

THE RED FLAG

A Journal of News and Views Devoted to the Interests of the Working Class

VOL. 1 NO. 17

VANCOUVER, SATURDAY, MAY 17, 1919

FIVE CENTS

A Letter from a British Soldier---A Prisoner in Soviet Russia

Below is a reprint of a circular distributed among British soldiers in Russia by the Russian Soviet Government at Moscow. It will be of interest to Canadian workers.

QUIT FIGHTING, BRITISH SOLDIERS, AND JOIN YOUR RUSSIAN COMRADES!

British Prisoner from Archangel Front Writes to His Brother Scots.

"Is it right for working people of one country to kill working people of another?"

The Allied troops, invading Russia, have so often been told that if they are taken prisoner they will be tortured and killed by the Bolsheviks, that it is interesting to see what in fact happens when a British soldier falls into the hands of the Russian workmen's and peasants' army. Here is the letter of a private of the Royal Scots taken prisoner last month near Archangel:

To the Men of the Royal Scots

Koutlas, Monday, Oct. 14, 1918.

"I wonder if you all know the kind of men you are fighting. I do. You are fighting an army of workingmen, and there are no officers amongst them. Everybody is the same. They ask, why do we fight them? Well, that is more than I can say; in fact, I don't know why we have come to fight them, and another thing that counts is, they don't want to fight us. They are not fighting their own class, the working class, but the capitalists of Russia and other countries. Since I have been a prisoner I have been treated as one of themselves, and they have given me plenty to eat and drink. I have also seen one of our men that lies in the hospital wounded. He tells me that he has been well treated and looked after as a friend, a working man, and not a soldier.

"Now I ask you this question; is it right, that

the working class of one country should come and fight the working class of another country? We are not at war with Russia, and the Russians are not at war with us, but with the capitalists of all countries, the people whom we work for and keep in plenty, while we, the working class, merely exist. If the working class knew why they are fighting and for who they would refuse to fight any longer. Think things over and ask yourselves, is it worth while killing each other to please other people, who care not what happens, as long as their pockets are being filled at our expense. From what I have seen the Russians are a good people and they are fighting for a good cause, a cause that every country in the world should follow.

"PRIVATE LAPHAM,
"10th ROYAL SCOTS."

Socialism a la Mode

"RADICALISM" has become fashionable. To be in the mode now one must speak of "the radicals" in an intimate sort of way, discuss "radical" movements, advocate "radical" changes, and be a regular fire-eater generally. "Have you read Upton Sinclair's latest book?" asks our hero when you meet him on the street; Isn't it fine that the A. F. of L. is coming out flat-footed for freedom of speech?" "Did you hear that radical sermon in the Congregational church last Sunday?" And some one else, fresh from a perusal of a New Republic editorial or Wilson's "Fourteen Points," sidles up to a Socialist with an unmistakable air of comradeship and remarks, "Why I'm a radical myself."

Even the churches are becoming "radical"—taking them at their own valuation. There are "open forums" in our Y. M. C. A.'s where questions of the day are discussed "from all angles." Respectable pastors are almost preaching revolution, but not quite. In fact, wherever people

congregate you will find self-styled "radicals," whose opinions are about as vague as the use of the term implies. The word "radical" may mean anything or nothing; it is an euphemistic expression supposed to be a password into Socialist circles, but at the same time not connecting any definite Socialist idea that would at all embarrass its possessor in a bourgeois drawing-room.

It is a bit disgusting to observe the importance attached to this word by some Socialists. Even "members of the party" may be heard referring to Anarchism as "more radical" than Socialism; whereas as a matter of fact Anarchism is "radical" only in the sense that it is radically wrong. The same class of half-informed Socialists look with admiration and favor upon the "radical" platforms of the Non-Partisan League and the Catholic Bishops and the "Committee of Forty-Eight." It is essential that the working class, in order not to be misled, realize that these are signs, not that capitalism is on the verge of adopting Socialism, but that an ambush has been set for the awakening proletariat. We must realize that these programs are not for the proletarian emancipation, but for proletarian palliation. They may be regarded as signs of capitalist capitulation only under this condition, that the proletariat maintains warily its class-conscious, uncompromising position on the basis of Marxism—and nothing else. No "radicalism" will do as a substitute.

One of the striking phases of this Cult of the Radical is the flood of red that has today dyed a multitude of emotional Socialists who were but yesterday decidedly lukewarm in their allegiance to revolutionary principles. They are aptly called "November Bolsheviks"—Bolsheviks who out-revolt the original revolutionists. They revel in descriptions of "mass-action" and are not averse to riots—anything that has a "radical" look, whatever the basis or the object may be. Such Social-

ists, who may have scarcely a speaking acquaintance with the "Communist Manifesto," call loudly for the immediate organization of "Soldiers' and Workingmen's Councils" in the United States, styling all calmer Socialists "Mensheviks," forgetful of the fact that these "Councils" may, if controlled by reactionary elements, hinder rather than help the Socialist cause. What is needed by these discontented soldiers and workmen is rapid educational work, intensive and extensive, in the principles of Scientific Socialism, so that these "Soldiers and Workmen's Councils," when organized under the pressure of social conditions, will contain the largest possible number of well-informed Marxians. It is SOCIALISTS that are needed now, not "radicals."

—OAKLEY C. JOHNSON.

DECLARATION OF FRENCH SOCIALIST PARTY

"Hoping to re-establish that socialist unity which is indispensable to the activity of the proletariat, the Party declares that those who refuse to recognize the essential principles of the class struggle and of Socialist opposition to all other parties, and those who refuse to accept the necessarily internationalist character of Socialism are the declared enemies of Socialism.

"Now, more than ever, when the revolutionary state of affairs becomes more accentuated day by day, the proletariat needs definite guidance. . . .

"The French Socialist Party speaks loudly and clearly. It raises its voice against capitalist society, which is responsible for the war; it advocates the complete destruction of militarism; it labors for the liberation of the workers by the establishment of collective production and collective ownership; it appeals to the revolutionary energy of the proletariat, in whose cause it proposes to employ every possible form of activity."

SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

SUNDAY, MAY 18

At 8 p.m. Sharp

EMPRESS THEATRE

Corner Gore and Hastings

Speaker.....Joe Knight, of Edmonton

Education Under the Bolsheviki

Foreword

This report will be run in the "Red Flag" in serial form, probably over four issues, and should be read by all who are interested in education and educational systems. That proletarian control will immediately result in drastic changes in the methods in vogue here, in this country, there is no doubt, and it, consequently, behooves us all to study the methods pursued in Russia and so benefit by both their successes and mistakes.

IN a country kept artificially in ignorance, the task of education could not find full development on the day following the people's revolution, which transferred the power to the toiling masses. It is evident, however, that neither the conquest of political power nor the attainment of the position of economic master of the country, could be lasting, if the people should not also attain knowledge.

Only a high level of public education could make possible a conscious governing-by-the-people, which should embrace large masses. During the interval an important role had to be played by the intelligentsia, which had enjoyed the odious privilege of exclusive erudition, and was considered in Russia to be in sympathy with the people. In the time of the 1905-6 revolution, Kautsky pointed out with hope the fact that in Russia the task of the working class would be made easier by its sincere ally, the revolutionary intelligentsia. Kautsky did not foresee at that time that at the moment of the concrete realization of his dreams, at the hour of the social revolution, even he himself would turn enemy to the proletarian vanguard.

However, there is no evil without its accompanying good. The abominable sabotage on the part of the majority of the Russian intelligentsia, and in particular of the so-called Socialist intelligentsia, proved an excellent lesson for the proletariat, laying stress upon the unalterable necessity for the proletariat to acquire real knowledge immediately—for himself so far as possible and in full measure for his children.

The leadership in this important task has fallen to the Commissariat for Public Instruction.

Sabotage by Teachers

It was extremely hard to fulfill it, for one of the most relentless detachments in the camp of the saboteurs was the gentleman-teachers, urged along by the All-Russian Union of Teachers. The officials sabotaged also, destroying the central apparatus of the former Ministry of Public Instruction. We found ourselves among the ruins, without guides, without actual connection with the schools, without connection with the provinces, and with our pedagogical forces limited to an unbelievable extent.

