The Invitation to Russia

THE motives which induced the peace conference to invite representatives of all the Russian Governments, real or pretended, to meet at Princes' Islands and talk things over were undoubtedly various. Whatever they were, however, the action itself is in the highest degree praiseworthy, and ought to have the hearty approval of everybody everywhere who at heart really cares for Russia and its people and desires that justice shall be done. If, as press reports affirm, the action was due primarily to President Wilson, it is a striking testimony to the weight of his influence and a distinct credit to his sense of fairness and right. However unsatisfactory his attitude with regard to Russia may have been in the past, his course in this instance calls only for commendation. It is entirely possible, too, that the representatives of the other Powers may have seen in the suggestion an opportunity to extricate their Governments from the dangerous and impossible positions which some of them, particularly France, have assumed toward the Russian imbroglio. If so, they may in due time be grateful for the service which Mr. Wilson has done them.

One result of the decision has already been highly satisfactory. A considerable number of prominent personages and their newspaper allies, who have been playing their game more or less under cover, have been forced to come out into the open and show their hands. The emigrant Russian princes and princesses, ex-Ambassadors of the Czar and Kerensky, and secret agents, who, safely in exile in Europe or America and abundantly supplied with money from mysterious sources, have been filling the press of both continents with denunciations of the Soviet Government or the Bolsheviki, or acclaiming Kolchak and his followers as the only government worth considering in Russia, or clamoring for an international army (to be paid for chiefly through American loans) large enough to occupy Russia from end to end, and who in the meantime have been carrying on an impudent and insidious propaganda through so-called "information" bureaus and other camouflaged organizations, are now protesting volubly and with tears that the conference has made a dreadful mistake, declaring angrily that it is impossible to treat with assassins and anarchists, and insisting that such a discussion as the conference has asked for would be little short of a crime. For all this the public should be grateful. It is well that the world should know, in order that it may remember, the names and the standing of those who have been working in secret for the restoration of the Russian monarchy, or speaking for the Grand Dukes and titled aristocracy who were Russia's curse, or scheming to recover the political influences which they lost by their own misconduct.

On the other hand, the implications which the action of the peace conference holds are obviously weighty. It must be assumed that the representatives of the Powers, in inviting a conference with the representatives of Russia, propose to go into the conference with entire sincerity and with an open mind; that the situation with regard to Russia, and the action to be taken in according or withholding recognition, have not been prejudged and virtually decided in advance; and that, in the interval, the time required for assembling and holding the conference and debating upon it afterwards is not to be used in furthering plans for some sort of coercion of Russia later. So far as the statement issued by the peace conference goes, it is unimpeachable in this point, but anything less than the strictest adherence to its spirit as well as to its letter would be a monstrous perversion of justice and equity, an open insult to Russia and its people, and a stain upon the honor of the peace negotiators and their governments which no subsequent good conduct in other directions would avail to wipe out. If the Powers allow themselves to deviate by a hair's breadth from the course which, by unescapable inference, they have now marked out for themselves, President Wilson would be justified in washing his hands of the peace conference and appealing to the peoples of the world against their governments.

How are the implications which inhere in the resolution of the peace conference to be realized in fact? Some of the prerequisites, at least, are clear. The delegates who are to represent the Allies and the United States in the discussions at Princes' Islands ought to be men of the highest character, competent by education, knowledge, and training to deal with the maze of facts and arguments which will be presented, and able to judge impartially the claims of the contending parties. There should be no place for partisans, or incompetents, or men with narrow vision, or reactionaries of any shade. No greater calamity could arise to cloud the future of Russia and the world's peace than that the men who represent the Allies and the United States, however high their intellectual equipment or technical repute, should nevertheless be of those in whose impartial judgment the world could have no confidence. Further, there ought to be no hurrying to get through and get away, and no attempt to restrict either the manner or the matter of debate. It is due to Russia that its spokesmen, whatever the character of the governments which they will represent, should be allowed to argue their case in their own way, to present all the data which they deem relevant, and to be listened to with the respect which is implied in the invitation which they have received. It is to be hoped that the conference will allow them nothing less than this courtesy.

