

THE RED FLAG

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

VOL. 1 No. 8

VANCOUVER, SATURDAY, MARCH 15, 1919

FIVE CENTS

In Commemoration of the Paris Commune 1871

IT is now almost half a century since the great working class tragedy was enacted in Paris. In 1871, a dense cloud settled upon enslaved humanity. An attempt had been made to overcome the conditions under which labor was exploited of all that could make for a free and full development. The attempt was doomed; and the overwhelming defeat was felt in every corner of the earth.

It resulted in the downfall of the First International, and opened the way to a general hounding of the foremost Socialists of Europe. Each year as the 18th of March comes round the memory of the men who fell in Paris is commemorated.

Notwithstanding the stupid lies which the great lying press indulged in at that time, the true story of what occurred in Paris between March and May of 1871 has long been known by the revolutionary workers. There are many, very many, even now however, who do not know that such an event is recorded in history. We are not surprised at this, seeing that most histories, which can spare pages to describe Louis Bonaparte's frantic actions at Sedan, dismiss the Paris Commune with a sneer. "The rabble seized Paris but was soon subdued." If more space is given, it is generally devoted to abuse.

That the Commune was the most vital and far-reaching event of the Franco-Prussian War they either ignore or seek to hide. It remains for working class papers and organizations to retell the story when the anniversary of the day of glorious memory recurs.

The events which preceded the seizure of power by the proletariat of Paris are of such character that no bourgeois historian has ever had the hardihood to excuse. From the time when the son of Napoleon's step-daughter stripped France of every particle of honor, by forcing a nation of over 40 millions to recognize him as emperor, all through his subsequent career; the never-to-be forgotten follies of the Crimean War; the double-crossing of Italy in her war with Austria; the insane attempt to create an empire in Mexico, and finally the crowning folly of forcing a war with Prussia, when that country was organized to the last man for such a war, and when France had not even a clear conception of where to attack.

To such a pass had the fear of a revolutionary working class led the French master class, that all the hair-brained schemes of the group which surrounded Louis Napoleon, were received without protest. Having control of the press, they could create the necessary atmosphere and their partisans paraded the streets, making the night hideous with noise, while any opposition was promptly squelched.

The result of the war is well known. When the German army came in contact with the French at some points, they found the French soldier digging in potato fields for food to keep from starving.

The war opened in July 1870 and the second of September saw Napoleon capitulate at Sedan. Two days later the republic was proclaimed in Paris, and two more days saw the publication

of the circular by the republic which contained the words "Not an inch of our soil will we cede, not a stone of our fortresses."

Then commenced the seizure of Paris. During the entire war, criminal incapacity, and unparalleled treachery characterized the conduct of those in charge of the destinies of France. So the Parisians declared, when on the 18th of March, 1871, the Central Committee took control of Paris, "amidst the failures and treasons of the ruling class."

The empty and absurd boasts of the politicians who seized control of France were solely for the purpose of deluding the French people. When they surrendered Paris and moved the seat of government to Bordeaux, the Parisians looked on with fierce distrust.

C. A. Fyffe in his "History of Modern Europe" tells that, that "Favre, Trochu, and the other members of government of defence had assumed power on the downfall of Napoleon III because they considered themselves the best individuals best able to serve the state. There were hundreds of other persons in Paris who had exactly the same opinion of themselves; and when, with the progress of the siege, the government of the defence lost its popularity and credit, it was natural that ambitious and impatient men of lower political rank should consider it time to try whether Paris could not make a better defence under their own auspices. Attempts had been made before the end of October to overthrow the government. They were repeated at intervals but without success. The agitation however, continued within the ranks of the national guard, which, unlike the national guard in the time of Louis

Phillippe, now included the mass of the working class and was the most dangerous enemy instead of the support of the government. The capitulation brought things to a crisis. Favre had declared it would be impossible to disarm the national guard without a battle in the streets. At his instance, Bismarck allowed the National Guard to retain their weapons and the fears of the government itself thus prepared the way for a successful insurrection." Page 469.

The Parisians considered themselves the centre and mainspring of France. The so-called government sought to humiliate and disarm them. for "Paris was the revolution armed."

It was not a working class revolt at first. The hangers on of capital saw ruin, immediate and complete, if the Bordeaux National Assembly matured their plans. Consequently, they urged Paris to resist. But when the supreme moment came they left the working class to carry on the struggle alone.

From the proclamation of the Commune, March 18th, to the surrender of the last fort, Vercennes, on the 29th of May, the Communists had to fight against treason within and the French army without the walls. Shut off by the German forces on three sides, they had to reorganize Paris, just recovered from a five months siege, by the German government, and a five months rape by the French government. They bent their energies to the task as only working men can. It was solely undertaken by the workers and in all its history the master class has never shown either the ability nor the courage needful to such achievements.

Overwhelmed by a greatly superior army and betrayed by spies, the Commune was overthrown.

We cannot go into further detail here, other than to state the gross and brutal treatment dealt out to the defeated Communards. Lined up in batches, they were mowed down with machine guns, after they had surrendered. All the horrors which the Great Lying Press tell of Russia today were enacted by the French government 48 years ago. In fact, if the unimaginative scribblers would get the records of that cowardly massacre, they could fill their papers with "situations" which at least would be plausible, instead of the stupid lies now their chief stock in trade. In doing this, they would not have to vary their tactics. Fastening their own crimes upon their opponents is their chief manoeuvre.

The lessons to be taken from the Commune of Paris are, first—Let the working class attend to its own business. Second—They have capacity in their own ranks to conduct their own affairs.

When and where the Commune failed was but a page from the history of our class. Russia has carried the story to a fuller and happier development. Germany has also taken the road and the hoary-headed, ancient old fogeys shake their heads and wonder if it is all true.

The Paris Commune was a step on the road, and Russia is a step further. We approach the goal. "Individuals often err in the safe-guarding of their interests. A class for any prolonged period never is in error." J. H.

NOW READY

A HANDY TEXT BOOK

on the economics of Capitalistic Production, being the first nine chapters of:

Vol. 1 Marx's Capital with the 32nd chapter on the Historical Tendency of Capitalist Accumulation included, also an extract from the preface to the same author's "Critique of Political Economy", which formulates the materialistic interpretation of history.

Prices are as per the following quotations:
Post paid in all cases

Single copies, paper covers, 50c.

25 copies or more, paper covers, copy, 40c.

Single copies, cloth bound, \$1.00 per copy.

10 copies or more, cloth bound, copy, 75c.

We await your orders, and we hope you will keep us busy, as success in this venture means much to the publishers' future efforts.

Make all remittances payable to C. Stephenson,
401 Pender Street East, Vancouver, B. C.

Litvinoff's Appeal to Wilson

ON December 24 last M. Litvinoff, the Bolshevik Envoy at Stockholm, made a special appeal to President Wilson. This was published for the first time by the Manchester Guardian on Monday last and is of such historical value that we publish it here for our readers' use, with cross-heads inserted to mark its more important passages.

Mr. President—In addition to the general peace offer recently addressed by the Soviet government to the Allies, I informally informed today the Stockholm ministers of the United States and of the Allied countries that I am authorized to enter into negotiations for a peaceful settlement of all questions making for hostilities against Russia. The principles proclaimed by you as a possible basis for settling European questions, your avowed efforts and intentions of making the settlement conform to the demands of justice and humanity, induce me to send you this statement, inasmuch as most points of your peace programme are included in the more extensive aspirations of the Russian workers and peasants, now rulers of their country.

The Soviets' Lead for Peace

It was they who first proclaimed and actually granted to nations the right of self-determination, who suffered most sacrifices in fighting imperialism and militarism both at home and abroad, who dealt the severest blow to secret diplomacy. And it is partly for these innovations in politics that they have been fiercely attacked by the former ruling classes of Russia and their counterparts in other countries. To justify this attack a network of lies and calumnies has been woven round the activities of the Soviets and forged documents put into circulation.

