down the offices of the rent collecting agency of the city, wreaking vengeance for the misery and suffering that this company had caused them in the past.

In spite of the wild and bitter struggles that marked this uprising in all parts of the Empire, the movement was for the most part conducted in an orderly fashion. The riot usually began in a peaceful demonstration that went to the homes of the rice dealers or to the granaries to demand cheaper food. Invariably it was the police who met the demonstrators with drawn sabres that turned these for the most part peaceful demonstrations into furious attacks. The people preferred prison and even death to starvation. This is the keynote of the revolutionary movement everywhere.

When the government saw the magnitude of the movement, it appropriated \$5,000,000 with which rice was bought up to be given away to the poor, or to be sold at greatly reduced rates to stem the tide of popular dissatisfaction. Rice became cheaper all over the country, and it was understood by the poor that this reduction was the direct result of their mob action. But the cheaper rice by no means disposed of their grievances, and the uprisings went on, more vigorously and more hopefully than before. Dry-goods stores were sacked, fuel yards and fashionable restaurants were taken by storm. The riots were originally caused, it is true, by the unheard of increase in the price of the chief food staple of the

Japanese people. But the people understood also that this rise in the cost of living was due not only to the rapaciousness of the dealers, but equally to the Government and to the political rulers who were encouraging the export of the necessary sustenance of the nation to other countries for profit, who had precipitated the country into a costly war, the interests of a rapidly developing capitalist class.

Significant for the importance of the revolutionary uprising is the impression that it created upon the minds of the intelligent classes of Japan. To them the power and influence that was wielded by the despised masses over the well-organized bureaucracy and powerful military forces and well-disciplined police, was a source of amazed astonishment. The role that the army played during these fateful days, the toll of killed and wounded that was exacted from the revolting proletariat at the point of the gun and the bayonet made the army the most hated institution in the empire. The rice riots have accomplished, in spite of their final suppression, the moral overthrow of Japanese militarism. For never again can the army regain the awe and the respect in which it was always held in the eyes of the Japanese people. Indeed the Terauchi ministry, the most imperialistic and militaristic ministry in the history of Japan, fell on account of the rice riots.

The following quotations from a number of Japanese magazines give a serious interpretation of the things that happened in Japan a few months ago, unlike the garbled and for the most part ignorantly untrue reports that appeared in the American press. The *Oriental Economist*, under the title of "Political Significance of the Recent Food Riots" says: The sole responsibility for the rice riots lies with the Terauchi ministry. The exceptionally high price of rice is directly due to the policy of the Government in aiding and encouraging export trade. The political machinery of the country functions exclusively in the interests of a few big capitalists while the interests of the vast majority of the people and the workers are completely disregarded. It can be truthfully said that

in Japan there is no government for the non-propertied classes. Certainly the rice riots, if they have any meaning at all, have proven that the government has failed to give to the people adequate protection, that they have risen in arms therefore to secure for themselves the protection that the government has refused to accord them.

In this sense these riots have revealed a great political crisis in our country. They were more than an isolated attack upon a few millionaires who were in the possession of the food supply of the nation. They were the signal fires for a class war against all propertied classes, on the broad basis of national politics.

"Japan and the Japanese," a monthly edited by Dr. Mijaki, one of the most prominent writers and thinkers of New Japan, says "The recent riots are the expression of the righteous indignation of the people against the government and a revolt against the lawless conduct of the millionaires." "The price of rice," according to this paper, "was only an incidental cause of the revolt against absolutism and autocracy. They were equally an expression of labor unrest and class feeling, a protest against an inadequate and unequal social system. The direct cause of the riots was the high cost of rice, but the principal cause lay in the Siberian invasion. Sending Japanese troops to Siberia was a **thoughtless and wicked act on the part of the government**. The riots were an open demonstration of lack of confidence on the part of the people in the government."

Dr. Yokoi, the agricultural authority of Japan, says in "Industrial Japan": "The past five years have produced super-abundant rice crops in Japan. Statistics show that there is no shortage in the rice crop in this year. The high price of rice is due solely to the inflation of currency, and the sudden rise in prices during July and August are directly attributable to the poor policy of the government in its management of the rice business of the country. The recent rice riots were caused, not by the lack of rice, but by the high prices that

were demanded for its purchase. The dissatisfaction thus created gave to the people in the lower strata of society the opportunity they have been seeking, to open up a class war against the rich. The class war is said to be the most potent force in the modern world."

In "The New Japan" Dr. Yamawaki says: "In a broad sense, the recent riots were a struggle between the working class and the commercial and industrial class on a huge scale. And if this class struggle should be carried to its ultimate political significance, we will find that in character and content it is a replica of the Russian Revolution. The recent mass action of propertyless classes and employees in Osaka, Kyoto and vicinity, expressing the popular indignation at the unreasonable cost of rice without waiting for the effect of the ineffectual policy of the government, attempted to lower the price of rice by force and violence, became, perforce, an attack upon rice merchants, a punitive war against rent collectors, a process of sabotage in the factories against the commercial and industrial classes. It is evident that these riots were a part of the class struggle, a popular movement for emancipation from the difficulties of living and of life."

In "Japan and the Japanese" Dr. Tuchiya says: "The recent riots have rapidly developed into a disturbance of the most dangerous nature, because the Japanese have not learned to use organized demonstrations. They have not been allowed to organize themselves even into labor unions. It is a crime to restrain the liberty of the labor movement. In the recent riots ninety per cent. of those arrested came from the working classes."

According to the latest reports (Sept. 12), over five thousand persons were arrested and are awaiting trial. It is estimated by the government that the number of arrests will reach more than 7,000 before the whole matter is settled. Among them are numerous socialists. Chief among these is Yei Osugi, arrested at Osaka. The government is particularly desirous of incriminating our comrades as mob leaders. Well-

known socialists were kept in confinement in their own homes during the progress of the riots by their supporters, as it was well known that the government was prepared to arrest them on the slightest pretext.

In Osaka the Governor published an edict forbidding more than five persons from walking together on the streets. In Yokohama street assemblies were limited to nine persons.

The riots have not been without the profoundest impression upon all classes of the population. The poor found that in mass action they possessed a powerful weapon, while the bourgeoisie of Japan has learned a lesson it will not soon forget. Since the food riots have ceased there have been labor troubles in the mines and factories all over the country. The "Oriental Economist" gives a detailed report of 7 large strikes that occurred between the 1st and the 19th of August, while the daily newspapers enumerate at least 40 others. It is to be assumed that there were many others not mentioned in the daily press. Some of these strikes involved as many as 8,500 workers in a single factory, and they are demanding recognition and rights according to the most advanced standards, with a clearness of purpose that will develop in time into a conscious struggle for the social revolution. On the whole we may well be proud of what the Japanese proletariat has accomplished in the face of one of the most powerful military bureaucracies of the world. They have brought about the overthrow of the Terauchi ministry and have placed the pro-Bolshevik diplomat Uchida into the office of the foreign minister, while Premier Hara has reversed the policy of the old ministry in Russian affairs and openly declares that Japan desires only a responsible government in Russia, whether it be Bolshevik or not. The intelligent classes of Japan are unanimous in their condemnation of the sending of troops to Siberia. But most significant to the great world-wide proletarian movement is the awakening of the Japanese poor and working classes to the coming of the social revolution!

Economic and Menshevik Determinism

By MAURICE BLUMLEIN

I.

