

THE RED FLAG

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

VOL. I. No. 1

VANCOUVER, B. C., SATURDAY, JANUARY 11, 1919

Five Cents

The 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, today 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 military 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-monarchical 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.

Today 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. The 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 Prince Maximilian to the Chancellorship, with the appointment

of 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 Dittman, 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 "Vorworts" 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 ecstatic 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 a 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 Dittman 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

(Continued on Page Two)

SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

PROPAGANDA MEETINGS
EVERY SUNDAY
At 8 p.m. Sharp

COLUMBIA THEATRE
Hastings Street, West
A. McKenzie, Chair.; J. Kavanagh, Speaker.

ROYAL THEATRE
W. Bennett, Chair.; J. Harrington, Speaker.

The New Germany

(Continued From Page One)

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 Germany today 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 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 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 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 mistep, 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 evinced, at all times, to the measures and tactics of the Bolsheviks 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 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 social revolution. The Independent Social Democratic Party, under Haase and Kautsky, pursue, as usual, the middle course. While they are opposed to the extremely opportunist 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

(Continued on Page Three)

The New Germany

(Continued From Page Two)

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 centre 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 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 poli-

tical 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. Today, under the new (Maximilian) government we are still living in a sea of lies. To call upon the people today 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 today not the destruction of Germany, but the destruction of those who bear the responsibility for the war. When the majority Socialists demand today 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 Milyukoff 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 monarchical 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 Ger-

many is rallying its disorganized forces. Already the call has gone forth to unite the liberal bourgeois elements, and all non-socialist elements in Germany today 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 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.

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

Vancouver, B. C., Saturday, January 11, 1919

The Censorship

Though most people know in a vague manner that a censorship of the press exists in this country, more especially on Labor and Socialist journals, few are aware of the existence of a secret censorship of the mails and that the postal service has become an adjunct of the secret service department. A means of intimidation and of spying on those suspected of holding views, economic, political or social, not in favor of the official circles of Ottawa or with the influential tribe on "Nob Hill."

Let us in some degree, though inadequately, relate the experiences which the head office of this organization is suffering from in this regard.

The official organ of this party has been suppressed and representations to Ottawa are so far without results.

Leaflets mailed have been confiscated and complaints ignored.

Almost every letter which arrives at this office bears unmistakable signs of having been opened, though no censorship mark to that effect is on them.

All such letters are unduly delayed, being some four, five and six weeks in the mails before delivery. Most of such letters contain remittances for dues or for literature, etc.

This action of the postal officials seems specially designed to seriously impede and cripple this party, both as an organization and in its business of supplying its customers throughout the country with literature on economics, history, sociology and on others of the special sciences. Be that as it may it is having that effect.

Moreover, letters and parcels which we have dispatched have failed to reach their destination. The mail of individual members of this party also suffers from the same despicable secret censorship.

Our protests and complaints to heads of departments result only in officially equivocal and evasive replies. The greeting the writer received from the postmaster in Vancouver on making personal representations to him was, "You are a Bolshevik," and that was all that he would vouchsafe of definite character in his replies to questions.

Our only resort now is to make the public acquainted with the fact that this public institution, the postal service, is being used for the purpose of spying into the affairs, private or business, of the public at the behest of an official clique in Ottawa.

Everyone who resents this Ochrana established in our midst should write to the postmaster-general, Ottawa, and to the chief press censor, Ottawa, protesting against the censorship of the press and the secret censorship of the mails. No stamps are required. Just write "O.H.M.S." on the envelope and insist in the letter on a reply.

MUST LET UP TO SECURE INDEMNITY

WASHINGTON, Jan. 6.—The state department let it be known today that it believes economic restrictions against Germany must be relaxed if indemnities are to be paid by that nation.

At the same time the view was expressed that the blockade may be lifted before the peace treaty is actually signed.