Unfortunately, Allied statesmen accept all the monstrous accusations against the Soviets at their face value, without taking the trouble to check them. Whilst agents of anti-Soviet parties are allowed and encouraged to move freely in Allied countries and disseminate untruth, representatives of the accused side have never been allowed to put fully their case and to answer the charges made against them.

Their Chief Aim

In fact, the chief aim of the Soviets is to secure for the toiling majority of the Russian people economic liberty, without which political liberty is of no avail to them. For eight months the Soviets endeavored to realize their aims by peaceful methods without resorting to violence, adhering to the abolition of capital punishment, which abolition had been part of their programme. It was only when their adversaries, the minority of the Russian people took to terroristic acts against popular members of the government and invoked the help of foreign troops that the laboring masses were driven to acts of exasperation and gave vent to their wrath and bitter feelings against their former oppressors.

The Crime of Allied Invasion

For the Allied invasion of Russian territory not only compelled the Soviets against their own will to militarize the country anew and to divert their energies and resources—so necessary to the economic reconstruction of Russia, exhausted by four years of war in the defence of the country—but also cut off the vital sources of foodstuffs and raw materials, exposing the population to most terrible privations, bordering on starvation. I wish to emphasize that the so-called "Red Terror"—which is grossly exaggerated and misrepresented abroad—was not the cause but the direct result and outcome of Allied intervention.

The Russian workers and peasants fail to understand how foreign countries, which never dreamed of interfering with Russian affairs

A MAGNIFICENT DEFENCE OF THE SOVIETS

when Tsarist barbarism—and militarism ruled supreme, and even supported that regime, can feel justified in interfering in Russia now, when the working people itself, after decades of strenuous struggling and countless sacrifices, succeeded in taking power and the destiny of their country into their own hands, aiming at nothing but their own happiness and international brotherhood, constituting no menace to other nations.

Workers Determined to Defend the Soviets

The Russian workers and peasants are determined to defend their dearly won power and liberties against invaders with all the means their vast country puts at their disposal, but mindful of the inevitable wanton loss of life and treasure on both sides, and wishing to avert the further ruining of Russia—which must result from the continuation of internal and external fighting—they are prepared to go to any length of concessions, as far as the real interests of their country are concerned, if they can secure thereby conditions enabling them to work out peacefully their social schemes.

I understand that the question of relations with Russia is now engaging the attention of Allied statesmen. I venture, then, to submit to you, Mr. President, that there are now only two courses open to them.

The Two Alternatives

One is continued open or disguised intervention on the present or on a still larger scale, which means prolongation of war, further embitterment of the Russian masses, intensification of internal strife, unexampled bloodshed, and perhaps total extermination of the Russian bourgeoisie by the exasperated masses, final devastation of the country, and, in case of the interventionists after a long struggle obtaining their end, a White Terror eclipsing

the atrocities of the Finnish White Guardists, the inevitable introduction of a military dictatorship, and the restoration of the monarchy, leading to interminable revolutions and upheavals, and paralyzing the economic development of the country for long decades.

The other alternative, which, I trust may commend itself to you, is impartially to weigh and investigate the one-sided accusations against Soviet Russia, to come to an understanding with the Soviet government, to withdraw the foreign troops from Russian territory and to raise the economic blockade—soothing thereby the excited passions of the masses—to help Russia to regain her own sources of supply, and to give her technical advice how to exploit her natural richness in the most effective way for the benefit of all countries badly in need of foodstuffs and raw materials.

Dictatorship Not an End But a Means

The dictatorship of toilers and producers is not an aim in itself, but the means of building up a new social system under which useful work and equal rights would be provided for all citizens, irrespective of the class to which they had formerly belonged. One may believe in this ideal or not, but it surely gives no justification for sending foreign troops to fight against it, or for arming and supporting classes interested in the restoration of the old system of exploitation of man by man.

I venture to appeal to your sense of justice and impartiality.

I hope and trust, above all, that before deciding on any course of action you will give justice to the demand of *audiatur et altera pars*.

MAXIM LITVINOFF, Late Representative for Great Britain of the Russian Federative Republic.

Stockholm, December 24, 1918.

From the "Labor Leader," Feb. 20.

The Revolutionary Movement in Ireland

The following report deals with the activity of the Socialist Party of Ireland and is a further instance of the solidarity of class conscious workers everywhere in demanding that their governments "withdraw from Russia."

Despite the police order prohibiting a Bolshevik demonstration, the workers of Dublin seized the opportunity to hail the revolution in Central Europe and celebrate the establishment of the Soviet Republic in Russia. The occasion was the mass meeting in the Dublin Trades Hall on Sunday, December 1, when the S.P.I. organized a rebel gathering to rejoice at "the downfall of Prussianism." The speakers and the audience made it clear be-

FROM TROTSKY'S ADDRESS ON THE RED ARMY, SEPT. 30th, 1918

"Such are the prospects. Two months ago our position was very difficult; but we did not lay aside our labors, and if we have maintained ourselves until today, no power will overthrow us. We must take advantage of the next few months to strengthen and develop our army. Relying on the authority of the Central Executive Committee and the sympathy of the industrial and peasant masses, we shall in a short time transform Russia, not in word but in deed, into an armed camp, and will overcome the conservatism of the provincial Soviet members, who do not always critically examine their standpoint on this question.

"Comrade Krassin has been placed in charge of the equipping of the army. He is pushing ahead, and the statistical returns he has made in the last few days show that the work of supply is

yond cavil that the Prussianism they meant was militarism, imperialism, and capitalism, and that it has been banished from Russia and Germany, it is still rampant and still ruling in Ireland and in Great Britain. The spirit and tone of the meeting were most subversive and the speeches were directed against the social and political disorder which is still maintained in this country. Eminently practical and pointed advice was given by the speakers, who included Tom Foran, Wm. O'Brien, Mrs. Sheehy Skeffington, Tom Johnson, Sidney Arnold, J. J. Hughes, Hector Hughes and Tom Kennedy. The war-cry of the meeting was: All power to the Soviets.

not at all in a bad way.

"The new calling up of young men will produce several first class divisions, which will constitute reserves for the army. We beg you, on your side, to support with your authority the work of its formation. We must convince the British and French that their intervention here is not only a dishonorable crime, but a piece of disgraceful folly. Our resistance on the eastern front will produce a gigantic effect on the other side of the Pacific; and to all our enemies on one side, to all our friends on the other, we shall show that we are a power—that we must live and shall live."

Propaganda meeting Sunday evening at 8 o'clock, at the Empress Theatre, corner Hastings and Gore.

Preface to an Open Letter to America

By ARTHUR RANSOME

Correspondent in Russia for the London Daily News

Every day brings a ship,
Every ship brings a word;
Well for those who have no fear,
Looking seaward well assured
That the word the vessel brings
Is the word they wish to hear.