That the proceedings at Princes' Islands should also be public, and that every possible provision should be made for reporting them in the press, goes without saying. We must not forget that there are special reasons why the entire record in this case should be open to the light. The facts regarding Russia have for more than a year been withheld from the public or misrepresented. Russia is at this moment practically cut off, by deliberate action of the Allies and the United States, from communication with the rest of the world by cable, telegraph, wireless, or post; commerce has practically ceased, and personal communication goes on mainly in subterranean ways. Gross partisanship on the one hand and heated denunciation on the other still characterize the bulk of the Russian "news" which reaches the public through the press. This great wrong should be righted. If the conclusions of the conference are to stand as the mature opinion of the nations, and if Russia is to be brought once more within the world family of free peoples, it will only be because the peoples of the world, with all the facts before them, have approved the action of their representatives. It is not the Allied and American governments, but the people who are asked to sustain their decisions, who have now to be disillusioned and informed. The magnitude of the decision dictates that the conference, whatever else it does or fails to do, should take the world into its confidence and let all its doings be known.

THE RED FUNERAL AT MOSCOW—An Extract From "The Red Heart of Russia"

[By BESSIE BEATTIE, War Correspondent of the San Francisco Bulletin]

Before the sacred shrine of the Iberian Gate a tiny lamp burned brightly; and an occasional soldier, strolling by, stopped to cross himself, and slowly to decipher the inscription that told how, by special provision of the Almighty, the ikon had been preserved from destruction throughout the raid of Napoleon.

While only a handful of people were killed in the Bolshevik revolution in Petrograd, Moscow's death-toll is estimated at from 750 persons to twice that number. Probably the former figure is more near correct.

Close beside the Kremlin wall, in the holiest of holy places the workmen and soldiers of Moscow dug the great trench that was to receive the bodies of their fallen comrades. All day they dug, and when night came they continued their work by the light of torches. The ghostly linden trees have stood watch over many strange scenes there on the edge of the Red Square, but none stranger than this crowd of silent men, speechlessly turning the earth through the long, chill, dark hours. By daybreak they had finished.

It was the day of the proletariat. All others stayed indoors. The streets, but for the mourners of the proletarian dead, were deserted. At eight o'clock in the morning the procession started, and all day long the people filed past—a vast, endless throng of them, men, women, and little children. There were no priests, no prayers. Strong young soldiers in mud-colored coats carried the red coffins on their shoulders, and above the heads of the crowd the crimson banners flowed like a river of blood.

A sobbing, singing mass of human beings, tragic and triumphant, filled the vast square. Cavalry troops rode by at attention, and girls with platoks on their heads carried great oval band-boxed wreaths of artificial flowers. Sometimes a military band went by, playing a funeral march, and sometimes the voices of the marchers lifted in the deep, rhythmical strains of the "Hymn of Eternal Memory." Men and women, old and young, wept as they saw the coffins lowered into that yawning trench.

If Mother Moscow wept that night, her tears fell quietly. She was in the presence of something big, something terrible, something magnificent—something unlike anything her old eyes had ever seen before.

There was another day, another funeral, another crowd of broken-hearted men and women. Their crumbs of comfort were more meagre, for theirs was the bitterness of defeat; but they also hugged the faith that the stalwart boys who lay stretched in their coffins had died defending an ideal.

Worlds of space lay between those two groups of mourners—they had no single thing in common but their grief. Their dead lay in the darkened recesses of great churches, and priests in funeral robes of black and silver said many masses for the repose of their souls. There were no red coffins, no crimson banners, no singing multitudes—only prayers and silent tears.

When it was all over—the killing and the burying—and there was nothing left but the joy of victory and the rancor of defeat, someone suddenly discovered that the lights before the shrine of the Virgin on the Iberian Gate had gone out.

All that was left of the sacred ikon was one bullet-wounded angel. Two soldiers passing by the shrine halted.

"Look," said one of them. "They said it was holy. It was just another of the d——d lies they have been telling us!"

COMRADE JOE KNIGHT OF EDMONTON

Vancouver Socialists will be delighted to welcome Comrade Joe Knight, of Edmonton, Alberta. This well-known organizer and speaker for the Socialist Party of Canada will speak from the platform of the Empress Theatre on Sunday evening, March 9.