(Continued)

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

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

But let us consider the present situation without any regard to its political side. What do you expect to accomplish in Russia? You certainly cannot imagine that the present forces in Vladivostok can accomplish anything in the way of a military occupation of Russia. By sending a few hundred thousand troops more,—and in this respect you will have to depend on the Japanese—you may accomplish as much as an occupation of the region between Vladivostok and Irkutsk—a distance as long as from New York to Utah. But even that is scarcely one-third of the distance from Vladivostok to the Ural mountains, and Irkutsk is still about six thousand miles away from Moscow. And when you have accomplished that, what then? The Baikal tunnels are blown up and without them it will be impossible under even the most favorable conditions to penetrate the vast region of almost insurmountable mountains around the Lake of Baikal, and by the time you get your hundreds of thousands of troops to Siberia the winter will set in and things drag on till next May.

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

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

There can be no more chance for a popular uprising in Russia against the program of the Soviet

Government than there would be a chance in America of a popular uprising of farmers against an increase in the price of corn and milk.

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

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

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

The same may be said in regard to the attacks on the Russian people because of their alleged social disorder and anarchy. It took ten years in America to establish a stable government and orderly efficient rule, after you had signed the Declaration of

(Continued on Page Five)

An Open Letter

(Continued From Page Four)

Independence. At that your revolution was mainly a political one, involving the change from one government to another, without any considerable changes in the social structure. Your revolution occurred at a time when the social problems confronting you were a mere bagatelle compared with those that the Russian people are asked to solve. Your revolution took place among a homogeneous nation of three millions, who had behind them a century of self-government and experience at individual as well as co-operative action. You were allowed to settle your problems not only without any interference from the outside after you had accomplished your immediate aims, but you received real help and encouragement from other nations. Even then it took you ten years to bring about social order. And now you are angry and impatient at the Russian workers and peasants, because they lack the strength to perform in a year a task a thousandfold more difficult than that which you could not perform in less than ten years, and under immensely more favorable circumstances.

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

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

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

Some time ago I sent you a copy of a speech held

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

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

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

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

And is there no lesson for you in the dispatches from Samara? The first dispatches from that city about a month ago were that the Czecho-Slovaks had occupied the city, disarmed the Red Guard and deposed the local Soviet, with the result that the local bourgeoisie at once proceeded to take a bloody revenge upon the workers, killing hundreds of Soviet members, the armed presence of the Czecho-Slovaks making this revenge possible, although they themselves did not participate in the execution.

After a few weeks the Red Guard took possession of the city once more, and one hundred Czecho-Slovaks were publicly hanged in retaliation of the execution of the Soviet members. That story will repeat itself over and over again. And for what use—as at the end of it all, sooner or later, there must be, and there will be, the ultimate victory of the social principles represented by the Soviets today!!

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

Is it then possible at all that the former ruling classes in Russia by sheer reasoning power should admit this fact and thus avoid unnecessary struggles and bloodshed? And if it is not possible for the Russian bourgeoisie to see it, as they personally have been deprived of all the privileges so dear to their hearts—is it not possible that you, their intellectual class brethren, who are not personally as closely interested in the situation, and, therefore, should be more able to retain your faculty of clear judgment, would advise them, or at least not encourage them in their blind class rebellion against forces that are unsurmountable?

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

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

"A comparative detachedness of the United States from European politics, which you call the principle of the Monroe Doctrine, has been one of your peculiarities up to the present time, as long as you economically were more or less independent of Europe and Europe was independent of you. When the world war revalued all former international values, and America became a part of the world family not only in words, but in action as well, and your Monroe Doctrine became more or

(Continued on Page Six)

An Open Letter

(Continued From Page Five)

less a relic of the past, all lovers of international democracy rejoiced in the fact, principally, because they hoped that this would mean not America's subjugation to outworn European diplomacy, but Europe's becoming inoculated with the young virus of all that which is real in the democracy of America.