Still other impediments arose along our road during the year. Suffice it to mention only one—the transfer of the Commissariat to Moscow at the time of the German invasion, before the Brest treaty, a necessity which destroyed a full half of the work that we had step by step put in order.

Nevertheless, the central apparatus, and in a great measure also the local, is at the present time working harmoniously; the greater part of the body of the teachers (the lower ranks) are sincerely working with us, the remaining part are willy-nilly creeping along.

Let us say here a few words in regard to the apparatus by which we have supplanted the old ministry and its local organs. At the head of the Commissariat stands the People's Commissar and his assistant, and the staff, consisting at present of seven persons, which decides all current affairs that are outside the competence of the branch superintendents. Basic problems are solved by a state Board of Public Education, which, besides the members of the staff and the branch superintendents, includes also representatives from the centres of the Soviet Government, from the labor

A Translation of the Annual Report of A. V. Lunacharsky, Commissar of Education in the Soviet Government, for the Year Ending November 7, 1918

FROM THE MAY "LIBERATOR"

unions and the workers' cultural organizations, and from that part of the body of the teachers which is taking a stand of loyal co-operation with the Soviet power.

Finally, problems of especial importance, for instance, regarding a general school reform, are considered at the All-Russian Conventions, the first of which, well attended, harmonious and imbued with communistic ideals, took place in Moscow in the month of August.

In the provinces the work of public education is being directed by the Departments of Public Instruction attached to the provincial ("gubernia"), county (ouyezd), city, and lastly the "volost." Executive Committees. The provincial, county, and city departments, corresponding to the Central Staff, have attached to them Councils of Public Instruction corresponding in the provinces to the State Board.

It is self-evident that the main care of the Commissariat for Public Instruction was the elaboration of the basic principles for a radical reform system to replace the school apparatus inherited by us from the czarist regime.

Class Education Abolished

In place of schools of all varieties and kinds—which formerly were sharply divided into a lower school for the plain people, and the middle school for privileged classes and well-to-do-people, and divided further into schools for boys and others for girls, into technical and classical secondary schools, general and special school institutions—the Commissariat has introduced the "Unified Workers' School" (covering the entire length of the course of instruction).

The unity of this school should be understood in two ways: first, that the class divisions are abolished and the school adopts a continuous grade system. In principle, every child of the Russian republic enters a school of an identical type and has the same chances as every other to complete its higher education. Second, that up to the age of 16, all specialization is omitted. It is self-understood that this does not hinder the adoption of the principle of individual attention, and of the greatest possible variety of forms inside each school. But specialization in the full meaning of the word is permitted only after attaining the age of 16, and upon the foundation of a general and polytechnical education acquired already. The school is declared an absolutely lay institution; diplomas, in their character of certificates granting special rights, are abolished; the classical languages are declared non-obligatory.

This school, unified in principle, is divided into two grades: the first of five years' duration, and the second of four years. This nine years' course is declared to be in principle obligatory.

Our school will be in fact **accessible to all**. To attain this end, not only are all tuition fees abolished, but the children are provided with gratuitous hot food, and the poorest children with shoes and clothing. It goes without saying that all school manuals are offered to the children free of charge by the school.

The Commissariat understands fully how immense are the difficulties which it will meet with on its road. The country is ruined and famished, there is a lack of manuals even for the needs of the old school, and still more for the immensely enlarged new school. The Commissariat, however, supported by the whole Soviet government, will undertake the overcoming of this difficulty, and hopes to master it if not at once at least in the near future.

Declaring the nine years' course to be **obligatory** in principle, the Commissariat intrusts all coun-

cils with registering all children of school age, with placing all those whom it is physically possible to include in the schools among various educational institutions; with giving to the rest certificates showing that they are outside the school not by omission or reluctance of the parents. After finding out the number of children of school age in each locality, the commissariat will immediately undertake the building of a school system. It is proposed for the next year to open 10,000 primary, and 1,000 secondary schools.

Work as the Basis of Education

The labor character of the school consists in the fact that labor, pedagogical as well as, in particular, productive labor, will be made a basis of teaching.

In the primary schools it will be mostly work within the walls of the school: in the kitchen, in the garden, in special workshops, etc. The labor must be of a productive character—in this way in particular, the children serve the needs of the school community so far as their strength will permit them. It bears, at this grade, mostly the character of domestic and artisan labor; in the city, naturally, approaching more the type of a workshop, in the village the type of a farm. It is proposed, however, to transfer in the summer time all city school activities as far as possible to the village places.

In the secondary schools the productive and the broad social character of labor is emphasized still more sharply. We deal here with children from thirteen years up. From this age there is possible an easy but **real** labor outside of the school; the participation in factory or shop work, the helping in serious farm work, the co-operation in some business enterprise, the co-operation in some social or state undertaking. From this age up we are **uniting** the labor of the children, the participation of the child in the social struggle for existence, and its development with its education. The school, without losing sight of the youngster, protecting it from harm, turning each act of its labor to the benefit of its general physical and mental development, will lead it into the very tangle of social productive work.

This task is the most novel and the most representative. Only by the way of experience and by an attentive co-operation of the teacher with the technical staff and the workers' administration of factories and workshops, shall we be able to feel out gradually the correct method of close relationship between the pedagogical and the industrial life.

In the meantime, we meet here with that very peculiarity which is proper only to the communistic way of solving the school problem.

Every time Marx happened to speak of education he turned to child labor, and laid stress upon the circumstance that not the prohibition of child labor, but the regulating and transforming of it into a polytechnical basis of education by way of a rational co-ordination with science, physical exercises, and aesthetic development—will create a harmonious and truly modern man. Such is, in general terms, the labor basis of our general education school. To be sure some specialization is also possible for the youth, the learning **by choice** of this or the other technical branch: individual schools of secondary grade may, too, in conformity with local conditions, concentrate their attention upon the local production—in such a manner, however, as to develop in the pupil through the example of the special production, all potential abilities and to acquaint him or her with the whole of culture and not confine too closely to the specialty. The actual specialization, then, the transition to the **vocational** preparation, is, in the opinion of the Commissariat, admissible only in the third grade, beginning with the age of sixteen, in schools which we call higher and in institutions of the extension-teaching type.

(Next Week: "City and Country Schools.")

Bolshevism---What It Is Not

Foreword

By JOHN REED

[From the May "Liberator"]

John Spargo has written a book—another one this time on Bolshevism, a book which is a joy to all anti-Socialists, as it was calculated to be. Spargo has been exposed as a literary charlatan time and time again. Some time ago we published in the "Red Flag" a scathing exposure by the late Franz Mehring (a lifelong friend and fellow-worker of Marx, of the methods adopted by Spargo in building up his fake "Life of Karl Marx."

By their friends ye shall know them! The Rev. Principal John McKay of Vancouver in an anti-Bolshevik lecture referred to Spargo's anti-Bolshevik book and affectionately characterized the author as a "truest type of Socialist." Either the rev. gent doesn't know his Spargo or he is using him on the principle that any stick is good enough to beat a dog. In the latter case his sudden affection for him is, to put it mildly, a piece of disreputable camouflage.

The following is a review of Spargo's latest, by John Reed, who was in Russia during the revolution and for some time afterwards.

THE bright, particular stars who make up the constellation known as the Social Democratic League of America now present an amusing spectacle to Socialist observers.

Professedly they withdrew from the Socialist movement because they wanted to destroy German militarism; in order to do this they adopted the tactics of the capitalist class.

German militarism now being destroyed—a little too much destroyed, as a matter of fact—the capitalists turn their attention to destroying the working class. And our friends Walling, Stokes, Frank Bohn, Charley Russell, Allan Benson, and the plausible John Spargo, turn with them.

One people, the Russian people, have seized the capitalist state, destroyed it, erected a proletarian republic, and are at this moment riding the storm of the Social Revolution, fulfilling the prophecies of Karl Marx. From nation to nations leaps the revolutionary lightning, across the face of Europe—liberating and glorious, Hungary, Bavaria, Germany. The technique of these modern revolutionists is what is called "Bolshevism."