Among the recognized students and exponents of Marxian philosophy and economics, there is a group that has come to the conclusion that the Russian Revolution is built upon a fatal violation of basic economic principles, that Lenin's extremism amounts to impossibilism, and that the resulting danger is not alone an inevitable collapse but an equally certain reaction that may mean the worst possible kind of dictatorship.

They arrive at this conclusion by an historical analysis involving economic determinism. According to Marx all progress recorded in history is rooted in production and productivity. Thus the system of exploitation in ancient times based on slavery was overthrown by the superior feudal system, which similarly gave way to production for sale. Capitalism then developed production to a stage where operation and ownership were concentrated on an enormous scale, thus preparing the organization of production for ownership and operation by society; the creation, development and organization of the institutions of production is the historical development of centuries, the task of changing the ownership from private monopoly and its inherent evils, to operation by and for society and its attendant blessings is the function of Socialism.

It is to be borne in mind further that where the production of a country is mainly or almost wholly agricultural, the stage of concentration has not been reached. Big scale production with its high degree of specialization and the division of labor occurs in industry. This means greater productivity and greater variety of production.

Russia is not in the latter stage, of that there can be no question; consequently it would seem to follow that the attempt to socialize ownership too soon, that is being undertaken at present, must end in a relapse to capitalism which will then perform the necessary industrial concentration. But the price of the attempt to progress too hastily by impossible means will have to be paid; the power of the people will be weakened and capitalism will return in its most tyrannical form, so that it will not only be worse than it would otherwise have been, but also may last longer in consequence.

This point necessitates the delegation of power to the bourgeoisie, either as sole executive with the Socialists in opposition, or in the form of a coalition. Both these alternatives have already been tried—the first mentioned in the form of the Milyukoff ministry, the latter in the form of the Kerensky combination which succeeded it. And both have been rejected at least thus far.

This rejection, however, has not caused the adherents of the Menshevik interpretation to give up their point of view and the diagnosis on which it is based. On the contrary they maintain with the persistence of infallibility that it will be absolutely necessary to return to the rejected principle in order to avoid the present path of anarchy and collapse, and return to the path of progress.

There is this much to be said in favor of the Menshevik position: if their diagnosis is sound, then their conclusions are not mistaken and they will not be disappointed in adhering to their claims. The fact that they did not succeed in remaining in power is not, in itself, a conclusive proof of the fallacy of their position. What we must try to find out is whether failure is incidental to, or inherent in, the policy, whether it is merely an initial loss or a permanent failure.

In view of what has thus far been said the problem to be solved is this:—Is the Soviet government conducting the Class Struggle in such a way as to violate what is historically

inevitable and economically determined and pre-determined? We shall have to arrive at a clear understanding of exactly what is fore-ordained by the Class Struggle, by historic inevitability and economic determinism.

CLASS RELATIONS

It is important to bear in mind that any and all reference to classes in the present analysis has no relation whatever to a classification based on the superiority of one person over another. The classes of the Class Struggle are based on the functions of the individual in relation to production: he can be either a producer or an owner of production. In a society where there were producers only, we should have one class economically or a one class system, i. e., a system of no classes. If a part or proportion of the product goes to the producing body, and the remainder to the owning class, we have what may be termed a two-class system, and it is the latter that covers the greater part of known history, from ancient times up to the present.

Of course, there are actually more than two classes in any class-ruled society, but they are built around the dual principle mentioned. We have skilled and unskilled among the workers, there are also organized and unorganized, etc., etc., and there are big capitalist and small capitalist groups, not to mention many other layers, but they are each and all related to production either as owners or as producers who are not owners.

It must be conceded that previous to the Great French Revolution, the two class basis could never have been abolished. For society regarded the ownership of production as a legitimate function, not yet having learned to diagnose the situation as a class relation. Thus the oppressed classes demanded either a change of personnel in the ruling class, such as, for instance, a good prince in place of a bad one, or at most they favored and accepted a new class relation in preference to an old one, such as feudalism instead of ancient

slavery. In other words, changes during this period of history were made by negative action, by getting rid of an oppressive condition. Where this was accomplished by a new class relation, the new system served the desired purpose, by giving comparative or temporary relief and freedom. Under such circumstances the abolition of classes is out of the question, because where the slave is not opposed to his slavery, or does not realize that he is accepting a new form of enslavement for an old one, he lacks the mental consciousness which is indispensable. It is not necessary, therefore, to investigate whether the material or objective conditions up to the end of the eighteenth century were ripe for the overthrow of the dual principle, for even if they had been it would have made no difference, inasmuch as society did not see this possibility and could not therefore avail itself of it.

But the French Revolution for the first time promulgated the idea of a society based on equality and fraternity, of a homogeneous society in which there should be one class. Not that this was as yet a clear scientific analysis; it was the expression in embryonic form of a social aspiration. The constructive formulation was to come later.

Meanwhile, the French Revolution solved the situation in accordance with the interests that guided the overthrow of the old regime, namely, the interests of the rising bourgeoisie. This class, at the same time that it did away with serfdom and privilege maintained the inviolability of private property (ownership of production) on the theory that the new order freed society for once and all by making it possible for the mass to combine earning and owning in the person of each individual. Anyone who was industrious, ambitious and frugal could become an owner through his earning capacity, and society would henceforward be founded on a large homogeneous mass each member of which combined in himself the "personal union" of the two functions which were regarded as fundamental. Individual ownership was regarded as an indispensable essential to the activity of the individual in society, it was merely the dislocation of ownership through

feudal privilege that needed to be rectified. Therefore, this process was supported concretely by the redistribution and subdivision of the property of the church and the feudal nobility.

The permanence of this solution depended on the continuance of the possibility of becoming an owner through productive activity, or on the permanence of the principle of distribution and subdivision of ownership in some other form (such as was done in the United States by the western land policy).

But this arrangement which afterward became the foundation of middle class ideology, had inherent material faults. In due course it transpired that the ownership and expansion of ownership (i. e., derivation of income from title to property) was the path of greatest gain and material progress for each, and the earning of wealth by productive activity (income derived from sale of labor-power) was a less desirable method. In fact, with the continual increase of productivity the share obtainable by ownership increased and the share of the worker dropped to cost of living. In consequence the union of earning and owning in each member of society was supplanted by a general scramble to acquire wealth by ownership and to make the acquisition by earning secondary or unnecessary. The result was a concentration of ownership in the hands of a decreasing minority (the successful ones) to the exclusion of the greater mass. When the property available had been appropriated by this competition, those who were left, had to get along without property. Thus the "personal union" was doomed by the evolution of its component essentials and their inherent incompatibility. The attempt to create a one class system by subdivision and de-concentration of ownership was in direct conflict with the interests of the members as individuals.

Thus the "personal union" was broken up by the dualism of functions on which it was founded, and resulted in the very thing which it thought to have done away with, a two class

system. This merely proved conclusively that the preservation of ownership of social property by the individual is incompatible with a one class system, no matter how plausible the scheme might appear on the surface.

Instead of being a solution, the middle class ideal proved to be a transition from one system based on two classes to another system based on two classes. Materially this ideal was not in accordance with the facts, and their inherent tendencies, but it derived its vitality from psychological delusion; society thought a thing to be possible through inability to see that it was impossible, or through inability to see exactly where the impossibility entered.

PROPERTY AND PROLETARIAN

The freedom of the French Revolution ended as was inevitable in decomposition: the dualism which is disguised in embryo resulted in a class formation based on the earning and owning functions, the big capitalist class and the proletariat.

This final outcome, this ultima ratio of earning and owning can be understood only in the light of the long historical development of which the final stage has been reached.