Emerson wrote the poem I have stolen for a headpiece to this letter, and Emerson wrote the best commentary on that poem: "If there is any period one would desire to be born in—is it not the age of revolution; when the old and the new stand side by side, and admit of being compared; when the energies of all men are searched by fear and by hope; when the heroic glories of the old can be compensated by the rich possibilities of the new era? This time like all times, is a very good one, if we but know what to do with it." Revolution divides men of character far more sharply than they are divided by war. Those whom the gods love take the youth of their hearts and throw themselves gladly on that side, even if, clear sighted, they perceive that the fires of revolution will burn up perhaps the very things that, for themselves, they hold most dear. Those others, wise, circumspect, foolish with the folly of wisdom, refrain, and are burned up none the less. It is the same with nations, and I send this pamphlet to America because America supported the French revolution when England condemned it, and because now also America seems to me to look towards Russia with better will to understand, with less suspicion, without the easy cynicism that prepares the disaster at which it is afterwards ready to smile. Not that I think all this is due to some special virtue in America. I have no doubt it is due to geographical and economic conditions. America is further from this bloody cockpit of Europe, for one thing. For another, even rich Americans dependent for their full pockets on the continuance of the present capitalist system, can wholeheartedly admire the story of the Bolshevik adventure, and even wish for its success, without fearing any serious damage to the edifice in which they live. Or it may be, that, knowing so little about America, I let myself think too well of it. Perhaps there too men go about repeating easy lies, poisoning the wells of truth from simple lack of attention to the hygiene of the mind. I do not know. I only know that, from the point of view of the Russian revolution, England seems to be a vast nightmare of blind folly, separated from the continent, indeed from the world, by the sea,

and beyond that by the trenches, and deprived, by some fairy godmother who was not invited to her christening, of the imagination to realize what is happening beyond. Shouting in daily telegrams across the wires from Russia I feel I am shouting at a drunken man asleep in the road in front of a steam roller. And then the newspapers of six weeks ago arrive, and I seem to see that drunk, sleeping fool make a motion as if to brush a fly from his nose, and take no further notice of the monstrous thing bearing steadily towards him. I love the real England, but I hate, more than I hate anything on earth (except cowardice in looking at the truth) the intellectual sloth, the gross mental indolence that prevents the English from making an effort of imagination and realizing how shameful will be their position in history when the story of this last year in the biography of democracy comes to be written. How shameful, and how foolish . . . for they will one day be forced to realize how appalling are the mistakes they committed, even from the mere bestial standpoint of self interest and expediency. Shameful, foolish and tragic beyond tears . . . for the toll will be paid in English blood. English lads will die and English lads have died, not one or two, but hundreds of thousands, because their elders listen to men who think little things, and tell them little things, which are so terribly easy to repeat. At least half our worst mistakes have been due to the under-estimation of some person or force outside England, and disturbing to little men who will not realize that chaos has come again and that giants are waking in the world. They look across Europe and see huge things, monstrous figures, and, to save themselves, and from respect for other little lazy minds, they leap for the easiest tawdry explanation, and say, "Ah yes, bogies made in Germany with candles inside turnip heads!" And having found their miserable little atheistical explanation they din it into everybody, so that other people shall make the same mistakes, and they have company in folly, and so be excused. And in the end it becomes difficult for even honestminded sturdy folk in England to look those bogies squarely in their turnip faces and to see that they are not bogies at all, but the real article, giants, whose movements in the mist are of greater im-

port for the future of the world than anything else that is happening in our day.

I think it possible that the revolution will fail. If so, then tis failure will not mean that it loses its importance. The French revolution gave a measure of freedom to every nation in Europe, although it failed most notably in France and ended in a dictator and a defeated dictator at that, and for the brave clear-sighted France foreseen by Diderot and Rousseau substituted a France in which thought died and every one was free to grub money with a view to enslaving everybody else. The failure of the French revolution did not lessen the armor which the ideas that sprang from it poured into the minds that came to their maturity between 1795 and 1801. And perhaps it was that failure which sharpened the conflict of the first half of the nineteenth century, in which, after all, many candles were lit and fiercely, successfully guarded in the windy night that followed the revolutionary sunset. Let the revolution fail. No matter, if only in America, in England, in France, in Germany, men know what it was that failed, and how it failed, who betrayed it, who murdered it. Man does not live by his deeds so much as by the purposes of his deeds. We have seen the fight of the young eagles. Nothing can destroy that fact, even if, later in the day, the eagles drop to earth, one by one, with broken wings.

It is hard here, with the tragedy so close at hand so intimate, not to forget the immediate practical purpose of my writing. It is this: to set down, as shortly as possible the story of the development of the Soviet power in Russia, to show what forces in Russia worked against that power and why; to explain what exactly the Soviet government is, and how the end of the Soviet government will mean the end of the revolution, whatever may be the apparent character of any form of government that succeeds it.

A. R.

Moscow, May 14th, 1918.

CHAOTIC RUSSIA

A correspondent of the New York "Nation" of March 1st, reports the arrival in America of agents of the Russian Soviets with six million dollars for agricultural machinery.

Propaganda meeting, Empress Theatre, every Sunday evening, 8 p.m.

Karl Marx

By FRANZ MEHRING

(Concluded from Last Issue).

Sad as this lot of a great spirit may seem, it rises to truly tragic eminence by reason of the fact that Marx voluntarily assumed these decade-long torturing burdens, and rejected every temptation to seek refuge in the haven of some bourgeois calling, which he might have sought with every justification. All that was to be said on this matter, he said simply and plainly, without any high-sounding words: "I must pursue my purpose through thick and thin, and dare not permit bourgeois society to transform me into a money-making machine." This Prometheus was not fettered to the rock by the bolts of Hephaestus, but by his own iron will, which was directed toward the highest goals of humanity with the certainty of a magnetic needle. His whole character is that of tempered steel. There is nothing more marvelous than to find him, in the same letter in which he seems depressed by the most sordid wretchedness, suddenly rebounding with magnificent elasticity and turning with the detached calm of a sage to a discussion of the most difficult problems, with not a furrow on his brow.

But we must not forget that Marx felt the blows

inflicted on him by bourgeois society. It would be a stupid stoicism to declare: What are such tortures as Marx suffered, to a genius who must wait for the approval of posterity? Silly as is the vanity of the literateur who is not happy unless he finds his name in the papers at least once a day, it is nevertheless a necessity to a man of really creative force to find a field large enough for the unfolding of his energy, and to draw new strength for further labors, from the echo that responds to his efforts. Marx was no mewling and pucking escetic, such as may be found in cheap plays and novels, but a lover of the world, like Lessing, and he was quite familiar with the mood expressed by the dying Lessing when he wrote to the oldest friend of his youth: "I do believe you have the impression that I am a man in any way hungry for praise. But the coldness which the world shows to certain people, in order to teach them that nothing they do is acceptable to it, is at least benumbing, if not destructive." Just before he reached the age of fifty, Marx wrote, with the same bitterness: "Half a century on my back, and still a pauper!" Once he wished himself to lie a hundred fathoms under the ground rather than continue to vegetate in this manner. Once,

a desperate cry bursts from his heart: he would not desire his worst enemy to wade through the swamp in which he has been stuck for eight months, infuriated by watching his intellect being neutralized and his power for work undermined by all sorts of bagatelles.

Marx did not, to be sure, become "a cursed dog of sadness" through all this, as he occasionally remarks, with irony, and Engels speaks the truth when he says that his friend never gave up the ship. But, although Marx loved to call himself a hard man, there is no doubt that in the furnace of misfortune he was hammered harder and harder. The clear sky that was spread over the labors of his youth became overcast with heavy thunderclouds as time went on, and from these his ideas sprang forth like lightning, his verdicts on his enemies, frequently also on his friends, assumed an incisive sharpness, which injured even those whose spirits were not weak.

Those who would therefore call him a cold and icy demagogue are no less—but we must admit, no more—mistaken than those nice subaltern spirits who behold in this mighty champion only the shining puppet of the parade ground.

THE RED FLAG Appeal of the Hungarian Working Class to the Workers of the World

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

SAURDAY March 15, 1919

WE THANK THEM

Forty-eight years ago in the city of Paris, the workers commune, along with those dreamers of a new social order, the Communards, was extinguished, blotted out in a bloody holocaust, to the savage plaudits of the bourgeois world.

Looking over a bound volume of an illustrated periodical of that time, the writer was struck by the seeming poverty of the human mind, especially the bourgeois mind. Issue by issue the pages of the periodical teemed with identically the same kind of vituperation, word for word, except for the nouns, the same identical lies, showing the same fear of the fundamental issues raised, as we find in our press today, when dealing with the revolutionary proletariat, in Russia, Germany or elsewhere.

The same lies, the same inflammatory language, and—the same solution: death and the galleys and deportation to the penal settlements. Stamp it out; utterly, and be quick about it! Hedge it about with a ring of steel "a cordon sanitaire," that it may not spread.