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

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

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

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

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

—as equal suffrage, social legislation and theoretical equality of opportunity. In Finland there was not even a question of the "dictatorship of the proletariat" such as in Russia. The Finnish workers expressly wanted to call together a Constitutional Assembly on the basis of equal suffrage for all inhabitants of Finland. The other side not only temporarily allied itself with the Germans, but was for three years criminally plotting with the German imperialists and in every way was an accessory to the most abominable crimes of Prussianism. Yet that other side was the one which received all the encouragement and still is receiving it from you. I was never given a fair and a serious hearing.

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

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

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

However, I did not write this letter in order to criticize only. I have lived in America long enough to become an admirer of your tremendous resourcefulness, your ability of initiative, your youthful social vigor, unhampered by centuries of feudal tradition, and I have dreamed, as many others have dreamed, that America, because of these her assets, will be able to bring common sense into a world, which is now paying a horrible price for the inability of its ruling classes to admit that the twentieth century is a century of labor democracy. And heaven knows that I, and almost everyone of us who believe in the Russian Revolution and in the ultimate victory of Socialism, from the very outset of the world war have been partisans of the Allies. Not that we for a moment renounced our convictions that class interests are the paramount issue in every capitalist state. Yet we are no such fools as not to see that modern industrial evolution, which inevitably leads to Socialism, is less hampered—at least normally has been—by the so-called

western democracy than by the rigid system of Prussianism. Also the sentimental traditions of liberal and revolutionary opportunity in France, in Belgium, in England, in Italy and in America as well as our whole-hearted disgust with those peculiarities of modern capitalistic materialism which more pronouncedly than anywhere else are expressed in the Prussian system, have kept us distinctly in favor of an Allied victory—if this war is to end in the victory of one or the other side. I only wish that the Allies, including the United States, would not have done everything in their power to make it as difficult as possible for any real radical to stick to those hopes!

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

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

If there is any hope of an honest ending of the present situation, it can be achieved only on the basis of actual negotiations with the Soviet Government. Today, I, as the representative of the Finnish Workers' Republic, am officially sending your government a proposition of mediation between America and the Russian Soviets. Not that I for one moment believe that such a proposition will be entertained, nor even acknowledged, but for the sake of historic record I will put myself and our cause down as having done everything imaginable and consistent with our principles to avoid the calamity of a general war between the Russian people and the Allies.

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

(Lenin's speech was greeted with tremendous enthusiasm, and a resolution was passed embodying his recommendations.)

The International Revolution

[By N. Lenin]

Speech delivered before the All-Russian Soviet Executive Committee, Oct. 22, 1918.

I BELIEVE our present situation, despite all the contradictions it contains, can be characterized by two theses: First, that we never before stood so near to the international proletarian revolution as at present; second, that we on the other hand never found ourselves in a more dangerous position than now.

And the most serious part of our situation consists in the fact that the broad masses of the people are hardly aware of the danger that menaces them. Therefore, it must be one of the principal tasks of the Soviet representatives to make the present situation entirely clear to the broad masses—no matter how difficult this task may sometimes be. The weightiest objection that was raised against the Soviet Government, not only by the bourgeoisie but also from the ranks of the lower middle class that had lost faith in Socialism, was that we allegedly had begun the Socialist revolution in Russia in a reckless manner, as the revolution in Western Europe was not yet due.

Comrades, now in the fifth year of the world war the general collapse of Imperialism is an evident fact; now it is clear that the revolution in all the belligerent countries is unavoidable. We, however, whose existence at the beginning was counted by days or weeks, at the most, have done more in this year of the revolution than ever has been done by any other proletarian party in the world. The bourgeoisie no longer denies that Bolshevism is now an international phenomenon. Of course, you know that the revolution has broken out in Bulgaria and that the Bulgarian soldiers are organizing councils, or Soviets, after the Russian model. Now comes the news that similar Soviets are in the process of being organized in Serbia. The national bourgeoisie of the various small states of Austria will not be able to hold out. In Austria, too, the revolution of the workers and peasants is knocking at the door everywhere.