There are indications that at an early stage society consisted of one class, that the change to the dual system was then brought about by the introduction of chattel slavery. What this means and has meant ever since, is that the ownership of the slave or exploitation of the wage earner is considered preferable to the performance of production. As such a principle was initiated by involuntary servitude, it could derive its origin only from force and conquest, but it owed its continued existence to the submission of the producer, or to his inability to combine the power and knowledge necessary to change his status.

Before the founding of Rome—in the very early Roman days, there was a one-class system in Italy, a body of free and independent farmers. This rugged body proved far too

powerful for the armies of the slave-owning Greeks and gave rise to the supremacy of Rome.

But from the free and independent farmers there developed a creditor and debtor class, and the impoverished portion was driven into slavery, or took refuge in Rome to constitute the first proletariat,—the Roman Proletariat.

The Roman Proletariat was, however, a transient phenomenon; chattel slavery was introduced on a large scale to take care of production, and any separatist interests or aspirations of the proletarian portion were disposed of by its incorporation in the ruling class. The Roman Proletariat participated with the propertied classes in the exploitation of the slaves, who performed the bulk of production.

There were powerful slave uprisings later, but they never accomplished permanent results. The abolition of chattel slave production took place in the form of Feudal Christianity or Christian Feudalism. The right to own human beings was done away with, and ownership was limited to the inanimate or to animals. But without the human factor no production was insured, and therefore the producer was bound to the property as a serf, but in return he was given a location to work and live, and the means to support himself as well as his lord. While the feudal system was just as enslaving as any other, it constituted a step forward by limitation of ownership.

It was inevitable that the next social upheaval would be directed against the attachment of the producer to the property, which was merely an indirect slavery. This was accomplished in the course of many long struggles covering the period from the Reformation to the French Revolution, and led, as we have already seen, to the abolition of serfdom and privilege, so that the producer was no longer a chattel slave nor an adjunct to the property, but belonged henceforward to himself. Thus capitalism was another step forward by limitation of ownership.

But the fact that man is free by not being a chattel slave and not being attached to the property of another proved to

be a very deceptive sort of liberty. Both chattel slavery and Feudalism recognized the principle that the world owes a man a living; not that it was ever formulated in so many words, but it was inherent in the nature of the institutions themselves, in the same way as feeding and taking care of a horse or a dog nowadays is incumbent not on the animals but on their owners. Neither slave nor serf had to worry where to "pitch their tent" the next day, nor where the next meal was to come from. But when a man owns himself and nothing else, that is to say when he has become a complete proletarian, he is not guaranteed the right to live nor the right to work, he is guaranteed the right or rather the need of attaching himself to the property of someone productively, or otherwise he is entitled to the privilege of dying by starvation or otherwise.

This proletarianization of the masses began around the time of the Renaissance in the sphere of agriculture, then the predominating form of production; it was the result of the productivity of the worker, and those who were not needed by the owning interests were driven out by these interests, which retained only as many producers as were necessary. Thus the peasants were expropriated on a large scale, and many of those who were driven from the soil took refuge in the cities where handicraft and commerce flourished: the increased productivity led to an increased variety of activity, corresponding to the rise of commerce and industry and the growth of the cities, and in addition to these internal changes there began a period of voyage and discovery, i. e., a process of expansion or radiation. People sought their fortunes either by a new form of activity or in new fields of activity, and this two-fold tendency checked the proletarianization of the agricultural population, by acting as an absorbent.

This stage of proletarianization began with peasant revolts and uprisings, and ended in the bourgeoisie middle-class program of the French Revolution. But the reign of the middle-class ideal was of short duration, for it was brought to a sudden termination by the invention of machinery and

the introduction of the factory system, giving rise to the big capitalist on the one hand and the industrial proletariat on the other.

With the entry of the industrial proletariat on the scene, the character of class relations and antagonisms reaches a stage that is historically decisive. The proletarianization of the masses can no longer be relieved by enlarging the sphere of activity, such as was the case when the rising cities and the voyages of discovery and migration opened up new channels of social drainage for population not needed in old spheres of production. For as a result of the penetration of continents, and the complete colonization of all known lands in recent years, the world has been grub-staked from end to end, and further expansion means, not the enlarging of the sphere of activity of an old society, but the collision of the expanding societies. External expansion means in that event, mutual destruction as a means of evading internal issues instead of solving them.

There is no absorbent for the modern industrial proletariat. It cannot be offered possibilities of ownership outside of the old society by which it was cast off and ostracized. The solution of the condition where part of society's members are the owners of all that society has and needs, must be met not outside of but inside of that society. The rehabilitation of the modern industrial proletariat cannot be accomplished by applying the old cures, by making the workers owners, by combining earning and owning in the person of each individual; additional property for that purpose is no longer available. Owning that interferes with earning is a condition that cannot be dealt with by the incorporation of new spheres of ownership, in other words by evasion. The problem must be faced not evaded; it cannot be shifted from the inside to the outside of the country, there is no longer a place to which the difficulty can be shifted. We have reached the point where we lack elbow room. Ownership must be prevented from interfering with earning, the owning portion of society can no longer be permitted to ostracize the mass from earn-

ing to send it elsewhere to seek its freedom, if it is not to remain at home in privation and slavery. The mass will free itself at home, it will at last meet the problem where it originated, it will solve the antagonism between owning and earning "at the source."

This distinction between the problem as it has been met, and as it has to be met from now on, differentiates the early manifestations of the proletariat (Roman, Agricultural) from the modern industrial proletariat. The early proletariat was transient and temporary, it tended to evaporate by expansion of the sphere of production and activity. The modern proletariat is permanent. The early solutions amounted to a "tabling" of the problem, the present situation makes a permanent solution necessary, and in fact unavoidable.

But there is no disagreement on the point that the proletariat must be abolished. The question is:

1. When? The Menshevik says not now.

2. How? The Menshevik says that the mere presence of a proletariat is not a sufficient basis for its immediate abolition, that a certain development of the factors of production must also be present first, and that therefore the abolition must be accomplished indirectly, by waiting, because this course is the only possible one, that to attempt to abolish proletarian conditions directly now and here (referring specifically to Russia at present) is to undertake a certain impossibility.

Before dealing with the reply to these questions, we must first continue to make clear the general principles on which the answer must depend.

EDITORIALS

The Bubble Has Burst

The next few months will show whether the hopes of the world for a new Democracy are to be fulfilled. The Peace Conference to be opened in January is expected by incorrigible optimists and illusionists to frame a new Magna Charta for the World, and to fulfill the promises of the statesmen of the victorious Powers to make the world safe for Democracy, once and for all.

The man in whom, of all the Allies, these liberal ideas have been particularly outspoken, has been hailed all over the world as the conqueror of militarism and the bringer of freedom for all. His utterances, therefore, have assumed a significance much bigger than that usually attached to the words of politicians and statesmen. When it was announced that President Wilson would address Congress on the day before his departure for Europe, it was thus naturally assumed that he would speak out, and frankly and resolutely restate before the American people the aims for which America, in his opinion, had been fighting, and the practical results that he would endeavor to force from the Entente Powers. The speech came at a psychological moment. Victory had been won on all fronts, monarchism and militarism in the Central Powers had been defeated. Their crowned heads had fled and were hiding in neutral countries. The masses of the peoples not only controlled but formed their governments. The premises for a "peace without victory," for a peace between democratic nations, were given. We were standing on the threshold of a new era. Did the President, in his message to Congress, express its spirit?

Never before had the world looked with such great expectations to the man who, in the eyes of the liberals of all nations, had seemed the incarnation of their hopes. And never has the President so sorely disappointed his adherents.

