

Raymond Robins, On Soviet Russia

A Letter From Louise Bryant

The Farmer

What Is a Strike?

THE RED FLAG

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

VOL. 1 NO. 19

VANCOUVER, SATURDAY, MARCH 29, 1919

FIVE CENTS

Americanism and the Soviet

By EVANS CLARK—Extract from New York "Nation," March 22

ONE OF THE most characteristic features of American culture is the unusual divergence between our political ideals and our political reality. Nowhere is this more marked than in the form and structure of our national government. Students of American politics of as divergent views as Burgess and Beard have emphasized this particularly glaring inconsistency. There is a fundamental antagonism between our democratic pretensions and the rigidity of our Constitution. The American nation is a youth, lusty and growing, but clothed in a straight-jacket. The change and expansion of our national life must in the end either bend our Constitution or break it. If the Supreme Court had not by the main force of constructive analogies stretched the Constitution far beyond the intentions of its makers the break would long since have occurred. Constrained by a Constitution written by men dead a century ago, and under the domination of courts pledged to maintain its integrity, not even the representatives of the people in Congress assembled can recast the American machinery of state. As Professor Beard has pointed out, "the extraordinary majorities required for the initiation and ratification of amendments have resulted in making it practically impossible to amend the Constitution under ordinary circumstances."

No such restrictions now bind the people of Russia. As in England, the national legislature

itself is the designer and repairer of the government machine. The hand of the past does not rest, an autocracy of death, upon the institutions of the Soviet state. The All-Russian Soviet fashions the instruments of government and can re-fashion them at will to fit the circumstances of change. The Russian state, thus formed, may well be described as a pyramid of responsibility. At its base are the voters of the cities, towns, villages, and rural sections. Elected by them, and forming the next tier in the structure, are the local Soviets; representatives of the people in whose hands are centred all legislative and executive authority over the territory from which they were returned. Elected by the local Soviets, are the provincial congresses of Soviets; similar bodies with jurisdiction over wider areas. At the top of the pyramid stands the All-Russian Congress of Soviets, a body composed of delegates elected by the local and provincial Soviets, which is, in the words of the Constitution, "the supreme power of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic." Each Soviet from the lowest to the highest acts as a general legislative and policy-determining body; but it delegates administrative and even legislative authority between sessions to an executive committee, which, in turn, assigns routine administrative matters to councils composed of the heads of the several executive departments. Each executive committee and council is at all times

under the control of the body that elected it. Thus is the pyramid built. The mortar that binds the whole structure from peak to base is the power of popular control.

One of the many divergences between American democratic ideals and American political practice lies in our electoral machinery. We talk of the will of the people, but we know it is more often the will of the boss and the boss of the boss that controls our political life. The manner of election of our legislatures is in large measure responsible for this anomaly. There is no intimacy between a representative and his constituency. In his nomination, his election, and his service as a lawmaker, the American legislator has closer touch with the professional politician than with those he is supposed to represent. For years forward-looking American political scientists have realized this and have talked of the value of economic over geographical representation as the only reasonable remedy. Men's interests, they have said, are essentially economic. People are bound together more closely by their occupation than by the neighborhood in which they happen to live. It might well be that legislative bodies representing different economic interests, instead of districts arbitrarily assigned on a map, would give more adequate expression of public opinion, and would bring the legislator into more constant

(Continued on Page Eight)

Problems of American Socialism

BY LOUIS C. FRAINA

THE attitude of American Socialism toward the Bolsheviks is characteristic of its general policy, of its anaemic, petty bourgeois spirit.

The accomplishments of the Bolsheviks are epochal. They have maintained for fifteen months a revolutionary dictatorship in Russia, have accomplished the first stage of the international proletarian revolution. They have organized a new state, upon the basis of which alone can Socialism be introduced. They have issued the clear, magnificent call to the international proletarian revolution; and they have been a decisive factor in the coming of the proletarian revolution in Germany. They are active in the struggle to develop the revolution in the rest of Europe, and the world; and they are preparing to wage a revolutionary war against international imperialism, if necessary, in co-operation with the revolutionary proletariat of Germany. The Bolsheviks have subjectively introduced the revolutionary epoch of the proletariat, objectively introduced by imperialism and the war. Socialism in action, Marxism become life—that, in sum, constitutes the accomplishments of the Bolsheviks.

But while the Bolsheviks have issued the clear call to the revolutionary struggle against capitalism and imperialism, they have equally issued the clear call to the revolutionary struggle against the dominant, petty bourgeois Socialism.

In Russia and in Germany, the great enemy of the proletarian revolution was not capitalism, per se, but moderate, petty bourgeois Socialism—that

majority Socialism become part of the national liberal movement, corrupted by petty bourgeois politics, allied with the middle class and with social-imperialism. Before the proletarian revolution could conquer capitalism and imperialism, it had to conquer the dominant Socialism. Why? Because the dominant Socialism, operating in an epoch of peaceful, national struggles, had become moderate; had become part of the governing system of things, indirectly its ally and protector, had, it is true, accomplished great things, but which did not and could not adapt itself to the new requirements of the revolutionary epoch introduced by imperialism and the war. Instead of promoting the proletarian revolution, the dominant Socialism was a fetter upon the revolution and betrayed the revolution. This is not true alone of Russia, Germany and Austria; it is true of every European nation, except Norway and Italy, where the tactics and requirements of the new revolutionary struggle are being adopted. Everywhere else, including the United States, the dominant Socialism pursues its old legalistic and corrupting policy, is the slave of petty bourgeois illusions, has its face turned to the past and not to the future, is not aware of the call to international action.

Out of life itself, and the relation of Marxism to life, the Bolsheviks and the proletarian revolution in Russia and Germany have developed the new policy and tactics of revolutionary Socialism:

rally the proletariat for the immediate revolutionary struggle against capitalism and imperialism; abandon the old tactics of parliamentary conciliation and compromise; depend upon the proletarian class struggle alone; carry on this class struggle by means of revolutionary mass action and the dictatorship of the proletariat!

These are the immediate purposes and tactics imposed upon Socialism by the prevailing conditions; these are the immediate purposes and tactics of the Bolsheviks, which alone can make Socialism vital and vitalizing.

Nor are these simply the purposes and tactics required when the proletarian revolution is actually in action; they are necessary in preparing the revolution, in preparing the forces that will direct the revolution to the conquest of power by the proletariat.

While the proletariat is revolutionizing capitalism, it is equally revolutionizing Socialism; what is the response of American Socialism to this epochal circumstance?

The Socialist Labor Party never responded adequately to the Bolshevik call to action, in spite of its revolutionary pretensions. Shortly after the Bolsheviks conquered power, the National Secretary of the S.L.P. published an article in the "Weekly People," declaring, in substance, that a proletarian revolution was impossible in Russia, because of its economically undeveloped condition and because the proletariat was not organized into

(Continued on Page Four)

Raymond Robins, On Soviet Russia

Raymond Robins of the American Red Cross mission in Russia in his statement to the Senate Bolshevik investigating committee laid the blame for the crumbling of the Russian military machine on the eastern front upon the United States.

He declared that had the United States responded to the message from the Soviet government of Russia and aided them at the crucial moment, Russia would have repudiated the Brest-Litovsk treaty and remained in the war.

Robins also said that, while he had been unable to obtain aid from the Kerensky government for the work of the Red Cross, that the Soviets had given the American mission support.

He pointed out that the reason that the Kerensky government failed the American Red Cross and the Soviets had been able to befriend it was that the Kerensky government did not control the vast areas of thinly populated country as the Soviets did.

In every respect America has failed utterly in her Russian policy, he said, piling blunder upon blunder and mistake upon mistake and endeavoring to cover the results of stupidity with lies.

"I worked three months sincerely and honestly with Kerensky, and I worked six months sincerely and honestly with the Soviets," he said. "And now, when I come to tell you who have never been in Russia something of the truth, you tell me I'm a Bolshevik."

Bolsheviki Fought the Kaiser

The Bolsheviki were the only party in Russia to consistently oppose the German autocracy. Robins said, intimating that alleged proofs of German-

Bolshevik connivance, such as the Sisson documents, had been prepared solely in order to cover up outrageous blunders made by administration leaders in their policy toward Russia. He gave an interesting sidelight on the dissolving of the constituent assembly, when he told how it was controlled by Teheroff, who, Kerensky and Breshkovskaya both agreed, was hand in glove with the German military intrigue.