And so, with all possible ruthlessness and savage vindictiveness neither man nor woman or child, neither youth nor venerable age was spared. Suspecting that some of the Communards had escaped from Paris and out of the country, the powers of the governments of other countries were also successfully invoked into the man hunt. No slaves revolting in ancient Rome were so ruthlessly and completely exterminated.

In addition to this, for fifty years, the circumstances surrounding the affair of the Commune have been misrepresented in bourgeois histories, in its press, in its schools, colleges, universities and encyclopedias. Fifty years of suppression of the truth, fifty years of censorship, fifty years of poison gas. Only a solitary individual or two have lifted the curtain and let us see the truth.

If ideas, which have their source in the material conditions of life, can be stamped out because they threaten the existence of an all powerful ruling class, surely, here is a case in point.

Yet the ideals and aspirations of those dreamers of a new social order, fifty years ago, are the most pregnant force in the world today. The schemes of the statesmen of the old order hang in the air, while this new, vital, potent force makes history. All power to the workmen's Soviets! Phoenix like from the ashes of eighteen seventy one arises the spirit which inspired our long dead comrades of the Paris Commune. The old order changeth, giving place to the new. The revolutionary working class has always held dear the memory of those sacred dead; has held tenaciously to their ideals; has cherished the memory of that splendid adventure and more than all has never forgot the manner of their going out.

The manner of their going out; their deaths, their bloody massacre, their imprisonments, their subsequent life of hunted rats, the suppressions, the censorships, the lies and calumny, these we will never forget while a ruling class remains on earth.

We thank the ruling class of their day for this memory, and, more than all we thank the rulers of our day for keeping the memory alive, refreshing it by their own impositions and tyrannies.

[From Seattle "Union Record," February 27.]

The senate of the workers has come to a very grave decision. The Hungarian working class now appeals to the working classes of the world and asks their aid to prevent the conquests of the Hungarian People's Republic, with its hardly acquired rights, from being destroyed under the pretext of the necessities of military occupation. Our delegates are going to all parts of the world; we shall utilize all methods and means for making the European proletarians familiar with the threatened condition of the Hungarian democracy, its Socialism, its working class movement, in order to secure effective help.

What is happening at the present time in Hungary? The revolution almost bloodlessly overthrew the old putrid system of tyranny. A Hungarian people's republic has been born. This republic of the people has rapidly swept out the vestiges of feudalism and has created in Hungary a most complete democracy, to be developed along Socialistic lines. But now the area of the conquered monarchy is inundated by troops of occupation.

Before the war of the entente came to a triumphant end, while the entente was yet fighting, freedom for small nations, the safe-guarding of democracy, was inscribed upon its banners. The entente have not brought freedom. The entente which promised that it would liberate the world from the yoke of German absolutism has subjected Hungary to the greedy hunger of a Rumanian, Serbian, Czechoslovakian imperialism. This imperialism represents an inferior degree of development as compared to the Hungarian democracy. The people's republic has secured for itself a most complete freedom of union, freedom of press and assembly. The occupying troops have peaceful relations with neighbors of assembly and union. The republic of the people has proclaimed a socialistic policy, freedom of organization and respect for labor. The troops of occupation are annihilating these germs of social policy, fettering our departmental organizations, and, instead of liberating labor, they are creating a new servitude.

Suppressing Labor

The occupation of Hungary signifies not only

For their suppression of the literature of the working class, we thank them; for their stifling of free discussion, we thank them; for their censorship of the mails, we thank them, and for the flatulent and self-contradictory lies, and reservations of their press as to the proletarian movement in Russia, Germany, France, Italy and Great Britain, we thank them more than all. Because these tyrannies add conviction to our knowledge of the bankruptcy of our rulers, they add fuel to our fire, they steel our hearts and fire our brain, they confirm our strength and expose the weakness of the enemies of the working class and of human progress.

Thinking of the Communards of '71, we quote the following lines by William Morris:

And we, shall we crouch and quail,
Ashamed, afraid of strife;
And lest our lives untimely fail
Embrace the death in life?
Nay, cry aloud and have no fear;
We few against the world;
Awake, arise! the hope we bear
Against the curse is hurl'd.

It grows, it grows; are we the same,
The feeble band, the few?
Or what are these with eyes aflame,
And hands to deal and do?
This is the host that bears the word,
No Master, High or Low,
A lightning flame, a shearing sword,
A storm to overthrow.

the oppression of all rights, not only the strangulation of a laboring class movement, but it further means the suppression of the possibility of labor itself. Where no coal is, there no labor can be. It seems that the army of occupation takes seriously the ironical words of Gen. Franchet d'Espèray: "If our steam machinery does not work, let us use windmills." The lack of coal signifies the destruction of our great industries, the bankruptcy of our traffic, rags and tatters in our villages, famine in our cities. And all this takes place because a now expelled monarchy made war against the entente. A war which the class conscious proletarians of Hungary abominated from the bottom of their hearts. A war into which the ruling class of the monarchy could only drive us by threatening Hungary by other nationalities. In fact, our governing class could only get us into this war by terrifying us by the specter of invasion from Rumania, Czechoslovakia and Serbia, yet these very nationalities now rule in Hungary as conquerors and are treading under foot the first fruits of a social revolution. We ask of the proletarians of the world: Will the workers of France tolerate, will the organized laboring army of England tolerate, will the working people of Italy look on quietly, will the proletarians of the world permit that the occupation of Hungary, made under pretext of keeping order, shall have as its effect a counter-revolution?

Cannot Be Vanquished

But the socialistic movement in Hungary can no longer be vanquished by such methods, because in Hungary at the present time, Socialism alone represents the ideas of social progress. Only through socialism, only through mutual agreements of the peoples, only by the support of the workers of the world is it possible that this country can become a land of peace and of productive labor, instead of a fighting ground for races and quarrels of peoples. The Hungarian people should understand that they must live in peaceful relations with neighboring nationalities if the world war is to come to an end. And the people of Europe should understand that if they do not desire that Hungary be the incendiary torch of Europe, if they wish that the storm clouds which hang over this country and menace the tranquility of Europe be dissipated, then they should not protect the provocative, greedy nationalistic tendencies and that they should insure the rule of democracy in Hungary, the realization in the nation of the proper right of self-government. Because the nations of Hungary cannot live peacefully side by side under the rule of absolutism and oppression, but only in a state of most complete freedom and most complete democracy.—Translated from the Ido Journal La Socio. of Holland.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

SUNDAY, MARCH 16

At 8 p.m. Sharp

EMPRESS THEATRE

Corner Gore and Hastings

Speaker J. H. Harrington

Bolshevism Is a Menace---To Whom?

Being extracts from an article in the Feb. 22 issue of the New York "Dial." We regret having to butcher this article, because of lack of space.

"By first intention and by consistent aim Bolshevism is a menace to the vested rights of property and of privilege, and from this the rest follows. The vested interests are within their legal and moral rights, and it is not to be expected that they will yield these rights amicably. All those classes, factions, and interests that stand to lose have made common cause against the out-and-outers, have employed armed force where that has been practicable, and have resorted to such measures of intrigue and sabotage as they can command. All of which is quite reasonable, in a way, since these vested interests are legally and morally in the right according to the best of their knowledge and belief; but the consequence of their righteous opposition, intrigue, and obstruction has been strife, disorder, privation and bloodshed, with a doubtful and evil prospect ahead.

Among the immediate consequences of this quarrel, according to the reports which have been allowed to come through to the outside, is alleged to be a total disorganization and collapse of the industrial system throughout the Russian dominions, including the transportation system and the food supply. From which has followed famine, pestilence, and pillage, uncontrolled and uncontrollable. However, there are certain outstanding facts which it will be in place to recall, in part because they are habitually overlooked or not habitually drawn on for correction of the published reports. The Bolshevik administration has now been running for something over a year, which will include one crop season. During this time it has been gaining ground, particularly during the later months of this period; and this gain has been made in spite of a very considerable resistance, active and passive, more or less competently organized and more or less adequately supported from the outside. Meantime the "infection" is spreading in a way that does not signify a lost cause.