In Germany the press already talks openly of the abdication of the Kaiser and the Independent Social Democratic Party now dares to speak of the German republic. This certainly means something! The German revolution is already a fact. The military party talks about it openly. In East Prussia revolutionary committees have been formed; revolutionary slogans are being uttered. The Scheidemann gang will not remain at the helm very long; it does not represent the broad masses of the people, and the proletarian revolution in Germany is inevitable.

So far as Italy is concerned, the revolutionary sentiment of the proletariat of that country is evident to us. When Gompers, the social patriot who has turned himself over to the bourgeoisie, visited the cities of Italy and preached patriotism to the workers he was hissed out everywhere. During the war the Italian Socialist Party has taken a big step toward the Left. In France at the beginning of the war the number of patriots among the workers was only too great, for it was declared that the soil of France and Paris was menaced. But there, too, the attitude of the proletariat is changing. When a letter was read to the last convention telling what mischief the Entente was up to in Russia there were shouts of "Long live the Russian Republic" and "Long live the Soviets!" Yesterday we got word that at a meeting held in Paris 2,000 metal workers greeted the Soviet Republic.

And in England it is true that the so-called Independent Labor Party has not openly entered into an alliance with the Bolsheviki, but its sympathies for us are constantly on the increase. The Socialist Labor Parties of Scotland have even come out openly for the Bolsheviki.

This fact looms up before us entirely on its own initiative: Bolshevism has become a world theory and the tactics of the international proletariat. And the workingment of all countries, who formerly read only the lying and calumnious articles and news reports of the bourgeois press, are now beginning to take stock of what is happening in Russia. And when last Wednesday a demonstration took place in Berlin, and the workers—in order to show their ill-will toward the Kaiser—wanted to march in front of his palace, they then went to the Russian Embassy in order thus to announce their solidarity with the acts of the Russian Proletarian Government.

So, Europe has got this far in the fifth year of the war. Therefore, we also declare that we never were so near to the world-wide revolution as we are today. Our allies are millions and millions of proletarians in all countries of the world. But for all that, I repeat that our situation never before was so precarious as it is at present, because in Europe, as well as in America, Bolshevism is being reckoned with as a world power and a world danger.

Immediately following the conclusion of the peace of violence (Brest Litovsk) we began the positive work of building up the Socialist republic. As soon as we gave an opportunity to the peasants actually to get along without the land owners, and a chance to the industrial workers to arrange their own life without the capitalists, as soon as the people understood that it could manage the State itself, without slavery and exploitation, then it became clear to everyone, and also manifested itself in practice, that no power and no counter-revolution in the world would be able to overthrow the Soviet power, i.e., the government of the workers and peasants. It required many months for us to come to this conviction in Russia.

In the cities the revolution began to consolidate itself already in November, 1917, but in the country it did not do so until the Summer of 1918. In the Ukraine, on the Don, and in various other places, the peasants have had occasion to feel the power of the Constituents and the Czecho-Slovaks in their own affairs. This required many, many months, but our agricultural population comes out of the struggle hardened. The peasants finally became aware of the danger menacing them from the side of the capitalists and the land owners, but were not frightened, and merely said to themselves: "We have learned much in a single year, but we shall learn still more."

The West European bourgeoisie, that up to now has not taken the Bolsheviki seriously, is now becoming aware that in Russia a power has arisen and stands there alone which is able to arouse true heroism and a genuine spirit of self-sacrifice in the masses. When this proletarian power began to infect Europe the bourgeoisie of the world noted that it, too, must reckon with this enemy. And so the bourgeoisie began to unite more closely in proportion as we drew nearer to the proletarian world revolution which flared up, now here, now there.