Among other things Bolshevism teaches that the most implacable and dangerous enemies of the Social Revolution are—not the capitalists, but those "Socialists" who have mapped and plotted the Social Revolution as it ought to be, and are shocked and disappointed that it doesn't act according to specifications. However, the Social Democratic League does not belong even in that category. Its members are forever self-exiled from the world Labor Movement, having taken their stand as "Socialists" on the editorial pages of the capitalist press, whence they spit their thin venom in the face of the oncoming proletarian revolution.

Naturally the chief point of their attack is BOLSHEVISM—as it is the chief point of attack of bankrupt capitalism. BOLSHEVISM is the workers' will to revolution; it is unanswerable, invincible. It overthrew the Russian bourgeoisie; it is overthrowing the German bourgeoisie; it will overthrow the bourgeoisie of the rest of the world.

At the time of the Bolshevik Revolution, in Petrograd, the bourgeois political parties disappeared. The chief and most desperate opponents of the Soviet Government were the Mensheviks and the Right Wing of the Socialist Revolutionary party—those "Socialists" of whom Bolshevism teaches.

Happening one day to meet the secretary of the Petrograd branch of the Cadet party, I asked him why the bourgeoisie was so quiet.

"Oh," he replied, "we can't do anything now. The Mensheviks and the Socialist Revolutionaries are playing our game for us—although they don't know it. Let them do the dirty work—we'll pluck the flower. . ."

Mr. John Spargo has written a book called BOLSHEVISM (Bolshevism. By John Spargo. Harper & Bros., New York, 1919. \$1.50 net.) which does the dirty work, and does it quite cleverly. This book will be one day ranked among the minor examples of political Jesuitism. With all Mr. Spargo's undoubted talent for insinuation, with his genius for assembling dubious evidence and passing it off as genuine, with his specious pretense at intellectual honesty and scientific impartiality, this work ranks with the best of the White, Orange and Green Books issued by the various belligerent governments to explain how they were forced into the war to defend themselves. The preface begins by deprecating the " lurid and sensational " stories about the Bolsheviks published in the capitalistic press.

"When the same journals that defended or apologized for the brutal lynchings of I. W. W. agitators and the savage assaults committed upon other peaceful citizens whose only crime was exercising their lawful and moral right to organize and strike for better wages, denounce the Bolsheviks for their 'brutality' and their 'lawlessness' and cry for vengeance upon them, honest and sincere men become bitter and scornful."

Mr. Spargo ignores, he says, "the newspaper stories of Bolshevik 'crimes' and 'outrages,'" he also ignores "the remarkable collection of documents edited and annotated by Mr. Sisson." So far, so good. Now for "on the other hand," Bolshevism, according to Mr. Spargo, is "an inverted form of Tsarism."

"That the Bolsheviks have been guilty of many crimes is certain. . ."

"Their worst crimes have been against political and social democracy, which they have shamefully betrayed and opposed with as little scruple, and as much brutal injustice, as was ever manifested by the Romanoffs."

He then proceeds to give examples of the very "crimes" and "outrages" with which the newspapers have been flooded for the past year—all except the lies about "socialization of women," which are too patently absurd even for the American public. Most of the evidence for these "outrages" Mr. Spargo takes from official publications of the Soviet Government, **articles in which the Bolshevik leaders themselves protest against abuses.** It is as if a Russian Bolshevik were to republish only accounts of the "brutal lynchings of I. W. W. agitators" which Mr. Spargo refers to, and call it "Americanism!"

The palpable viciousness of Mr. Spargo's method is apparent in the insinuations of treachery, dishonesty and sinister motives on the part of the Bolshevik leaders, and of Lenin in particular, all through the book.

For example, Mr. Spargo doesn't actually say that the Bolsheviks were paid by Germany. In fact, he begins:

"In judging the manner in which the Bolsheviks concluded peace with Germany, it is necessary to be on guard against prejudice engendered by the war and its passions."

But after all, says Mr. Spargo, "there were ugly-looking incidents which appeared to indicate a close co-operation with the Germans." What, in Mr. Spargo's opinion, is the chief of these "ugly incidents?" The "acknowledged fact," as he puts it, "that the Bolsheviks . . . immediately entered into negotiations with the notorious 'Parvus.'"

"Parvus," as the author hastens to tell us, was "one of the most sinister figures in the history of the Socialist movement"—suspected spy, war profiteer, and finally, German agent in Scandinavia. He was denounced, not only by Mr. Spargo's friends, but also by the Bolshevik leaders, and especially by Lenin, as "the vilest of bandits and betrayers."

What is the evidence that "the Bolsheviks entered into negotiations with the notorious 'Parvus'?" Mr. Spargo merely cites a dispatch in the German Majority Socialist press, republished in "Justice," to the effect that "Parvus" brought to the Bolshevik Committee at Stockholm the congratulations of the German Majority Social Democrats, and these congratulations were transmitted to Petrograd, and further, that Scheidemann told Haase that the Bolsheviks had invited "Parvus" to come to Stockholm. And that is all. Mr. Spargo admits that "Pravda," the official Bolshevik organ, branded the latter statement as a lie.

"More than once," he says, "the charge of being a provocateur was leveled at Lenin and at Trotsky, but without justification, apparently. . . ." (Then comes the sly thrust.) "There was, indeed, one incident which placed Lenin in a bad light." Then he tells the story of Malinovsky.

All through Russian revolutionary history run the stories of spies and provocateurs who wormed their way into the movement, and took an active part in the revolutionary parties. Malinovsky was a Bolshevik, and was elected to the Fourth Duma by them, being a close friend of Lenin's and greatly admired by him—proposed by Lenin as delegate to the International Socialist Bureau. Later he was discovered to be a police spy. . . . And that is all there is to it!

Mr. Spargo knows full well that hundreds of police spies entered the revolutionary parties—such as Azev—and were trusted implicitly by their comrades.

But the case of Malinovsky is not all. In 1917 Burtzev exposed three provocateurs who were working on the Bolshevik newspaper "Pravda"—and had doubtless been placed there by somebody for a purpose. Mr. Spargo then publishes a long telegram from the Jewish Committee in Petrograd (whatever that was), to the effect that the Bolsheviks, in August, 1917, were in "tacit coalition" with the Black Hundreds. Of course Mr. Spargo adds, "That the leaders of the Bolsheviks, particularly Lenin and Trotsky, even entered into any 'agreement' with the Black Hundreds . . . is highly improbable."

However, this does not prevent him, in the next paragraph, from asserting that "they have associated with themselves, too, some of the most corrupt criminals in Russia."

Mr. Spargo gives a list, of which he says in a foot-note: "Most of the information in this paragraph is based upon an article in the Swiss newspaper Lausanne Gazette, by the well-known Russian journalist, Serge Persky, carefully checked up by Russian Socialist exiles in Paris."

One of these "criminals," it appears, is Kameniev, whose "crime" was that he was arrested by the government at the beginning of the war, and acted in such a cowardly manner that he was censured by his party!

Another is Bonch-Bruévitch, whom Mr. Spargo calls "Bonno Bruévitch," and qualifies as "Military Councillor to the Bolshevik Government," and "a well-known anti-Semite." There are two Bonch-Bruévitches—one a General—commandant of the Northern Front under Kerensky, dismissed by the Bolsheviks when they came into power; and the other Vladimir Bonch-Bruévitch, a lawyer, not a military man, not an anti-Semite, whose position was First Secretary to the Soviet Government, and who had never been "dismissed by the Provisional Government."

Another "criminal" is a certain Galkine, "friend of the unspeakable Rasputin," as Mr. Spargo puts it. This is a mistake—apparently on the part of the "Russian journalist" mentioned. The Galkin who was active in Petrograd, and whom I knew had been for many years an active Socialist, and a Bolshevik, in exile.

And Muraviov, whom Mr. Spargo says "had been chief of the Tsar's police, and was regarded

(Continued on Page Six)

THE RED FLAG

A Journal of News and Views Devoted to the Working Class.