Where they expected him to define and outline a practical application of his famous fourteen points, he was eloquently silent.

Where they hoped for a reiteration of the principle of the right of self-determination of nations, not only for those small nations that had been freed from the domination of the Central Powers, but of those larger and once more powerful nations, Germany, Austria-Hungary and Russia, that have freed themselves from their own oppressors, he announced the necessity of retaining a "considerable proportion of the American Army" in Europe.

Where they thought that America, under his leadership, would set to the world an example of naval and military disarmament, he urged Congress to order the execution of the three-year-naval construction program, while two days later the Secretary of War, Baker, one of the President's closest advisors, spoke, guardedly, it is true, but very suggestively nevertheless, of the probable necessity of universal military service.

Where they awaited a general pardon for all political prisoners and conscientious objectors, where they were confident that he would recommend the immediate repeal of all war restriction laws on the freedom of speech, press and assemblage, he was mute.

Where they were sure that a comprehensive reconstruction program would be presented to Congress, that radical recommendations in favor of a general minimum wage and eight-hour laws would be made in this message, there came the statement that "from no quarter have I seen any general scheme of 'reconstruction' emerge which I thought it likely we could force our spirited business men and self-reliant laborers to accept with due pliancy and obedience."

Where they were convinced that he would insist, not only upon the retention of the railroads and public utilities already under national domination, but that he would favor an extended system of state capitalism of some of the other important industries of the nation, he declared that he had been unable to form

an opinion on the subject, and that he would bow gracefully to any decision that the Bourbon gentlemen from the South and the pliant Republican tools of the big interests in the East and West might reach.

So in a single speech, Wilson shattered the house of cards that honest ideologists, "practical" socialists and gullible radicals had constructed out of his fine speeches and appealing phrases.

The bubble of World Democracy and Liberalism by the grace of so-called progressive statesmen, by a reconstruction of this capitalist world, has burst.

The struggle for liberty still rests alone in the revolutionary movement of the working classes of the world.

L.

The Elections

The election that has just taken place brought the results that were to be expected. The absence of the most vigorous element, the young enthusiasts, from the ranks of our workers, the disorganization that followed upon the imprisonment of many of our ablest comrades and party officials, the intimidation by the press and the super-patriotic element of the population could not but lessen our activity and propaganda.

At the same time it was to be understood that the big vote polled by the Socialist Party at the 1917 election in different sections of the country was more of an anti-military, anti-conscription and anti-war vote than one for socialist principles. The Socialist party, as the only party opposed to war had to attract,—beside a part of the pro-German vote,—the men and women who were honestly opposed to the war. This vote, naturally swings back to the old parties as soon as the cause of their desertion has been removed, and since the armistice negotiations that had started a few weeks before election, most of these votes returned to the old parties. Nor can it be overlooked that the sentiment of the public at large has changed to a great extent, and that the intensive drives and

skillful newspaper and publicity propaganda, together with overtime wages of a considerable portion of the workers had created a determination to "see it through" in place of the former opposition.

Nothing is known as yet about the results in the West. This in itself proves that the party there has made a poor showing. Nothing seems to be left of the sprinkling of socialist legislators that were elected in the previous year in Washington, Oregon, Nevada and California. In the Middle West the results are little better. Kansas, Idaho, Illinois and Minnesota are again without Socialist representatives in the legislatures, and Minneapolis lost its Socialist Mayor, Van Lear, which is hardly to be regretted. For Comrade Van Lear, who under very difficult circumstances, in the beginning of the war stood his ground courageously and well, and had valiantly fought against the infamous Public Safety Commission of Minnesota, compromised himself and the party that had elected him, by joining hands with the American Alliance of Labor and Democracy, and by speaking from its platform at a so-called Victory Meeting—not victory over Germany, but a victory over the radical "anti-American" movement of Minneapolis. That Van Lear took this stand not so much from a change of conviction as from openly opportunistic motives, because he desired, above all, to be reelected, by no means detracts from this sorry spectacle.

Wisconsin is the only exception from the rule. There Victor L. Berger was elected to Congress, 17 Assemblymen and 4 State Senators sent to Madison, and the full socialist ticket in the county of Milwaukee was chosen. Besides Milwaukee the Socialist Party vote for Governor, in four counties was higher than that polled by either of the capitalist parties. In three counties the full county ticket was elected, and in numerous other counties socialists were returned to office. Undoubtedly a portion of this vote must be ascribed to the opposition to the war; that is only natural in a state where so large a proportion of the population is of German extraction. But it would be worse than folly to overlook the

fact that the militant stand that was taken by the Milwaukee Leader and its editor, Victor L. Berger, that the aggressive attitude of the socialist movement of Wisconsin under this leadership toward prosecution and suppression had very much to do with this splendid showing. We believe that the feeling prevails that Victor L. Berger, in spite of many sins of omission and commission would have been the right man in Congress during the period of the war. At least he would not have been afraid to speak out against the government whenever the interests of the socialist and labor movement demanded it. His usefulness to the party during the critical period that now lies before us, will be determined largely by the trend that events in Europe will take. For, after all is said and done, Victor L. Berger is still the great American opportunist.

In the East the loss of the Socialist Congressman from New York is one thing to be thankful for. Meyer London has not been simply opportunistic or careful, he has been much worse. He created the impression that he stood in with the enemies of the Russian revolution, he encouraged the counter-revolutionists in this country by sending them telegrams and promising to speak at their meetings. He joined the capitalist politicians and the capitalist press by denouncing the Bolsheviks and their regime. He failed to condemn intervention in Russia when the party instructed him to do so. In the fight for free speech and assemblage, against the pernicious legislation enacted by the last Congress, he was content to play the role of tail to the Republican kite. We do not underestimate the difficulties a lone Socialist Congressman must face in times like these. But he might at least have kept his record clean, if he had not sufficient determination to make it effective. His renomination is not to the credit of the membership of New York, even though it was prompted by the consideration that the district would be lost if another candidate were nominated in his place.

That it was impossible to elect Hillquit, Scott Nearing, Shiplacoff and Whitehorn to Congress is surely to be re-

gretted, for men of their caliber would have laid a good foundation for the more numerous socialist Congressional delegations of the future.

The Assembly delegation at Albany was cut down from 10 to 2 and has lost its best timber. Let us hope that the two comrades Claessens and Solomon will understand the spirit of our times and not fritter away their energy with the promulgation of meaningless petty reforms.

The world is aflame, and is burning up all that is old and obsolete, all that is rotten and miserable in the human race. Ours cannot be the role of the fireman who vainly tries to save unimportant and insignificant rubbish at the risk of his life. The world demands from us greater and bigger work.

L.

EUGENE V. DEBS

In this vast country, with its tremendous distances and its one-hundred million population, a national leadership is not easily won. The West and the East, the South and the North, each develop their own leaders according to their own more or less clannish ideals and movements. The labor movement of this country has been no exception to this rule. On the Pacific coast new men have arisen from time to time to prominence and influence who remained almost unknown in the East. The "big" men of the East have been without influence in the other regions of the United States. This tendency has made itself felt even in the Socialist movement where, on account of its international character, territorial differences have made themselves felt to a far lesser degree. Morris Hillquit was the acknowledged Leader of the East, Victor Berger and Seymour Stedman held the Middle West, while Job Harriman ruled the Pacific Coast. Not even Eugene V. Debs, who on account of his prominence in the Labor movement and his extended and frequent tours through the country, became better known than any of the others, could obtain the

influence in big party questions throughout the national movement that was justly his due. The various sections of the country were often strongly moved by sectional influences, not so much because they desired to serve regional interests and needs, as from the natural variation in viewpoint that must arise where men and women live under such widely diversified conditions. The difference in attitude on the I. W. W. and the A. F. of L., on prohibition, on the Negro question, on the Non-Partisan League and on the war are illustrations of this condition.