All the while the administration has been carrying on military operations on a more or less extended scale; and on the whole, and particularly through the latter part of this period, its military operations appear to have been gaining in magnitude and to have met with increasing success, such as would argue a more or less adequate continued supply of arms and munitions. These military operations have been carried on without substantial supplies from the outside, so that the administration will have had to supply its warlike needs and replace its wear and tear from within the country during this rather costly period. It has been said from time to time, of course, that the Bolshevik administration has drawn heavily on German support for funds and material supplies during this period. It has been said, but it is very doubtful if it has been believed. Quite notoriously the Bolsheviks have lost more than they have gained at the hands of the Germans. And imports of all warlike supplies from any source have been very nearly shut off.

Such information as has been coming through from the inside, in the way of official reports, runs to the effect that the needed supplies of war material, including arms and ammunition, have in the main been provided at home from stocks on hand and by taking over various industrial works and operating them for war purposes under administrative control—which would argue that the industrial collapse and disorganization cannot have been so complete or so far-reaching as had been feared, or hoped. Indeed these reports are singularly out of touch and out of sympathy with the Associated Press news bearing on the same general topic. It appears, dimly, from the circumstantial evidence that the Bolshevik administration in Russia has met with somewhat the same surprising experience as the democratic administration in America—that in spite of the

haste, confusion, and blundering, incident to taking over the control of industrial works, the same works have after all proved to run at a higher efficiency under administrative management than they previously have habitually done when managed by their owners for private gain. The point is in doubt, it must be admitted, but the circumstantial evidence, backed by the official reports, appears on the whole to go that way.

Something to a similar effect will apparently hold true for the transportation system. The administration has apparently been able to take over more of the means of transport than the Associated Press news would indicate, and to have kept it all in a more nearly reasonable state of repair. As is well known, the conduct of successful military operations today quite imperatively requires a competent transport system; and, in spite of many reverses, it is apparently necessary to admit that the military operations of the Bolshevik administration have on the whole been successful rather than the reverse. The inference is plain, so far as concerns the point immediately in question here. Doubtless the Russian transportation system is in sufficiently bad shape, but it can scarcely be in so complete a state of collapse as had been reported, feared, and hoped by those who go on the information given out by the standard news agencies. If one discounts the selectively standardized news dispatches of these agencies, one is left with an impression that the railway system, for example, is better furnished with rolling-stock and in better repair in European Russia than in Siberia, where the Bolshevik administration is not in control. This may be due in good part to the fact that the working personnel of the railways and their repair shops are Bolsheviks at heart, both in Siberia and in European Russia, and that they have therefore withdrawn from the train service and repair shops of the Siberian roads as fast as these roads have fallen into non-Bolshevik hands, and have migrated into Russia to take up the same work among their own friends.

The transportation system does not appear to have precisely broken down; the continuance of military operations goes to show that much. Also, the crop year of 1918 is known to have been rather exceptionally good in European Russia, on the whole, so that there will be at least a scant sufficiency of foodstuff back in the country and available for those portions of the population who can get at it. Also, it will be noted that, by all accounts, the civilian population of the cities has fallen off to a fraction of its ordinary number, by way of escape to the open country or to foreign parts. Those classes who were fit to get a living elsewhere have apparently escaped. In the absence of reliable information one would, on this showing, be inclined to say that the remaining civilian population of the cities will be made up chiefly, perhaps almost wholly, of such elements of the so-called middle classes as could not get away or had nowhere to go with any prospect of bettering their lot. These will for the most part have been trades people and their specialized employees, persons who are of slight use in any productive industry and stand a small chance of gaining a livelihood by actually necessary work. They belong to a class of smaller "middle-men," who are in great part superfluous in any case, and whose business traffic has been virtually discontinued by the Bolshevik administration. These displaced small business men of the Russian cities are as useless and as helpless under the Bolshevik regime as nine-tenths of the population of the American country towns in the prairie states would be if the retail trade of the prairie states were reorganized in such a way as to do away with all useless duplication. The difference is that the Bolshevik administration of Russia has discontinued much of the superfluous retail trade, whereas the democratic administration of America takes pains to safeguard the reasonable profits of its

superfluous retailers. Bolshevism is a menace to the retail trade and to the retailers.

But it menaces also certain vested interests outside of Russia, particularly the vested rights of investors in Russian industries and natural resources, as well as of concerns which have an interest in the Russian import and export trade. So also the vested rights of investors in Russian securities. Among the latter claimants are not certain governments lately associated with Russia in the conduct of the war, and more particularly the holders of Russian imperial bonds. Of the latter many are French citizens, it is said; and it has been remarked that the French statesmen realize the menace of Bolshevism perhaps even more acutely than the common run of those elder statesmen who are now deliberating on the state of mankind at large and the state of Russian Bolshevism in particular.

But the menace of Bolshevism extends also to the common man in those other countries whose vested interests have claims on Russian income and resources. These vested rights of these claimants in foreign parts are good and valid in law and morals, and therefore by settled usage it is the duty of these foreign governments to enforce these vested rights of their several citizens who have claim on Russian income and resources; indeed it is the duty of these governments, to which they are in honor bound and to which they are addicted by habit, to enforce these vested claims to Russian income and resources by force of arms if necessary. And it is well known, and also it is right and good by law and custom, that when recourse is had to arms the common man pays the cost. He pays it in lost labor, anxiety, privation, blood and wounds; and by way of returns he comes in for an increase of just national pride in the fact that the vested interests which find shelter under the same national establishment with himself are duly preserved from loss on their Russian investments. So that, by a "roundabout process of production," Bolshevism is also a menace to the common man.

How it stands with the menace of Bolshevism in the event of its infection reaching any other of the civilized countries—as, for example, America or France—that is a sufficiently perplexing problem to which the substantial citizens and the statesmen to whose keeping the fortunes of the substantial citizens are entrusted, have already begun to give their best attention. They are substantially of one mind, and all are sound on the main fact, that Bolshevism is a menace; and now and again they will specify that it is a menace to property and business. And with that contention there can be no quarrel. How it stands, beyond that and at the end of the argument, with the eventual bearing of Bolshevism on the common man and his fortunes, is less clear and is a less immediate object of solicitude. On scant reflection it should seem that, since the common man has substantially no vested rights to lose, he should come off indifferently well in such an event. But such a hasty view overlooks the great lesson of history that when anything goes askew in the national economy, or anything is to be set to rights, the common man eventually pays the cost and he pays it eventually in lost labor, anxiety, privation, blood and wounds. The Bolshevik is the common man who has faced the question: What do I stand to lose? and has come away with the answer: Nothing. And the elder statesmen are busy with arrangements for disappointing that indifferent hope.

—Thorstein Veblen.

Dr. Dillon, in a cable dispatch to the Vancouver Province of March 12, reports the Berlin government as being compelled by the workmen to incorporate the workmen's Soviet into the new constitution and deems it the most pregnant world event since the armistice.

From "Problems of American Socialism"

By LOUIS C. FRAINA

REVOLUTIONARY Socialism does not mean the abandonment of the immediate struggle; it engages aggressively in this struggle. But revolutionary Socialism accepts that struggle, or phase of the immediate struggle, which is fundamental; and pursues this struggle by means in accord with revolutionary Socialism—promoting the final struggle, and developing reserves for the revolutionary conquest of power.