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

Japanese Socialists on the Bolsheviks

We have received the following exceedingly interesting letter and resolution, passed by the Japanese Socialists, from the People's Information Bureau, whose headquarters are at 152 Fleet St., London, E.C.4, and should like to take this opportunity to draw our readers' attention to the opportunity this bureau offers them to learn at first-hand what at least is the Bolshevik rulers' ideal and intent in all that has happened in Russia since they formed their government, and what is their statement of the facts in the various happenings as against that of the capitalist press.

"The Japanese Socialists are opposing this the second Russo-Japanese war just as they opposed the first. We all remember the energetic protest made by the Japanese Socialists when their government started the war in Korea in 1905. We know that this protest was met by a whole series of unspeakably harsh persecutions by the Japanese Government. During and immediately after the war the Japanese Government was careful not to foment discontent, but later on all Socialists and Radical societies and groups were dispersed. The reaction culminated in the so-called "Kotokussk" affair; some of our best Japanese comrades were hanged and others were sent to prison without trial or judgment. Since that period there has been no Socialist organization in Japan, and the persecution of Socialists is carried on with even greater barbarity than under the Romanoff regime in Russia. Nevertheless, Socialism has not died out, for it is immortal. Small Socialist groups exist in various towns, for instance, in Tokio and Yokohama."

The following letter addressed to the Russian comrades is the first joint effort of the Tokio and Yokohama groups. These groups are protesting against a Japanese military intervention in Siberia, and have adopted the Bolshevik point of view:

"It is a matter of great joy to us that the Socialists of the most reactionary country in the world have come forward with a clear and definite statement of their views on the important problem of the world's revolution. We rejoice still more at the fact that in spite of the lying bourgeoisie press, the idea of Bolshevism has had such a strong influence on the Japanese workers.

"The Japanese workers are too weak at present to prevent the Japanese intervention in Siberia. Hundreds of Socialist publications have been burned in Japan in the course of the last four years, but during the same period hundreds of strikes have taken place. Some of these strikes have been suppressed by armed force and there have been many killed and wounded. The Mikado's mailed fist has fallen heavily upon the Japanese proletariat. We greet our Japanese comrades and are glad to receive this expression of their sympathy and goodwill.

To Our Russian Comrades

"From the very beginning of the Russian Revolution we have followed your fearless activities with enthusiasm and admiration. Your doings have had an enormous influence on the psychology of our people. We are now indignantly protesting against the dispatch of Japanese troops to Siberia under any pretext, as such an act will inevitably impede the free development of your revolution. We are grieved that we are too weak to avert the peril with which you are threatened by our imperialistic government. We are unable to help you in any way as we are persecuted by the government. But rest assured that the Red Flag of the Revolution will in no distant future float over the whole of Japan.

"We, the Socialists of Japan, having met in Tokio, express our deep sympathy with the Russian Revolution, to which we do homage.

"We recognize that the Russian Revolution is on the one hand a political revolution of the bourgeoisie against a mediæval absolutism, and on the other hand, a revolution of the proletariat against present-day capitalism. The transformation of the Russian Revolution into a world social revolution concerns not Russian Socialists only, but the Socialists of the whole world. The capitalistic order has in all the countries of the world reached its highest development, and we have now a period of a full-blown capitalistic imperialism. Unless they wish to be deceived by the ideologists of imperialism, the Socialists of all countries must hold steadfastly to the international standpoint, and all the forces of the international proletariat must be directed against our common enemy—international capitalism. Thus only will the workers be able to fulfil their historic mission. The Socialists of Russia and all countries must do their utmost to stop the war in order to help the workers of the belligerent countries to direct their attacks, not against their fellow workers, but against the ruling classes of their own countries. We have faith in the heroism of the Russian Socialists and of our comrades throughout the world. We are firmly convinced that the revolutionary spirit will spread and permeate all the countries.

"Executive Committee,
"Socialist Group of Tokio."

Clippings From the Press

ALLIED TROOPS MAIN CAUSE OF TROUBLE

"The Soviet republic, of which Lenin and Trotsky are the leaders, is the logical and historical movement and best able to bring order in Russia," said Frank Keddie, a Scotchman who for the past three years has been in Russia and who passed through Seattle this week on his way to New York, where he will sail for his home. "The chief trouble in Russia now is due to the presence of Allied soldiers, Czecho-Slovaks and the Cossacks. There has been considerable violence, but the Cossacks and Czecho-Slovaks are far worse than the Bolsheviki. I am greatly in sympathy with the Bolsheviki."