This has been considerably changed during the last year, by the persecution that set in against the socialist movement as soon as the war broke out. All sections of the country have been hit, and no matter how cautious and careful our more moderately inclined comrades expressed their criticisms, they were indicted just as quickly, and sentenced just as mercilessly as their more temperamental and more radical comrades. It is a fact that the first socialist victims of the Espionage Law were comrades holding extremely moderate views who, at St. Louis were with that winglet that was strongly in favor of striking a war bargain with the government. The open warfare that was declared by the government on all Socialists aroused the Party to a white heat of indignation that has welded all its elements. The trials became the rallying points of the movement, and the opposition to the petty and brutal policy of governmental oppression and suppression grew in leaps and bounds.

But in all of these trials something was lacking. While our comrades defended themselves against the indictments, while they showed that they had committed no crime, they never were bold enough to become the accusers of the policy of the government. Friedrich Adler's glorious example in justifying his act found no followers in the United States.

But then a prosecuting attorney blundered. Eugene Debs was indicted. He sounded the clarion call for which the whole movement had been waiting. Standing before the bar

as a criminal in the eyes of justice, after forty years spent in the struggle for labor, a struggle that began with a prison sentence earned in the cause of labor, he proclaimed the right of every human being to fight against capitalism and all forms of capitalist misrule. He proved that his fight against militarism and war was but a part of this gigantic world-wide struggle of the working-class. He acclaimed the right to revolution and maintained that the struggle between the classes of society would be fought out until the proletariat is free.

The trial of the great American socialist came at a psychological moment, when events in Europe and at home had aroused even the most forgiving of our members.

We were ready for unvarnished speech, and Debs' declaration before the court brought the whole Party, from Canada to Mexico, from the Atlantic to the Pacific, to its feet, in one burst of enthusiastic acclaim. Here was a man who dared to say what they all were thinking, here was a man who expressed the sentiments that had taken possession of the American movement as they had never been able to do before. The Socialist Party of America had found a leader, a leader who was able to unite all shades and all factions, all groups and all opinions into one, because he represented the spirit of the International.

The Debs trial is more than an episode in the history of the Socialist Party. Its influence will make itself felt, and will permeate the movement everywhere. Its effect was apparent in the second Masses' trial. While the first trial had shown a wavering and rather apologetic attitude on the part of the defendants, the example of Debs had braced them up, and made them defiant. Max Eastman, in a strong, masterful speech, defended the St. Louis Declaration of the Party and the Party itself; John Reed, who had been in Russia during the first trial, explained and proclaimed the class war, and Floyd Dell and Art Young were no less outspoken and manly.

The example of one man had worked a glorious change in the attitude of a big national movement. L.

The Red Flag

It has been a common occurrence that people whose past will least bear investigation, are loudest in their protestations and their professions of the very virtues they least possess. The latest example of this noble human characteristic is Mayor John F. Hylan, of New York City, that priceless jewel in the crown of Tammany, who was elected with the whole-hearted support of the most flagrantly "un-American" element of the city. We can appreciate that Mayor Hylan would do his damndest, once his election was assured, to wipe this unpleasant stain from his fair name. It came with particularly good grace, therefore, from his Honor, to be the first public official in this country to forbid the use of the red flag at street and hall meetings and to outlaw it as the emblem of Bolshevism, this bogy of every respectably stupid American citizen.

The alleged cause that inspired this patriotic outburst on the part of the gentleman in the City Hall was a peaceable parade arranged by Local New York in honor of the German Revolution, which was brutally attacked by a mob of sailors, sent there by the National Security League and other "patriotic" organizations of the same caliber. That the attack was entirely unprovoked, that the rowdies in uniform, with admirable impartiality, beat up men and women alike for the unpardonable crime of wearing a red button, even the capitalist press was forced to admit. It was clear. Something had to be done about it. Such outrages could not be permitted to occur on the orderly streets of the City of New York. The Socialists must be stopped from provoking such unlawful demonstrations.

But the New York Times, of Wednesday morning (the demonstration was held on Monday night) with characteristic bluntness, gave away the truth. On Tuesday evening, according to their report, a banquet of the Society of Arts and Sciences was held at which a number of prominent politicians and capitalists started a crusade on the Red Flag. Job Hedges, a Republican politician who enjoys the enviable repu-

tation of having candidated for almost every office in the gift of his party without ever having been elected, whose reputation as a cheap-wit after-dinner speaker makes him a popular guest at such "intellectual" feasts, charged the red flag in a venomous speech that delighted the assembled "artists" and "scientists" to such a degree that they rose to their feet and cheered this brave defender of simon-pure Americanism, when he cried out, striking a melodramatic attitude: "Let us dedicate ourselves so that never again shall be raised the voice or the symbol of disloyalty to what is decent on this earth. The red flag of anarchy must go or the red blood of the martyrs has been shed in vain . . ."

But Mr. Schwab, the labor hater from the Bethlehem Steel Company, recently the much heralded "one dollar man" ship-builder, who, only a few months ago showed so much understanding for the ideals of the Socialist movement, that some of our more optimistic comrades were almost ready to welcome him into the party, rehabilitated himself by doing his bit "against the red flag of so-called Socialism." He closed with the demand that the "red flag must be wiped off of this democratic earth if democracy shall survive."

Three days later the obedient tool of capitalism, Mayor Hylan, issued his red flag order to the police commissioner. And again three days later, in the Board of Aldermen, Kenneally, Charles F. Murphy's own alderman, introduced a "Red Flag" ordinance, that was adopted a week later against the Socialist votes and that of one lone Democrat by the servile henchmen who are our city fathers. Since then Chicago and Minneapolis have passed similar ordinances, so that it is safe to assume that, very soon, we will have a universal "Red Flag" prohibition in the United States, especially as the National Security League has already announced its intention of having such a bill introduced in Congress.

The National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party that will be in session in January must plan an energetic and aggressive campaign against the red flag anathema. The

fight against the red flag is by far more important than is generally understood, for its purpose is not merely a fight against a symbol, but against the aggressive and revolutionary character of our movement. The capitalists of this country have no objections to academic banquet speeches and intercollegiate conferences. But they do object to the demonstrative emphasis laid upon the revolutionary character of an aggressive and militant fighting machine. They object to the red flag because it is the incarnation of this spirit, as the open challenge to oppressing, exploiting capitalist misrule, and as the insignia of international solidarity with the revolutionary forces in Europe. And, above all, it should not be forgotten, that this anti-red flag campaign is a part of the great drive upon public opinion against the Bolsheviki in Russia and the radicals in Germany. The American public must be mentally and spiritually prepared to enter into the coming onslaught against revolutionary Europe, and nothing will do this so effectively as the creation of a wholesome fear of the red flag and of all that it signifies.

It is a mistake to regard this exception-law against the socialist movement as unimportant. The fight for the red flag is more than the fight for a mere meaningless symbol. We should go into the battle with all the enthusiasm of which our movement is capable, and use every weapon that is in our possession to force its retraction. Our delegation to the Board of Aldermen should break, once and for all, with their Sysiphus task of exclusively proposing and sponsoring reform measures that never see the light of day. They should adopt new aggressive and obstructive methods, and in the interests of the party they represent, should vote against every and all financial bills and appropriations in the Board until the Red Flag ordinance has been repealed and the police department has stopped its work for a boycott of Socialist meetings by the hall owners, i. e., until the Socialist Party of Greater New York has been restored to an equal footing with all other political organizations.