Published When Circumstances and Finances Permit
By The Socialist Party of Canada,

401 Pender Street East, Vancouver, B. C.

Editor C. Stephenson

SATURDAY MAY 17, 1919

A WARNING AGAINST THE "KEPT" PRESS

The "kept" press in Canada is living up to its job and its reputation. The Vancouver "Sun" seized the occasion of the Winnipeg strike to appear with flaring red scare-heads, reading "Veterans Declare Against Bolshevism." In doing this it calculates to obscure the real issue of the strike, which is over the principle of recognition of collective bargaining, by slamming in the face of the reading public a proposed resolution, in which reference was made to Bolshevik and revolutionary propaganda. This resolution was submitted to a meeting of returned soldiers, in Winnipeg, called to discuss the strike. A careful reading of the whole dispatch, however, reveals the fact that the resolution was rejected and its references to Bolshevism hotly resented by the meeting. It was another resolution, to which the flaring headlines had no relation whatever and which contained no reference to Bolshevism at all, which was passed. The principal features of this latter were, that the meeting endorsed the strike and declared itself for the preservation of law and order and for a discussion with organized labor, after the strike was over, on the deportation of aliens. The whole resolution, as we said before, bore no relation whatever to the designedly inflammatory and misleading scarehead. With the resolution, as it stands, no exception can be taken and it calls for little comment. The clause dealing with law and order was unnecessary in so far as the workers are concerned, but it can apply to others. If there is one out-standing feature in all the history of the struggles of labor, it is this, that the workers themselves are never the first to break the peace, but, that this has always been due to irritation stirred up by the misrepresentations, lies, and slanders of the bourgeois press and to the activities of the paid provocateurs and thugs of the employing class. It is for the employing class and their friends to pay heed to the terms of that resolution of the returned soldiers. The possession of a battery of machine guns and uniformed men in your pay is no criterion that you stand for the interests of law and order or in the interest of a decent organization of life.

According to reports that reach us here on the Pacific Coast the strike is well supported and organized, and labor is out almost 100 per cent. That in itself bespeaks organization, discipline and control, and is the best guarantee for the preservation of law and order. Organized labor will see to that. The pretentious anxiety of the press over the situation is mere camouflage, covering up its real desires, that something untoward may happen which will afford excuse for armed intervention.

We remember when a big strike was on in Great Britain, some time before the war, that all the editorial scribes in this country were saying that a strong man was needed at the head of affairs in the old country. And, whisper it not in Gath, the then German emperor, Potsdam Bill, as the irreverent used to call him, was suggested as the man with many considerations as to his

"Germany is now flooded with counterfeit mark notes, that are as excellent in quality as those turned out by the government. There is so much of this money that the banks dare not refuse it, so it is current everywhere and good. The Deutsche Bank no longer knows whether it is solvent. The same admission was made to me by the head of another big banking institution, who asked me how much German money I had in my pocket. I produced about a thousand marks. The banker showed me that about three hundred of them, in fifty mark notes, were bad. I had obtained them in exchange for British sterling at one of the best known bureaux of exchange in Berlin."

Thus writes a correspondent of the "London Times," whose name is not divulged. The writer goes on to tell of the establishment of presses in Berlin for the purpose of printing phoney French and English Bank Notes, which he says are of excellent quality, inferring further that these will be shipped into France and England with the idea of undermining the credit of the financial institutions of these countries. This "destruction of the currency," he claims, is the "ablest idea the brain of Lenin has yet conceived."

Now while we are at all times ready to admit the genius of Lenin, we are sorrow that in this case Lenin has been forestalled. He is, as it were, but following in the wake of those masters of finance who put the Russian rouble note out of commission as a token of wealth. According to the Finnish paper, "Keleivis" of January 15, 1918, "Money has recently been abolished in Russia by decree of the Soviet Government, and labor coupons issued in their place," a statement that is borne out by Swiss Ambassador Odier, who has just returned from Russia, and informs his government that Russian rouble notes are now so worthless that they are gathered in sacks as waste paper.

On January 9 of this year at the closing session of the All-Colonial Soviet of Russian Organizations in the United States and Canada" held in New York, the statement was reported to have been made that a member of the Russian Embassy at Washington had caused to be printed in this country, by a well known bank note firm, a large quantity of Russian rouble bills of different denominations, for use in combatting the revolution. Documentary evidence was produced in proof of this statement.

The secretary of the bank note company, interviewed by a representative of the New York World, characterized the source of the information as "extremely unreliable" and declined "to go into private matters between his firm and clients, or to say whether such an order had been filled by the Russian Embassy."

The documents referred to consisted of correspondence between Serge Ughet, described in the "Congressional Directory" as Financial Attache to the Russian Legation, and F. W. Gullet, Esq.,

superior qualifications over a certain other person, his cousin, to wit, and there was much speculative discussion as to his chances of succeeding to the British throne.

That was a good example of the way the fundamentally ignorant bourgeoisie imagines you can solve all social problems—either import a "strong" man or deport a so-called agitator. It is so easy—a solution like that it hardly costs any thought or—profits. The working class, however, are beginning to see that there is only one way to solve the problems of today and that is for society itself to own and control its own means of life and so abolish the wages system of exploitation.

We earnestly caution the general public against the "kept" press. The members of working class organizations need no warning, the past record of this tool of the masters of society is graven too deep in ineffaceable lines, within our memories.

Nemesis

assistant manager, foreign department, American Bank Note Company the first two being letters from Ughet to Gullet acknowledging receipt of sample rouble notes from 1 to 100 and 50 kopek note together with an enquiry as to the prices of printing. These letters bear date of July 22nd and 23rd, and sample bills were apparently shipped immediately to Vladimir Vladimirovitch, Pushkareff, for approval, as a letter written to the party named, in America." This letter bears the signature of our friend S. Ughet.

The last letter is an acknowledgement of the estimate tendered by the American Bank Note Company, which says, "I am in receipt of your letter dated the 31st ult., and beg to thank you very kindly for your estimate of prices for the execution of the notes in the denomination of 50 kopeks and roubles, 1, 3, 5 and 10, in variance, according to the manner of printing the same, as enumerated by you, made up similar to models which duly reached me and based on minimum quantities of at least 5,000, 000 notes of each denomination." Five million of each denomination as a minimum quantity. The lowest sum possible in this quantity is 971-2 million roubles. Then follows a telegram, dated September 11th, addressed to S. Ughet, to the effect that the American Bank Note Company "had handed over all goods as ordered, to the American Express Company" but the export license had not yet been granted. This latter difficulty was probably easily overcome, and the worthless specimens of American art poured into Russia.

Two days after the convention of the All-Colonial Soviet a news item appeared in the columns of the New York World, with date line, San Francisco, "Eight hundred cases of Russian currency, weighing approximately fifty three tons, printed in New York, will be seized when it arrives here tomorrow, on the Japanese freighter, Tatsumo Maru, customs' officials say."

Comparison of the dates here show that four months had elapsed since the first shipment. No attempts were made, apparently during that time, to intercept any of this counterfeit promise-to-pay, but, according to the Finnish paper, it had become known just before this date, that the Central executive committee at Moscow, had abolished the rouble note, so that if the consignment on the Japanese freighter was seized, no harm was done to anyone, and a little more space provided on the boat when bottoms were so scarce.

No, we are sorry we cannot hang the laurel on Lenin's brow, as being the originator of the scheme to "destroy the currency," but we will admit there is some credit coming to him for turning this weapon on its authors, the criminal counter revolution and all the Allies. The Germans first used poison gas, the Allies improved on it; the counter revolution first destroyed the currency" as an offensive weapon, Lenin has improved on it.

As we never had any bank notes, we should worry!

W. Bennett.

EXPEDITION LOST

England has done in Russia what she frequently did in the Soudan, and what she has done frequently in Afghanistan, namely, flung a small force into a huge and barbarous country, and left them to do the best they can. Not only did we send small forces to Murmansk and Archangel, but we despatched a handful of men and officers, under Major Goldsmith, to Eastern Russia, and dubbed it the Caucasian Mission. The Murmansk and Archangel forces are in danger; but the unfortunate Caucasian Mission has been captured, and the officers and their men are now undergoing the horrors of captivity in the cells of Moscow at the tender mercies of the Bolsheviks.—Saturday Review, April 12th.

Determining Factors of Social Progress

HUMAN progress, from the rude and savage conditions of the life of primitive man, to modern times has been a process, in which certain forces have had a dominating influence. They have determined the general form of man's society, of his institutions, customs, ideas and the nature of his relationships with his fellow men. And it has been when his form of society and its institutions have allowed full play and the free working out of those forces that the greatest progress has been made and when the most harmonious conditions of social life prevailed.