"I believe the forcible adjournment of the constituent assembly was in the interests of the Allied cause," he said.

Mme. Breshkovskaya also came in for some sharp criticism from Robins, who said that, much as he admired her, he felt her attitude after Kerensky fell to be very inconsistent.

Hits at "Babushka"

"She spent her leadership," he said, "in trying to restrain the peasants from realizing what she had always promised them. If you encourage a revolution, you must not be heard to weep when it comes."

A little later he remarked that, "if I had lived in a state like Russia, I, too, would have been opposed to half-way measures when the revolution came."

Colonel Robins told of his many conferences with Lenin and Trotzky and of his sincere admiration for the statesmanlike qualities of the former, who, he said, always was amenable to reason. Trotzky he characterized as "a brilliant orator with power of swaying men such I never have seen in another mortal."

One conference he had with the Bolshevik

leaders was on the subject of debt repudiations. Both said they were willing to take care of the American and British investment in Russia, but they could not stand for the French debt. Lenin explained that the loans of the French bourgeoisie to the Czar had kept autocracy in the saddle in Russia 30 years after it would normally have fallen and that the people of the country would not stand for repayment to those whom they regarded as the murderers of their kin.

He utterly condemned the Czecho-Slovak invasion in Siberia, and told how it had overthrown a stable government in the outlying part of Russia. To illustrate this he told of his own journey across Siberia just before France pushed the Bohemian troops in that country. The trip, he said, was made almost as quickly as under the best days of the Czar's regime. A letter from Lenin was his unquestioned passport over the entire 6,000 miles of travel and every courtesy was shown him by the local Soviet authorities.

More Disorder in United States

"After the Czecho-Slovaks got in, I heard of plenty of disorder in Siberia," he commented dryly, adding that in his entire sojourn in Russia he had not come across half as much disorder as he could read about in a single issue of an American newspaper.

How weakness and indecision on the part of the State Department and ridiculous propaganda falsehoods by the Creel bureau contributed more than any other factor to the Russian collapse, and thereby cost thousands of American lives, was dramatically revealed by Colonel Robins.

FROM THE NEW YORK "NATION," MAR. 15

BOMBAY STRIKES—WEIRD LABOR SCENE

A CHALLENGE

Have the Allies yielded too late? "It is a race against time and the Spartacides," says a recent dispatch from Paris, telling of the final reluctant decision of France to allow food to go to Germany. Three hundred thousand tons of food a month are now promised to fight the Allies' cause against Bolshevism and terror spreading westward. The mere promise of food will probably strengthen the hand of the German Government, but it begins to look as though more blood must be spilled before Germany can pull herself together into a coherent, organized national whole. Forcible revolution seems to be the only human recourse against hunger and desperation. When General Plumer reports that the British soldiers of the Army of Occupation will themselves revolt rather than endure longer the sight of women and children dying of famine, it is not hard to imagine the mental state of the starving women and their husbands and sons. The "race against time and the Spartacides" bids fair to be a close one. The strikes and the revolutionary disorders appear to be temporarily under control at the cost of hundreds of lives, but the very stringency of the government measures of repression indicates the real extent of the unrest. It is interesting in this connection to note with how much complacency the press remarks upon the wholesale execution by the Ebert Government of hundreds of revolting Spartacans. There is no talk of terror or massacre or refusing to deal further with a government of assassins. Obviously, execution is the only way to handle counter revolutionists—in Germany. The fact of the matter is that the Allies have need of a government in Germany, a government crippled to be sure by terms ever more severe, but still something in the shape of a "stable" government with which they can make peace and to which they can render their bills for fabulous indemnities.

At least General von Hindenburg has the unique distinction of a definite Russian policy. Almost simultaneously with the announcement by Bonar Law that none of the Allies would recommend dispatching the necessary forces to quell anarchy

LONDON.—The dockyard strike has ended, the government granting substantial increases in response to the men's demands (says the Bombay correspondent of the Daily Express in a message dated January 21).

The cloth market strike also terminated after the employees had carried into execution their remarkable threat to lie down in front of the shops and let the masters walk over their bodies if they wanted to enter the shops.

This novel form of passive resistance, which is typically Indian, had an immediate effect.

At the main gate sixty men lay in a solid phalanx on the ground, and a similar spectacle was witnessed at the other gates, of which there are about twelve.

In Russia, comes the report that von Hindenburg is recruiting troops to fight the Bolsheviki on the Baltic front. Bonar Law complains that conditions are terrible in Russia; starvation is the newest crime of which the Bolsheviki are guilty. The people, he asserts, are starving to death at the rate of 200 a day in Petrograd alone, and yet the Allies, thinking ever of the cost, procrastinate and refuse to act. Only Hindenburg sees his duty, and, quite simply, sets out to do it. When people are starving the obvious remedy is to kill them as rapidly as possible. If any Bolshevik apologist should attempt to excuse the crime of starvation on the ground that, while the Germans seized and pillaged the food supply of the Ukraine, the Allies completely cut off Soviet Russia from access to the crops of Siberia, it is probable that neither Bonar Law nor von Hindenburg would find it necessary to make any reply. Von Hindenburg, as a simple man of action, would go on recruiting troops to crush the infamous thing, and Bonar Law would shake his head and regret the lack of a positive Russian policy. The Allies have failed in their war on Russia; they appear to have failed almost as signally in their awkward attempt at conciliation. Are they winning by their subtler war of starvation against Soviet Russia?

The success of the rapidly growing revolutionary movement is having a splendid effect upon the press of this country. Nearly all the Sunday papers are hysterically frantic regarding the success of the Bolshevik demonstrations at present being held throughout the land. The Sunday papers are asking: Where are Socialists finding the money to print their literature? In the "Socialist" we print the names of the subscribers to our press fund. Will the Liberal and Tory papers now print the names of the subscribers to the secret funds of their political parties. We challenge them to do it!—From the Glasgow Socialist.

DISTRESSING CONDITIONS ARE REPORTED IN LANCASHIRE

Due to the closing down of cotton factories there is much unemployment in Lancashire. Huge demonstrations have taken place in Manchester and other cities. In Manchester at one meeting, the speakers estimated the unemployed in that city at between 30,000 and 40,000, including about 10,000 ex-service men. Interviewing the city council a Mr. Keeling said the city was on the verge of a catastrophe, and Lieutenant Birch, president of the Unemployment Association, said there was revolutionary talk in the air, and he, as a soldier, did not want to see bloodshed in the city. The Lord Mayor: "You do not suggest that is possible, do you?" Lieut. Birch: "I do suggest it is."

In the discussion objection was taken to the council being asked to endorse the proposal to reduce the hours of labor.

Alderman Abbot: "Are we to recommend a reduction of hours in the cotton trade if we pass this?" The Lord Mayor: "Yes." Alderman Abbot: "It is ridiculous." Eventually the matter was passed on to the government to deal with. The alderman was right. If anyone thinks that industries can be run for the benefit of the people as a whole, under capitalism, he does not understand the economics of capitalism and consequently, as the alderman says, is ridiculous.

A Letter From Louise Bryant

The following letter from Miss Louise Bryant, author of "Six Red Months in Russia," explains the reasons for her failure to extend her lecture tour through the United States, to include Vancouver.

We thank Miss Bryant for her letter and commend it to our readers as worthy of their most earnest consideration. A stern duty is placed on us all to fight for Soviet Russia, here. Let every one get busy, there is no time to lose, and open the eyes of people to the perfidy of the Allied professions in regards to the abandonment of their intervention programme.

Munitions of war and re-inforcements are quietly, secretly, against the public knowledge, being dispatched to every Allied front against Russia. In the meantime, they are trying to weaken the workers' republic by starvation through a stringent blockade. If there is starvation in Russia, the Allied governments are directly responsible for it. The Soviet government has been petitioning them for months for permission to trade with the outside world but without avail. Their petitions have been suppressed and enquiries on the matter have been answered with lies.

