Problems of American Socialism

By LOUIS C. FRAINA

The ultimate decision as to whether capitalism or Socialism shall control the world will be rendered in the United States. As American capitalism is now the arbiter of international imperialism, so the American proletariat will become the arbiter of international Socialism. This imposes a great responsibility upon American Socialism, determines its problems and the international character of its policy. . . .

Even now, after the accomplishments of the war, the enormous power of American capitalism is not fully appreciated. It is not appreciated because of the rapid ending of the war, of America's small sacrifice in men; one must probe below the surface to understand the decisive role of the United States in the war But facts are facts. The United States provided the men and munitions that steadied the wavering front in France, providing means for the offensive; and it provided that deceptive ideology of democracy which steadied the wavering morale of the French, British and Italians, that seduced large sections of the masses, and, in Britain, Belgium and France, seduced the dominant Socialism and Laborism. The threat of American capitalism to Socialism is not alone physical, it is equally moral; moral, in the sense that its deceptive democracy is a splendid means for promoting imperialism and seducing the masses.

The United States has become a world power. It will maintain that position—potential of evil—unless the proletariat acts for Socialism. American capitalism is perhaps the most highly developed in the world, the most efficient, the mightiest; it controls a large section of the world's richest territory, bursting with natural wealth; it has tremendous resources of raw materials within its own borders and it can at any moment seize upon the tremendous resources of Mexico, Central and South America, convert them into means of conquest. Imperialistic finance capital nowhere is as aggressive, commands as much power, as in the United States. The wealth of the United States is twice as large as that of Great Britain—which is much more wealthy than its nearest rival. And this wealth is simply a symbol expressive of the enormous capacity for productivity inherent in American capitalism—a terrific power. The United States has a large navy, has proved that it can easily develop a large army, and is laying plans for the largest navy in the world, and will retain universal military service in one form or another. American capitalism has all the physical reserves for aggression and is becoming the gendarme of the world.

These physical reserves are supplemented by moral ones. In no other large nation is the labor movement as reactionary as in the United States; in no other large nation is organized Socialism as loose, as purposeless, as petty bourgeois, as in the United States. Should Great Britain, France and Italy decide upon complete military intervention in Russia, the revolutionary proletariat may march into action—surely in France and Italy; but should the United States decide upon this brutal military adventure, the American proletariat on the whole will acquiesce, and its representatives will manufacture justifications for the offensive against Socialism and the coming new civilization. And all this, not because the American proletariat is not possessed of reserves for action, but because of the organizations of this proletariat.—This is one aspect of our problems.

The American proletariat has an inspiring history of aggressive struggles. The great Homestead strike, the American Railway Union strike in 1893, the implacable industrial struggles in Colorado, at Coeur D'Alene and Goldfield, the strikes at McKees Rocks, Lawrence, Paterson, Passaic, Ludlow, the Mesaba Range—all these are expressions of an aggressive proletariat, of a proletariat capable of great things. The American radical Labor movement first clearly formulated the principles, forms and purposes of industrial unionism, yet industrial unionism has made infinitely larger strides in Great Britain, Australia and elsewhere than it has in the United States. The American Labor Union, twenty years ago, formulated the industrial union program, but it went the way of all flesh; the Western Federation of Miners adopted industrial unionism, waged inspiring struggles against capitalism, and then was captured by the reaction; the Industrial Workers of the World started with great purposes and expectations, contributed a vital and aggressive spirit to our movement, in spite of all its faults; but the I. W. W. is incapable of rallying the revolutionary proletariat, and never builded definitely upon the basis of its achievements.

Why? There are a large number of reasons, material and ideologic; but one alone that can be considered here, and that is the petit bourgeois spirit that animates American Socialism—the Socialist Labor Party. All these great instinctive revolts of the proletariat, under the impact of which new forms of industrial organization and struggle, a new ideology, were being developed, met the open hostility or lack of understanding of Socialism. Instead of accepting these forces as the initial expression of new tactics and forms of action, the dominant Socialism tried to compress them within the stulifying limits of petit bourgeois and parliamentary Socialism—make them serve the ends of the middle class and petty bourgeois, "liberal" democracy. The Socialist Labor Party, which was an active force in the initial development of the new unionism ,savagely attacked it and the I. W. W. when they did not pursue the road charted by an essentially petty bourgeois conception of the revolution. To attack the unskilled proletariat rallied by the I. W. W. as a "lumpen-proletariat"—that was a characteristic expression of the fundamental defect of the S. L. P. in action, its petit bourgeois ideology, which, while it rejected the gradual peaceful conquest of power by the Socialist proletariat, accepted an equally fallacious policy, the gradual, peaceful conquest of power by the proletariat through organizing the majority of the working class into industrial unions. The Socialist Party majority was even worse—it rejected the I. W. W. while serving the monstrous reaction of the American Federation of Labor,—its attitude toward the new ideas compounded of hypocrisy and animosity. American Socialism has not yet developed a realistic, revolutionary policy—a policy that is instinct in the struggles of the proletariat—a policy able to arouse integrate and direct the revolutionary energy of the proletariat.

The petit bourgeoisie is the slave of the illusions of democracy, avoids the implacable industrial struggle, rejects movements and struggles that refuse to proceed within the orbit of parliamentarism; the petit bourgeoisie pursues an anaemic policy, a routine activity, chained to the old and rejecting or camouflaging the new—refuses to consider the actual problems of the revolution and the violent struggles necessary to realize the revolution. What the American proletariat requires is a Socialism that has snapped asunder its petit bourgeois fetters, that issues to the proletariat the clear call to the revolutionary struggle—and which the proletariat will yet answer.

SPAIN

Spain, like all other countries is troubled with the unrest of its working class.

The workers in Spain are very poorly organized yet all over the country strikes are occurring, which, while without apparent connection with each other, have taken on the complexion of industrial revolts, revolutionary in their tendencies. To such an extent is this so, that the governing classes appear to be panic-stricken. Bolshevism has reared its head, they say, and it is recalled that some years ago, Trotsky paid a visit to the country while a little while ago Lenine was reported to be in Barcelona. The police are rounding up all Russians and other foreigners suspect of Bolshevist tendencies, for deportation, some eight thousand having been registered in Barcelona. Just so it is thought to solve the problem; just so, the ostrich thinks to hide himself by burying his head in the sand.

Nevertheless Soviet Russia is serving as an inspiration to the proletariat of Spain as the following quotation from the Christian Science Monitor will show. "Thus at a meeting held in the Teatro de Marvillas in the Cuatro Caminos, fiery speeches were made by such advanced elements at Evaristo Gil, Manuel Sainz, Garcia Cortes, and Virginia Gonzalez. Gil said that Socialism was about to triumph all over the world; Sainz declared that Russian Bolshevism was sacrosanct, was the essence of Socialism, and that Spanish Socialists were disposed to implant it in their country as soon as they had the opportunity; while Virginia Gonzalez had it that this was the hour not for preaching, but for acting and what they ought to do was to shake up the people so that the Socialist pest, as it was called by the bourgeoisie, might be spread all over the world. Garcia Cortes said that it would emancipate the working classes. So long as a man had not the economic means, he could not be really free.

SOUTH AFRICA

The agreement of the Negro and native population of South Africa to refrain from political agitation for the duration of the war was formally renounced at a mass meeting of the colored citizens of Claremont called by the African Political Organization. An aggressive campaign of organization and agitation was determined upon with a view to combating discrimination against the colored people of the Union. A resolution supporting "any action the African Political Organization may take to obtain the deletion of the 'color bar' from the Act of Union" was unanimously adopted.

SOVIETS IN GERMANY

These workmen's councils "will not merely participate in regulating the general conditions of labor in different workshops and factories, but also in controlling and fixing production and distribution of wares and likewise measures of socialization, also tendering advice to the government respecting all legislation of a social and economic character, the government promises to introduce no such legislation without previously consulting the Soviets. The cabinet has further promised to introduce a law and has accepted and undertaken to introduce other measures without delay and to submit all offences even by the military to civilian tribunals."