Nearly three years ago Mr. Keddie went into Russia as a Red Cross worker and has seen service in Petrograd, Moscow, the Ural mountains, Harbin and other places in both Russia proper and in Siberia. The centre of his work or a good part of the time was at Buzuduk, about two days' journey from Moscow. Through his connection with people prominent in affairs in Great Britain, Mr. Keddie was enabled to gain close touch with officials in Russia, visited at the homes of the younger Tolstoys, through his knowledge of the Russian language was enabled to get much valuable first-hand information regarding the life of the peasants and workers, their aims, hopes and ambitions.

"The Bolsheviki are strong in the country districts," said Mr. Keddie. "The peasants are illiterate, but they are doing a lot of thinking and are the keenest politicians in the world. The co-operative societies of Russia are very strong and are a source of hope for the future. Every village governs itself. The peasants do not want to fight anybody. The Bolsheviki are standing for temperance, and I saw more drinking among the Allied troops at Vladivostock than anywhere else.

"Allied capital is the chief reason for the presence of Allied troops. No matter what the troops do they can never stamp out Socialism in Russia; they can never police Russia, for the troops will become converted to Bolshevism. I am very hopeful of Russia if the Allied troops will clear out—then could come a temperate government—but if they do not clear out there is a long and dreary road ahead.

"Lenin certainly did a brave thing when he cut off all the lands of the church. There were 400,000,000 acres taken from the church in one slice. When he took away the lands I was in Moscow and saw a great procession of church dignitaries and a multitude of followers protesting against the action. That same night there was posted on the billboards all over the city these words: 'The church protests when her land is taken away, but did not protest when 3,000,000 of her children were killed.'

"The Russians love freedom intensely. They are idealistic, have little regard for precedent and pity people who keep their eyes so much on wages. Marriage is civil. Anyone may have any extra ceremonies, such as that of the church, if he wishes. The marriage laws are quite simple, but proper. The expense of getting married is reduced to 20 or 25 cents, which is a grand relief to the peasants.

Bolsheviki Main Hope

"I think the Bolsheviki failed when they began to use force, although it seemed necessary when Korniloff and Kerensky threatened to evict Lenin and Trotsky. Nevertheless I am confident that considering all the conditions that hope for Russia lies best in the Bolsheviki. It is true they have confiscated lands and houses, but not generally for themselves. Some of the leaders are living on a mere pittance. I remember, for example, that the very finest house in Buzuluk was taken over, but it was converted into a home for babies."

Asked regarding Mme. Breshkovsky, "grandmother of the Russian revolution," who arrived in Seattle from Siberia last Sunday, Mr. Keddie confirmed the statement made by members of the local Russian colony by saying that she belonged to the old revolutionary days and was not in step with present-day conditions.

From every part of our own land and from every part of Canada the cry goes up: "Bring the boys home." The war they engaged in is over and done. They must not be used as pawns for the designing money and territory grabbers of Europe. They have done their work; they have suffered enough; they are all democrats who fought to make an end of war and who believe in the self-determination of peoples. They are too good to be compelled to do the dirty work which powerful interests want done in Europe.

Bring them home from Siberia. After all our vast pretensions there, our boys are now forced to maintain a new czar who has overthrown the elected representatives of the people, who is turning over to the firing squad the soldiers and the common people who refuse to fight against their own kind in his behalf, who has restored the manufacture of vodka to raise revenue and to besot the people that he may the better exploit them. It is as foul a mess as the earth has brewed. Get our boys out of it.

Bring them home from Archangel. There again, after months of "establishing democracy," there is no government but Capt. Miller of the British army. Without much hope or relief there our boys are in danger of blind wrath of an outraged people. Get decent Americans out of it at once.

Bring the boys home—home from Siberia, Archangel, France, Germany, England, Ireland. They may be very useful in all these places to designing monarchists and plutocrats, but their place is at home. Let us have no more lying excuses. Just bring them home.—Seattle Union Record, Feb. 12.