There is no hope in our capitalistic governments. In the name of the working masses of Russia, we appeal to the working masses of Canada for help, in their behalf, to defeat the fate prepared for them by those blear-eyed old men, scheming in Paris. Only in our own class is their hope. Come, Comrades, win them over, it is only that they do not understand, if they are not with us. —Editor. Following is the letter:

Dear Comrade Bennett:

I regret exceedingly that I am not able to come to Vancouver. Your friendly and encouraging letter made me anxious indeed to speak in Canada but I found myself facing a peculiar situation. In order to go there one must state one's business. Now I was planning to lecture on Soviet Russia, to make a favorable report on what I have myself seen of the working out of that great experiment. Such an undertaking, I find, is against the regulations and such a report has no possibility of being understood or in anyway intelligently interpreted by the authorities. Now, of course, it is easy to go to Canada by evading the issue. But I cannot do that. I have set a definite course for myself. I am against intervention in Russia. It is foolish and useless to deny it. So I cannot come to you; I can only send you a brief message.

We face, my dear comrade, a terrible situation.

Within a few days some momentous decision must be arrived at by the peace delegates. Even by clever diplomats, it will not be possible to juggle the issues much longer. Those gentlemen are fiddling while Rome burns. Soon the flame of a burning world may creep too near for comfort. They have only two ways out. They must openly and squarely meet delegates of Soviet Russia in some open prominent place, and actually make good those false promises of "open covenants openly arrived at" or—they must declare war on Russia! If they declare war on Russia they declare war on all revolutionary governments with all the sweeping and awful consequences of such a decision.

Now it is my opinion that the working people of my country and the working people of all countries, have no quarrel with the workers and soldiers and peasants' government. I believe it is quite a different thing to ask our people to fight Soviet Russia than it was to ask them to fight Imperial Germany. I believe the reaction to such a demand will be altogether different. Our statesmen seem to be deliberately shutting their ears and their eyes and their hearts against all progress in the world, against all change. As well might they try to sweep back the sea with a broom.

Even if they succeed—and I very much doubt it—in crushing the revolution in Russia and setting up a monarchy or any reactionary government, they will eventually lose. Their temporary success is not a large matter to history. For a year and a half the Soviets have demonstrated that a Socialist state existed against the greatest odds that any state ever existed under. Russia has already won! We have a new world and a new consciousness.

I spoke recently before the Senate Judiciary Committee. I went there full of hope, but I came away with many old, vague fears suddenly become realities. Here in America I had always told myself we will be able to get together—even in this critical hour—we will somehow peaceably settle our difficulties. I seem to have been mistaken, I am not sure of anything.

Now, I am not afraid of intelligent conservatism but I am afraid of ignorance. Ignorance is blind and it is cruel. It strikes out into the dark without purpose. Just now it is bent in shutting off all free discussion of the serious and great issues before us. It imprisons every leader, every idealist whose voice is heard above the babble of hysteria and tries to drag along in its ruinous path

millions of unwilling victims. So, as I say, our reactionaries have set their faces against the tides of history and it appears impossible to deal with them.

We want change. We must have it to fit the age—legal, calm change. If we do not get it, it will not be our fault, but the fault of stupid politicians.

We have at present no adequate reconstruction program. Strikes are increasing, unemployment is increasing. What do we do about it? Do we attempt to remedy it, to honestly face the situation? Not at all. We blame all our ills on the Bolsheviks! We start Anti-Anarchist Associations. We don't even find out what the word means. We do not admit that the Bolsheviks are not Anarchists, but Social Democrats. Why? Even the sympathetic strike in Seattle was blamed on her. As if those good people across the world fighting for their lives against all Imperialists had not enough to do to attend to their own troubles!

My friends, what can we do? Our duty seems to lie in doing our best to prevent another terrible war. We do not have many efficient means at hand. We can only petition, and send protests to our statesmen. But we must do this NOW!

Where, let us ask them have vanished those high ideals with which we went into the great war? Millions of lives were sacrificed that the light of democracy might not be extinguished. Have these lives been sacrificed in vain? Let us look around us with clear eyes. What are we doing now? Are we defending democracy across the sea? Or are we defending autocracy? What is this Kolchak government and who is behind it? Is it the expression of the toiling masses of Russia? Would it live a day or an hour if it was not supported by "foreign" bayonets?

Comrades, great unhappiness, like a dark cloud, settles over the world. If our diplomats are wise, perhaps they will avert the storm. If they declare war on Soviet Russia or if they continue secretly and unfairly to war on her as they are doing now they will bring down on their heads world revolution!

Each one of us must look inward—into our own hearts. In this vast struggle, each one must decide for himself where he stands.

I hope, Comrades, that there will soon be a sunny day when I may come freely before you and speak all that I think and feel.

I am, sincerely,

LOUISE BRYANT.

Hotel Washington Annex, Seattle, Wash.,
March 26, 1919.

Clippings From the Press

PARAGORIC IN THE VANCOUVER "SUN"

The revolution's all off, boys. One of Vancouver's intelligentsia has scotched it with a flood of paragoric. Two whole columns of paragoric. That is not all the paragoric in the "Sun" by any means. But the paragoric in question belongs to the particular paragoric pedler who wrote the two columns of paragoric aforesaid. The paragoric pedler says it will be like this under Socialism "Every baby will have the same kind of cream, the same quantity of paragoric. It won't matter if some babies need paragoric and others magnesia, they will all get the same amount, the same kind and number of booties, the same kind of safety pins, and an equal number. They would doubtless also be fed from the same kind of bottles with the same kind of milk from the same kind of cows and there would be no profit to anyone for producing any of the baby's requirements," etc., etc. for two columns, while Rome is burning.

RUSSIAN PROBLEM ONE FOR LEAGUE

LONDON, March 27.—The Military Service bill passed through the report stage without amendment in the House of Commons on Wednesday. The proposal to limit the operation of the bill to December 31, 1919, instead of April 30, 1920, was rejected by a vote of 382 to 70, and another amendment excluding liability to service in Russia from its scope of the bill was voted down, 281 to 48.

In declining to accept this amendment, Winston Spencer Churchill, secretary of war, said the government had no intention of raising a large conscript army to be sent to Russia.

"The general question of the Russian policy," he said, "is not a question for the British government. It is a matter to which a league of victorious nations must address itself."

Propaganda meetings every Sunday evening at Empress Theatre, Hastings and Gore.

URGES RECOGNITION FOR LENINE REGIME

[From the Vancouver "Daily Province," March 25, 1919]

NEW YORK, March 24.—Recognition of the Lenine-Trotsky government by the United States and the Allies was urged by Col. Raymond Robins, former head of the American Red Cross mission to Russia, in an address before the League of Free Nations' Association.

Asserting that since his retirement from the mission, he felt no longer the necessity of silence, Col. Robins vigorously defended the Bolshevik leaders and criticized the attitude of the United States towards them.

Col. Robins said he had found the Soviets were the only force in Russia who could get something done and done expeditiously. Defending Lenine and Trotsky, he said they would not have signed the Brest-Litovsk treaty with Germany had their overtures to the Allies been accepted.

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 March 29, 1919

THE WAR OF THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION

The greatest struggle of the ages is being fought and a whole world is caught up in its travail; two forces battling in titanic struggle, whose battleground wide as the world, has neither geographical boundaries nor racial cleavages. The forces of imperialistic capitalism at its climax and of proletarian Socialism rising in power, wrestle in death grips for world supremacy. Capitalism or Communism one or the other, there is no room for both.

Both of these warring forces spring from the same source: the social powers of production raised to a world economy of socialized production. Upon this basis the forms of capitalistic society exist, but exist only at a cost of endless fratricidal strife.

As the aggregations of capital increase and centralize into the control of fewer hands, there is produced powerful groups of capitalists, organized upon national lines who bend the national policies to serve their needs. For their industrial enterprises they need control of the sources of raw material. For their ever swelling volumes of surplus wealth they need exclusive control of fields of reinvestment. To obtain these the powerful aid of the State is invoked as well as to support them in the struggle on the world's market, against their competitors, in the disposal of the enormous output of modern industry. The very fact of the vastness of the investments, the scope of the operations and the volume of output destined for the world's competitive market, determines that the groups shall be organized along national lines, for, in a competitive world, aggressive capital, must have force, the political, physical force of the centralized power of the state behind it for the success of its imperial designs. The problems of imperialistic capital becomes more and more the problem of politics and of statesmanship.