This development in Germany has had a profound effect in France. Employees of public services, of the railways and of the state, desirous of winning the right of collaborating with the government for realization of labor reforms and with other kindred aims have decided to join hands with the general confederation of labor, which is a revolutionary organization, and demand nationalization of all public services. Yesterday the following resolution was adopted:

"All employees of the public services send fraternal greeting to the organization of working men and undertake to make the necessary propaganda to bring about a speedy adhesion of the administrative proletariat of the general confederation of labor."

Article Two---General Provisions of the Constitution of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic

Chapter Five

9. The fundamental problem of the Constitution of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic involves, in view of the present transition period, the establishment of a dictatorship of the urban and rural proletariat and the poorest peasantry in the form of a powerful All-Russian Soviet authority, for the purpose of abolishing the exploitation of men by men and of introducing Socialism, in which there will be neither a division into classes nor a state of autocracy.

10. The Russian Repubilc is a free Socialist society of all the working people of Russia. The entire power, within the boundaries of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic, belongs to all the working people of Russia, united in urban and rural Soviets.

11. The Soviets of those regions which differentiate themselves by a special form of existence and national character may unite in autonomous regional unions, ruled by the local congress of the Soviets and their executive organs.

These autonomous regional unions participate in the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic upon the basis of a federation.

12. The supreme power of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic belongs to the All-Russian Congress of Soviets, and, in periods between the convocation of the congress, to the All-Russian Central Executive Committee.

13. For the purpose of securing to the toilers real freedom of conscience, the church is to be separated from the state and the school from the church, and the right of religious and anti-religious propaganda is accorded to every citizen.

14. For the purpose of securing the freedom of expression to the toiling masses, the Russian Federated Soviet Republic abolishes all dependence of the press upon capital, and turns over to the working people and the poorest peasantry all technical and material means of publication of newspapers, pamphlets, books, etc., and guarantees their free circulation throughout the country.

15. For the purpose of enabling the workers to hold free meetings, the Russian Federated Soviet Republic offers to the working class and to the poorest peasantry furnished halls, and takes care of their heating and lighting appliances.

16. The Russian Federated Soviet Republic, having crushed the economic and political power of the propertied classes and having thus abolished all obstacles which interfered with the freedom of organization and action of the workers and peasants, offers assistance, material and other, to the workers and the poorest peasantry in their effort to unite and organize.

17. For the purpose of guaranteeing to the workers real access to knoweldge, the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic sets itself the task of furnishing full and general free education to the workers and the poorest peasantry.

18. The Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic considers work the duty of every citizen of the republic, and proclaims as its motto: "He shall not eat who does not work."

19. For the purpose of defending the victory of the great peasants' and workers' revolution, the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic recognizes the duty of all citizens of the republic to come to the defence of their Socialist fatherland, and it, therefore, introduces universal military training. The honor of defending the revolution with arms is given only to the toilers, and the non-toiling elements are charged with the performance of other military duties.

20. In consequence of the solidarity of the toilers of all nations, the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic grants all poiltical rights of Russian citizens to foreigners who live in the territory of the Russian republic and are engaged in toil and who belong to the toiling class. The Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic also recognizes the right of local Soviets to grant citizenship to such foreigners without complicated formality.

21. The Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic offers shelter to all foreigners who seek refuge from political or religious persecution.

22. The Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Repubilc, recognizing equal rights of all citizens, irrespective of their racial or national connections, proclaims all privileges on this ground, as well as oppression of national minorities, to be in contradiction with the fundamental laws of the republic.

23. Being guided by the interests of the working class as a whole, the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic deprives all individuals and groups which could be utilized by them to the detriment of the Socialist Revolution.

Competition in Relation to Progress

(Continued from Page Six)

366,638, and to save another $7,000,000 on advertising." The "level-headed," faced by similar facts everyday recognize that competition is inefficient and costly. The demand for economic co-operation grows daily.

The present day tendency toward social ownership may answer the charges based on the alleged benefits of competition, well enough; but at the same time it presents a serious problem to revolutionary socialists. This tendency supports the highest of bourgeois ideals—state socialism—ownership, through the state, by an economically dominant class of not only the means of production but of the very persons of the proletariat. It is true that state socialism would demonstrate that the bourgeois form a "superfluous class," but mankind is not likely to arise to action from deductions.

On the other hand, it relieves to some extent the necessity for revolt; for it is from a glut in the world's labor market that a thoroughly proletarian revolution, the realization of the ideals of the revolting proletariat is impossible.

Consequently, the time is near when actual revolution is most advantageous, and the time is at hand when the need of widespread revolutionary propaganda and economic and poiltical education is most urgent.—F. W. T.

"RED" SENTIMENT IS GROWING IN SIBERIA

VLADIVOSTOK, Siberia, March 17.—(Delayed)—The Russian press comment on the League of Nations is satirical, pointing to the results of Allied occupation of Siberia as an object lesson. The Allies, it is pointed out, had decided to restore order and good government in Russia and had sent detachments of troops with no good results owing to the impossibility of an agreement over the methods to be followed. The real result is loss of Allied prestige in Russia.

The situation in the country is generally worse than last autumn and Bolshevik sentiment is apparently growing.

FAMINE IN EUROPE

The Allied policy of blockade has met with vigorous objection from the Socialist groups in France and Great Britain. The following protest by Jean Longuet appeared in the Populaire (Paris) of January 24.

It might have been hoped that with the cessation of hostilities the food situation in Europe would at once improve and rapidly become normal. The event proves quite otherwise. The mad policy of the ruling classes aggravates further the evil which it was hoped might be cured after the armistice, and there is no longer a single country on the continent where the situation does not appear alarming. The blockade, maintained rigorously not only against Germany and Central Europe but against Russia and all Eastern Europe, causes a tragic state of things. In Western Europe and in particular in France capitalistic speculation cynically gives itself reign. The absurd slowness with which demobilization is effected and the consequent retention under the colors of millions of idle men explain the more and more intolerable increase in the cost of living. In the north the lamentable way in which the food supply is being handled explains the scandalous situation there. So in different ways the continent is filled with catastrophies.

At Paris the suppression of price regulation, freeing the appetite for speculation, makes us pay a franc for an egg and ten francs a pound for butter. And all the rest is in proportion.

In Germany there is no longer any doubt that the situation is terrible. The Manchester Guardian announces that the blockade there is enforced more vigorously than before the armistice. Mr. Henry Nevinson, an eminent journalist, has published in the Daily News a tragic description of what he found in the hospitals of Cologne: "Although I have seen many horrible things in the world," he writes, "I have seen nothing so pitiful as these rows of babies feverish from want of food, exhausted by privation to the point that their little limbs were like slender wands, their expression hopeless, and their faces full of pain."

RUSSIA—SOCIAL REVOLUTIONARIES AGAINST INTERVENTION

The following resolution was voted by an All-Russian congress of the Social Revolutionary Party:

Russia should only be restored by her own efforts, independently of any foreign influence. Only complete liberty can bring a normal development and save the country from enslavement by foreign capital. The attempts made by the Entente Imperialists—under the pretext of aiding Russia or combating anarchy—to conquer by military means a part of Russian territory, are interference in Russia's internal affairs, and are absolutely hostile to the interests of the working classes. Russian democracy unanimously demands the immediate evacuation of the territories occupied by Entente troops.

The "Temps" Correspondent Converted!

But it is not only Russian Socialists who have been denouncing intervention. The Russian correspondent of the Temps, who is now returning to France, has caught Bolshevism, and an article of his which the Temps would not publish is summarized in Humanite of February 19. After declaring that the original purpose of the Allied expedition to North Russia no longer exists, the correspondent (M. Nadeau) points out that nine-tenths of the elected members of the constituent assembly were representative of Socialist parties, all of which have now declared their opposition to intervention. M. Naudeau says that a surprising reorganization of Russia is being effected by the Bolsheviks:

The Bolsheviks, those pitiless destroyers are gifted with extraordinary energy and a rare capacity for organization. Intervention is regarded by the whole of Russia as an attempt to restore the Tsarism; and no nation has the right to cripple the social experiment begun a year ago in Russia.