Now the situation for us, for the Russia of the Soviets, has changed and events are following their course at a quickened pace. Before, we had to deal with two groups of imperialistic robber States, that were striving to destroy each other. But now they have noticed, especially by the example of German Imperialism, that their principal enemy is the revolutionary proletariat. By reason of this fact a new danger for us has now arisen, a danger that as yet has not quite unfolded itself, and is not yet fully visible—the danger that the Anglo-French Imperialists are quietly preparing for us. We must keep this danger clearly before our eyes so that we, with the aid of the leaders of the masses, with the help of the representatives of the workers and peasants, may make the broad masses of the people aware of

this danger.

In German Government circles we may now observe two lines of thought, two plans for salvation, as it were, if there can be any talk at all of salvation. One group says: "We want to gain time and hold out until Spring; perhaps we may succeed in winning by arms!" The other says that it is of the greatest importance to arrive at an agreement with England and France at the expense of the Bolsheviki. In this connection one might believe that between the English and French on the one side, and Germany on the other, a tacit agreement something like this exists: "Don't you Germans leave the Ukraine so long as we have not arrived there. See to it that the Bolsheviki don't get in, then everything else will be adjusted." And the Germans take great care to do so, for they know that for proved service they, too, will get some of the loot.

That is the judgment of the Anglo-French imperialists, for they very well understand that the bourgeoisie of the occupied districts—Finland, the Ukraine, or Poland—will not be able to hold its ground a single day after the withdrawal of the German garrisons. And the bourgeoisie of these countries, who only yesterday sold their territory to the Germans, are today offering their fatherland to the English and the French. This conspiracy of the bourgeoisie of all countries against the revolutionary workers and the Bolsheviki is constantly becoming more clearly outlined and becomes cynically apparent. So it is our direct duty to point out this danger to the workers and peasants of all the belligerent countries.

But for us, comrades, the German revolution is favorable. Considering the power and the degree of organization of the German proletariat, we may believe that the German revolution will develop such power and will be so well organized that it will solve a hundred international problems. Only we must know how to march in line with the German revolution, not to run ahead of it and injure it, but to help it. And our comrades, the communists of the Ukraine, must bear this in mind. Our principal work must be carrying on propaganda, but a daring, persistent propaganda.

We must not forget that Germany forms the most important link in the revolutionary chain. The success of the world revolution depends to the greatest degree upon Germany. We must not fail to consider the changes and exerecences accompanying every revolution. In every country the revolution follows its particular ways and these ways are so different and tortuous that in many countries the revolution can be delayed one or two years. Every country must pass through definite political stages in order to arrive at the very same point—the inevitable proletarian revolution. And although the international proletariat is now awakening and making important progress, we must confess that our position is particularly difficult because our enemies direct their attacks against us as their principal enemy. Now they are preparing to fight, not against the hostile armies, but against international Bolshevism.

We must direct our entire attention at present to our southern front, where the fate, not only of Russia, but also of the international revolution, is to be decided. We have many prospects of victory. But what favors us most of all is the fact that a change has taken place in the popular feeling. The people have grasped the fact that in defending Soviet Russia it is not defending the interests of the capitalists, but its own interests, its own country and desires, its factories and shops, its life and liberty. The discipline of the Red Army is gaining, but it is not a discipline of the club, but the discipline of Socialism, the discipline of a society of equals.

The army is turning out thousands of officers who

(Continued on Page Eight)

The Russian Policy in the Orient

[From New York "Nation"]

The following statement of the policy of the Soviet Government in the Orient was contributed by the chief of the Oriental division of the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs, Arsene Voznechenski, to the "New Orient." It is here translated from the "New Yorker Volkszeitung of December 8:

Our policy in the Orient has already been stated in the peace decree unanimously adopted at the session of October 26, 1917, of the All-Russian Congress of Workers', Soldiers', and Peasants' Deputies. The imperial regime created in the East a special sort of hidden annexation, based upon so-called rights of European "concessions," or, as they used to be called, "factories," and upon the institution of "capitulations"—the arrangement by which persons belonging to foreign countries were withdrawn from the domestic jurisdiction and thereby from the laws and regulations of Oriental countries. Thus imperialist countries, supported by the armed force which they had at their disposal on foreign territory, consisting partly of their own military forces and partly of native organizations formed on the spot, created conditions in the Oriental states in which their citizens and their interests were especially protected at the expense of the Oriental state. They have their own "concessions"; that is, they have created for themselves settlements within which the native population are on the level of slaves or even are not permitted to remain at all. They have put on the armor of complete independence of the authority of the state in which they live, and in this way they have to a certain degree erected an unapproachable citadel from which they can gradually extend their power over the subject peoples of the East. Although this state of things may appear to have been sanctioned for centuries, Socialist Russia, from the first days of the October revolution, has made known to the enslaved peoples of the East that it was not only ready itself to renounce such rights," but that it would also exert all its powers to secure, in union with the peoples of the East themselves, the abolition of this crying injustice and to make it possible for them to win back again their lost freedom. We have abrogated all secret treaties which the ruling classes of Oriental countries had made with the Czar's Government, whether from their own interest or from fear of foreign violence, and by means of which the masses were kept in subjection for decades and even for centuries. In the same way we have withdrawn our troops from the occupied territory of Persia, and recalled our military instructors who were in command of a native army for the protection of the interests of Russian capitalists and the support of Persian absolutism. We announced to China that we renounce the annexations of the Czars' regime in Manchuria, and that we restore the sovereignty of China in those regions in which lies the most important channel of trade and communication—the Chinese Eastern Railway, the property of the Chinese as of the Russian people, which has swallowed up many millions of the people's property and for this reason can belong only to the two peoples and to no one else. We intend to permit China to acquire the interest of the Russian people (in that railway) even before the date set by the contract that was forced on China, if China repays the amount spent by the Russian people on the construction of the road. We have recalled all our consular guards which the Czar's Government, and the Kerensky Government likewise, had sent to China to maintain the autocracy and arbitrary power of the old Russian bureaucracy. It is our purpose to renounce the right of extra-territoriality of our citizens in China, Mongolia and Persia. We are ready to renounce all those contributions which were imposed upon the peoples of China, Mongolia and Persia under all

sorts of pretexts by the old Russian Government. We wish only one thing, that these millions of the people's property may be spent to the advantage of the cultural development of the Oriental masses and for the cause of Oriental democracy.

What an impression the October revolution has made upon the masses of the people of the East is easily conceived. The events in our country have naturally found an echo first and foremost among our eastern neighbors, and the great upheaval has awakened in them an effort toward a new life. Not even the official representatives of the capitalist government are able to hide this fact from us. The party that brought about the "coup d'etat" in Russia is called in China, "huan-i-t'ang," the party of the most far-reaching humanism. In Persia, which is torn to pieces and has no power in herself to fight for her existence, there has nevertheless arisen a movement which regards the creation of democratic organs, similar to our Soviets, as the only means of salvation from the yoke of foreigners and of the ruling classes who have sold them to the foreigners. In south China, with its more awakened population, open revolution already rages, and we have ourselves received recently the admission of the leaders of this movement that the fact of the eight months' existence of a Socialist government in Russia is alone sufficient to convince the peoples of the East that they, too, need such a new, firm order of society. There in the Far East, also, the people are struggling against the secret treaties that have been forced upon them. The representatives of revolutionary China have given public notice to all the democracies of the world that China does not recognize the recently-concluded alliance with a neighboring power—a treaty which robs the Chinese people of the right to determine for itself its own destiny and draws it irresistibly into the bloody war.