The law of the life of capitalism as of all other things, is expansion. Capital is wealth used for the production of more wealth. When it ceases to do that, it stagnates and perishes. Huge agglomerations of capital on a national scale cease to function, as capital, once it ceases to expand and with this, the industrial life and the social life generally, of the nation stagnates and decays.

The earth is limited and the world market has its limit or does not extend at the rate of increasing productive capacity and so it becomes a case of dog eat dog; a case of cannibalism.

The inescapable forms in which the human race lives, moves and has its being under the capitalist system are:

Class ownership of the means of wealth production.

Production for profit by means of wage labor.

Production for sale on the world's competitive market.

Examine those forms and it will be seen that they are the condition, the fundamental basis, for the discordances, the antagonisms, flaming ever and anon, into conflicts either international, national or civil.

Today, capitalism's era of peaceful penetration is gone. The manufacture of textiles, that was the dominant type of industry, seeking only for consumption markets, in friendly rivalry, is gone. Iron

and steel leads the way, dragging the world in its wake. Iron and steel signifies lock up investments: control of the sources of raw materials; backward countries to be developed; railroads, rolling stock, bridges, skyscrapers, ships for waterways, agricultural and mining machinery and along with these banking institutions, and all the paraphernalia of the credit system, by which, the laborers at the basic industries of the country are exploited. Wherever these operations are carried on or are projected they demand, because the capitals are lock-up investments, exclusive control, by one group or another, of the political policies of that country both externally and internally. Thus the economic necessities of capital, as such, becomes more and more the determining, potent, factor in politics and of the activities of statesmen and legislators. This is so to the neglect of all considerations for the well being and progress of the human elements in the social structure.

These latter need the establishment of bases, material foundations, for the harmonious relationships necessary for individual happiness and social well being. They need the opportunity to strive consciously to leave the swamps of ignorance and squalor and scale the heights that are already in sight, up along the true paths of progress.

Instead of that, resounding throughout all the world, we hear the gospel of hate, the propaganda of the lie, of misrepresentation, and of half truths that are worse than lies. From high places, from the public forums, from the pulpit and the press, from every vantage point that the monster capital furnishes them, the moral perverts, the mercenary bravos thunder forth their blasphemies against their kind. Setting the peoples against each other so that the reign of capital might endure.

Setting the peoples at each other's throats, so that eight millions four hundred thousand men in their prime have been killed and countless millions crippled and driven insane and more unnumbered millions of civil populations starved to death or reduced to spectres of want and misery, all in four short, fateful years.

So, capital, the monster.

Permanent war—that is bourgeois society's method of solving the problems of capital. Permanent war—bourgeois civilization's method of saving civilization.

Permanent war, that is the choice put to the world, that, or—proletarian Socialism, with society on the sound basis, for harmonious human relationships—Social ownership of the means of wealth production and of production for use.

The choice is then, permanent war or revolution. Which?

Let us quote: "The war of 1914 is the most colossal breakdown in history of an economic system destroyed by its own inherent contradictions.

"All the historical forces whose task it has been to guide the bourgeois society, to speak in its name and to exploit it, have declared their historical bankruptcy by the war. They defended capitalism as a system of human civilization, and the catastrophe born out of that system is primarily their catastrophe. The first wave of events raised the national governments and armies to unprecedented heights never attained before. For the moment the nations rallied around them. But the more terrible will be the crash of the governments when the people, deafened by the thunder of cannon, realize the meaning of the events now taking place in all their truth and frightfulness.

"The revolutionary reaction of the masses will be all the more powerful, the more prodigious the cataclysm which history is now bringing upon them.

"Capitalism has created the material conditions of a new Socialist economic system. Imperialism has led the capitalist nations into historic chaos. The war of 1914 shows the way out of this by violently urging the proletariat on to the path of revolution.

"The way in which proletarian Socialism meets the imperialistic perplexity of capitalism is by opposing to it, as a practical program of the day,

PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SOCIALISM

(Continued from Page One)

industrial unions; that the day of the Bolshevik victory was the day of their defeat; that the Bolsheviks should not have seized power, but should have labored hard and waited—precisely the policy proposed by the counter-revolutionary Mensheviks. The S.L.P. did not act upon the Soviet proposal for an armistice; and in this, the S.L.P., together with the N.E.C. of the Socialist Party, missed a great revolutionary opportunity and perpetrated a real betrayal of trust. This S.L.P. policy of partial repudiation and misunderstanding was pursued for months; now it is trying to atone, by claiming that it was for the Bolsheviks. But in what way? The S.L.P. does not understand the Bolsheviks; its attitude is something like this: what is good in the Bolsheviks is implicit in the S.L.P. program; what is not in the S.L.P. program, is not worth anything. They have forgotten nothing and learned nothing; they do not realize the infinite broadening of tactics made necessary by the new conditions and the experience of the proletarian revolution in action; they do not understand the functions of revolutionary mass action and dictatorship of the proletariat: we have the truth, have always and always will have the truth: three cheers for the S.L.P.!

The official majority in the Socialist Party adopted a disgraceful policy toward the Bolsheviks. It never answered the call to agitate for the armistice proposal; it was silent about the great proletarian revolution in Russia, until the up-surge of feelings of the membership compelled them to speak—and then they spoke in the terms of the politician, in the terms of camouflage. They cheer for the Socialist Republic in Russia, and simultaneously they cheer for—the Socialist Republic in Germany, the bourgeois, counter-revolutionary republic of Ebert, Scheidemann & Co., which is betraying the revolution!

The representatives and officials of the party refuse to penetrate beneath the surface of events, refuse to "take sides." They deny, as did Morris Hillquit, and still deny, I believe, that the international collapsed during the war; they speak much about the "revival of Socialism"—which Socialism? They do not admit the fact that this Socialism is in relentless hostility to the old Socialism, that the implacable struggle against the old petty bourgeois Socialism is a phase of the "revival of Socialism." They adopt this attitude, because their "Socialism" in fundamentals is identical with that of the Mensheviks in Russia, with that of Ebert, David, Scheidemann & Co., in Germany, with petty bourgeois "majority" Socialism everywhere. They do not want to accept the new, and so they pervert, disguise, and distort events. (To Be Continued in Next Issue)

SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

SUNDAY, MARCH 30

At 8 p.m. Sharp

EMPRESS THEATRE

Corner Gore and Hastings

Speaker..... J. Kavanagh

the Socialist organization of world economy.

"War is the method by which capitalism, at the climax of its development, seeks to solve its insoluble contradictions. To this method the proletariat must oppose its own method, the method of the social revolution."

A RUSSIAN POLICY AT LAST

The disquieting news comes from Paris that the statesmen there assembled have definitely resolved to crush Bolshevism in Russia by force of arms. This news confirms the worst fears raised by the recent Allied abandonment of the Prinkipo conference, and by their sheer hypocrisy of the statement issued in justification of that step. The impossible is to be attempted. Ideas are to be fought with machine guns. With the avowed object of stamping out Bolshevism throughout the world. Our negative Russian policy, namely, a determination not to treat under any circumstances with the Soviet government, has suffered a gradual metamorphosis in the furnace of white-hot political affairs, and now appears in its durable form as a positive policy, dominating the whole situation.

Sergius Sazonoff, the Czar's Foreign Minister in kine government, and holding also a mandate from 1914, now minister of foreign affairs in the Denike Omsk government in Siberia, emerges as the leading figure in that group of diplomats who represent in Paris the anti-Bolshevist Russian factions. More and more, according to authentic report, he is the man to whom the Allies are looking and with whom they are dealing for the development of that policy which ostensibly is designed to "save Russia," but which in reality is calculated to destroy the Soviet authority. Lvov, Tchaikovsky, Bahkmeteff, and even Maklakoff, are hesitating amateurs in comparison with this old-line diplomat who speaks the full language of the Quai d'Orsay and retains no uncomfortable illusions. His is the plan for retrieving the Russian situation which is coming to be the generally accepted policy of the Allied statesmen.