These correspondents have a way of seeing things in not quite the same light as their Paris, and, shall we say, when we think of Philips Price, their London and Manchester editors.—From the "Labor Leader," February 27.

The Bolshevik Government

By JOHN RICKMAN

[Mr. John Rickman's capacity to judge the Russian situation may be gathered from the fact that he was in Russia from September, 1916, to October, 1918, and returned via Vladivostok. He was working for the Friends' War Victims' Relief Fund and came into touch with the people as a country physician.—Editor.]

Are the Bolsheviks Fulfilling the Requirements of the Russian People? Is Their Government Popular? Is it Stable?

The Bolsheviks came into power largely because the other candidates, perhaps through no fault of their own, did not appear to be giving the people what they wanted, because the constituent assembly seemed likely to repeat the faults of the prvious governments and to embarrass the movement towards freedom by compromises with a class which had always held power. Having gained power the Bolsheviks more slowly gained popularity.

The Social Revolutionary right party had on its programme the nationalizing of the land, but it held the idea that the Socialist programme must come slowly; it was in favor of disposing of the estates only when the peasants were ready for them. Lenin incorporated the land question into the revolutionary movement by his order: "Peasants, siize the land." This did not, however, make Bolshevism popular, the peasants remarking. "Lenin did not give us the land; we took it." The movement of the workmen to take possession of the factories was more properly attributed to the Bolsheviks, but it did not in my opinion make that party popular.

The General Social Programme: Ten Years' Trial

It was, I think, the general social programme of the Moscow Revolutionaries which commended itself to the people, which slowly took shape and may be judged in the constitution (Fundamental Law) of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic, adopted, July 10, 1918. The Bolsheviks have attempted to deal with the

> fundamental problem; the abolition of exploitation of men by men, the entire abolition of the division of the people into classes, the suppression of exploiters, the establishment of a "Socialist Society." (Constitution, Article 1, chapter 2, paragraph 3).

Great masses of the people, of course, remained in ignorance of the real meaning of "the establishment of a Socialist society." It was interpreted to them as being the organization of a state on principles very similar to their village communes, and the peasants thinking that as good or better than any alternative that had met yet, did not give their allegience to it, but showed a readiness to see whether it would work. They knew that no government in Russia had thus far been satisfactory so they said they would give the Bolsheviks ten years before they would judge if it was really good or not. Such patience was not found in Moscow, nor apparently in foreign countries.

In Line With Russian Sentiment Against War

Under the federal system great liberty was given to each province and county for the development of its own ideas and government and in this way the difficult problems connected with mixed racial populations were partly solved.

The breaking up of the empire into small units and their reunion into the Socialist Federated Republic gave support to one of the chief causes of Bolshevik popularity; that the war which was begun by the Tsar should be ended by the people; their avowed intention of "breaking secret treaties, of organizing on a wide scale the fraternization of the workers and peasants of the belligerent armies, and of all efforts to conclude a general democratic peace without annexations or indemnities, upon a basis of the free determination of the peoples." (Constitution—article 1, chapter 3, paragraph 4 coincided with the Russian sentiments on war. Accordingly the treaty of Brest-Litovosk came as no surprise, and I heard in all the time I was in Russia no workman or peasant disparage it.

The Generous Educational Programme

The educational programme of the Bolsheviks commended itself to the people as being the most generous that had been placed before the public, and the zeal with which it was carried out seemed to the people to indicate that the energies of the government were turning principally to internal reforms. The wishes of the people were studied, not only in broad principles, but in details. "For the purpose of enabling the workers to hold free meetings the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic offers to the working class and the poorest peasantry furnished halls, and takes care of their heating and lighting appliances." Constitution—article 2, chapter 5, paragraph 15). Libraries were opened in the villages and theatres in all the towns and were maintained at the public expense.

The First Real Test of Popularity

The popularity which the Bolshevik government earned by its measures was not seriously tested till the spring of 1918, because it had no serious rivals who could call for the allegiance of the people on the strength of their programme for internal reforms. In the early summer, when civil war was financed from abroad and supported at home by large sections of the upper classes, the first real test came. Districts which had tried both the Bolshevik regime and that set up under the Czechs when free to do so reverted to Bolshevism. The Czechs were forced to retire from the Volga to the Urals because of uprisings among the people. The Soviet of Vladivostok was returned at the July election though the "Reds" were in prison. From the Urals to the eastern coast the people were discontented with the directorate and preferred a return to the Soviets.

No body of people I met feared the Bolshevik government except the rich merchant and landowning classes, and among them I noticed a phenomena not uncommonly seen in the last few years, that supreme sacrifices are easier to ask for and easier to make in many cases than smaller ones. When all rich people were losing their property it was not in accordance with the temperament of the better Russian to display great grief at an irreparable loss. I think there was hardly more grumbling than occurred in England over the budgets and the insurance act of a recent government. Through their losses some perceived, often with mixed feelings, the increasing sense of equality, and many contrasted the smallness of their loss with the great sacrifice of war.

Bolshevik Finance

The Bolsheviks, in the opinion of the writer, used the repudiation of the foreign debts as a measure of internal politics, when the country was loath to assume any obligations contracted by the Tsar, but would in time have persuaded the people willingly to pay interest on the foreign loans because they realized that no further money would be lent to them unless they did.

I believe that the condition of finances under the Bolsheviks compares favorably with that of any administration in the last sixty years in Russia except under Ministers of Finance Kankrin and Reitern, or with the present administration in Siberia before it reintroduced vodka distilling as a source of revenue. It is possible that new criteria may have to be formed before it is wise to come to definite judgments regarding the financial condition of a community that hopes "to establish a Socialist society" and eliminate the use as far as possible of currency."—From the "Labor Leader."

SOCIALIZATION TALE MYTHICAL

The capitalist gutter press is remarkable for its consistency in some respects. Concerning the workers in any land, particularly where the workers have become a power, it lies consistently, viciously and stupidly. How many times have we not had rehashed the mythical story of the nationalization of women in Russia. Following the Western Labor Conference, the Calgary "Herald" repeated the story culled from the London "Times" stating that it MUST be true else the "Times" would never have printed it. Now comes the Vancouver "Sun," organ of indisputable veracity, and gives again, in another form, the old story of Bolshevist immorality. Yet, truth will out, and sometimes, per accidentum, gleams of light radiate even from the gutter.

The Vancouver "World," for instance, (March 10th, 1919) gives the following:

"CHICAGO, March 10.—Mrs. Raissa Lomonssoff, of Petrograd, who is at present in Chicago, has exploded the popular impression about the "Socialization" of 50,000,000 Russian women—by law—making them brides of different men for a year at a time, the men to have their pick.

"Russia has a funny paper called 'Mucha,'" explained Mrs. Lomonssoff. "It is similar to your 'Puck' or 'Judge.' Now when the Soviet government established the revised rules of marriage, more strict in the protection of the virtue of women than the old laws, the anarchists saw their chance to pit the church against the Bolsheviks—the latter two being enemies of the anarchists. The anarchists began to deride the Bolsheviks and called the marriage plan 'free love.'

"The paper 'Mucha'—which means 'housefly' in English—saw the chance to poke a little fun, took up the anarchists' humorous cry and 'spread' on it. Copies of it fell into the hands of Americans, English and others, and translated it seriously. Meanwhile the Russian state church, seeing its chance and being 'sore' over having its monopoly knocked out, made an issue out of it, capitalized the burlesquing publicity, and roused the world."

Added to this can be given the denials of persons acquainted with recent Russian events, such as Louise Bryant, John Reed, and even the old lady now being toted around America by John D. Rockefeller and Cleveland H. Dodge, Madame Catherine Breshovsky.

COMPETITION IN RELATION TO PROGRESS

With the bourgeoisie it has been a favorite argument that competition is a source of progress, that Socialism fails to provide competition, and that, therefore, Socialism is baneful to progress.