Intelligible also is the great influence which the Russian revolution has had upon the capitalist system in Oriental countries. Already in February, there was a rising of the working masses of Tokio. The movement was nipped in the bud by the Japanese Government, and five of the most important representatives of the embryonic Social-Democratic party were arrested. The Japanese censorship exerted itself most zealously to prevent any publicity regarding events in Russia. Our revolutionary Siberia is still threatened with foreign interference, and since April 5, moreover, a Japanese detachment has occupied Russian soil. But in Japan the struggle for the right of the people to determine their own destiny is slowly and surely beginning, and this struggle has also already had results in the struggle over intervention in Russia. The man who must be regarded as the author of the Japanese intervention policy—a representative of the dying but still strong feudal system, Count Monoto, the former ambassador to Russia, who stands in close relation with the Russian reactionary "emigres" who have fled to Japan—was obliged to leave his office. Today, the chief opponents of intervention are the moderate liberal elements who would, indeed, be glad to get from us certain definite advantages for themselves by peaceful means, but who do not wish to create in Russia an everlasting enemy of themselves. They understand fully that interference in Russian affairs might shape in momentous ways our mutual relations and also, possibly, the history of the whole further development of the Far East.

We are ready to concede to the Japanese citizens who desire to develop the natural resources of Siberia opportunity to take a larger part in our industrial and commercial life. We declare ourselves ready also, in case China will agree, to renounce our rights to a part of the Chinese Western Railway and to let Japan take by purchase the southern subsidiary lines of this road. We are also ready to

grant every possible facility in regard to both export and import of Japanese wares to and from Russia. We are also ready to renew the commercial treaty and the fishery treaty with Japan, the latter of which is the basis of popular welfare for Japan, the Russian fish being not only the most important element of the food of the Japanese public but an almost indispensable fertilizer for their rice-fields. The Japanese Government is informed as to these intentions of our and a formal exchange of views concerning them has already taken place.

The Japanese people should know this. They should be aware how far we are ready to go to meet their wishes and what significance this has for them. But perhaps it is kept secret from them, like so much else that happens in Russia. Perhaps the Japanese people are not even aware that the Russian people are eager to offer them their hands to build up Russo-Japanese relations on a sounder and firmer basis. The Japanese public should know that if this is not done, if our outstretched hand is not taken, the blame falls on those classes in Japan who, knowing all this well, have kept it secret from the Japanese people for the sake of their own predatory interests. If it should happen that Japan, fooled and blinded by its military class, decides on a reckless step against the Russian revolutionaries in order to stifle them, then the working classes of Russia will rise like one man to the defence of their greatest and dearest good—the winning of the Socialist revolution.

[The Paris "Populaire" of November 10 has a summary of events in Russia from November, 1917, to November, 1918.]

LONDON ANXIOUS

LONDON, Jan. 2.—Russian affairs are causing the British foreign office considerable anxiety, says the Mail. The necessity of formulating a definite Allied policy as to Russia is extremely urgent and it has been decided that the Russian question will be the first to be discussed at the peace conference.

The International Revolution

(Continued From Page Seven)

have gone through the course of study in the new proletarian military schools, and other thousands who have only gone through the hard school of war itself. Our southern front is the front against the whole Anglo-French imperialism, against the most important opponent we have in the world. But we do not fear this opponent, for we know that it will soon face the struggle with its "internal enemy." Three months ago it was said that only the half-crazy Bolsheviki could believe in the German revolution; but today we see how in the course of a few months Germany has changed from a mighty empire to a rotten tree trunk. The force that has overthrown Germany is also working in England. It is only weak today, but with every step that the English and French advance in Russia, this force will steadily rise to power and will even become more terrible than the Spanish influenza.

The seriousness of the situation must be apparent to every worker who knows what he is aiming at and he must make the masses see it, too. The mass of workers and peasants is mature enough to be allowed to know the whole truth. The danger is great, but we must, and shall overcome it, and for this purpose we must develop and solidify the Red Army without halting. We must make it ten times as strong and large as it is. Our forces must grow with every day, and this constant growth will give us guarantee, as before, that international Socialism will be the victor.

Propaganda meetings every Sunday at 8 p.m. at Columbia Theatre and Royal Theatre.