Britain and Russia

By DOUGLAS YOUNG

[Mr. Young, as the British Consul, was in sole charge of British interests in Archangel from December, 1917, until the military occupation on August 2, 1918.]

DURING my eleven years' service under the Foreign Office in posts ranging from the equator to the Arctic circle, I have seen how the direction of foreign affairs is the close preserve of an exclusive class bureaucracy; and how matters vitally affecting international relations are decided by officials, often of minor rank, who, for the most part, have no first-hand knowledge of the countries on which they are experimenting, and who ignore, if they do not actually resent, any suggestions or advice from "outsiders" who happen to possess such knowledge. The plea of "State Secrecy" is used by this bureaucracy to conceal their blunders, which often involve the lives of thousands of the people. Our diplomatic representation abroad is also the exclusive preserve of caste, the members of which in most cases do not even speak the language of the country in which they reside, and who gather their knowledge within the four walls of their Chancelleries or in the Court or aristocratic circles which they exclusively frequent.

In my three years' service as British Consul at Archangel during the war, I have seen the money of the British taxpayer squandered with the most cynical indifference by a similar bureaucracy established by other departments.

A Double Game

The British Government played a dirty, double game with the Soviet Government in Russia. First they gave a solemn assurance, which was published over my name in the Archangel Press, that they had no annexationist intentions and that they would not interfere in the internal affairs of Russia. This was accepted by myself and by every man who read it, and who was not concerned with the niceties of diplomatic quibbling, as meaning that the British Government intended no military action against the Soviet Government. Then they stabbed that government in the back by forcing a landing of Allied troops at Archangel under a specious pretext.

So far from the Soviet Government having violated the sanctity of the British Embassy at Petrograd, the Embassy no longer existed, as its personnel had ignominiously fled the country some months previously, and official representatives of the British Admiralty and War Office were abusing diplomatic privilege—to which, in fact, they had no claim—to organize, in conjunction with Russian counter-revolutionaries, under cover of the Embassy building, a plot to overthrow the Soviet de facto authorities in Archangel and elsewhere.

The British Government having completely failed to understand the cause and significance of the Russian Revolution, and the ideals and aims of the Soviet Government, proceeded to suppress any news or any expression of opinion which did not coincide with their preconceived ideas, and was therefore calculated to expose that blunder; and, further, they proceeded to misrepresent and blacken every action of the Soviet Government, giving either deliberately untrue or evasive replies to the few independent members of all parties who have tried by questions in Parliament to extract the truth, though there is, of course, always the possibility that ministers have not been allowed by their officials to know what was going on.

The Peril at Archangel

The Archangel expedition, considered only as a military enterprise, and apart from questions of morality or political expediency, is already admitted even by its militarist sponsors to be an even greater fiasco than might have been anticipated. It is actually in danger of being thrown out into the White Sea, leaving the civil population of Archangel to the vengeance of the Bolsheviks. And this failure is due primarily to the fact that our naive authorities grossly underestimated not only the moral force but also the military power of the Soviet Government, apparently believing that in its stronghold at Moscow, 700 miles from Archangel, the walls of Bolshevism would fall to the ground at the approach from the White Sea of a few "brass-hats" and a nondescript force of a few hundred men "scraped together."

The danger of the moment is that this disastrous experiment, which has only brought ruin and death to the Russian classes in the interior whom it was naively intended to help, may be repeated in the Black Sea, nearly 1,000 miles from Moscow, with inevitably similar results.

British Prussianism

I have seen in Archangel a British general acting toward the Russian population in their own country as despotically as any Tsar and conducting himself as scandously as any of those Russian generals of the old regime who were a common subject of superior criticism on the part of British residents in Russia. One can only conclude from this that the war against Prussian militarism has created a Whitehall militarism little better than the Potsdam variety, and a British bureaucracy perhaps less corrupt, but hardly less incompetent than that of St. Petersburg.