As well as I can, within the scope of this article, I shall attempt to show how these forces have influenced society and the course of its development, using as guide and interpreter, the Materialistic Conception of History, the principles of which were first formulated by Karl Marx in his preface to his "Critique of Political Economy." In the formulation he says, in part: . . . "The method of producing the material livelihood determines the social, political and intellectual life process in general.

"It is not men's consciousness which determines their life; on the contrary, it is their social life which determines their consciousness. . . ."

As a basis for human progress the climatic and physical features of a country must first be favorable, they then constitute the jumping-off ground for development. Neither the rigors of the Arctic zones nor barren deserts or mountainous regions are favorable. And again, where nature is bountiful and climate mild and little exertion is required to procure a subsistence, there is lacking the spur of necessity. The rewards of achievement must be within reach and yet be such as to inspire constant effort.

But here we are faced with the fact that while man has developed from stage to stage and his social institutions from one form to another, the climatic and physical features of all countries remain comparatively static and unchanging and thus could not be determining factors as to the nature of the social and political structure of a form of society, nor effective in determining its change from one form to another. The factors determining change must, of necessity, be changing, moving, developing forces in themselves, corresponding with whose developments the changes in the social structure and the political and intellectual life generally, must be related.

As Marx points out, and a study of history shows, it is the changing means of production, the developing tool, by which man procures his livelihood, which is the basic factor of his progress. It was by raising his productive power that man lifted himself from the low order of life of primitive savagery to the high civilization of today. And as showing the effect of a particular manner of procuring a livelihood on the customs and intellectual life of a people, the hunting stage of tribal communism may be cited as being marked in every age and in all parts of the world by a similar intellectual development and similar conceptions by its peoples of the world around them. The general characteristics of their religions, ideas, and their tribal customs being the same. Wherever progress has been made from those crude ideas and ways of life, it has been due to material factors outside man himself and has not been due to any innate superiority of one section of the race over another, as some believe, because a creator played an absurd game of special favorites. Present-day superiorities which may exist are due to a historical development in superior environmental conditions. We have only to observe our modern machinery, ships, bridges, skyscrapers, or printing machines, etc., to realize how much we owe to the discovery of iron as a factor in our progress and to realize how, to a large extent, the backwardness of other peoples, as in Central Africa, may be due to its absence or to the

difficulty of extracting it, in that part of the world. Similarly the backwardness and apparent stagnation, so far as progress was concerned, of the American Indian can be traced largely to the lack of animals which were fit subjects for domestication, for, the possibility of domesticating animals in Europe and Asia play an enormous part in raising man out of the hunting stage, and adding to security of life. And it was neither accident nor design that the first mighty civilizations of antiquity arose in the fertile deltas and valleys of the great alluvial bearing rivers of Egypt and Asia.

With the introduction of the domestication of animals and agriculture, private property and chattel slavery appears, causing the breaking-up of tribal communism and the ushering in of a new social order, i.e., the class societies of the ancient slave empires of Assyria, Egypt, Carthage, Greece and Rome. The technical achievements of those days, in production, were perhaps not great in comparison with our own, but countless millions of slaves toiled and sweated and heaped up wealth, and made possible the magnificence of the Eastern empires, the intellectual culture that was the glory of Greece and the power and grandeur that was Imperial Rome. Rome, the last of the slave empires, weakened by the internal contradictions which are the nemesis of all exploiting systems, fell before the invading hordes of barbarians from the then drying-up plains of Asia. After that, a period of chaos, and a final settling down into the feudal order of society. Europe advances slowly, painfully, through the "dark ages" of political subjection to the anarchic rule of the rapacious and arbitrary feudal baron, and of intellectual bondage to the ignorance and religious intolerance of the priesthood. In comparison with the ancient Greeks, those highest exemplars of culture and intellectual freedom, there now comes a period of intellectual retrogression. Nevertheless progress was made in the development of technique and the tools of production. This manifested itself in the continually greater quantities of surplus products offered for exchange and the increasing size and importance of the towns and cities and of the wealth and influence of the merchant or burgher class. At this stage the conflict of interest between baron and burgher began to assume an aspect disturbing to the feudal order. The coarse rapacity and brute power of the baron was meeting a challenger in the quick-witted cunning of the trader.

Productive power increased and more and more surplus products were produced. The isolated self-supporting feudal communities let down their barriers in the face of opportunities for trade and commerce. By specializing in production they came to depend more and more on the exchange of the surplus of their special products in order to supply their wants. New lands were discovered for settlement and for markets and new trade routes by sea were found to the Orient. Because of this, the merchant and manufacturing capitalist class were now, so far as the economic activities of society were concerned, of much greater importance than the feudal landlord class, who had become parasitic. The former were now struggling to overthrow the latter's monopoly control of the state powers, in order that the domestic and foreign policies of their countries might run in line with their own interests. Finally, after many bloody conflicts, they got control, and though their own interests were the ends they had in view yet they performed the historically necessary task of freeing the forces of production and society from the bonds and fetters of an archaic, out-of-date, political superstructure. Thus we see the effect of the developing means of production, in forcing a politically submerged class to seize power from a previously dominant class and bring into being a new order of society.

The criterion which history submits to any ruling class, if they could only see it, is that, in their form of society, the forces of production must have room for free development and the full exercise of their powers. If these powers can not be exercised to the full because of the nature of the system of production, then the doom is sealed either from within or without, or both, of any social order; when, with abundance of natural resources, the means of production and the laboring forces, possessed with abounding capacity to produce wealth, are lying idle and in consequence there is poverty, famine, misery and starvation.

C. S.

SCOURGES—CAPITALIST OR BOLSHEVIST!

Says the "New Republic": How does a land look where the scourge of Bolshevism is upon it? The British White Book on Bolshevism recently issued, pictured the collapse of industry in Russia. The linen industry it said, is fifty per cent of normal, the woolen trade sixty, coal production sixty, the cotton mills running at seventy. Can we visualize this? Have any estimate in our land that gives us the basis for a comparison? Yes. The National Manufacturers Association, comprising about 4,400 industrial establishments classified in 22 groups, has just completed a survey of business conditions in this country, (U. S. A.) Of the 22 groups, sixteen report business as being 25 to 50 per cent of normal." There we have the balance of production in favor of Soviet Russia. You have also another balance in favor of the Russian workers in that they are producing for use as against the American worker who is producing for the profit of the American capitalist or at least for those who own the stock of American corporations, the Lord knows who they are, Chink or Jap or English. Then what about India with 150 mill. on the verge of starvation and 32,000,000 dead from the same cause. That is British capitalism. Yer takes yer choice o' scourges. Either the scourge of Capitalism or the scourge of Bolshevism. Mind you the capitalists who own the industries and the banks and the mortgage companies etc. those drain pipes of surplus values (profits) have not suffered the loss of a meal yet, nor are the likely to. It all depends upon which end of the scourge you are on.

The Censorship.

The Censorship on Foreign news is heavier just now than ever. There is a reason. By accident they let us know of a dockworkers strike in England, in explaining why the British Mail was delayed. Thus they try to segregate the workers of all countries from each other.

LENIN'S BIRTHDAY CELEBRATED IN ROME

ROME, April 9.—The Socialist Chamber of Commerce has decided to proclaim a general strike in Rome tomorrow for twenty-four hours in honor of Lenin's birthday.—Manchester Guardian.

Man is the only animal which esteems itself rich in proportion to the number and voracity of its parasites.—G. Bernard Shaw.

CHRISTIAN LOVE

The Christian Herald printed a full-page ad picturing Bolshevism with the head and shoulders of a gorilla, carrying a flaming torch in one hand and a bloody knife in the other. This is to be expected from Christianity. The Christian nations have not done any killing of late, have they?

"We must have the Saar basin," says M. Marcel Hutin.

"Then let them have it, and keep it with French soldiers, French guns, and French money," retorts Editor Massingham of the Nation.