We have steadily doubted their major premise. With its adulteration of goods, its wasteful expenditure on advertising, its disturbing short-lived "bubble" and general cost of disorganization, as its liability, the financial competition of capitalism did not seem to us to have given sufficient improvement in the quality of goods or the efficiency of their distribution to make up a satisfactory credit. What improvement there has been could better be attributed to further development of scientific theory and application of theory, independent of competition. But in arguing with the "level-headed" we were little likely to meet with success; they had on that point secured an evasive position.

But now the question appears in a new light. Another of Engel's prophesies is being fulfilled. Socialism will not supply economic competition; and it gradually becomes evident that capitalism has long since begun to fail in the same respect. Competition, being a form of disorganization, is inefficient; and, consequently, cannot survive, even under a capitalist regime. The report on state operation of the United States railroads shows that "the abandonment of competition has made it possible to save $1,500,000 annually on legal expenses, to consolidate ticket agencies, thereby saving $23,-

(Continued on Page Seven)

Parliament Discredited in England

(From New York "Dial," March 8.)

The influence of the Russian revolution, which was at first enormous but was arrested by the withdrawal of Russia from the war, has revived and been intensified by the revolutions in Central Europe. There is in the working class a profound distrust of parliament and politicians, and an increasing tendency to disbelieve in the efficacy of parliamentary methods. The advocates of "direct action" are increasing in number daily. There have been striking examples of ts efficacy in the successful resistance of Ulster to Home Rule for Ireland, the refusal of Mr. Havelock Wilson to allow Internationalists to cross the channel, and such successes as that of the police strike in London and the retaliation of the electricians against the manager of the Albert Hall when he refused it for a labor meeting—until his light was cut off, when he yielded at once. The Conservative press, with fatuous blindness, applauded Sir Edward Carson and Mr. Havelock Wilson, forgetting that others could play at their game.

Moreover, the result of the general election has strengthened the hands of the advocats of "direct action." Only half the electors took the trouble to vote, and an illogical electoral system has resulted in a House of Commons which does not properly represent the voters. The poll of the Labor Party entitled it to twice as many members as it has obtained, the Opposition Liberals are even more under-estimated, and the Unionist party has a clear majority of the house, whereas the voting showed that it is in a minority in the country. Were the representation of the various parties in the House of Commons even approximately proportionate to their respective polls, the ministerial coalition would have a moderate majority instead of an overwhelming one and that majority would depend on the Liberal members of the coalition, whereas at the present moment the Unionists alone have a majority over all the other parties put together.

Parliament is in consequence more discredited than ever and it has even been proposed that the Labor members should refuse, like the Sinn Feiners, to take part in its proceedings. The proposal has not been adopted, but it is significant that it should even have been made. Nobody supposes that the present parliament can last very long. The soldiers, very few of whom were able to vote, will demand another general election after the demobization is completed. Mr. Lloyd George has threatened a dissolution if he is thwarted in his policy. That he recognizes the necessity of a thoroughly democratic policy is certain and there can be no doubt as to his skill and intelligence. But it is unlikely that he will be able to regain the confidence of the workmen as a body, nor has he a sufficiently profound grasp of the factors in the situation. He is extraordinarily skilful in dealng with the difficulty of the moment, but he sometimes does so in such a way as to create further difficulties in the future. Just before the poll of the general election, he suddenly made a violent attack on the Labor Party and accused it of being led by "Bolsheviks." That will not be forgotten in a hurry.

The soldiers are quite as discontented as the men engaged in industry during the war. There were recently several manifestations of their discontent, which did not enforce discipline. The causes were dissatisfaction at the system of demobilization and unwillingness to take part in any expedition to Russia or anywhere else. The government was obliged to declare officially that no more troops would be sent to Russia. The announcement that 900,000 men are to be retained under the colors for another year to form an army of occupation in the territories of our late enemies will not improve feeling in the army or the country. It means a prolongation of conscription. Both the army and the country will demand peace terms which do not make any army of occupation necessary and, if they do not get them, there may be trouble.

I am disposed to think that the present strikes will not last long; by the time that this article appears in print it will be known whether I am right. But their end will not mean the end of the industrial unrest. Rather is it likely to extend. As demobilization proceeds the economic conditions will become more and more difficult and the causes of discontent will increase rather than diminish. We are entering on a period of strikes and industrial troubles such as England has not known since the days of Chartism. What its issue will be no man knoweth.—Robert Dell.

Why Bolshevism Gains Ground in Russia

(Editorial in The Springfield (Mass.) Daily Republican, February 19.)

In no respect has the censorship given a falser picture of Russia than by creating the impression that massacre was the monopoly of the Bolsheviki. The mistake should be corrected, not to clear the character of the Lenin government, which history will in due time probe with unsparing thoroughness, but to get get a truer conception of the course events. The strong recent drift toward Bolshevism would be utterly inexplicabel if it were really true that the Bolsheviki dominated solely by terror. How far this is from being the case is shown clearly by John Rickman, an Englishman who saw much of the revolution, and writes of it with careful impartiality in the Manchester Guardian. In particular he explains why the anti-Bolshevist forces felt justified in resorting to massacre:

It seemed clear to some people that the longer the Bolsheviks were in power the greater would be the process of dissolution, and, to continue the metaphor, the debris would be reduced to a finer state of subdivision. Therefore, the longer the delay the harder would be the task of reconstructing the state from the broken remains of the old regime. At all costs the Bolshevik power must be broken at once, and however distasteful it might be, the use of severe measures and bloodshed must in the end be a wise economy. Faith in the essential soundness of the system of the old regime justified the means they adopted, and appeared to sanctify their hatred for the Bolsheviks. Orders were promulgated that all commissaries and members of the Soviets and all men in the red guard captured by them were to be shot.

This was the "white" or "red and white" terror, and in the region of which he writes from observation it did not follow but preceded the red terror, of which alone the outside world has been allowed to hear. But the "red" terror followed very soon after the issuance of this order to execute Bolsheviki, over 20 supporters of the old regime being put to death in that region by way of reprisal.

But the point of importance is not so much the question of blame, which is always difficult to apportion in a savage civil war, as the consequences of this resort to terrorism. The immediate effect of this violent suppression of Bolshevism, notes Mr. Rickman, was its spread even in the territory controlled by the anti-Bolshevist forces. "We saw the Cossacks driving through the streets with a cart-load of headless bodies, the peasants remarking: "Those bodies were our sons; they joined the red guard to defend the revolution." Then the Cossacks patrolled the town while an election on a limited franchise was held, and people began to say, "This is too reactionary for us." The aristocratic order began to reappear, officers were distinguished by insignia, ladies by their silk dresses. Public notices told the people that prosperity had returned, but the people grumbled; in three months the region had abandoned the cause of popular discontent: "Faced with the alternative of Bolshevism or a government which they considered both oppressive and reactionary, it was not unnatural that the people should prefer Bolshevism, because, though it might spell chaos it did permit a large degree of freedom for opinions, and its program included projects, such as those dealing with education, which the people considered of vital importance."

Mr. Rickman considers that the people were too impatient and did not give the anti-Bolshevist government a fair chance. It worked hard at important tasks like opening the railways and the banks and in helping large business concerns to re-establish themselves, but it was swept away by popular resentment before it had time to prove its worth. Thus the net result of this effort to "'stamp out" Bolshevism by executing the Bolsheviki has been to give Lenin millions of new converts and to complete his control of eastern Russia. Mr. Rickman's observations confirm the impression, drawn fro a study of the military situation, that the impressive recent gains of the Bolsheviki in that region were due not to military victories, but to the conversion of the people to Bolshevism. The case merits study by those who still think that the only way to deal with Bolshevism is to exterminate the Bolsheviki.