I hate "Bolshevism"—a product of reaction working upon national war-weariness and popular discontent. But I am convinced that the policy—or absence of policy—of the British Government as regards Russia is responsible for having strengthened "Bolshevism" by forcing the Soviet Government to adopt cruel and inexcusable measures for its self-preservation, and incidentally for placing Russia still more under the heel of Germany and for slamming the door of Russia in our own faces against British political and commercial influence in that country. I believe that Bolshevik propaganda has had much to do with the sudden collapse of Germany as our military operations. And, I am afraid that, at the moment the most urgent problems of domestic reconstruction are awaiting settlement at home, we shall fritter away our strength and desources in a vain effort to restore order in the Russian Colossus; and that if we do this we shall sooner or later provoke an outbreak of Bolshevism in the United Kingdom, thus realising the aim of the extreme Russian Bolsheviks of spreading their ideas throughout Western Europe.

A New War?

Russia cannot be invaded and conquered by a few thousand men. The distances are enormous: the difficulties are great; the Bolsheviks are strong and are growing stronger. It is not a question of "restoring order" in Murman or the Crimea. It is a question at least of penetrating to Moscow. That means war on a large scale—it may be years of war. It means the sacrifice of thousands of lives and millions of money, with heaven knows what purpose or result. There cannot be limited intervention. If it continues it must be on a large scale—with all the consequences that implies.

There is another alternative. I believe that if a delegation, composed not of bureaucrats or militarists but of broad-minded representatives of all British political parties, were to meet a Soviet delegation in a neutral country an understanding might be swiftly reached after a few hours' deliberation. And I believe that that understanding might be acceptable alike to our extreme Socialists and to British capitalists whose sole interests in Russia seem to be to get their money back and to secure a field for making more.

M. Litvinoff is reported to be in Stockholm offering to open negotiations. It is for British public opinion to see that the opportunity for retrieving a ghastly blunder and for removing a stain on our national honor is not missed.

—From the "Herald," London, Eng.

THE FORTY-FOUR HOUR WEEK

LAST May at their convention in Baltimore the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America voted to establish the forty-four hour week in the men's clothing industry. This meant that they were no longer satisfied with the straight eight hour a day six days in the week for which the American Federation of Labor had been contending for more than a generation. Fourteen weeks ago their employers denied their demand. A combined lockout and strike followed. Last week this contest ended in complete victory for the workers. According to the officers of the union, this is the first case in which the forty-four hour week has been established as the standard throughout an American industry.

This fact in itself is sufficiently noteworthy; but the circumstances surrounding the achievement are even more remarkable. The great majority of the men's clothing makers are recent immigrants, men and women whom the older American unions have sought to exclude from the country for fear that they would lend themselves to the debasement of the "American standard of living." This fear and the resulting prejudice against these immigrant workers is in part responsible for the exclusion of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers from affiliation with the American Federation of Labor. The long strike for the forty-four hour week has been won without either the moral or financial support of the official organized labor movement by an "outlawed" organization of immigrant workers, who have thus forged into a position of leadership in the improvement of working standards. It is not surprising, therefore, that these despised immigrants should celebrate their triumph as a battle won by themselves in behalf of American workers generally. The leading article in their official journal, the Advance, rejoices that "our victory means legislation not only for the clothing industry but also for the entire Labor Movement. . . . The official Labor Movement does not recognize our existence, our struggles or our victories. But we send this message to our fellow workers in and out of the official Labor Movement: 'We have organized, built, fought and won single-handed. But we have done all this not for ourselves alone, but for the working class as a whole. Whatever your attitude toward us may be, we know you only as flesh of our flesh and blood of our blood. We have made a glorious beginning. We hope to see you follow our example.'"—From The New Republic, Feb. 1, 1919.

"REDS" AGREE TO TALK—WILL RESPECT OBLIGATIONS

LONDON, Feb. 6.—The Russian Soviet Government, in a wireless message announcing that it is willing to begin conversations with the Entente with the object of bringing about a cessation of military activities, declares it is willing to acknowledge financial obligations regarding the creditors of Russia of Entente nationality.

The statement was sent out from Moscow by M. Tchitcherin, the Russian minister of foreign affairs. Besides willingness to recognize the Entente creditors, the Soviet Government offers to guarantee the payment of interest on its debts by means of stipulated quantities of raw materials.

The Bolshevik government is likewise willing, it declares to place concessions in mines, forests, etc., at the disposal of citizens of the Entente, provided "the social and economic order of the Soviet Government is not affected by internal disorders connected with these concessions."