The first tenet of this plan, as already stated, is a firm resolution to crush the Soviet government in Russia. No more dallying with Prinkipo conferences and such-like compromise measures; they are too likely to play the boomerang. The Soviet authority is to be destroyed if it takes a term of years. Sazonoff sits in the Russian Embassy in Paris and outlines his plan openly to the newspaper men (though they do not send it to us, for some reason). He thinks that with 200,000 troops he can smash the Soviet government in eighteen months, provided a rigorous economic blockade is meanwhile maintained against Soviet Russia. What sort of troops? British, French, and American, of course. And where will they operate? In the Black Sea region—this is the main feature of the plan. The Archangel adventure was bound to be a disaster; we must be wise and practical this time. The Dardanelles are now open, the climate is milder in the Ukraine, and food is more plentiful; we must work up toward Moscow from the Black Sea as a base, consolidating the country as we go.

From a military point of view it seems like a sound plan, except that it will need 2,000,000 troops instead of 200,000. But from a political point of view, it is incredible that the diplomats of the Quai d'Orsay can still harbor such a notion. Yet the news is that they actually do harbor it. If they cannot read the signs in the sky, have they forgotten the march of Napoleon? If they cannot comprehend the daily and hourly events in England, France, Italy and Germany, have they not yet discovered that the intervention of last August in Russia only strengthened the Soviet authority?

INTO GALICIA

BERNE, March 28.—Bolshevik troops are reported to have penetrated Eastern Galicia and to be progressing rapidly, threatening German-Austria. They are reported to have occupied the Galician oil region already.

COPENHAGEN, March 28.—War Minister Trotsky has announced in a wireless statement that the Soviet revolution in Galicia is gaining headway, a Vienna despatch reports.

Wilson's Fourteen Points

The Liberal New York "Nation" has found out President Wilson. It finds there is a shocking disparity in the plain English of the "fourteen points" and the meaning President Wilson now gives to them. The "Nation" feels itself bemocked and deluded. Poor thing! This world is no place for such an innocent. Socialists had that methodical hypocrite's measure taken long before the war. The following is an extract from the article in the March 22 issue:

"The first half-dozen of the 'fourteen points' were calculated to raise liberal hopes and stimulate liberal enthusiasm above measure. Understood for what they meant in the plain natural sense of language—and not for whatever Mr. Wilson's subsequent glosses might make them mean—they could reasonably be accepted, and by many were accepted, as a definite statement of the purposes for which the Allies were fighting—the purposes for which the United States, at least, was certainly fighting. Open diplomacy; freedom of the seas; freedom of trade; disarmament; the principle of self-determination; and the rights of small nations—such was Mr. Wilson's lofty bid for the liberal's toleration of the war. 'Caesari appelasti, ad Caesarem ibis.' What we have got is a connivance hatched in impenetrable secrecy, a secrecy of which Mr. Wilson was himself among all the machinators present the most jealous; a connivance, further, which enables the carrying out of every execrable secret bargain laid down by the Allied governments since the war began. So much for the first blandishment in Mr. Wilson's elaborate seduction of liberal opinion. If he has made good his professions with anything more substantial in respect to the other five points of promise, there is nothing in his proposed covenant to indicate the fact. Free seas, free trade, disarmament, self-determination, and the rights of small nations have now the precise status which they had before Mr. Wilson offered them his devotion; and his address of January 8, 1918, has the indelible indorsement of history as a 'good-enough-Morgan.'

"What we have is a calm, arrogant, and ruthless formulation of a plan of world-domination by the five conquering powers, a device for causing the exploitable territories of the earth to stand and deliver without the risk and cost of war. Stripped of its verbiage and a cant that is matched perhaps only in the Act of Algeciras, this is the

sheer fact of Ariteles xvi-xix inclusive. The governments of the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan are the league of nations; they are the executive council; they appoint the quamy directors; they pass finally on the qualifications of candidates; they are, in short, an absolute and irresponsible oligarchy. So far from recognizing freedom of the seas, freedom of trade, disarmament, or self-determination, their collusion precludes these possibilities. International commerce cannot be carried on except at their pleasure, under their jurisdiction, and it is surely by this time superfluous to add, to their profit. Teleologically considered, we are offered an economic alliance which has as its primary object, in general, the exploitation of a propertyless dependent class the world over, and, as between nations, the exploitation of the vanquished by the victors, and of weaker nations by the stronger. It is an organization of what Mr. Frederic C. Howe calls "financial imperialism" raised to its highest possibility. It contemplates only a political peace, and that a 'pax Romana.' Of economic peace it gives no hint; on the contrary, it contemplates the inauguration of unprecedented economic war.

"This, then, is the ground of objection to the covenant upon which we choose to stand. We ask that the document be taken upon this ground and examined, with strict attention to the economic implications of every proposal, the possibilities of economic exploitation covered by every arrangement. Especially we urge this upon the propertyless and exploited class in all countries, for it is their chief concern. The past four years fortunately have given them some useful experience of the niceties of diplomatic language, and they now have the opportunity to turn it to most profitable account. They are, too, in a position where they may have something effective to say about the point-blank handing over of their economic destiny to persons or to groups that have hitherto shown themselves conspicuously dishonest in their administration of a similar trust; and they can say it none too soon. The nationalist interest of the document is for us all; its economic interest is peculiarly theirs. Let them consider what the six doctrines for which Mr. Wilson offered a casual and opportunist sponsorship in January, 1918, mean for them; then let them consider the proposals which he now sponsors and insists upon, and see which way their economic interest inclines them."

UPRISINGS FEARED

BERNE, March 27.—Bolshevist uprisings in Austria and Czecho-Slovakia are imminent, according to advices received here today. Any move in those two countries against the Hungarian soviet government is expected to precipitate trouble.

The Austrian population is greatly excited over events in Hungary, especially in view of their own economic situation. All restaurants in Vienna are closed, there is no gas or coal and the meat ration has been reduced to an infinitely small quantity. Bolshevism apparently is proving an increasing attraction to substantial portions of the population. Fritz Adler, according to reliable information, is preparing to lead a Bolshevist uprising against the present Austrian Government.

In Prague radical Socialists are demanding immediately general nationalization. The entire Socialist party is threatening a general strike if an effort is made to mobilize against Hungary.

The latest advices received here indicate Hungarian communism is making the Russian soviet republic appear almost conservative. Everything is being socialized and the most severe penalties are provided for any form of resistance.

Propaganda meeting every Sunday evening, Hastings and Gore.

AMERICANIZATION BY NEWSPAPER CONTROL

NEW YORK, New York.—Stock control of the American Association of Foreign Newspapers, of which Louis N. Hammering was formerly director, is now in the hands of the members of the Interracial Council, of which T. Coleman Dupont is chairman. All future policies of the association will be directed by the council.

Mr. Hammering has severed all connection with the organization. The Interracial Council, which plans to Americanize foreign-born residents of the United States, was organized several weeks ago through the efforts of Miss Frances Kellor. According to Miss Kellor, the control of the newspaper association will promote better relations between readers of the foreign press and citizens of the United States. These readers will also be shown the importance of becoming familiar with American-made products through the advertisements, Miss Kellor said.

THE LAW

The law in its majestic equality forbids the rich as well as the poor to sleep under bridges, to beg in the streets and to steal for bread. — Anatole France.

What Is a Strike?

By MARGARET P. WATT

Many people, especially newspaper editors, do not seem to know what a strike is. A strike simply means that the workers have withdrawn their commodity, labor-power, from the market.

A market is a place where things are bought and sold for a price. When goods are scarce and the demand is heavy, prices rise; when commodities are plentiful and there is no demand, prices fall. But it sometimes happens that the sellers of commodities have to "test" the market in order to see whether they can raise the price of whatever they are offering for sale. To test the market means to "withdraw" commodities from it in order to see whether the purchasers will offer a higher price for the goods which they wish to buy. To test the market is the indispensable right of all commodity sellers. It is a necessary condition of capitalist society, which is based upon the production and "exchange" of commodities. As "exchange" is inseparable from "production" under capitalism it follows that in exchanging goods upon the market the owners of commodities demand the right, and it has never been denied them, to test the market by withholding goods from it in order to see if prices will rise.