Economic and Menshevik Determinism

By MAURICE BLUMLEIN

(Continued from Last Issue)

At the time of the French Revolution the bourgeoisie at least did a real service to society. It was not only a basic factor in abolishing feudal privilege, but it also had a constructive program and gave to society a one-class arrangement with relative freedom; moreover, it must be borne in mind that an industrial proletariat did not yet exist, that there was only an agricultural proletariat. Marx said as late as 1848: "It is quite evident and equally borne out by the history of all modern countries, that the agricultural population, in consequence of its dispersion over a great space, and of the difficulty of bringing about an agreement among any considerable portion of it, can never attempt a successful independent movement; they require the initiatory impulse of the more concentrated, more enlightened, more easily moved people of the towns." Thus the motive force of the French Revolution was furnished by the physical power of the exploited peasantry under the leadership of the bourgeoisie of the cities.

The fact that the middle class ideal proved eventually to be a transient makeshift, does not affect its validity in the case of the pioneer nations. Nor does it seem possible to deny that the middle-class form is better suited than any other to small-scale production; had production not progressed beyond that stage, the personal union of earning and owning in each individual might have remained the best solution.

As the Russian bourgeoisie can no longer fulfill any such useful functions today, the only thing that it could accomplish would be to develop a revolutionary consciousness where it already existed, and at the same time try its best to preserve the class system as long as possible, a task which it will at all times take up without requiring any special encouragement.

It is contended, also, that we cannot abolish class control until it shall have reached a stage where it is no longer able to fulfill the function of production; in other words when the stage is reached that the forces of production become so great that the maintenance of class relations can be preserved only by limiting production. When such a condition has been reached it is then conceded by the Menshevik scientist that the overthrow of class rule becomes necessary, that this is economically sound because the one-class system will then be more productive since it does away with a system of production based on artificial curtailment.

This interpretation sins in overlooking the fact that when the capitalist class is forced to limit production, it does not see the error of its ways and abdicates; it is then in a situation where the world is too small for all the bourgeois groups or nations; this ends the international harmony of the bourgeoisie and splits it into two contending forces. Each of these will attempt to avoid the need of limiting production at home by expanding the outlet abroad; each will aim to maintain the condition of its further existence at the expense of the other, by the defeat of the competing group so as to attain world domination, i.e., the largest possible sphere for the distribution of its products and its capital. And after that they would have nothing better to offer than to play the same game over again from the beginning, by another splitting up and another era of military glory.

Besides in this process of self-preservation, by splitting the bourgeois world into two camps, the forces of society are employed destructively on a maximum scale, so that during the contest itself the forces of production are engaged to their fullest capacity. Thus instead of abdication on account of limitation of the forces of production, we get war and the fullest expansion of production.

Furthermore, Socialism, when it is installed, will not be automatically more productive than capitalism, but will have to use its forces for protection in order to defend itself against capitalism

invading from without, with its forces of production fully employed and organized to destroy the Socialist state. In the course of this struggle, too, the capitalist state will not be undermined by compulsory limitation of production.

Another contention to be dealt with is that as Russia still consists of many small units of production and few large ones, the conditions for social ownership and operation are not yet present. This means that there is still a good-sized middle class in Russia and a small-sized capitalist class. But here as elsewhere the middle class has been ground into impotence between the the upper millstone of modern big capital and the nether millstone of an industrial proletariat with a constructive program. No middle class anywhere can offer even a temporary solution at this late date; for it is a declining class, and cannot perform a socially useful function, as it did in days gone by before production on a large scale by big capital had taken the lead, and also before a permanent industrial proletariat was fully developed and had become conscious of its destiny of social emancipation. The middle-class principle and middle-class ideals are utterly unsocial and useless today, quite irrespective of the industrial stage or degree of development.

Presumably, the Menshevik position, therefore, is that the proletariat should perform the role of

BOLSHEVISM—WHAT IT IS NOT

(Continued from Page Three)

by even the moderate members of the Provisional Government as a dangerous reactionary." In all this there is not an atom of fact. Muraviev was an army lieutenant, who rose to a captaincy under Kerensky, for whom he organized the shock battalions in the summer of 1917. And Schneour, the provocateur, who was a member of the Bolshevik peace delegation at Brest-Litovsk, was discovered to be a provocateur, and imprisoned by the Bolsheviks themselves.

It is perfectly true, as the Commissar of Justice said: "Our chief enemies are not the Cadets. Our most irreconcilable opponents are the Moderate Socialists." The truth of this statement cannot be more clearly shown than by the way Mr. Spargo, taking the position of the Moderate "Socialists," distorts the facts in his attack on Bolshevism.

It all comes down to a question of What is Socialism? Some years ago Mr. Spargo wrote a Life of Karl Marx which was received with hilarity by practically all Marxian circles the world over, and especially in Germany. In the present work he still persists in foisting on the world his own discredited caricature of Marx, and of Socialism, plentifully sprinkled with quotations devoid of their original meaning, and grossly misinterpreted.

I could go on indefinitely quoting and commenting upon this book, had I space and the inclination. It is only fair to say that Mr. Spargo in his ignorance often presents Bolshevism in what he thinks is an evil light, but which actually, to workers, will appear very attractive.

But in the last analysis, when the author has ended his veiled hints and thrusts at the Bolsheviks in Russia, his thesis becomes openly an advocacy of bourgeois Liberalism, as opposed to Socialism.

This, for example, is his idea of the way to achieve industrial democracy:

"... Our American labor unions are demanding, and steadily gaining, an increasing share in the actual direction of industry. Joint control by boards composed of representatives of employers, employees, and the general public, is, to an ever-increasing extent determining the conditions of employment, wage standards, work standards, hours of labor, choice and conduct of fore-

watchful waiting while the big capitalist class wipes out small capitalist production; for only after this has taken place is the emancipation of society by the proletariat indicated according to the inevitable laws of economic science. Apparently that means that the highest forms of production must be introduced by the bourgeoisie and cannot be installed by any other agency. If that is the inference, nothing could be further from the truth. The biggest enterprises of late have grown altogether beyond the capacity of privately owned capital and have been undertaken by the political state, with the backing not of individual capitalists but of the nation as a whole. The Panama Canal is a shining example, but since then, in the course of the war period, cases of this kind are sufficiently frequent not to require detailed enumeration.

It is not clear, therefore, why the Russian proletariat should lengthen the time of its industrial slavery as a means of social emancipation. The abolition of the class control of industry and production should be the means of installing the biggest and best forms of production and distribution by the industrial state. And this will then be done by a one-class government instead of by mass agony. The state will have to perform the work that was done elsewhere by the big capitalist class, and it will do this much more quickly and thoroughly by borrowing the equipment of the other advanced nations, if not betrayed previously by the world proletariat.

men, and many other matters of vital importance to the wage-earners."

And here is the path he points to us as the high-road to Social Revolution:

"... The striving of modern democracy for the peaceful organization of the world, for disarmament, a league of nations, and, in general, the supplanting of force of arms by the force of reason and morality."

SATURDAY REVIEW, APRIL 5

Mr. Lloyd George is one of the most reckless electioneers that the democratic system has yet produced; and sooner or later he will be punished. Mr. Churchill invented the Chinese labour cry in 1906; which after the election he cynically admitted to be a lie.

The Prime Minister during the last election did promise and vow three things; that should be no more conscription; that Germany should pay the cost of the war; (put by Mr. George at 25,000 millions); and that the Kaiser should be punished. Already it has been discovered by the twenty million simpletons of both sexes who voted, that there is to be conscription for (at least) eighteen months; that Germany cannot pay 25,000 millions, or 5,000 millions; and that the Kaiser will be a very difficult person, not to hang, but to convict any known offense.

Missions have been sent to Russia. But they are secret and have been sent in such a way that Mr. Bonar Law can deny them. The press is being worked, one day to attack the Conference, the next day to praise it.

Germany is being consulted, but in such a way that it can be said with verbal accuracy that no such thing is happening.—J. R. M., in "Common Sense."

First Capitalist: What do you think of the League of Nations?

Second Capitalist: Oh! "Capital," my boy "Capital"!

Class Consciousness

Society is divided into two classes; the shearers and the shorn. We should always be with the former against the latter.