"We Must Produce Cheaper"

TODAY, the subject of greatest interest and importance to our masters, is how to increase production—how to reach the maximum of wealth output with the smallest possible expenditure in wages.

Much has been done during the war, by dilution and the abolition of privileges, toward this end. but the capitalist looks forward to the piping times of peace, when the supply of labor-power will exceed the demand, for a fuller realization of his avaricious dreams.

The question as to how it will affect the workers does not concern him; first, because he is a capitalist and therefore only interested in profits, and secondly because he keeps an army of unscrupulous journalists whose business it is to persuade the workers that whatever is beneficial to the class that own the means of wealth production, must be beneficial to society as a whole, and therefore to the working class.

To prove, however, that an increase in production, side by side, with a reduced wages bill, will improve conditions for the working class, would seem an impossible task; nevertheless, the economic quack, relying on the workers' ignorance of economics, proceeds to demonstrate it. One writer who advocates shorter hours of labor as a means to increased production says that after the war—

> We shall need the greatest possible output and the most economical production, consistent with health, to enable us to get the most trade and re-establish our position and profitably employ all our people.

Other writers lay even greater stress on the last suggestion, claiming that industry is run by the capitalists as much to give employment as to obtain profits. Hence we find an economic quack measuring a capitalist's usefulness to society by the number of "hands" he employs.

It is perfectly true that the capitalists of every concern have a keen desire to employ more and more workers, but there is a proviso—markets must be assured in order that the surplus-value produced by the additional workers can be realized in profits on the same scale. For that reason only, and only in that sense, is the capitalist interested in giving employment to the workers. He employs the workers when by doing so he obtains profits. In the past, when new machines and methods have enabled him to increase output while at the same time reducing the number of his workers, he has never objected on the score that unemployment would be intensified. Neither has he hesitated to advertise extensively among the nations of the earth for workers with which to flood the labor market, long before the wage-slaves who were "his own countrymen" were absorbed. In short, the record of the capitalist class speaks for itself. Ever since the days when our peasant forefathers were driven off the land in order that they might be available for the fore-runners of the modern capitalists in the towns, up to the present day, it has been one of the chief concerns of our masters to have a substantial margin of unemployed, and for two reasons. First, to keep down wages, and second, to be called upon in case of a sudden expansion in trade.

There is another side to the question, however. The capitalists of every land want "the greatest possible output, the most economical production, and the most trade." They know that the world market is limited, that within a certain period, say one year, the world's population can only absorb a limited amount of wealth, and that goods or wealth produced beyond this amount will be left on the owners' hands. The same applies to those goods whose owners, for some reason, fail to place them on the market at the prices ruling there. Hence the need for the most economical production, in other words, for the maximum of labor-power in exchange for a minimum wage "Consistent with health" is capitalist irony, because the workers' health is never studied except for the purpose of increasing their productive power.

The other side peeps out in the sentence "to enable us to get the most trade." The workers of each country must submit to "the most economical production" in order to assure to their masters "the most trade." Thus they enter into a new form of warfare against the workers of other countries in the interests of their masters. And when the capitalists of one nation succeed in obtaining the "most trade," and their workers demand higher wages, because the masters can afford to pay them, these same masters reward them with the sack, and entice the workers of other lands to fill their jobs. Where, then, do the workers of the world come in, whether they win for their masters markets or wars!

The capitalist group of every nation will point to their own prosperity as evidence that employment is good, when they deem it necessary to gloss over the unemployed army—that instrument of coercion against their workers They boast that there is no sentiment in business, and an unemployed army is necessary to their business. In the past they have—except in a few rare instances, chiefly occupational—always been blessed with a solid margin; the future is full of promise for them, and we can rely on them to make the most of their opportunities in order to coerce the workers into the economic war.

Already in the mad race for markets we are told that—.

> The old slack methods have given way to something approaching American hustle. Supervision is more strict, rest times have been reduced, furnaces are bigger and hotter, machines run faster, tools and appliances are heavier and need more strength and nerve for their manipulation, shops are more noisy and crowded, dusty and hot, materials are harder to work, labor is more fatiguing and hazardous.