Among the many commodities offered for sale is labor-power. This commodity is sold in what is termed the labor market. The workers are compelled to sell their labor power to the capitalist class upon the labor market, because that class owns and controls all the means of existence. In return for selling their commodity, labor power, the workers receive wages, the "price" of labor power. Like all other commodity sellers the wage earners must "test" the market, in order to know if they can force a higher price, by withdrawing their commodity from the market. Therefore, when any group of artisans attempt to raise their wages, or shorten their working week, they can only "test" the

labor market by withholding their labor power. The workers in doing this only adopt what is considered the legitimate right of every commodity seller. But when the workers withdraw their commodity, labor power, from the market that is a strike. And then the press, politicians, and pulpiteers go stark, raving mad and scream about the rights of the community, of the state and of the public. Nay, further, the government sends policemen to bludgeon the strikers armed troops are drafted into the area, and tanks appear on the scene. And all for what? Because the workers do what every commodity seller does, what every merchant does—withdraw their commodity from the market in order to test it.

Last Sunday's National News (16/2/19) contains a series of bold, front-page headings which show that food merchants, meat contractors, fish dealers, and landlords are holding their commodities off the market in order to get higher prices. We have read this paper carefully and we have scrutinized the small paragraphs with a microscope, but we have not seen any references to indicate that the government had sent policemen, soldiers, or tanks against those merchants. The National News calls the rent raisers "modern-highwaymen." But there have been no landlords sent to prison. These gentlemen are sent by the government to the House of Lords!

Wherein, then, differs the action of the merchants who withhold their commodities from the market and the strikers? Why are the former made O.B.E.'s and the workers branded as criminals? The difference is that when capitalists increase the prices of their commodities profits rise. When the workers increase the price of their commodity, labor power, i.e., wages, profits fall!

And, Mr. Worker, because you attack profits the army, police, tanks, and the labor party is set upon you. Glasgow Socialist, Feb. 20, 1919.

THE POLICY FOR PEACE

[From "The Labor Leader," February 13]

The time is critical. The workers have felt that and have put in their claims early. Reconstruction is going on. Big business has been busy throughout the war. New machines for coal-getting, for example, already are at work to dispense with labor. The workers were right in not waiting for that leisurely peace. They have put in for the reconstructors to take account of them first instead of last. The Premier has had to come home and get a new Labor Minister. But, in this supreme concern of better conditions for the people, Labor must still remember that we cannot go two ways at once. We cannot win through with a peaceful, fruitful revolution at home while helping to create starvation, unemployment and civil war abroad.

There must be one policy for home and foreign affairs. Unity of policy is a first necessity. The day has gone past for paradox, like that hideous futility of ensuring peace by preparing for war. Time has revenged itself on all such contradictions. The French peasants wanted the Republic to be peaceful and secure—and they lent money to Tsarism. The German workers wanted a better standard of life—and they tolerated militarism! The English people saw Chamberlain the Radical—and yet suffered Liberal Imperialism to join its talons with Russia in Persia! Kerensky, child of a revolution against Imperialism and war, nevertheless arranged for a great offensive. So one could continue.

But there must be an end to such follies. American capitalists at any rate have some wit for this situation. American papers are explaining why, on purely business grounds, Central Europe must be fed. We have a greater principle. An injury to one is an injury to all. The

blockade—that strangle-hold on half Europe—has become the meanest, most despicable extension of warfare, and the most dire threat to peace. Yet while peace is planned—or plotted—at Paris this act of war goes on. Instead of a renewed half-war a preliminary peace with Germany should by now have put an end to belligerency. The principles were settled last October. The peace itself should have followed before Christmas. Had it been taken in hand Europe would now know its position. There would have been a real peace upon which the international Labor movement could organize for the betterment of the workers of the world. Instead of that it is still possible to threaten the Labor movement at home by checking demobilization and renewing the talk of war.

The Liberals behind President Wilson have some glimpses of the need of a consistent policy for peace. They see the alternative between an ultimate destruction of civilization and a League of Nations. They begin to realize that no league can last which does not guarantee international co-operation in regard to raw materials. But Wilson, like John Bright and his school of old, does not follow out this reasoning. He does not perceive that co-operation between nations is helpless unless Socialist states swallow up capitalism within the nations. On the other side are the Jingo Labor men and social reformers, who are all for a British co-operative commonwealth and Rule Britannia. Either road is impossible. The resources of the nation for the free and equal people of the nation; the resources of the world for the free and equal nations of the world—that is the sound way. There can be no Merrie England without the subversion of Imperialism by International, and no international order without democratic social order at home. Faithful to one policy at home and abroad we may conquer the whole evil of the world. Faithless in either sphere we are doomed.

MOSCOW AND THE UKRAINE

[From the Manchester Guardian of March 6]

The Bolsheviks announce that the first supplies have reached Moscow from the Ukraine as a result of the Ukraine going Bolshevik. The amounts mentioned are modest enough, and we have not forgotten that the Central Powers, despite great trumpeting, did not get much out of the Ukraine. It is very possible, indeed, that the Ukraine, which has known so much disorder, has little if any surplus for export. Still, for what it is worth, this is the beginning of the breaking of the iron ring of the blockade with which the Russian dissidence and Allied policy have surrounded Great Russia since the Bolsheviks came to power. It offers a good opportunity to the Allies to reconsider their blockade policy. We shall not argue that the suspension of the blockade will automatically bring about the downfall of the Bolsheviks; no man knows whether it will or it will not. But if the blockade is likely to be pierced by the expansion of Bolshevik authority, then it is unlikely to have much political authority. It becomes merely the bootless infliction of so much hunger and misery upon so many millions of hapless persons. We could wish our rulers could acquire the habit of thinking about the blockade in concrete terms—as the torture, for instance, of babies, as the misery of mothers, as miscarriages, as infant mortality, as disease, as incurable sickness. None of us want to inflict these things, but we are inflicting them on most of Europe and a goodly stretch of Asia. And we are doing it because there is so fine-sounding a name for it as—the blockade.

THE BLOCKADE OF RUSSIA

"At this moment, three powerful Allied fleets are blockading Revolutionary Russia. One is guarding the landing of 20,000 soldiers sent by the Entente to the northern region. A second is operating in the Black Sea. A third is occupying the Baltic and the Gulf of Finland. The English admiral who commands it has ordered the sinking, no more nor less, of Russian craft commanded by sailors and Bolsheviks. It is bombarding the Baltic coast. So much for doings by sea. On land the Entente has laid hands on the wheat grainaries of Siberia, thus preventing Russia from getting food; it coolly condemns her to famine and death; it then spreads, by means of its press, rumors of ghastly distress which, as a fact, is desolating Moscow and Petrograd. The Entente has hypocritically allowed it to be believed that it has renounced a military expedition: a lie. It has not withdrawn a single man, either from the Murman coast or from Odessa, or from Siberia. On the contrary, it is sending relief forces daily. In the bargain, the Poles, Lithuanians, Finns, Ukrainians are to be excited against the Russian Republic, a Polish expedition is being prepared—we are maintaining, with the money of the French people, reactionary troops, commanded by felons outright like Denikin, Koleshak, Krasnov: more, we are maintaining German troops in the Ukraine."—M. Cachin, in L'Humanite, Paris, Feb. 27.

BESSARABIA IS IN REVOLT

WARSAW, March 27.—Bessarabia has proclaimed its independence, established a Soviet republic and begun an offensive against the Roumanian army of occupation, a despatch from Chotin announced today.

Bessarabia is a former province of Russia, bordering Roumania on the northeast. It has been claimed and occupied by Roumania.

The Bessarabian army has captured the important town of Sadagora and is pushing the Roumanians across the Pruth River toward Largu.

The belief was expressed here that the Russian Bolsheviks are engineering the Bessarabian campaign for the purpose of establishing direct communication between Moscow and Budapest.

The Farmer

Fellow farmer, this is written to you, by one who has been a member of the wage-earning section, the proletariat, but has for fifteen years been one of you. One who has worked his twelve to sixteen hours a day in the summer, and has used the leisure of the long winters to inquire why the members of his section of the working class are in no better position, financially, than the wage-earners, why the only benefit in being a farmer, over being a wage earner, is that the farmer has a steady job. It is the result of this inquiry that he wishes to present to you, for your consideration.