While the moderate Socialist nobly wages the class struggle by conciliating the petite bourgeoisie, by introducing in legislative bodies bureaucratic reform measures, by ascribing to parliamentarism a creative and revolutionary significance which it does not possess, the revolutionary Socialist accepts a proletarian ideology, engages in the aggressive mass and industrial struggles of the proletariat, awakens in the proletariat a consciousness of its control of industry—out of the mass strikes of the proletariat the revolutionary Socialist tries to develop more effective forms of organization and means of struggle. Socialism is the class struggle—this is decisive in our policy. The moderate Socialist depends upon the petty bourgeois parliamentary struggles, and degrades politics; the revolutionary Socialist depends upon the proletarian mass struggle, and makes politics one phase, and an auxiliary phase, of the proletarian struggle. Vary as the immediate conditions may, revolutionary Socialism always expresses its fundamental policy in theory and in action. . .

The necessity of revolutionary Socialism in the United States does not depend upon the immediate coming of the final revolutionary struggle; but revolutionary Socialism develops the coming of the final struggle by adapting itself to the prevailing conditions: out of these conditions emerge revolutionary consciousness and the final struggle.

The revolutionary crisis in Europe is surely influencing the consciousness of the American proletariat, which it is our task to express and bring to a focus; and this influence will become stronger as events sweep on. But certain objective conditions are developing which, in proportion as Socialism appreciates the opportunity, will accelerate the development of class consciousness and revolutionary action.

Capitalism in the United States has profited enormously from the war. But, precisely because of this fact, capitalism must aggressively and consciously accept imperialism. The new industrial efficiency developed by American capitalism, the lower costs, the increasing volumes of profits, and surplus capital and goods—all this implies the necessity for new markets, for undeveloped territory, for investment and markets. American capitalism must pursue the practice of imperialism. An understanding of imperialism, as marking a new and final stage of capitalism and introducing the revolutionary epoch, is necessary; and equally necessary is the adoption of revolutionary tactics to fight imperialism. Yet American Socialism to these problems of revolutionary theory and practice. . . .

Simultaneously, American capitalism will itself provide the objective conditions out of which can be developed the spirit for the revolutionary struggle. The war has sharpened imperialistic appetites and antagonisms. Capitalism must "reconstruct" itself. In this reconstruction, new and more acute problems will develop, new forms for the exploitation of the proletariat, coincidentally with the development in the proletariat of a more conscious and aggressive spirit.

But capitalism cannot reconstruct itself. Capitalism cannot solve the multiplying antagonisms of a system of production that is decaying, that is becoming international while its forms and control are still national. Demobilization will offer enormous problems of providing employment. Adapting industry again to peace conditions means new complications. The sharpening of imperialistic competition and the new industrial efficiency, each

will contribute in a measure to unemployment, to the necessity of still more oppression of the proletariat. Crises and antagonisms, industrial dislocation, will characterize capitalism in the days to come.

Without considering the influence of the developing international revolutionary crisis, the coming period will be characterized by giant industrial revolts, by strikes larger and more numerous than in the past, by an intense unrest of the industrial proletariat. These strikes, which will assume the form of mass revolts, will particularly affect the larger, basic industry, where the industrial proletariat is concentrated. Conciliation, reconstruction, "understanding" between employer and employee, will not prevent the coming of this period of great strikes, of mass industrial revolts, of potential revolutionary mass action.

This situation will offer a great opportunity to Socialism. But if, as in the past, the Socialist Party uses these great strikes to make political capital, to prove to the workers the futility of strikes, and the power of the vote—then a great opportunity will be wasted. That is the petty bourgeois policy, which tries to compress the elemental action of the proletariat within the stultifying limits of parliamentary action, as such.

The Socialist Party, revolutionary Socialism, should use these strikes and mass industrial revolts to develop in the proletariat the consciousness of revolutionary mass action, to develop the concept and practice of political strikes, to make it realize that its action should centre in the large plants, that when it wants to act, its action should develop out of the mill, mine and factory. Our political action should become part and parcel of this mass action, should promote the aggressive industrial struggle. To broaden a strike into a demonstration, to develop, out of these, revolutionary mass action against capitalism and the state—that is the policy of revolutionary Socialism, that is the policy which will transform the coming period of strikes definitely into a period of revolutionary action, preparing the mass action of the revolution.

The proletariat must be made to realize that the futility of industrial action lies not in its being industrial action, as such, but in that it is incomplete, does not broaden and deepen itself into class action, is not sufficiently general and aggressive. The proletariat must be made to realize that its great strength lies in its control of industry; and it is necessary to develop the consciousness and forms of workers' control of industry. The proletariat must be made to realize that its characteristic tactics consist of industrial mass action developing into revolutionary mass action, and that through this class struggle of the industrial masses alone can the Socialist proletariat conquer.

And Socialism must be made to realize that the value of parliamentary action lies not in "constructive legislation" and bureaucratic, petty bourgeois reform measures, but in revolutionary criticism, in developing the industrial action of the masses, in awakening their revolutionary consciousness; and that when the class struggle turns into a test of power, it is the revolutionary mass action of the proletariat that will conquer, parliaments and parliamentary activity will disappear: politics may assist in developing the revolution, but can never become the instrument of revolution, unceasing practice of Socialism must be revolutionary mass action; the unceasing object of Socialism must be the revolutionary conquest of power, the dictatorship of the proletariat.

An important problem is the movement developing among the unions of the American Federation of Labor to organize a Labor Party; in some cities this has been done, in others the proposal has been approved.

This may, in a measure, be a reflex of similar action among the Canadian unions. It is, in still larger measure, an expression of the new currents

that the war and events in Europe are developing in the world's working class—expressed in immature and conservative form. It is, accordingly, a move that, while it should not meet enthusiastic and uncritical acceptance, merits the serious study of the Socialist who does not flee from reality by means of phrases, nor accepts every "reality" as real, but who studies the social alignment, its development and peculiar forms, as the basis for appropriate Socialist tactics.

The organization of an American Labor Party may prove a step forward for the A.F. of A., but not necessarily a step forward for the American proletariat. The A.F. of L., which has insisted all along upon "no politics in the unions" while dicker and compromising with Republican and Democratic politicians, may develop a cleaner sense of independence by means of independent politics, in spite of the petty bourgeois forms these politics will necessarily assume. It may, moreover, by showing the futility of A. F. of L. politics, impress upon the proletariat the necessity of revolutionary Socialist action.

The New York Call wails that there is no necessity for a Labor Party, since the Socialist Party has been in the field for twenty years. This is either an admission that the Socialist Party in practice is no more than a Labor Party, or a characteristic Menshevik refusal to admit the fundamental differences between a Labor Party and a Socialist Party. In either case, it is counter-Socialism.

What is a Labor Party? The Labor Party, in England and Australia, has been, from the standpoint of revolutionary Socialism, hopelessly reactionary, consistently un-proletarian. The British Labor Party's policy is a petty bourgeois policy, a counter-revolutionary policy, as has been clearly apparent from its unity with imperialistic capitalism in the British Cabinet, its declaration that the war was a war of democracy, its accepting petty bourgeois liberalism instead of proletarian Socialism, its nationalistic proposals concerning Ireland, its virtual acquiescence in the expulsion of Maxim Litvinoff from England, its accepting the resolution of the Inter-Allied Labor and "Socialist" Conference favoring "democratic" intervention in Russia, its bureaucracy through Arthur Henderson acting against every development of revolutionary energy in the British proletariat. The British Labor Party has been a typical party of laborism, in that it struggles for a place in the governing system of things, for petty advantages to the upper layers of the working class, instead of struggling for the overthrow of the governing bourgeois system. The British Labor Party has been and is a party of social-imperialism: a policy characteristic of laborism and petty bourgeois Socialism.

A characteristic of laborism is that it acts against the broad masses of the industrial proletariat, against the unorganized proletariat of unskilled labor. The "labor" government of Australia, once in power, used armed force to break the strikes of unorganized, unskilled workers. Moreover, the "labor" government, instead of introducing Socialism, as was expected by the glib Socialist, strengthened capitalism, became the unifying centre of bourgeois reaction camouflaged in "labor" and "liberal" colors. When the war broke out, "labor" Australia was even more patriotic and imperialistic than bourgeois Canada, "labor" Premier William Morris Hughes becoming the particular pet of the ultra-imperialistic forces of British capitalism. There has been a revolt in the Labor Party against the "excesses" of Hughes, and more radical currents are developing under pressure of the industrial proletariat and revolutionary Socialism, but the tendency still remains characteristic of a party of laborism.