Our Book Review

Petrograd was in danger! Korniloff and his Cossacks threatened the Red centre of the revolution. Tens of thousands of factory workers poured out of the slums of Petrograd. Men, women and children, with rifles, spades, picks; all the paraphernalia of war and peace; "the revolutionary proletariat defending with its breast the capital of the Workers' and Peasants' Republic. . . Heads up, they tramped in the chill mud in irregular lines of four, without music, without drums. They were young. The expression on their faces was that of men who know they are going to die." In a few days the undisciplined horde, the proletarian rabble had become a well-organized army, obedient to its own elected high command. This was their battle, for their world, the officers in command were elected by them. For the moment that incoherent multiple will was one will."

Thus was the Red Army organized; that army which a Moscow citizen referred to as "the only army in Europe that was not liable to become tainted by Bolshevism." The Cossacks fled before them. They have been fighting the world in arms ever since and are still victorious. What the Czar could not compel them to do, they now do blithely for themselves and the brotherhood graves show where many of these nameless heroes of the revolution have made the "supreme sacrifice" for that land that is well worth fighting and dying for.

What manner of men were these that carried on the work of the revolutionary proletariat? Any one looking here for great men will not find them apart from the mass. The average bourgeois historian or essayist would describe for us a struggle for control between Lenin and Kerensky before November 7 and after that date till the consolidation of their power as a struggle between Lenin and Tchernov or Martov. From Reed's book we gather no such impression.

The will of the toiling masses was without form and void; the Bolsheviks gave it expression; it took shape with growing class-consciousness. The Bolsheviks knew how to get what the workers wanted although the workers themselves did not. This is the reason for their success. It was not that they were supermen although the executive of the All-Russian Congress has been described as the most cultured cabinet in history.

If Dybenko, the big bearded sailor who was in command of the navy, had been an American he would have been acclaimed as the greatest hero of the world war. This man alone rode into the camp of General Krasnov where Kerensky was in hiding. What he said or did to the Cossack general nobody ever found out, but Krasnov surrendered with his staff and several thousand Cossacks. One sailorman and a big blue steel revolver! When that kind of thing happens in America the last part of the film tells us that it is all a phantasy or a dream, but in Bolshevik Russia it is a fact. Krylenko, dazed for lack of sleep, held on his feet by four or five of his comrades lest he should fall off the armored car he stands on, entreating, arguing, threatening the soldiers in the garrison, is an excellent picture. Of him John Reed tells a good story. An anarchist who considered the Bolsheviks "common, rude, ignorant persons without aesthetic sensibilities," met Krylenko and reminded him of the time when they were in prison together. Krylenko remembered him and asked him what he was doing now. "Oh," he said, "just looking on." "Yes," said Krylenko, "the revolution is a great success. Perhaps we shall meet in prison again."

Such was the need of trained soldiers that the man Muraviov, who was placed in charge of the forces for the protection of Petrograd, was a soldier of the mercenary type that flourished during the Thirty Years War. He was an efficient man but worth watching.' Antonov, the commander-in-chief of all the armies, had been an officer in

"TEN DAYS THAT SHOOK THE WORLD"

John Reed (371 pages, \$2.00)

Boni & Liveright, Publishers, 109 West 40th St., New York

(Continued from Last Week)

the army of the Tsar before being exiled to Siberia. He qualified as a good strategist in so far as he was "a mathematician and a chess player." Podvoisky, who framed the strategy of insurrection, was a civilian.

The determination of these men was well expressed by Strupniak and Petrovsky, when the Cossacks were marching on Petrograd. "They'll never take us alive," and "Tomorrow we'll get a sleep—a long one." This referred to the fact that sleepless nights were commoner than downy couches while the struggle was at its fiercest. Their purpose was voiced by Volodarsky, "a tall, pale youth with glasses and a bad complexion," who said, in speaking of the compromisers who were threatening to sabotage on the Congress, "If they succeed in preventing its meeting—well, we are realists enough not to depend on that."

The women of the revolution were no whit less active than their men-folks. Alexandra Kollantai, as Commissar of Public Welfare, and Marie Spiridonova, "the best known and the most powerful woman in Russia," were excelled by none in their efforts towards the establishment of the Soviet Republic.

Perhaps we made a mistake in saying that there are no great men in Reed's book apart from the mass. That would be calculating without Lenin and Trotsky. These two names will rank with Marx and Engels in the eyes of the revolutionary proletariat and will be feared by the bourgeoisie during the short span of history that capitalism remains.

Lenin, the insurrectionist! "A short, stocky figure, with a big head set down in his shoulders, bald and bulging. Little eyes, a snubish nose, wide, generous mouth and heavy chin; clean shaven now, but beginning to bristle the well-known beard of his past and future. Dressed in shabby clothes, his trousers much too large for him. Unimpressive to be the idol of a mob; loved and revered as perhaps few leaders in history have been. A strange popular leader—a leader purely by virtue of intellect; colorless, humorless, uncompromising and detached, without idiosyncracies—but with the power of explaining profound ideas in simple terms, of analyzing a concrete situation. And combined with shrewdness the greatest intellectual audacity."

These words are characteristic of the man: "Either we must abandon our slogan, 'All power to the Soviets,' or we must make an insurrection—there is no middle course." Among those opposed to this insurrectional policy, the revolutionary determination" of the proletariat was advanced as a sufficient weapon to overcome the bourgeoisie. Lenin, in replying to their arguments, said, "Count on that revolutionary determination but don't forget your gun." Cromwell and Bonaparte for the same purposes advocated the same safeguards.

His understanding is clearly shown in the speech to the Peasants' Congress: "At this moment we are not only trying to solve the land question, but the question of Social Revolution—not only here in Russia, but all over the world. The land question cannot be solved independently of the other problems of the Social Revolution."

Every revolution produces its orator. Trotsky is the orator of the proletarian revolution. His is not the oratory of the windbag type but of the plenitude of knowledge. Speaking in aphorisms he wastes no words. Every sound has its value. Reed writes of his "pale cruel face," positively mephistophelian in its malignant irony, his rich

voice and sneering tone. Listen to him: "Our Revolution will remain the classic revolution of history."

"All the so-called Socialist compromisers, those frightened Mensheviki, Socialist Revolutionaries, Bund—let them go. They are just so much refuse which will be swept into the garbage-heap of history."

"These comrades who are now caught plotting the crushing of the Soviets with the adventurer Kerensky—is there any reason to handle them with gloves? After July 16- and 18 they didn't use much ceremony with us."

"We've won the power now; we must keep it." As President of the Petrograd Soviet he refused to allow a debate on principles, stating, "Our debates are now in the street."

To a foreign journalist who asked if he had any statement to make to the world, he replied: "At this moment the only statement possible is the one we are making through the mouths of our cannon."

"There are only two alternatives; either the Russian revolution will create a revolutionary movement in Europe or the European Powers will destroy the Russian Revolution."

"The old regime must die. That must be understood once and for all."

"The characteristics of bourgeois governments is to deceive the people."

"A new humanity will be born of this war. . . In this hall we swear to the workers of all lands to remain at our revolutionary post. If we are broken then it will be in defending our flag."

These are the men and women of the Russian Revolution, and we hope the little we have told of them will induce the reader to procure a copy of the book and circulate it among members of the working class who may never see this paper. The Bolsheviks are doing their part. We owe it to them to do ours.

"Before the workers of Russian open new horizons which history has never known. . . All the workers' movements in the past have been defeated. But the present movement is International and that is why it is invincible. There is no force in the world that can put out the fire of the revolution." "The old world crumbles down, the new world begins."

W. BENNETT.

GREAT BRITAIN

The Manchester Guardian says: If the peace conference were to collapse what would happen? It would mean that the West would follow the East, and that the world would only find its unity again on the basis of a new democracy. It is not difficult to forecast a situation in which the only men who could make peace for any country would be the leaders of the advanced democratic forces. There are those who think it not unlikely that when peace is finally made the chief British representative will be Mr. Robert Smillie.

IRELAND

"Twenty thousand children in Belfast can not go to school because their were no schools for them" said Sir D. MacLean speaking in the British House of Parliament. Mr. MacPherson replying for the Government said that they realized the great importance of a education." The Irish are awful hard to satisfy. Haven't they got 44,000 troops, besides the constabulary garrisoning the country.