L.

One Measure For All

In the excitement that attended the latest trials of socialist and labor leaders in this country, one of the most shameful attacks that have ever been perpetrated against organized labor has been well-nigh forgotten. Now comes the news that the indictments brought in against the twenty-five pillars of society in Bisbee and other towns of the Arizona ore-mining district have been "quashed" *for technical reasons*. Thus one of the vilest crimes that was ever committed against the American working-class remains unavenged.

Many months have passed since the occurrences in Bisbee took place. We are living fast, and the labor movement is quick to forget its wrongs. Nobody cares about things that happened in June, 1917; many have never known of the crime perpetrated against the miners of Bisbee. The capitalist class of the West can deliver this blow in the face of the working class with impunity. They have nothing to fear.

What was it that occurred in Bisbee? Four thousand miners went on strike against the Phelps Dodge Mining Corporation for a ten per cent. wage increase and a reduction of the ten-hour workday to nine hours. And in spite of the fact that the company imported an army of gunmen and armed bandits—to maintain order—in spite of all provocations, the miners remained so utterly peaceful that the Phelps Dodge Company began to feel uncomfortable.

The miners remained solidly on strike. By fair means or foul the strike had to be broken. At that particular time there was an enormous demand for metal ore, and the highest prices were being paid. The Company saw fat profits slipping away between their fingers; the strike was costing them millions of dollars. They were, therefore, prepared to come to terms on the question of wages, and would perhaps have granted a reduction of working hours. But they refused point-blank to consider the recognition of the union demanded by the striking miners.

Then came the great coup on the 17th of June, 1917. Two months later the strike began. A great crowd of striking miners

that had gathered about the entrance to one of the mines was surrounded by an army of police, deputy sheriffs and gunmen, were driven, unarmed as they were, before the loaded guns of their captors, to the railroad station. There, all of them, men, women and children, were forced with unbelievable brutality into a waiting freight train, in which they were shipped across the border of the state into New Mexico, about seven hundred miles from Bisbee, where they were thrown out of the cars in the midst of an uninhabited desert. In this deserted region of New Mexico, completely cut off from all communication with their families and with the world, these unfortunate men, women and children were exposed to the most intense suffering. And only the foodstuffs that were brought them by organized labor at the earliest possible moment saved these thousands of workers from a miserable death.

It took some time before the energetic protests of labor in the West were finally able to force an investigation. In the investigation it was disclosed that this dastardly crime had been committed not only with the knowledge, but with the assistance of the management of the mines and the local authorities of Bisbee. The corporation officials had paid the gunmen, while the local authorities had engaged the scoundrels who did this dirty work. Indictments followed, indictments that incriminated the highest officials among the millionaire knaves at the head of the company. Proudly the capitalist press showed that in the United States of America there was no class justice, that rich and poor were measured by the same standards, that not even the richest of the men responsible for the Bisbee outrage would be able to escape the hand of justice.

That was six months ago. Since then things have been strangely quiet. And now comes the news that the entire matter has been dropped. Because of a technical error in the indictments. The comedy is over. The curtain has fallen.

In St. Quentin jail there sits a man whom millions believe innocent, millions not only of the class to which he belongs and for which he has fought, but even his judge, the judge in whose

court the verdict was given, and the death sentence spoken. Letters, sworn testimony and witnesses whose veracity is above all suspicion, have not only shaken the testimony of the witnesses upon whose testimony rested the entire proof of the prosecution, but have actually exposed the trial as a judicial farce that was built, from beginning to end, upon a fabric of lies and forgeries, by a district attorney who is little less than a criminal. The whole trial fell to pieces like a house of cards. And yet one court after the other, from the lowest to the highest court of the Nation, has deposed that there can be no appeal from the sentence of death that had been passed upon Tom Mooney, that there was no legal justification for the granting of a new trial.

The gentlemen of Bisbee did not have to protest or to plead. The case against them was thrown out of court, and no one so much as thinks of demanding a new indictment. But Tom Mooney, the workingman, whose innocence is beyond all doubt, has been "pardoned" to life imprisonment.

There are no classes in the United States. There is no such thing as class justice. *"One nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all!"* L.

"Our" Peace Delegates

The publication of the names of the American peace plenipotentiaries was received all over the country as a matter of course. It was known that the choice of the American representatives lay wholly in the hands of the President, and it was hardly to be expected that he would choose men other than those who were in full accord with his policies. The expectations of those who hoped that one or more men of a more progressive type than those who were actually chosen, would represent the American people at the peace negotiations were out of the question from the very outset.

In one respect, however, there was perhaps some disappointment among certain elements of the population. It had been more or less confidently expected that the President of the American

Federation of Labor would be one of the delegates, thus giving organized labor a representative on the American peace delegation. The government is now being accused of not sufficiently appreciating the services rendered by Samuel Gompers during the past year for the country.

In our opinion such an attack upon the government is wholly unjustified. For we are convinced that Washington would have been perfectly willing to give Gompers the fifth place in the peace delegation. And, pray, why not? Surely the President of the American Federation of Labor would have fitted perfectly into the general character of that delegation.

As a matter of fact, the refusal to name a nominal representative of the working class as one of the peace commission, was caused by entirely different considerations. It lies in the absolute refusal of the English, French and Italian governments to send labor representatives to the peace conference. And these governments had, as a matter of fact, very excellent reasons for so doing.

Whom should Great Britain, for instance, send to Paris to represent labor? There is not a representative of the British labor movement who could even be considered who is not a Socialist. The appointment of Havelock Wilson, who is perhaps nearest of all British Labor men to the Gompers type, would have created a storm of protest all over the country. The choice lay between Arthur Henderson, Ramsay MacDonald and perhaps Ben Tillet. And every one of these men was on the face of it absolutely out of the question.

Similar conditions prevail in France. Whom could the French government have chosen? Jouhaux, Thomas, Renaudel or Longuet, all Socialists. However they may have differed in their attitude toward the war, they all are members of the socialist movement, and as such would energetically oppose the predatory desires of the bourgeois delegates.

In Italy and in Belgium, the same considerations prevented the sending of labor representatives. Everywhere the line of class distinctions is so clearly marked that a unity of the exploiting and

the exploited classes, even on peace terms, is impossible. The delegations of the capitalist countries will not and cannot include real representatives of the working-class.

Samuel Gompers, the anti-Socialist, is the victim of the socialist epidemic that has spread through all European working-class movements.

L.

VICTOR ADLER

The years of war have taken their toll in the international socialist movement not only from among the young. During these last five years the socialist movements of France, England and Austria have lost their best and foremost leaders, Jaurès, Keir Hardie and Victor Adler, men whom the working class could ill afford to miss at any time; their loss at such a crisis, when their counsel was so sorely needed, made its trials doubly hard to bear.

Nowhere in the entire International has the movement of a country been more inextricably associated with the name of a single man than was that of Austria with its Victor Adler. A physician by profession, Adler had always keenly felt the inequality of the struggle that was being fought by the men, women and children of the poor against terrible conditions, in the factory and the home. This interest in the unfortunates of his country led him to take up an intensive study of factory legislation, and he tried, in order to put the knowledge he had gained to some practical use, to receive an appointment as factory inspector from the government of Vienna. The rejection of his application for this position because of the place that he already occupied in the labor movement, made him realize that better conditions for the working class must be won not through but against its capitalist exploiters, and Victor Adler thenceforward devoted himself whole-heartedly and unselfishly to the cause of labor.