PANACEA FOR UNREST AMONG THE FRENCH WORKERS

Under this heading the "New York Times" has a lengthy article by Gertrude Atherton but the most information is disclosed in the following paragraph. She commences by stating that "One hears a great deal in France about the possibilities of a revolution" and then after assuring her readers that there is no real fear comes this startling revelation:

"It is true that certain of the discharged soldiers who have drifted to the large cities will only do a minimum of work at the maximum price, and it is also true that in 1917 there were serious mutinies in the French armies, soviets were formed, there was a spreading disinclination to go on fighting forever against what seemed to be hopeless odds. These mutinies were suppressed by shooting one culprit out of every ten, for France, being a real instead of an amateur military nation, stands no nonsense, and the danger was passed before the French civilian public got more than an inkling of it. Nevertheless the "Bolshevist tendencies" of a certain part of the French army, and its danger to French institutions after demobilization, are openly discussed by the pessimists."

So little by little the news leaks out. Had the Russian Bolshevists adopted similar methods to quelch counter-revolution it would have been blazoned forth with brilliant head-lines but "when one out of every ten" is shot in the interests of capitalism we only hear of it incidently months later. These facts should be cried forth from the house-tops by the workers as it is members of their class who pay the penalty whenever they refuse to lick the hand that beats them.

"Arise like lions after slumber in unvanquished numbers shake your chains to earth like dew, ye are many, they are few"—From the Edmonton "Soviet."

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 22, 1919

The New Unionism

There is some truth in the saying that there is nothing new under the sun. Every now and then the organizations of Labor undergo a radical change. Then we hear much and read much of the new unionism. The latest new unionism has on this continent been prominent since 1905, when the I. W. W. held its first convention at Chicago.

Last week the B. C. Federation of Labor held its annual convention in Calgary. We have not yet seen the official account of its deliberations; but the news perverters, conventionally called newspapers, carried daily accounts of what they desired us to believe. The insidious character of these reports suggest that the author of them has a thorough grasp of the fundamental differences in working class policy. The ingenious manner in which the proceedings in Calgary were linked up with the I. W. W. shows a greater knowledge of working class affairs than is possible to the mental makeup of the average newspaper man. This is also reflected in the distinction made between Socialism and anarchy.

As prominent members of the Socialist Party of Canada were saddled with the responsibility of originating the "One Big Union," much comment is being made as to what our official attitude might be on the matter.

There has been a decided urge towards industrial unionism for many years, which has lately become very insistant. We have referred to this movement several times and have criticised it and analysed it. That is our function. We do not initiate movements, we seek to understand them. We realize that beyond a very transitory influence, great movements are not caused by individuals, they are the result of conditions.

When we have fuller and official information of the Calgary conference, we will have something to say. In this same matter we will take up the Industrial Union Movement in general. This ought to be possible next issue.

In the meantime, we inform the unregenerate, that the policy and program of the Socialist Party of Canada rests with the Dominion Executive Committee, working under the party constitution.

What Is a Wealth Producer?

Sir Alfred Yarrow, head of a shipbuilding firm on the Clyde, has been wailing about the pre-war emmigration of 100,000 men yearly from the Old Country. We will quote part of the interview from the report in the Vancouver "Province" of March 15. He says: "Have you calculated what a loss that is in actual and potential wealth? It is not overstating it to say that it costs four hundred pounds to bring a youth to manhood. When that amount has been spent on him, and he reaches the point of becoming a wealth producer, he migrates say, to the United States. If a horse is sent to the United States we expect payment, but we do not ask anyhing for he man it has cost four hundred pounds to rear. Multiply that by 100,000 and you see we were giving to America each year forty million pounds worth of wealth-producing manhood. That was wrong, yet people talked about getting rid of our surplus population." Just as an ancient slave owner would have talked. Butter, eggs, cheese and lard, shoe laces, buttons, pigs, horses and—"wealth-producers," all reduced to terms of money. This man Yarrow knows what he is talking about. Why shouldn't he, when it is out of the pockets of he and his class, that the four hundred pounds comes for the rearing of "wealth-producers." Wages come out of their pockets, for do they not own the means of wealth production and the products of the country? Taxes come out of their pockets, for how could the working class pay taxes if they did not get wages? Think of the rotten investment of the capitalist when he handed over good money, in wages, to the father or mother of a "potential wealth producer," for his rearing, only to loose him to our dear Uncle Sam. And then, multiply him by 100,000. Its all a matter of calculation—for the Yarrows. Of course there is consolation in the fact, that our "wealth producer" does not escape altogether. Dear Uncle Sam or some other dear gets him. Nevertheless it is bad policy to get "rid" of our surplus "wealth producers," because a surplus is necessary to keep down wages. Buyers of labor power, the Yarrows, like lots of competition among the sellers of it, ie., among the "wealth producers." Then they are cheap. Sometimes, cheap as dirt. Sometimes there are no buyers on the market. It is then that a "wealth producer" is not a wealth producer. He is only a "potential" wealth producer. So he does not get any wages then, but they, the Yarrows, establish bread lines and soup kitchens and the "potential" wealth producer gets his bread and soup, he gets his bread and soup, he gets his bread and soup, three times a day, like they done in Vancouver, befo' the war.

Red Guards and Cossacks

The following extract is taken from "Six Red Months in Russia," by Louise Bryant, who was in Russia at the time of the Bolsheviki revolution. In her book she speaks from personal experience, as an eye witness, of stirring events and was personally acquainted with Lenin, Trotsky and other leading personalities, both of the Bolsheviki and their opposing parties.

On Thursday, March 27, Miss Bryant, now Mrs. John Reed, will speak in the Dominion Hall, Vancouver, under the auspices of Local Vancouver No. 1, S. P. of C., when all who are interested in the welfare and success of Soviet Russia will be delighted to hear at first hand the experiences and opinions of a trained observer of the incidents of the revolution and the progress of affairs in that country.

"I will never forget the first time I saw the Red Guards going out to battle. A cruel wind swept the wide streets and hurled the snow against the bleak buildings. It was twenty-five degrees below zero; I felt ill with cold under my fur coat. And there they came, an amazing, inspired mass in thin, tattered coats and their pinched white faces—thousands and thousands of them! The Cossacks were marching on Petrograd and Petrograd rose to repel them. They came pouring out of the factories in a mighty, spontaneous people's army—men, women and children. I saw boys in that army not over ten years of age.

We were standing on the steps of the City Duma and one of the Duma members, a cadet, said to me: "Look at the Hooligans—They will run like sheep. Do you think such ragamuffins can fight?"

I didn't answer. I was thinking of many things, things way back that made up the deepest impressions of my childhood. For the first time I visualized Washington and his starving, ragged army at Valley Forge. . . I felt suddenly that the revolution must live in spite of temporary military defeat, in spite of internal strife, in spite of everything. It was the Red Guard that made me realize that Germany will never conquer Russia in a hundred years. . . .

I wish everyone in America could have seen that army as I saw it—all out of step, in odds and ends of clothing, with all sorts of old-fashioned fighting implements—some only armed with spades. If that wish could be granted there would be much more sympathy and much less scorn for the Red Army. It took infinite courage, infinite faith to go out untrained and unequipped to meet the traditional bullies of Russia, the professional fighters, the paid enemies of freedom. All of them expected to die. Suddenly they broke into a wailing, melancholy, revolutionary song. I threw discretion to the winds and followed. . . .

Soldiers in the regular army used to have contempt for the workers in the towns—the soldiers are mostly peasants. They used to say that the people in the towns did all the talking, while they did all the fighting, but that was before the Red Guard came into being.

The city workers are smaller than the peasants; they are stunted and pale, but they fight like demons. Lately they have put up the most desperate resistance to the Germans in Finland and the Ukraine. In this particular battle with the Cossacks they were so unused to warfare that they forgot to fire off their guns. But they did not know the meaning of defeat. When one line was mowed down another took its place. Women ran straight into the fire without weapons at all. It was terrifying to see them; they were like animals protecting their young.

The Cossacks seemed to be superstitious about it. They began to retreat. The retreat grew into a rout. They abandoned their artillery, their fine horses, they ran back miles. . . .