Financial position means power to possess commodities, and when we consider where commodities come from we find that there are two factors necessary to the production of a commodity: First, the natural resources of the earth—nature bestows these on those who are able to take and use them—man, "dominating," has supreme claim; second, to make use of these natural resources man must labor, so, a commodity is the result of labor applied to natural resources. Naturally then, man says, if the natural resources are the free gift of nature, the giving of my labor or service is the only thing that costs me anything, and that cost is measured in time: a portion of my life. I give a portion of my life to produce commodities, then if I allow someone else to have those commodities, they are getting my time, so I want in exchange an equal quantity of their time. Man then pays for his commodities with labor, service, reckoned in time.

So, if a person does not labor in some way to produce commodities, there is nothing else he can give for the things he must have, and so he is getting something for which he has paid nothing. It is impossible to rob such a one, even if you take all that he possesses.

Now, fellow farmer, it is impossible for us to explain all the intricacy of value and price in so short an article, or give the proofs we would like to give. All we can do is touch on the main points, the basic principles, and make an appeal that we hope will be timely.

Capital is wealth used in the production of more wealth, and for the exploitation of labor. Capital is itself the product of labor, just as all wealth, whether used in the production of more wealth or not, is the product of labor. So it is not possible for capital to give to the commodities which it is used in the production of, a value greater than its own. That is, capital is not greater than its creator. The labor time embodied in the machine is given to the product of the machine in the exact proportion that the machine is consumed, or worn out.

Take the average binder, for instance; say its value is \$200 (or 200 hours) including value of repairs; say it wears out in ten years and cuts 200 acres a year, or 2,000 acres in all—then there is embodied in the crop from each acre, on the average, ten cents given to it by the binder, or one-tenth of an hour, or the time necessary to produce that one-tenth of a (gold) dollar.

Price is not value (except in a broad sense which we cannot here explain). Price is determined by supply and demand, but the basis of price is value; that is when those two opposing forces, supply (tending to send prices down) and demand (tending to send prices up) are equal, then the one counteracts the other and prices are at values, or, the time embodied, in the gold is equal to the time embodied in the other commodity which exchanges for it.

If, after looking up the price of a commodity in a mail-order catalogue, and getting a price of a similar commodity in your town store, you are inclined to doubt the above statement, go back to the first part of this, and rest assured that any seeming contradictions can be explained.

It has been computed that on the average a man produces a value which is about five times

that which he receives as wages, that is, he receives (on the average) about \$2 a day and produces about \$10, the \$8 is, therefore, the product of unpaid labor, or surplus value. Whether this calculation is correct or not, the war has shown that it takes only a small percentage of the workers to produce the necessities of life for the whole population. We believe that the value created by the average worker is rather more, than less, than \$10 per day of 10 hours, or rather more than \$1 per hour. [Evidently our contributor is using pre-war figures.—Ed.]

Now, fellow farmer, when you have a little time, figure out for your own satisfaction how many hours you work in a year, leaving out any work that a wage-earner would do for himself, or pay for out of his wages, such as a small garden, and then estimate roughly what you get for this labor; find out what you get for yourself and family—this does not include such things as money spent on machinery (farm), horses, harness, binder, plow, etc., but includes only what is spent on yourself and family for your keep and "pleasure," and see whether it comes near a dollar an hour. Then decide for yourself whether you are wasting your labor, whether you are putting more time into the production of farm produce than the average farmer. The result will surprise you.

We figured the thing out very carefully on a well-managed farm of 480 acres, estimating a long life for machinery (12 years), and making all our calculations in cost of production on the low side, and all calculations with regard to receipts according to government statistics, (average price for wheat 73 1-5 cents on track, and average yield 18.6 bushels to the acre); also, no account was taken of an engine which was sometimes used for ploughing, and the farm had a large pasture and hay swamp which yielded cheap feed, and still the total receipts for labor were only 38 1-2 cents an hour, not \$1, by any means. And it must be remembered that the average farm in Saskatchewan is less than 320 acres, and the larger the farm the cheaper, normally, can production be carried on. We believe that when interest on mortgages and notes is taken out of the value the average farmer receives, his "wages" will not compare very favorably with those received by the average wage-worker. But figure it out for yourself.

How, then, are we robbed or exploited? By the action of economic law, which says, when there is an over-supply, a commodity shall be "cheap." There is an over-supply of labor power on the world market. Part of this over-supply flows into the farming industry, the effect is a chronic over-supply of farm produce which keeps the price down to the point where (on the average farm) the farmer can "make" a living for his family and himself, and interest on the comparatively small amount of capital invested. The interest goes to the owner of the capital, whether that is the farmer, or a machine or mortgage company. ("Abnormal" war conditions left out of the calculation.) [Note: The value of a commodity is determined by the socially necessary labor involved in its production, measured in time. Over a period of time, during which the fluctuations of prices cancel each other, commodities are sold at value. There is an average degree of productivity within the socially necessary. Those individual producers who produce with greater efficiency than the average rate of productivity, receive above the average rate of profit. These producing with average efficiency will receive value for commodities, or average rate of profit for capitalistic enterprises. Those producing below the average rate of efficiency will receive less than value. This latter class are known as marginal producers, being on the margin of production, and will generally include small farmers, whose inefficiency may not be due to lack of skill and know-

ledge, but to lack of capital. The small farmer's poverty is, we believe, mainly due to the fact that he is a marginal producer, though other minor factors are also contributors. Comrade Smith's factor may be one.—Ed.]

We cannot stop the wage-worker from flooding our field of operations, because it is easy to start farming, so the remedy which will free us from the exploitation which we are subject to, is to help the wage-worker free himself from exploitation.

The power that keeps the workers in the position they are, is the power of the state, behind which is the capitalist class, the ruling class. So, to attain the result we desire we must unite to remove this class from their dominating position with regard to the state, and institute a state dominated by the workers, as a stepping-stone to the time when all will be workers, and there will be no need for a repressive state, as there will be only one class, the working class.

Fellow farmers, comrades, there is no narrower way to free ourselves from the difficulties and excessive toil which we suffer from. The road we must travel is the broad, as yet untravelled, road of unity; not only unity among ourselves, but unity with the wage workers, the peasants, and the farmers of all lands, for the ONE purpose of overthrowing the useless, oppressive, vampire class, by reason of whose greed, "bred-in-the-bone," we must all suffer. H. F. S.

A CAPITALIST "MARXIAN"

Mr. H. N. Barnes, director and general manager of E. Pollard, Ltd., may or may not possess a knowledge of Marxian economics, but the following observation culled from an article written by that gentleman in the Draper's Record for February 1, 1918, makes interesting reading to Marxian students.

We Marxians have endeavored to din into the minds of the workers the truth that the money they receive as wages is only on the average equivalent to the value of the food, clothing and shelter necessary to maintain the workers, etc. And that actual money-wages are only nominal wages: real wages being the purchasing power, or the amount of food, clothing, etc., one can buy with one's wages. Mr. Barnes, in an article, the object of which is to convince business people that they need not be alarmed at high prices, etc., for despite high money figures the workers are only getting the same real wages as before the war. Says he:

"After all, the real crux of the matter is the altered value of money. The exchange value of services is much the same as in pre-war days. A wage earner turns out a week's work in exchange for a week's provisions, etc. The face value of the money he receives is of no consequence; it may be five or fifty pounds, but if it is only exchangeable for his week's sustenance nothing really matters."

It is delightful, isn't it, to have a capitalist prove to us that the workers' condition under capitalism is incapable of permanent improvement.—Glasgow Socialist.

PRINCE KROPOTKIN IS ALIVE AND WELL

LONDON, Feb. 17. (Mail Correspondence).—Prince Peter Kropotkin, Socialist leader, despite various reports to the contrary, is alive and well at Dmitrovsk, near Moscow, according to Alexander Berkenheim, vice-president of a Russian society here. He says he saw the prince last December and recently has received letters from him.

"Now as always," Berkenheim said, "he remains far from the seat of any political activity, and is occupied with literary work. He enjoys the greatest esteem and consideration of all circles in Russia without exception."