An American Labor Party would be an expression of the A.F. of L. The policy of the A.F. of L.

(Continued on Page Six)

Reconstruction in Russia

FROM "PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SOCIALISM"

(Continued from Page Three)

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

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

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

2. The introduction of measures of temporary reconstruction. The transition from capitalism to Socialism is not accomplished in a day: it is a process. But while the moderate and the revolutionary Socialist agree that the transition to Socialism is a process, there is violent disagreement as to the character of the process. The moderate Socialist assumes that it is a process operating

upon the basis of capitalism and the bourgeois state; a gradual penetration of Socialism into capitalism; but this is a process that cannot and never will emerge into Socialism, being the process of petit bourgeois collectivism, and making for state capitalism. The revolutionary Socialist assumes that the process must be a revolutionary process operating upon the basis of the proletarian state—a process of reconstruction which alone annihilates capitalism and introduces Socialism. Moreover, the transition, the overthrow of the political power of the bourgeoisie, necessarily disorganizes industry, and creates a measure of demoralization; many of the measures of the dictatorship of the proletariat, accordingly, must be of a temporary nature in order to overcome this demoralization, and increase productive capacity. The rapid increase of production, a vital task of the proletarian state, is accomplished also by all the measures of reconstruction, by means of a dictatorial regulation of production.

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

ROMAIN ROLLAND TO RUSSIA

M. Romain Rolland, the famous French writer and author of "Above the Battle," which, as our readers will remember, was reviewed in the Labor Leader of March 9, 1916, has, we understand, addressed a letter to the Russian Soviet government. M. Rolland was recently elected a member of the Russian Socialist Academy of Sciences. In his letter M. Rolland says:

"Russian brothers, creators of a great revolution, accept our congratulations and gratitude. The freedom you have won is not for you alone, but for all of us, your brothers of the west. Human progress is an evolution, slackens its pace, stops, stumbles over obstacles, or falls asleep in the road like a lazy mule. To arouse it, vigorous shakings are from time to time necessary; powerful revolutionary stimuli are required which spur the will, strain the muscles, and surmount all obstructions.

"Our revolution of 1789 was one of those awakenings of the heroic will, which drag the human race away from the beaten track and drive it forward along a new path. But after this effort, no sooner had mankind advanced than it again halted. The fruits of the French revolution were long ago gathered in Europe. But the time has come when the once fruitful ideas, the propellers of a new force, become but dead idols of the past, pushing backward not forward, and rising athwart the road as obstructions.

"New times—new battles, new hopes. Russian brothers, go boldly forward, and we will follow you. Every nation in turn must lead mankind. Your virgin strength was not wasted during the long years of forced inactivity. Now pick up the axe at the spot where we dropped it, and cut new paths and sunny avenues for us through the maze of injustice and falsehood.

"Our revolution was the work of great bourgeois, men of great vices and great merits. Their race has died out long ago. Your revolution must be the revolution of a great, healthy, united, and generous people, and must avoid the mistakes which we in France have made.

"Above all, be united and strong in spirit. May our example be a lesson to you! Remember our French Convention, the Saturnus—which was ever devouring its own children—be more tolerant than we were. Let all your energy be given in defending the cause of liberty which you are bringing to the world; defend it from the mischievous and perfidious enemies who are lying in wait to attack you as you weaken or become disunited.

"Remember, Russian brothers, you are fighting not for yourselves alone, but for us. Our forefathers raised the banner of revolution in 1792 in order to give liberty to the world. They were unsuccessful; perhaps they were insufficiently equipped for the task. Nevertheless they were animated by a noble and ardent desire for liberty. May this wonderful fire burn also in your hearts." —Romain Rolland

SWITZERLAND

Of interest as throwing a light on labor opinion in Switzerland was the decision arrived at by a special conference of the Swiss Metal and Watch Workers Union held at Bern to give qualified sanction to the use of the general strike. The union previously committed to the position that the general strike was not a legitimate trade union weapon, reversed its attitude, on the ground that the general strike, favored by the war and the revolution, had come into common use. The conference limited its endorsement, however, by adopting the position that in a democracy the general strike should be utilized only as a last means of exerting pressure upon a reactionary majority. The conference defeated the proposal of the Zurich delegates to establish soldiers' and workers councils in all parts of the country to lead the labor struggle.

LOCAL VANCOUVER NO. 1

will hold its Annual Commune Celebration on March 18, 1919, at Lester Court. Admission by ticket only. Positively no money accepted at the door.

is clearly reactionary. It acts against the great masses of the unorganized and the unskilled, as is proven by its attitude during I.W.W. strikes. The A.F. of L. is an organization of craft unions, that splits the working class; an organization, moreover, that represents only a very small part of the working class, being largely an organized system of "job trusts." The A. F. of L. during the war has pursued a policy of the utmost reaction, even more reactionary than many circles of capitalism; it united with capitalism against Socialism in the United States, and in Europe through its "Labor Missions"; and a Labor Party would pursue an identical reactionary, petty bourgeois policy.

There are elements in the Socialist Party, whose policy is not at all Socialist but the policy of reactionary trade unionism and laborism, who would welcome a Labor Party, and urge merging with it. That would be suicidal; there must be an independent Socialist Party: to merge with a Labor Party would promote confusion, compromise and disaster.

But it must be admitted that the official majority policy of the Socialist Party in action is, in substance, the policy of laborism disguised with "Socialist" phraseology. Should our party retain this policy, it would become the "fifth wheel of the wagon, serve no necessary mission, and would either decay or become absorbed in the Labor Party. The Socialist Party would have to irrevocably separate itself from a Labor Party and wage war upon it by means of revolutionary Socialism.

The movement to organize a Labor Party, all the developments now transforming the world, are a call to Socialist reconstruction, to the annihilation of moderate, petty bourgeois Socialism. The Socialist Party must re-organize in accord with the new conditions, must adopt the policy of revolutionary Socialism, of the Bolsheviks—accept the ideas now developing a new pulse in international Socialism, and which alone represent Socialism and Marxism.

The way to wage war upon a Labor Party, should it eventuate, is not to promise more reforms than the Labor Party, is not to plead and placate, but to develop the revolutionary consciousness of the proletariat, to awaken to action the great, unorganized industrial proletariat, which is the dominant force in industry, and which will determine the destiny of the revolution. This would mean a broadening of the conception and practice of politics—a broadening fully in accord with Marxism and fundamental Socialism. The A. F. of L. does not represent the elements of the real proletariat—the industrial proletariat massed in the basic larger industry. The A. F. of L., except in the case of anachronisms such as the miners, represents the skilled workers, the aristocracy of labor, men who have skill and consider this skill "property." Their ideology is a petty bourgeois ideology, and their domination of Socialism and the industrial proletariat would prove a calamity. The answer to the A. F. of L. compromise and petty bourgeois policy is to awaken the industrial proletariat, and pull out of the A. F. of L. unions, such as the miners, which belong with the industrial proletariat.

As against the Labor Party, a Socialist Party: as against the aristocracy of labor, the masses of the industrial proletariat; as against A. F. of L. unionism, industrial unionism; as against conciliation with capitalism, the revolutionary struggle against capitalism.

There is no magic in "labor"—it depends upon what labor represents, its tendency and action. There is no magic in "Socialism" either; both may be reactionary and counter-revolutionary. The great task of Socialism is its own reconstruction—this animates its policy on all problems.

Labor at the Crossways

HELLEN Marot writes a thoughtful review of the present state and tendencies of the American and British organized labor movements in the New York "Dial" of February 22.