It was a strange procession that came back into Petrograd the next day. A huge crowd went out to meet them with the usual floating of red banners, singing and swinging new revolutionary songs. The returning victorious army had been without food for a long time and they were dead weary but they were wild with joy. The tradition of the Cossacks was broken! Never again should they seem invincible to the people!

NOTICE

The meeting announced to be addressed by Louise Bryant, on her experiences in Russia, in the Dominion Hall, Thursday evening, March 20, has been postponed for one week, to March 27, owing to illness of the lecturer.

A BRITISH BOLSHEVIK

Manchester Guardian Correspondent To Be Prosecuted!

In the House of Commons, last Thursday, Commander Bellairs (C.U.—Maidstone) asked whether Philips Price, formerly correspondent of the Manchester Guardian, had been editing a Bolshevik newspaper, the Call, which was spread among the British troops in the Murman territory; whether the newspaper had incited them to revolt; and whether full information had been collected in regard to this man with a view to his ultimate trial?

Mr. Cecil Harmsworth (Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs)—The answer to the first and second parts of the question is in the affirmative. Information has been collected in regard to the activities of Mr. Philips Price, and will be available in the event of his return to this country, and a decision being taken to take action in the case. —(Cheers).

Mr. Philips Price (says the Manchester Guardian) is a member of a well-known and distinguished family, and was at one time Liberal candidate for Gloucester—"He is a great traveller, and, though he has never been a regular correspondent of this paper, he has sent us valuable letters from time to time from Persia, Armenia and elsewhere. He appears recently to have become a convert to the economic doctrines of Bolshevism, but we should be slow to believe him guilty of any dishonorable act. Since we were informed of his connection with Bolshevik propaganda we have requested him to cease to correspond for us."

The Commodity Status of Labor

Capitalism is a system of production for sale. All the results of its productive labor are destined for the market and hense become commodities: things bought and sold on the market.

Exhaustive enquiry and research has finally established the truth that over a period of time these commodities sell at their value, the fluctuations of prices cancelling each other, that is, a commodity of a certain definite value exchanges with another commodity of the same value. That is the rule, though everyday experience, however, seems to contradict this.

Present day society presents a condition where some of its members are rich with the abundance of things and others poor in a descending scale to destitution. In former times, students of this problem of the unequal distribution of wealth, attributed it to various causes and suggested various remedies. In the early days of the capitalistic method of production, before its economic laws were so well understood, it was thought that poverty and riches were the result mainly of unequal exchanges and it was suggested that society be established on a basis that would prevent this. It was suggested that labor time be the basis upon which commodities be exchanged and that labor tickets be issued, instead of the usual currency, the tickets to certify the bearers right to commodities on presentation in the market. For many years this idea was advocated, its sponsors claiming that inequalities of wealth and social position would be reduced to a minimum. Those with ability or especially deserving, above their fellows, as industrious, were, by some ledgerdemain, to be rewarded suitably according to their deserts. Demonstrations of the feasibility of this plan were even attempted, but of course without success.

In course of time, however, a better knowledge of the laws of commodity production and exchange was arrived at. And to the surprise of many it was discovered, that, in fact, commodities really did exchange on a basis of equal values and that the source of the extremes of wealth and poverty must be sought for in other directions than at the point of exchange or consumption.

Be it noted that no economists have considered worthy of entertainment the theories of our Sunday school moralists that sin, or laziness, or drunkenness, etc., were the cause of poverty or that such theories were of any value in the elucidation of the problem, the poorer classes having no monopoly of these vices, in fact poverty is the greatest bar to over indulgence and it also compels industry. Attempts have also been made, to claim for the rich, extra ability, and saving habits as the cause for their wealth, but the history of capitalistic accumulation gives a different story and in its light and common sense the contention looses force.

From primitive times to the present day, enormous social powers in production have been developed. But these powers are a historical product, representing the accumulated accomplishment of the whole of the human race and not of one class. The principles of co-operation and subdivision of labors in industry and their ever-developing application are the fruit of ages. Physics, mechanics, the sciences generally, knowledge itself, are social products. Yet still do we find the majority of the people laborious, thrifty, perforce temperate, but disinherited, living a precarious existance on the subsistance line, while a small minority rendering no useful service in society, appear to be the heirs of all the ages. Wealth and culture and an assured existence theirs, while the others have poverty, squalor and insecurity for their lot.

Observation shows that the wealthy have ownership and control over means of wealth production. It also shows that the poor are without ownership or control in these, hense their respective conditions. But how this was brought about is the thing to know before a solution offers. Antique slavery and feudal serfdom may be accounted for largely as due to superior physical and political force, but the proletariat, or the disinherited of bourgeois society, though political force was used to force them from the common lands of Europe, were also disinherited, directly by economic development.

The small hand tool gave way to the machine, the hand loom weavers cottage, to the factory and the freighter's wagon or pack horse to the railroad. The day of the small independent producer owning his own tools was gone for in the competition with the owner of the new expensive means of production he was squeezed out into the ranks of the proletariat which grew in numbers as the numbers of other class relatively decreased.

The above is a brief sketch of the process of capitalist accumulation and of the growth and development of the proletariat as a class. And noticing the play of economic development under capitalist production we can see the tendency to perpetuate and develop a class of proletarians and a class of capitalists and also to emphasize the distinction and widen and deepen the social gulf between them as time goes on.

Now we must return to our problem of value and our statement, that in exchange, equal value for value is the law. On a superficial view of the theory and its application to the proletarian or wage worker, who hires himself to the capitalist, it appears as a fallacy. If value for value is the rule, then it appears as though the value of his labor would be the value he created, which would leave no values for the capitalist to accumulate or even to live upon. The early enquirers into this matter asserted that the value of labor is what it creates.

Finally, what appeared as an experience contradicting the modern theory of value, was explained away when it was shown that when the worker hired out to the capitalist for a wage, that it was his power to labor that he sold and that it had a commodity status, i.e., that it was sold as all other commodities, at its cost of production, i.e., in its case in food, clothing and shelter, etc., or as expressed in the formula describing value, in the socially necessary labor, measured by time, involved in its production.

It was then seen that the wage worker might then produce in two, three, or four hours values equal to the value of his labor power, the remainder of the values created, being what is called surplus values, going to the capitalist class in rent, interest and profit.

The point of the exploitation of the proletariat was shown to be at the point of production, the point where all values are created and following from this is seen the futility of consumers leagues as means of solving the social problem of the unequal distribution of wealth. This problem along with the economic servitude of the masses of the people can only be swept away by socialization of the means of production.

International capitalism has risen in its wrath against Bolshevism, because it has uprooted the commodity status of labor power and of producing wealth. In seeking to do this, the Communists of Russia are striking at the very roots of capitalism. Municipalization, state control, or nationalization, do not touch the commodity aspect of wealth production. By that token we know that those things do not and cannot end capitalism. "Communism means the production of wealth, not for profit, but for social consumption. It therefore, means the end of commodity production—the production of goods for the market in order to be exchanged to realize profit—and of capitalism.

"Build up the Communist movement and smash the system that reduces men and women to the level of commodities. Build up the Communist movement and become free men and women."

FROM "THE COMING CRASH"

[By J. T. Walton Newbold]

America's Hold On the Allies

Unfortunately, trade necessitates an exchange of values, and Britain and France were too preoccupied to produce commodities for export. Paper was worth the amount of labor involved in its production—that, and no more, and gold was too precious to lose. Some of it had to go west, but in two and a half years not more than £200,000 was transferred from Europe to the United States. Besides, there was not gold enough to pay for the demands of the Allies. However, Britain and France had lent to the capitalists of the United States more than £1,000,000,000, which had never been repaid and, in addition, they had enormous mortgages on Central and South America, not to mention Canada.