The Technique of Revolution

["The Nation," March 22]

The old European civilization has passed away forever; we are watching beyond the Atlantic the birth of a new order—not in Paris, where we witness only the vain attempt of politicians to keep alive a decrepit state system by injecting into its hardened arteries the saline solution of a league of nations falsely so called. No, the new order comes to birth where the pulsing life of the peoples begins to find expression in new forms of economic and political organization which better meet the needs of human beings. It comes with travail and sometimes with bloodshed, as in Russia and Germany, but it comes—not only on the Continent, but in England; not only in England, but here in the United States, where a few short months ago reaction seemed to hold us in a vise-

like grip. The transfer of power to the masses of men, with the accompanying break-up of economic privilege, is occurring before our eyes all over the world, and even if we did not see the same processes beginning here, it would be inconceivable that the United States alone should remain immune. Today sober and competent observers the country over admit that the revolution is upon us; it is ours to ride the storm.

With their thinking faculties apparently paralyzed by fear, the holders of power in this country turn unseeing eyes upon Russia. They perceive only that social disorganization has occurred and that privilege has crumbled. They do not observe that the mighty of Russia chose to rely on forcible repression, and that while repression did not in the end suffice to maintain their

privilege, it brought in its train disorganization and the machine gun as the technique of the revolution. The spectacle is terrifying, and the ordinary American beholder turns from its contemplation to bow down in gratitude before our Gregorys and Overmans and Hansons, prayerfully beseeching them to save us from the same dread fate. But in his blindness the American overlooks the fundamental fact. Privilege in Russia was outgrown, and it inevitably fell; it is outgrown here, and here, too, it is about to fall. The appeal to the little gods of force can mean only, here as it meant there, that the unavoidable fall will be accompanied by violence, bloodshed, and disorganization. The responsibility will rest with those who attempted to resist an inevitable social process with machine guns.

AMERICANISM AND THE SOVIETS

(Continued from Page One)

and intimate relations with those he represents. No definite programme has even been worked out in America to put such a plan into effect. It has remained for Russia to take the lead in its concrete political application.

Elections in Russia are, so to speak, by the shop and not by the map. Each factory, each economic organization, in proportion to the numerical strength of the group, elects its own delegates to the Soviet. The assembly is made up of representatives, not of districts, but of economic interests. Every member of the Soviet works in the same factory or organization with those who elected him. He is known to them personally; he is in constant contact with them, and is under their continuous instructions; his sympathies are their sympathies, his loyalty is their loyalty.

Elections alone, however, even such elections as these, would leave an essential weakness in the pyramid of responsibility. Pioneers of democracy in the United States have realized this for years. Merely to elect a candidate to office, they have pointed out, does not insure his responsibility. The threat of the next election is oftentimes far less powerful than immediate political advantage. Without a continuing control a representative is, for the time being, irresponsible. For the past twenty years there has been a campaign in the United States for the recall of elected officials. From its inclusion in the Los Angeles charter of 1903 to the present day, the recall has made its way into the constitutions of two or three States, into the general laws of several more, and into the charters of almost two hundred municipalities. In one sweep the principle of the recall was, in 1917, put into effect in every governing body of Russia from Petrograd to Vladivostok. The Law of the Soviet Organization (addendum to paragraph 2) prescribes that "if a member of the Soviet deviates from the instructions of his constituents, then the constituents have the right to recall him and elect another in his place." This applies to every Soviet and every committee of every Soviet under the jurisdiction of the present Government of Russia. Leon Trotzky, for instance, as Commissar of the Army, is responsible by election and recall to the Executive Committee of the All-Russian Soviet, which is responsible to this Soviet, which, in turn, is responsible to the local Soviets, which are responsible to the voters that elected them. Besides this, Mr. Trotzky carries a double responsibility as a member of the All-Russian Soviet and of the local Soviet of his own district. Whatever else Mr. Trotzky may be, he cannot be called a dictator. Whatever else the Soviet may be, it cannot be classed as an autocracy.

The Soviet is not a dictatorship. Neither can it accurately be called "of the proletariat." The term has been torn from the lexicon of Socialist vernacular and has been used to describe what it

was never meant to describe. The phrase connotes class rule, the control by one caste of the destinies of another, the tyranny of labor over capital. While it may well apply to a period of transition in the Russian revolution, it cannot correctly be used to describe the ultimate composition of the Soviet state. The accomplished society of the Soviets is a caste-less and a class-less affair. The great object of the revolution has been to eliminate entirely the present antagonism between labor and capital in the only way which to the Russian is possible; by the elimination of the party of the second part. It is of the greatest importance to note, however, that there are two ways in which this can be accomplished. Fre property owner can be eliminated by the elimination either of the property or of the owner himself. Newspaper reports would lead us to suspect that the latter method is the policy of the Soviets. Such is emphatically not the case. One need have no illusions about the by-products of a revolutionary upheaval when individuals and mobs run riot, and may yet be convinced by the evidence at hand that the policy of the present Russian Government is to eliminate the property owner only by nationalizing his property.

The present Russian Government has taken over one by one the ownership of the great resources of the nation. Capital, in the sense of property, remains, but in the hands of the people through the state. In this way the private owner of capital who exploits it for his personal advantage is rapidly being eliminated from Russian society. If the Czar should not own and operate the government for his personal benefit, why should the capitalist own and operate the factory to the same end? The nobility have already been expropriated; the capitalist soon will be. When the change has been accomplished, the nobles and the capitalists will still live but they will be workers and not owners for a living. There will remain neither "bourgeoisie" nor "proletariat"; there will be only workers in Russia. Such is the logic of the Russian revolutionist. In the phraseology of the Russian Constitution (Section 9): "The fundamental problem of the Constitution of the Russian Federated Soviet Republic involves, in view of the present transition period (italics mine), the establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat . . . for the purpose of abolishing the exploitation of men by men" and of insuring that there shall be "neither a division into classes nor a state of autocracy."

To accomplish this purpose the owners of capital have been excluded from the franchise. Every inhabitant of Soviet Russia, male or female, of eighteen years or over, who has "acquired the means of living through labor that is productive and useful to society" or "who has lost the capacity to work," and also "persons engaged in housekeeping," are entitled to vote and to be elected to the Soviets. "Persons who employ hired labor in order to obtain from it an increase in profits" and those "who have an income without doing any work" are definitely excluded from voting or holding office. Temporarily this means

a class domination. There can be no dispute as to that. Even so, however, it is the majority that has willed it.

Were the figures available they would probably show that even with the property-owners excluded the franchise is more democratic in Russia than in England or the United States. It is probable that a larger portion of the population is entitled to vote today in Russia than in any other country of the world. In the first place, only a small proportion of the Russian population has ever been included in the property-owning class. Russia is and always has been an agrarian land. Its population has been composed overwhelmingly of peasants and workers. In the second place, so-called democracies like England and the United States have limitations of the franchise that Russia has not. England still frankly retains property as the basic qualification for suffrage, excludes women under thirty, men under twenty-one, and aliens. About one-half of the American States exclude women from the franchise; several require educational tests, and many also demand a poll tax; Southern States in practice exclude the Negro; and most States allow only citizens of the United States to vote, while every one disfranchises all men under twenty-one and those who have not lived a certain time in the district from which they vote. Only nine out of forty-five million persons in England voted in 1918, and only eighteen out of over a hundred million in the United States.

In Soviet Russia there are no residence requirements, while all men and women over eighteen, including aliens, can vote. The lack of other limitations in Russia will probably outbalance the exclusion of the property-owners in a comparison of the proportion of the population even now entitled to vote.

Ultimately, however, age will be the only limitation upon the suffrage of Soviet Russia. Like the physician whose highest function it is to make himself unnecessary, the temporary domination of the majority continually works to eliminate itself. The property-owner is excluded, but with an ever-increasing nationalization of capital each month sees fewer and fewer in the property-owning class. The property-owners become workers and entitled to the franchise; the disfranchised rapidly approach complete absorption as the limit they will ultimately reach. Each month makes the electorate more nearly all-inclusive, more completely democratic. What has been called the "dictatorship of the proletariat" proves upon analysis to be ultimately a democracy of the unclassed.

Soviet Russia throws our American institutions into a novel perspective. It probes anew our ideals of self-government. The Soviet, unified, responsible, controlled by the masses at every point, and amenable to change with the times, is a penetrating commentary on our congealed constitution, our sovereign courts, our President, our Senate, and our House, only intermittently responsible and frankly designed to check and to balance the popular will, and our restricted and rather futile electorate.