In comparing these movements she finds a significant development in the British Labor movement which is at present not in evidence in the American movement. This development in Britain, she claims, is a manifestation of the workers' desire for control over the industrial processes of the nation. A desire which has been given impetus and clarity of vision through the example furnished by the proletariat of Russia. This desire of the workers for control, which she is pleased to call a spectre, first raised its head in Russia two years ago but which, she thinks has not yet crossed over to America. We will let the writer speak for herself. . . .

But it has taken up its abode for the time in England, and looks so like a native there that they forget to call it by its Russian name. It has made it clear in Great Britain that its special mission is not confined to the protection of wage rates but that it is concerned primarily in jacking up labor into the belief that political states and financiers are incompetent to carry industry forward to the satisfaction of the people of any land. The most recent reports which have come from England, Scotland and Ireland show developments which were not defined when Mr. Cole's article which appears in this issue of The Dial was written. The strikes are developing unusual significance as they are advancing. The latest reports show that the men are out for something quite different from collective bargaining between employer and employed. The most favorable settlement terms fail to bring a sense of permanent peace. A forty-hour week seems to be no greater accomplishment than a forty-eight. There are boilermakers, shipbuilders and engineers who "impudently" assert that they are out for the control of industry, that they intend to see that it no longer pays business men to carry on. But more significant is the fact that the strikes represent a rank and file movement; that the old leaders and organizations are defied; that the movement in throwing off the old leadership has substituted an organization which has a centralizing power of its own rather than one imposed from above and existing by the weakness of its membership. The European movement on the continent and in Great Britain is characterized by a decentralization of power and an attempt of the worker to gain status through control and self-government, in his organizations as well as in the workshop.

Referring to the proposal of the railroad workers in the United States to congress that they take over the entire operating control and financial management of the roads. She says: "The proposition wears indeed the same air of 'impudence' which was objected to in England. But the animus is not the English nor the Russian. It is not impudent and is not compelled by any revolutionary thoughts or intention. Specifically it is a defensive move against the federal regulation which denies government employees the full right of organization. Although the proposition may be no more than a matter of trade-union strategy, as it comes at this time when the industrial and labor situation is highly sensitive to suggestion, it cannot fail to mark a new era in labor psychology. What will be said in the next few weeks on the question of acceptance or rejection of the proposal must inevitably leave an indelible impression on the future if not on the present policy of the labor movement.

In the first place the proposal involves a complete shift from craft to industrial unionism. It is implicit in the very statement of the proposition that industrial organization is the prerequisite of mastery and control, for the very simple reason that it is the basis of actual industrial operation. Whatever disposition is made of the scheme, the 500,000 members of the Railroad Brotherhood and

[Extracts From an Article in New York "Dial," Feb. 22.]

the 1,500,000 members of the A. F. of L. craft unions which are involved in the proposal will all recognize that any suggestion which insures a change of status for labor or places it in a position of control will require this shift from craft to industrial organization. For the advancement of industrial unionism the event could not have been more timely. During the war the development of efficiency methods in the factory reduced many of the so-called skilled processes to mechanical operations which would fit the strength and experience of women and young people. This dilution of skill and of male labor has its serious, direct and obvious consequences for the craft unions.

One of the most important effects of industrial unionism is the compulsion which it imposes on labor to think in terms of the enterprise rather than the job. On the other hand, industrial unionism does not, as is often supposed, insure industrial democracy or give of necessity opportunity for self-government. In respect to the latter this scheme of the railroad unions furnishes a striking contrast to the English movement of the shops, which is also industrial in its direction. It is not the industrial form of organization of the shop stewards movement which gives it its democratic character; it is the desire of the shop workers to participate in industrial management. The existence of this desire in England and its absence in America is a pertinent illustration of the differences which exist in trade union psychology. The division of labor and the successful competition of machine production with hand production, of the factory with the workshop or the craftsman, never destroyed completely the British tradition that bound the workman to his industry. This tradition which has persisted for nearly two centuries without apparent warrant or value has made its contribution at last in the swift development of labor organization which is determined by the men at work in the shops. Even should this shop steward movement end without complete victory over the unionism which is superimposed, this habit of mind of the British worker toward industrial responsibility is a labor asset with which the vested interests of Great Britain will eventually reckon.

END OF GLASGOW STRIKE

The Clyde workers, after one of the greatest fights in industrial history, were advised to resume work on Wednesday, and did so with a view to resuming the offensive to win the 40 hours at the first opportunity.

The advice to resume was given in the following notice in the Strike Bulletin on Tuesday:

The Joint Committee, having fully considered the whole position of the strike, and due consideration being given to the attitude of those officials of certain Trade Unions in supporting the government and the employers against the workers in their demand for 40 hours, recommend a full resumption of work by all strikers on Wednesday, February 12, until such time as we can perfect the organization of our forces with a view to making our claim for 40 hours on a national basis, and to enforce it by a national strike of all workers in the near future.

The Joint Committee in control of the strike is to be kept in being, and meets again next week. The brutal alliance of government and profiteers have employed military force to crush a Trade Union movement for reduced hours. The effect of this repression has been to make the workers more determined than ever to establish social and industrial equality.

The Clyde strike originated among the workers,

Because modern industry has made little impression in Russia, the Russian workers as a whole have never experienced an industrial environment which is as irresponsible as is our own for production. Producing wealth in Russia has always been a matter for serious concern, and the brunt of the concern as well as the labor was borne by the peasant. It is not difficult to trace the idea of industrial self-government for which the Soviet stands to the old Zemstvos and to understand that the Russian workers are better prepared for the assumption of industrial responsibility than the workers of the United States. It is important to remember in estimating the elements which have given the workers of Russia and Great Britain their impetus for industrial democracy that in both of these countries the workers' co-operative enterprises have persisted with the strong tendency to preserve the idea of responsibility for productive enterprise which had rested with workers before the days of business enterprise.

The attitude of American labor toward production is the national attitude of giving as little and taking as much as we can get away with. This attitude is common enough in modern Europe but in America it is without inhibitions sufficiently important to have had their effect, either conscious or unconscious, on industrial responsibility. I have not space to speak of the part this attitude may play in the revolutionary changes which are apparently scheduled to come off sooner or later on this side of the Atlantic. But as industry is reorganizing for the benefit of financial interests it has become apparent that the interest of labor and its sense of industrial responsibility must be aroused if American industry is to hold its own in the world market. There is no known way of developing responsibility except by experiencing it, and this proposal of the railroad workers is the first suggestion that the unions may seriously regard themselves as responsible factors. While this proposal is not as yet representative of current thought in labor organizations, it will be received there as a highly agitating event and one with which the interests in some connection will have to deal. Today the situation in this: the officials of unions representing 2,000,000 wage workers have broken down all precedent as they have proposed in serious form to take over the management of the railroad systems of the United States. Here is adventure and imaginative matter injected at a time when suggestion counts. —Helen Marot.

and was by them carried on for three weeks against powerful opposition which included, I grieve to say, Trade Union executives and "leaders." These men were eloquent about the need for "discipline" on the part of the workers, but had never a word of protest against the military and police brutality against the strikers. Instead they had so much advice to give the latter to submit meekly to punishment and accept whatever scraps the employers are pleased to give them, that it seemed as if they imagined they were paid to regulate labor for the benefit of profiteers. The workers have enough enemies to overcome without having to carry faint-hearted executives and leaders on their backs.

One effect of the strike will surely be a movement towards full autonomy for the Trade Unions in Scotland. The London "leaders" seem to know little more about the aspirations of the Scottish workers than, say, Mr. Balfour. The Clyde strike was a general action in which workers from all crafts and trades fought together as one man for a common aim. In this lay their honor: weakness resulted directly craft divisions were re-introduced by the "leaders."

All sections of capitalism fought unitedly against the Clyde strike, and they could only be beaten by a combined movement on the workers' side. —Myner Collier, in the Labor Leader, Feb. 13.