The British treasury began to advertise in the press its desire to buy American and other foreign bonds and stocks owned by its subjects, who hastened to exchange these for government script at a sacrifice—to their country. The British treasury then "swapped" these bonds and stocks with their American agents for munitions, the latter making a profit on the deal. In this way the Americans paid off their debts, capital as well as interest and still the Allies wanted more supplies. Then, the Americans began to lend money to buy munitions, or, rather to lend to the Allies the money to buy munitions, taking promise of payment in the form of claims on British property. So, the Americans became creditors to the Allies, and with the growth of their credit holdings, their enthusiasm for the rights of small nationalities waxed exceedingly. They discovered, being the sons of the Pilgrim Fathers of Puritan New England and Pennsylvania, the profound truth of the saying. "Wheresoever thy treasure is, there will thy heart be also."

EVACUATION OF ODESSA RUMORED

LONDON, March 19.—Official reprts received in London are to the effect that a critical state of affairs exists in Odessa, the chief Russian port on the Black Sea.

No confirmation could be obtained in London of rumors that Odessa was being evacuated by Allied forces, but the report is not denied.

BOLSHIES HOLD UKRAINE

LONDON, March 20.—Virtually all of the Ukraine is now in the hands of the Bolsheviki, according to advices reaching London today. In heavy fighting at Nikolaiev, northeast of Odessa, the Bolsheviki lost between 5,000 and 8,000 men, but forced the French garrison after fierce fighting, to withdraw to Odessa.

ARTILLERY USED TO QUELL STRIKE

BERGAMO, Italy, March 20.—Striking workmen who seized the Franchi Gregorini Automobile Works here were driven out by artillery and infantry, which attacked the plant from three sides.

After a conference it was argreed that work would be resumed pending re-examination of the strikers' demands.

PEACE?

Col. Currie in the Canadian House of Commons, March 18: "The world was now engaged in an economic war. England had slammed her door and put an embargo on manufacturs of other countries. France and the United States had likewise put on their embargoes. There was no country at the present moment discussing free trade except Canada."

The State and Revolution

By NIKOLAI LENIN

1. The State Is the Product of the Irreconcilabiilty of Class Contradictions

The teachings of Marx are faring now as have fared more than once in the course of history, the teachings of revolutionary thinkers and leaders of the oppressed classes in their struggle for freedom. During their lifetimes, the great revolutionists have met, at the hands of the oppressing classes, only constant persecutions, and their teachings have encountered the most savage hostility, the most insane hatred, the most irresponsible flood of lies and slanders. After their death the effort is always made to transform them into harmless ikons, to canonize them, as it were, and to surround their names with a certain halo, so that they may be used for the "consolation" of the oppressed classes and for their stupefication, by emasculating the content of the revolutionary doctrine, removing its revolutionary edge, and vulgarizing it. At present the bourgeoisie and the opportunists within the workers' movement are united in the performance of this "operation" on Marxism. They forget, gloss over, pervert the revolutionary side of the doctrine, they steal its revolutionary soul. They place in the foreground and magnify whatever is acceptable or appears acceptable to the bourgeoisie. And don't forget that all Social-Chauvinists are now "Marxists"! More and more the German bourgeois scholare, who but yesterday were specialists in the extermination of Marxism,, talk of our "national-German" Marx, as if he had originated the workers' unions, so magnificently organized for the waging of a war of conquest!

In view of this situation, in view of the wide currency of Marxist distortions, our task becomes, first of all, to reveal once more the true teaching of Marx concerning the state. For this purpose we shall have to reprint a large number of long selections from the words of Marx and Engels themselves. Of course, it is true that long extracts make a presentation somewhat heavy, and will in no way contribute to its popularity. But it is impossible to dispense with them. All, or at least all the important, passages from the works of Marx and Engels with regard to the state must absolutely be quoted in the fullest possible form, so that the reader may form an independent idea of the whole system of the views of the founders of scientific socialism, and of the development of these ideas, and also, so that the distortion of them at the hand of the now dominant "Kautskianism" may be proved by means of documents and made evident to every eye.

Let us begin with the most widely known work of Friedrich Engels: The origin of the Family, Private Property and the State, of which the sixth edition appeared at Stuttgart in 1894. We are cbliged to translate the quotations from the German original, as the Russian translations, although they are very numerous, are for the most part either incomplete, or executed in an extremely unsatisfactory manner.

"The state," says Engels, drawing the final conclusions of his historical analysis—"does not represent in any way a power that is imposed upon society from without. Nor is the state the 'realization of the moral idea,' 'the form and reality of reason,' as Hegel affirms. The state is a product of society at a certain stage of its development, the state is the recognition of the fact that society has become lost in a maze of unsolvable self-contradictions, has been split by irreconciliable oppositions, which it is powerless to escape from. And in order that these oppositions, these classes with contradictory economic interests, should not consume each other and the state in fruitless contlict, for this purpose there was needed a power, standing, apparently, over society, but placing itself over society, a power which should moderate their collisions, and maintain it within the bounds of 'order.' And this power arising out of society, but placing itself over society, and estranging itself more and more from it, is the state." Sixth German edition, pp. 177-178.

Here we have with absolute clearness the fundamental Marxist thought on the state, its historic role and its significance. The state is a product and an expression of the irreconcilability of class contradictions. The state comes into being wherever, whenever, and insofar as the class contradictions, as an objective fact, can no longer be reconciled. And, conversely, the existence of the state is a proof of the fact that the class contradictions are irreconcilable.

And it is at this most important and fundamental stage of the discussion that the distortion of Marxism sets in, proceeding along two principal directions.

On the one hand, the bourgeois and particularly the petit bourgeois ideologists, under the pressure of indisputable historical facts, recognize that the state exists only where there are class contradictions and class struggle, and "correct" Marx in such manner as to make the state appear as the organ of the reconciliation of classes. But Marx said that the state could never arise or maintain itself if any reconciliation of classes were still possible. But the petit bourgeois and philistine professors and publicists would have it appear—and often with condescending use of Marx as an authority! —that it is precisely the state that reconciles the classes. But according to Marx the state is the organ of class rule, the organ of the oppression of one class by another, the creation of "order," which legalizes and perpetuates this oppression, 'by moderating the clashes between the classes. But in the opinion of the petit bourgeois politicians, order is precisely the reconciliation of classes, and not the oppression of one class by another; to regulate the clashes means to conciliate and not to deprive the oppressed classes of certain ways and means in the struggle for the overthrow of the oppressors.

For example, the S. R.'s (Social-Revolutionaries) and Mensheviki in the 1917 revolution, when the question of the function and significance of the state arose in all its magnitude, as a practical question requiring immediate action and furthermore, action on a mass scale—all accepted, suddenly and completely, the petit bourgeois theory of th "conciliation" of the classes by the "state." Countless resolutions and articles by the politicians of these two parties are permeated absolutely with this philistine, petit bourgeois doctrine of "conciliation." The fact that the state is the organ of the rule of a certain class, which cannot be reconciled with its opposite (the class opposed to it), is altogether beyond the comprehension of the petit bourgeois democracy. Their relation to the state is one of the most striking indications that our S. R.'s and Mensheviki are not Socialists at all (we Bolsheviki have repeatedly pointed this out), but petit bourgeois democrats with an almost socialistic phraseology.

On the other hand, the Kautskian distortion of Marxism is even thinner. "Theoretically" it does not deny that the state is the organ of class rule, nor that class contradictions ar irreconcilable. But it loses sight of, or obscures this fact: if the state is the product of the irreconcilability of class contradictions, if it is a power standing over society, and "more and more estranging itself from society," then it is clear that the liberation of the oppressed class is not possible unless there is not only a revolution by force, but also an annihilation of the mechanism of state power created by the ruling class, in which this "estrangement" is incorporated. This inference, which is theoretically clear enough to stand on its own bottom, was drawn by Marx with the utmost definiteness, on the basis of a concrete historical analysis of the tasks of revolution. And just this conclusion, as we shall clearly show in our further exposition, is forgotten and distorted by Kautsky.

(To be Continued)

Industrial Parliaments

The intensity of the industrial unrest in England is shown by the convening of an "Industrial Parliament" on February 27. This parliament, while its purpose was to allay the unrest, indicated that a real industrial crisis is on, of which the flaring up of great strikes is another indication.