Adler came into the socialist movement of his country at a time when it most needed a leader who understood its principles and aims. Torn into national groups which reflected the national

struggles that threatened the very existence of the Austrian monarchy, the working class was wasting its energies in a struggle between the factions and groups of its own movement. His tireless efforts to reconcile these antagonisms gained for him the name, the great compromiser, a role that Victor Adler played throughout his career. He was always the buffer, always the intermediary, between the various nationalistic groups at first, and later between the conservative and the radical elements of the movement.

Adler's extraction and profession always inclined him toward the opportunistic wing that was particularly strong and influential in Austria. The physician in him was tortured by the misfortune and misery he saw on every hand and was impelled, sometimes at the expense of our revolutionary aims, to support every measure that would ameliorate these conditions, often to oppose revolutionary tactics when they seemed to threaten the success of immediate reforms. But in spite of this, Adler was always a Socialist in the largest and best sense of that word, a great man, intellectually better fitted than any of those who to-day lead the European proletariat, to stand at the head of his class.

This same tendency toward overemphasis of the importance of reform measures gained under a capitalist government led Adler, when first the war broke out, to cast his lot with the nationalist elements in the socialist movements of Germany and Austria. Though he was far removed from the position taken by the Scheidemanns and Davids of Germany and the Renners and Seitz' in his own party, he was never in complete sympathy with the small group of revolutionary radicals to which his son, Friedrich Adler, belonged. The shooting of Count Stürghk by his son was a double blow to him, because he was incapable of understanding the motives that prompted this desperate act.

In Victor Adler the International loses one of its pioneers and real statesmen. That this man should become Minister of Foreign Affairs of the German-Austrian Republic, after a life of untold labors and sacrifices for the proletariat, was a fitting climax to the career of the noblest and kindest among the Socialists of the old school.

L.

Documents

A Protest of the Independent Labor Party of England

The International Socialist Commission in Stockholm transmits the following protest of the Central Committee of the Independent Labor Party of England against the intervention of the Entente in Russia:

The Allies have landed in the north of Russia. It is reported that the Russian government has protested against the occupation of a neutral and peaceful country, which is regarded as equivalent to an act of war, and has declared that it will take measures accordingly. It is reported in addition that an Allied expedition consisting of English, French, American, Japanese and Chinese troops intends to occupy Siberia in order to support the Czecho-Slovaks who are fighting the authority of the Soviets in this region in order to break their power.

It is no longer claimed that the campaign of the Allies is to serve the purpose of carrying on the war against Germany on the western front of Russia. This idea was never practicable: the most elementary conception of the nature of the case is sufficient to enable anyone to understand that it is impossible to move a large army and all the necessary appurtenances and supplies 7,000 miles across country where there are difficulties of transportation on all sides. And even that were not so, the idea of occupying a neutral country on the pretext of military necessity would nevertheless be unacceptable, and should be strongly condemned. Such a procedure would be exactly the same in its nature as the German invasion of Belgium. The intervention of the Allies in Russia has been decided upon without the consent of, and in fact, in direct contradiction to the wishes of the Russian government, and is being received by the masses of the Russian people with intense uneasiness and ill-will. On the other hand, the intervention scheme is being hailed by the English and foreign press as a step in the direction of the suppression of the Russian Revolution.

It is claimed that the Soviet government is not the expression of the will of the Russian people, and that the Allied occupation is for

the purpose of freeing the people from the tyranny of the government. We shall not render an opinion concerning the accomplishments or mistakes of the present Russian government. It is generally admitted that it is difficult to know what is going on in Russia at this time. However, that claim that the Russian government exists in opposition to the will of the people is contradicted by two important facts. The first fact is that the government, while maintaining its authority, has in the course of nine months introduced extensive social measures based on a program of reorganization; the second proof is that no counter-revolutionary movement has taken place, based on the support of the people, which was in a position to even attempt to overthrow the Soviet government and to substitute another government for it.

The Allies, it seems, have really effected a change of government in the neighborhood of the Murman coast, but that was accomplished by means of sending in supplies and financial support, whereas in Siberia the so-called uprising is nothing else than the attack of an allied power (the Czecho-Slovaks) on the Russian people and the Russian government. The only support accorded the Allied intervention is derived from Aristocratic and Capitalist sources (the very same as in the Ukraine, along the Don and in Finland, supported and welcomed the German military power to suppress the Revolution in those regions); also from the very feeble liberal and socialist "intellectual" sources that supported the Kerensky government, whose overthrow drove them over to the reaction.

The intervention of the Allies in Russia, contrary to the will of the Russian people and the Russian government, is a challenge to Socialism and to Democracy. In our opinion it is nothing less than an attempt to suppress the Social Revolution and to establish the power and dominion of Capital. The Russian people will fight invasion, which at most can succeed in increasing enormously industrial disorganization and starvation.

The Socialists of England and the other allied countries cannot remain silent and indifferent over against the threatening aggression of their governments. Accordingly, we turn to the organized English workers and summon them to condemn as strongly as possible the participation of the English government in an undertaking which is a crime against the national independence and against the Russian Revolution, which in spite of its faults has done so much to revive the hopes of human freedom. It is a crime which, if it is adhered to, can lead to fatal results not only in the case of Russia, but in the matter of the freedom and democracy of the whole world.

An Appeal of the Soviet Government

"Pravda" of August 1st issues the following appeal to the proletariat of the Entente countries, written by Lenin, Chicherin, and Trotzky:

The entire capitalist press of your countries is howling with a hoarse voice, like a dog loosened from his chains, for the "intervention" of your governments in the internal affairs of Russia; they cry: "Now or never!" But at the very moment that these hirelings of your exploiters are throwing off all disguise and speaking openly of an attack on the workers and peasants of Russia, they are still shamefully lying and deceiving you outrageously, for while uttering their threats of "intervention," they are already conducting military operations against the Russia of the workers and peasants.

You who are shedding your blood on the Marne and on the Aisne in the interests of Capital, in the Balkans, in Syria, in Mesopotamia, you are now also to lie in the snows of northern Finland and in the mountains of the Ural. In the interests of Capital, you are to be the hangmen of the Russian Revolution. In order to disguise this crusade against the Russian Workers' Revolution, your capitalists also explain that the expedition is not to be undertaken against the Russian Revolution, but against German Imperialism, to which we are said to have sold ourselves. We were forced, however, to divide Russia, because your governments, which knew very well that Russia could fight no longer, would not enter into peace negotiations, at which their strength would have saved Russia and assured us an acceptable peace. Not Russia, exhausted by 3½ years of war, has betrayed your cause; rather have your governments thrown Russia under the feet of German Imperialism. They think only of squeezing out the interest on the old loans advanced by French capital to Czarism. The Allies warned us that the Germans would occupy the Siberian and Murman Railways; these two direct lines, they said, which connect us with the outer world, must not come under German control. But in the end it was not the Germans who actually took possession of the railroads, which was impossible for them, at their distance from the railroad, but the Allies themselves. They are thus pursuing three objects: 1) the occupation of as much Russian territory as possible, in order, by holding its resources, to secure the payment of the interest on the loans made by French and English capital; 2) the suppression of the Workers' Revolution; 3) the erection of a new eastern front, in order to divert the Germans from the western front to fight on Russian soil.