LABOR AND INTERVENTION IN RUSSIA

Several branches of the National of Railwaymen have protested against intervention in Russia by the Allied armies, and requested the Executive to call together the Triple Alliance of forcing the Government to withdraw the troops.

Russia Under the Soviets

Being a series of articles based upon an interview with Wilfred R. Humphries, American Red Cross man, recently returned from Russia

By W. A. PRITCHARD

As we talked about things in general respecting working class administration in Russia, Humphries referred to a statement issued by the people's commissar of education, A. V. Lunacharsky, who has now gone into another office, being succeeded by Maxim Gorky, who for some considerable time was violently opposed to the Bolsheviks. Questioned as to why Gorky should have received this position Humphries said: "I suppose they wanted to make as much use of Gorky as they could. He has an immense prestige both in Russia and outside Russia. Here is a statement he made at the time of accepting the position of commissar of education:

'The cultural and creative work of the Russian Soviet government, which is going on under most difficult conditions, and requires heroic exertions, is now about to have a scope and a form which has hitherto been unknown in the history of mankind. This is no exaggeration.

'A short time ago I was still an opponent of the Bolshevik government, and I am still in many ways in disagreement with its methods of procedure, but I know that the historians of the future, when they come to estimate the value of the work that has been done by the Russian workers in the course of a year will be unable to avoid admiring the magnificence of their creative efforts in the realms of culture.'

And that statement issued by Lunacharsky? "Oh, yes, he calls the statement 'The People's Education' and he directly addresses himself to the citizens of Russia. It says right in the commencement that the laboring masses have acquired for the first time the real power in the state. He is careful to explain that this power has been temporarily transferred from the All-Russian Congress of the Soviets to its executive committee and to the Peoples' Commissar of Education. Observe this clause in his reference to the darkness the Russian people had been kept in so long:

'Every genuinely democratic power must, in the domain of education, in a country where illiteracy and ignorance reign supreme, make its first aim to struggle against this darkness. It must acquire in the shortest time universal literacy by way of organizing a net of schools answering the demand of modern pedagogy; it must introduce universal obligatory and free tuition for all and establish at the same time a series of such teachers' institutes and seminaries as will most quickly furnish a powerful army of the peoples' teachers so necessary for the universal instruction of the population of this unlimited Russia.

'Later the commissar goes on to say that the school system must be uniformly organized according to grades. According to Lunacharsky, the ideal is to make even the higher education universal, if possible. You will observe that he says: "The working men who have taken the power cannot help remembering that education will serve them as the greatest instrument in their struggle for a better lot and for spiritual growth." Then he adds: "However needful it may be to curtail other articles of the people's budget, the expenses for education must stand high. A liberal education budget is the pride and glory of a nation." Take notice of this paragraph: "The fight with illiteracy and ignorance cannot confine itself to a just establishment of school education for children and youths. The adults, too, will be anxious to save themselves from the debasing position of a man who cannot read and write. The school for adults must occupy a conspicuous place in the general plan of the people's instruction!"

"Lunacharsky, by the way, has some advanced ideas with regard to the difference between in-

struction and education. He says that instruction is the transmission of ready knowledge from the teacher to his pupil and that education is a creative process.

"He says: 'The laboring masses of the people, the workmen, the peasants, the soldiers, are thirsting for elementary and advanced instruction. But they are also thirsting for education. Neither government nor the intellectuals nor any other power outside themselves can give it to them. The school, the book, the museum, etc., may here be only aids. They have their own ideas, created by their social position, so different from the position of those ruling classes and intellectuals who have hitherto created culture. They have their own emotions, their own ways of approaching the problems of personality and society. The city laborer, according to his own fashion; the country toiler, according to his, will each build his clear world conception, permeated with the ideas of the workers. There is no more superb and beautiful phenomenon than the one that our nearest generation will witness and participate in, the building by collective labor of its own general, rich and free soul. Instruction will surely be an important, but not a decisive element. What is more important here is the criticism, the creativeness of the masses themselves, for science and art have only in some of their expressions a general human importance. They suffer radical changes with every far-reaching class of people!'

"You would hardly credit what a clamor there is among the Russian people for educational opportunities. Lunacharsky speaks of it here. He says that a powerful educational movement has already risen both among the city workers and the peasants. He calls attention to the rapid growth of workmen's organizations for study and of soldiers' organization, too. He says he wants to clear the road before them. He appreciates the value of this impulse that comes from within. For this reason he wants to keep the control of the schools as local as possible and as independent as possible. He is apparently afraid of the standardizing effects of too much control by central authority. He goes at his problem with the air of one who knows just what he's doing. He doesn't want merely to upset everything. He isn't that kind. On the contrary, he mentions the importance of calling in experts for counsel. He says that no measure in education should be adopted till it has first been considered by those who represent the teachers of the country. Incidentally, he mentions that there must be an improvement in the teachers' position. He is strong for having the salaries in the elementary schools, those that are closest to the people, raised at once. He declares that the proletariat of the schools have been asking in vain for an increase for the teachers and that it would be a disgrace any longer to hold in poverty the teachers of the overwhelming majority of the Russian people."

(To Be Continued Next Issue)

We Can't Get the Truth

Will Irwin, a Saturday Evening Post writer and an anti-socialist, had the following to say when speaking to the San Francisco Press Club: "The world never knew such an age of lies as that in which we live today. . . . Every factor, every government, has brought pressure on the value of publicity in some form of propaganda until we can't believe anything. . . . This artificial bluffing is a fierce kind of a game. We can't get the truth. . . . Speaking for the newspapermen I will say that they have exerted every diplomacy, every energy known to the craft, to get news. Some of the brightest men and women in the profession have hunted day and night, without rest, but on all sides encountered that great game of bluff which is corrupting public opinion."

The great game of bluff! These trained seekers for news, find themselves baffled in their quest, everywhere, by a "great game of bluff." Every factor, every government, is in "the great game of bluff." There are two classes of society today: the bluffers and the bluffed. Bluffing and being bluffed is the great game both of high politics and of low politics. And this at the time when knowledge of the truth and of stark naked fact is absolutely essential to orderly progress out of the desperate plight that the world of men are in.

Press censorship on Socialist books, magazines and papers is in stricter force in Canada than ever.

The Canadian Capitalist Press in Canada is serving its masters well in their "great game of bluff," by making a great spread of "news" that the press censorship had been lifted. Some of them had the effrontery to publish editorials congratulating the public on this action of authorities even while they knew that the literature of that most important section of the public, the working class, was still prohibited from being published, from entering the country, and also denied the mails. The Western Clarion which is the official organ of the Socialist Party of Canada is still banned from publication.

The fact is that no Socialist paper is allowed mailing privileges in Canada.

The publications of Chas. H. Kerr and Company are prohibited from entry, in spite of the protests against this, to Ottawa, from labor bodies and farmers organizations from all over the country. Chas. H. Kerr and Company are the sole publishers of many scientific works on sociology absolutely essential to a correct appreciation of social problems.

The works of Marx, Engels, Kautsky, Lafargue, William Morris Belfort Bax and Labriolo are thus banned. Louis H. Morgan's "Ancient Society" is also banned. This latter work is said, by some capable of judging, to be the only American contribution, of first-rate calibre, to science. Besides these the results of labors of many another genius are denied circulation for the reason, in view of facts we can arrive at no other conclusion, that these works are of special value to the working class in the consideration of problems touching them and their welfare.

To the working class in Canada we convey this information, thus giving the lie to Ottawa that the press censorship has been lifted and thus also, to our best, endeavors, exposing the "great game of bluff" in this instance carried on by the Capitalist press.

THE FEEDING OF RUSSIA HOAX

The press is carrying the statement that Dr. Nanson is to take charge of the distribution of food-stuffs in Russia when the Soviet Government decides to stop fighting. "As all fighting in Russia is being done either by Allied or American troops or by counter revolutionary troops instigated, financed and supplied by the Allies (according to the frank admission of Mr. Lloyd George in the House of Commons on April 16,) it is difficult to see how the Soviet Government can cease fighting until the Big Four call off their dogs," says the New York "Nation." This project in fact, is all of a piece with other capitalistic perfidy in regards to Russia.