This "Industrial Parliament," an adaptation of the "Industrial Councils" idea decided upon by the British government about two years ago, was composed of 500 delegates of organized labor and 300 delegates of the employers. The parliament decided upon motion of Arthur Henderson, to elect a committee of sixty composed of 30 delegates each of labor and capital, to "inquire" into the causes of industrial unrest, the general conditions of industry, unemployment and measures for its prevention, and methods for co-operation between labor and capital. The committee will report to another session of the "Industrial Parliament" on April 5.

The sessions of the parliament indicated that the official trades unions officials and the employers are each eager for "industrial peace," each are in dread of a proletarian revolution. The union delegates were very moderate, John Robert Clynes warning labor not "to demand too much in too brief a space of time." But Arthur S. Draper, in a cable to the New York Tribune, said: "The labor leaders are much more moderate than the workers and are rather doubtful of their ability to hold them in check."

The trades union officials at the parliament insisted upon the state ownership of mines, railways and mercantile transportation. But these demands are repudiated by larger minority of the workers, who are insisting upon industrial self-government, the Soviet administration of industry. The parliament is accepted by the union officials, but is being repudiated by large groups of the workers, who want no conciliation with capital. A delegate of the Transport Workers' Federation bitterly attacked the resolution for an investigating commission declaring: "The conference has been called for the purpose of side-tracking all the efforts of the men and women workers to improve themselves."

The parliament was a temporary victory for the union officials and the employers—for the union officials, in that it maintained their prestige; for the employers, in that they have secured a respite from large strikes, particularly in the case of the miners. The most serious problem of the British government is to maintain the apthority of the reactionary union officials; the revolt against these misleaders is assuming formidable proportions, they have been repudiated in strike after strike, the workers turning to mass action and they are becoming the bulwark of capital against proletarian revolution.

FORTY THOUSAND MINERS ON STRIKE

LONDON, March 19.—While awaiting the report of the special parliamentary committee on its investigation of the mining situation, forty thousand coal miners in Nottinghamshire have gone on strike, it was announced today.

The walkout was unexpected, as the miners' officials had dropped the strike, recently voted by an overwhelming majority, until March 20, so that the committee's report, scheduled to be presented tomorrow, could be debated.

THE RED FLAG

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

VOL. 1 NO. 9 VANCOUVER, SATURDAY, MARCH 22, 1919 FIVE CENTS

GOVERNMENT AND PROPAGANDA

From the New York "Nation," March 1, 1919

"The war has revealed to the groups of men who govern the several great nations new and hitherto undreamed of ways of fortifying their control over the masses of the people and of suppressing the opinions of hostile minorities. Not until the world war came had we Americans beheld loyalty to the policies of men temporarily chosen to represent the people in Washington made synonymous with loyalty to our institutions. Then it came about that if you believed our going into this war a mistake, if you held, as President Wilson did early in 1917, that the ideal outcome would be "peace without victory," you were a traitor. The government maintained this attitude toward dissenters by censorship of the press, by suppression of books, by the extraordinary powers of the department of justice, by the tremendous influence exerted by ythe secretary of the treasury over banks and business, by the use of private detective associations, and above all through propaganda of various kinds.

"For the work of propaganda our extraordinary American power of organization came into full play, stimulated by the appeal to patriotism, which, if not the last refuge of the scoundrel, as Johnson put it, certainly covers a multitude of sins. It speedily became a crime to think for oneself if one thought differently from the bulk of one's articulate fellow-citizens. On the other hand, the American love of a contest and of a game was utilized to the uttermost to put town, village, city, county and state "over the top," and the failure of any citizen to join in became thus an offence not only against loyalty but also against his neighbors and his community.

"After all, however, the most effective weapon in the hands of Washington has been the control of the press and the creation of a bureau of propaganda. In our civil war there were the beginnings of propaganda by the government in the sending to England by President Lincoln of Henry Ward Beecher and other to present the cause of the north to the British public. But in no other war, so far as we are aware, has there been the creation of official departments of propaganda, possessed of vast sums of money, headed, in some cases, by men of light and leading, and recognized as an important adjunct to the fighting forces.

What has happened in regard to Russia is the most striking case in point as showing what may be accomplished by government propaganda. Owing to its geographical situation Russia easily lends itself to news control. Particualrly since the appearance of the Czecho-Slovak movement and the capture of Vladivostok by our own and Japanese troops, it has been possible practically to isolate Russia. For months past only such news has emanated from that country as the English censor and American government have desired. Wireless messages from Petrograd and Moscow have been "jammed," and the cable despatches so withheld that our American Associated Press correspondents voluntarily withdrew from Russia—to their credit be it said—because their position was utterly incompatible with self-respect.

"Our own policy with regard to Russia was, first to inform the Russian peoples, through the medium of the Root Commission, what they ought to do with their newly won liberty. Then, the refusal of Lenine and Trotzky to take advice produced the Sisson "documents"—intended to justify our attacking Russia without a declaration of war. Never could there be a clearer case of what government control of news sources can do than the fact that the bulk of the American people still believe Trotzky and Lenine to be the sum total of human depravity and wickedness, corrupt, lining their pockets with blood money. Bloody enough they doubtless are; yet it is an unqualified misfortune that the many good features of the Soviet republic, the wonderful qualities inspiring the revolution, the glorious vision that came with it of a freed and redeemed humanity, are not allowed to reach the American people For months there have been issued from Russia, not the facts, not the truth that because of Allied intervention the Bolshevist government is growing stronger and stronger, but chiefly inventions. Bartholomew nights that never take place, together with the wildest rumors of communism in women, and of murder and bloodshed, taken from obscure Scandinavian newspapers, are hastily relayed to the United States, while everything favorable to the Soviets, every bit of constructiv accomplishment, is suppressed. Thus are our opinions shaped.

"It may, of course, be said that all these things are justified as temporary war measures—but when peace comes? Shall we never see a yielding to the temptation to use these new and vast powers of propaganda for the benefit of those in office or for the propagation of the views that they hold? The right to control news from abroad will cease; no longer will Mr. Creel "prove" this or that as to happenings overseas. The daily newspapers will be relieved from the necessity of approving everything the government does. Yet the thought will not down that, having discovered how easy it is to "sell" opinions, we may see attempts to sell them in the years to come. And this is no idle fear. Have we not witnessed this very thing in connection with our recent adventures in the Caribbean?

"Again, suppose that Mr. Wilson or one of his successors should decide on a new war. Is there any one who still believes that the power to make war resides in congress as called for by the constitution of the United States? Mr. Wilson has three times shown us, as Mr. Cleveland did in the Venezuelan crisis, that this power belongs practically to the president. Mr. Wilson puts us into war with Mexico at Vera Cruz and again when he sent General Pershing's army to invade Mexican soil. Our entry into the world war rested with the president; had he in April, 1917, still insisted that peace without victory was the desideratum, the country would have stood firmly behind him. Suppose now, on the other hand, the president should aver that we were ill-treated at the peace conference, should rouse the country's patriotic spirit and demand the support of all Americans in a final war to end war—by breaking the British naval menace and thus winning the complete freedom of the seas. He could at once denounce any opponent as traitor to our ideals, could incite the passions of the people against any leaders urging time for sober second thought by calling them wilful men, and having them morally lynched as Messrs. La Follette and Norris and the others were lynched. He could moreover set in motion vast propaganda along precisely the lines so ably utilized since we went into the present war. Santo Domingo shows what can be done. Strange things are being done in these days in the name of loyalty. The pity of it is that nowhere has this government propaganda been used for healing or reconstructive purposes. It has all been destructive—instinct with the spirit of hate."

This is an American liberal protest. It supports the Socialist contention that the bourgeois press under its mask of being the public press is nothing else but the mercenary tool of predatory capitalism ready and willing to campaign, on behalf of any vile, imperialistic adventure.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

SUNDAY, MARCH 23

At 8 p.m. Sharp

EMPRESS THEATRE

Corner Gore and Hastings

Speaker.....W. A. Pritchard

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.