The agents of your capitalism also explain that in this way they

will lessen the pressure of the German arms upon you, and hasten the victory over German Imperialism. But German Imperialism can only be crushed if the imperialism of all governments is defeated by the simultaneous revolt of the world-proletariat. The attempts to draw Russia into the war will not save you from the shedding of blood: they can only deliver up the Revolution to the sword. We have endured all too long the encroachments of the representatives of Entente Imperialism, we have allowed those who lay at the feet of the Czar, to remain in Russia, although they did not recognize the Soviets. And even now, when French officers are commanding the Czecho-Slavs, now that the horrors of the Murman coast have begun, even now we have not uttered a word of protest against the presence of your diplomats in the territory of the Soviet Republic, not recognized by them; we have only demanded their removal from Vologda to Moscow in order that we might protect them against the attacks of a people deeply enraged by their criminal enterprises. And now, after the departure of the Entente ambassadors, not a hair on the heads of the citizens of your countries who are living with us, will be touched, provided they obey the laws of the Soviet Republic. We are convinced that if we had returned two blows for each one received from the Entente usurpers, you would have witnessed not only an act of lawful self-defense, but also the defense of your own best interests; for the salvation of the Russian Revolution constitutes a common interest of the proletariat of all countries. Forced to war against Entente capital, which wishes to add new chains to the chains already imposed upon us by Germany, we turn to you with the cry:

Long live the solidarity of the workers of the whole world! Long live the French, English, American, and Italian proletariat, together with the Russian! Down with the robbers of International Imperialism! Long live the International Revolution! Long live the Peace of the Peoples!

Abrogation of the Brest Treaty Between Russia and Turkey

Chicherin's Note

As is learned by the correspondent of the "Neues Wiener Journal," Dr. Friedegg, the Russian government has sent the following note to Turkey:

"New political and territorial relations between Russia and Turkey were created by the Peace Treaty of Brest-Litovsk of March

3, 1918. Art. IV of the Brest-Litovsk Treaty granted to the populations of the provinces of Kars, Erzechem, and Batum, which had been a part of the Russian Republic, the right to establish a new regime based on an understanding with neighboring powers, particularly Turkey. The lot of these regions, their international position, was to be decided by the will of their populations. Yet, after the signing of the peace treaty, these districts were occupied by Turkish troops, and the regular establishments of military occupation were there instituted, accompanied by theft and plunder of intolerable degree, as well as acts of violence against the peaceable population. Simultaneously with the introduction of the Turkish rule, the forcible recruiting of the male population over 19 years of age was begun. The population, the free expression of whose desires was to be secured by the new order of things, was terrorized and placed into a condition of life that cannot be otherwise designated than as a farce and a travesty of the conception of justice. Respected citizens of the provinces, whose influence might have operated to Turkey's disadvantage, were banished or arrested and in many cases shot. In these acts of cruelty, as well as others practised against the population of the provinces ceded by Russia, the Soviet Government finds a **serious violation of Art. IV of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk.**

"The Peace Treaty further provided for a cessation of military hostilities between Russia and Turkey. Instead, after signing the treaty, Turkey again resumed hostilities, which are still in progress. Regular Turkish troops, acting in concert with bands of robbers, continue to occupy lands belonging to the Russian Republic, are visiting towns and villages with plunder and devastation, massacring the Christian population, women and children not excepted, and treating human beings with unparalleled cruelty. The Soviet Government has repeatedly protested against the continuation of this animosity on the part of Turkey, but all such notes of protest had no result. Finally, in June, the Ottoman army undertook an expedition against Baku, and after a heroic resistance on the part of the Soviet troops against overwhelming odds, the way to Baku, one of the most important cities of the Russian Republic, lay open to the Turks. All protests on the part of the Soviet Government were met with open and outright denials from Turkish authorities, later with the statement that only irregular bands were operating at Baku, until finally a regular Turkish army attacked the city and Shevket Pasha, on July 30th, called upon its inhabitants to surrender unconditionally.

"Now that the city has been taken and a Turkish army holds every nook of it, now that the population is defenseless and the city is the object of daily sack and pillage, its people subject to daily

massacre and other acts of violence, not only at the hands of the Tatar bands who are associated with the regular Turkish troops, but also from such regular troops themselves; it now appears that the statement of Turkish officials, to the effect that only local bands were involved in the attack on Baku, is merely a subterfuge, devoid of truth, intended simply to veil the cruelty of Turkey and the systematic violation of the Brest-Litovsk Treaty.

"For six months without cessation the Ottoman Government has been violating the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk in spite of all protests from the Soviet Government. And now, finally, it crowns its deeds by seizing and transforming into a frightful ruin one of the most important cities of the Russian Republic. The Ottoman Government has in this manner shown that the treaty of Brest-Litovsk, which was signed between Turkey and Russia, is no longer in force.

"The Government of the Russian Socialist Federative Republic is constrained to recognize, that in consequence of the acts of the Ottoman Government, the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, which was to establish amicable relations between Russia and Turkey, is null and void.

(Signed) Chicherin."

This note had been preceded, before the end of September, by another, in which the Russian Government demanded that Turkey withdraw its troops behind the boundaries fixed by treaty, that an international commission be appointed to determine the amount of damage done, and that the German Government should guarantee the carrying out of these conditions. Turkey promised an answer by September 30th, but delayed it until October 2nd, then declaring that the withdrawal of the regular troops was already under way. The Russian Government finds that the failure to mention irregulars is a failure to meet the conditions it prescribes, and finds that the answer is also vague in other respects.

The fact that Russia expects the Brest-Litovsk Treaty to be abrogated by Germany is also to be inferred from the following note of Russia to Germany, dated Oct. 2nd and printed in "Vorwärts":

"Radek, who is closely associated with circles in control of our foreign policy, outlines in his articles the fundamental views of these circles. The same is not to be said of domestic policy, and therefore his article on the 'Red Terror' was only an expression of his own private opinion. The case is quite different, however, in matters of foreign policy. In his article published by 'Izvestiya' on Oct. 1st ('The Shadow of Russia'), the following words require particular emphasis:

"Silently Russia bares her wounds to the German people. Now, while the German people is passing through hours of serious trial, joy is absent also from the hearts of Russians. The Russian workers desire no victory for American or London capital; they have experienced in their own persons the significance of the 'liberating motives' of Anglo-French imperialism. The Russian people were unable to sign a peace by understanding with German imperialism; the latter, moreover, forced a peace by violence upon the Russian people. At the moment of this ominous crisis of German imperialism, the masses of the Russian people do not say to it: 'Give back what you took from us'; they know that German imperialism will hardly return to them what it has taken from them by such means. The insane policy that is characteristic of all imperialistic states can hardly admit such a sensible step, a step that might alleviate the situation of Russia, and make it possible for that country to defend its own interests against the Allies without making a pact with German imperialism and to frustrate the ambitions of Anglo-French capital for the creation of a new eastern front against Germany.

"The above is a literal reflection of our feelings at the present moment: Silently we bare our wounds and assume that the step required by Germany's best interests will be undertaken by Germany itself."

One Year of Revolution

Celebrating the Anniversary of the Founding of the
Russian Soviet Republic

Contains the wonderful appeal of the Sailors of the Baltic fleet, Trotzky's address to the German soldiers, Tchicherin's reply to the charge of red terror, articles by Reed, Williams, etc., etc.

This pamphlet breathes the Spirit of new Russia, speaks the language of a new ideal that has penetrated to the masses of an entire nation. Full page picture of Lenin and Trotzky, and facsimiles in Russian and German of the most important documents.

Price, 15 Cents, postpaid

Special Prices to Agents and Socialist Locals

Socialist Publication Society

431 Pulaski Street

BROOKLYN, N. Y.