But, like everything parasitic, the capitalist is insatiable. The concerns in which his capital is invested must either beat their competitors in the race for cheaper production or go under. And concerns do go under almost daily, their share of the market being taken up by their competitors, while the workers they have employed swell the unemployed army until they can be "profitably employed" by other capitalists.

Capitalist governments have for years made promises to deal with unemployment—they have even made pretence of doing something—but the evil has grown. One government gave us labor exchanges—to find jobs for the unemployed, they said—but all these institutions did was to save the capitalist time and money in his search for the workers he needed. The latest suggestion is that hours of labor should be reduced, but those who advance it claim that a reduction in hours would result in greater production. Coming from those who plead that the workers should be more fully employed, this suggestion is a curiosity in logic.

But the richest contribution to the whole discussion has been made by the "Committee on Adult Education." They say:

> Industry exists for man, and not man for industry. The world seems to have been carried on in the opposite principle, and it will be no easy task to alter it.

Rich in irony is this utterance when we get behind the camouflage of assumed innocence, for the committee know that industry is run for their class that they, as a class, own the nature-given material of the earth, that the dispossessed workers of the world, owning nothing but their energy, are forced by hunger to sell even that as a commodity. They know that the factory with its raw material and machinery absorbs the commodity labor-power, and out of the union comes surplus-value to be realized in profits. To them the working class is God-given—a class to work for them while they luxuriate in idleness.

Industry will only exist for man when man controls industry. Today the workers cannot control industry because the means of wealth-production are owned by the capitalist class, and their ownership is defended, through their parliament, by armed forces.

Until the working class control industry, industry will exist for the capitalist class, as it exists today. And the working class can only control industry when they own the means of wealth-production. Ownership of the means of wealth-production is the basis of capitalist domination; their ownership, however, is maintained politically and until their political power is broken, or acquired by the working class, the latter cannot take possession of the means of wealth-production.

SATURDAY REVIEW, JAN. 11

It would be a piquant event if the Entent forces were to co-operate with the German troops in putting down Bolshevism in Berlin. And yet it may be the wisest, indeed the only course, to pursue. There is no possible comparison between Germany and Russia, where ninety per cent. of the inhabitants can neither read nor write, and are steeped in superstition. The vast majority of the German nation must be on the side of law and order, and all the adult males have some military training. It ought to be possible to co-operate with the law-abiding and sane majority of Germans in establishing a responsible government for the German confederation. Unless this is done, the conference at Versailles will be wasting time.

PRITCHARD-MAKOVSKI DEBATE

(Sunday, Feb. 9, Empress Theatre)

The debate between Comrade Pritchard of the Socialist Party of Canada, and L. W. Makovski of the "Daily Province," on Bolshevism, was held last Sunday afternoon in the Empress theatre before a crowded house.

Comrade Pritchard based his argument on the concrete achievements of Bolshevism in Russia, "open diplomacy," "restoration of the land," education, and the fact that they have remained in power up till now through the expressed will of the majority of the people, being his chief points.

Mr. Makovski based his argument on the capitalist press reports, which he assumed were true, and on Lenine's "Soviets at Work," which he misinterpreted. He tried to establish an analogy between "Soviet administration" and "German junker autocracy," in which he miserably failed. He could see no difference between discipline for the benefit of capitalist exploitation and discipline for the social good.

The debate will probably be given in full next week.

DEMONSTRATION BEFORE PRES. WILSON

A significant incident of the reception of President Wilson at Paris that received little attention in the American press at the time, is reported by "Common Sense," London, in its issue of Dec. 21. In spite of the prohibition by Premier Clemenceau of a Socialist and trades union parade in honor of President Wilson, a demonstration was organized by the Labor Federation of Mutilated Soldiers. Carrying red flags and singing the International, crippled and mutilated soldiers marched through the streets and broke through several cordons of police and mounted municipal guards that tried to disperse them. The paraders, numbering several thousand, also made hostile demonstrations before the officers of the Action Francaise and the Matin.

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.....FEB. 15, 1919

Revolutions

Marx in his 18th Brumaire quotes an English journalist as saying, "The political servant girls of France are mopping away the glowing lava of revolution with old mops and they scold each other while doing their work." This, concerning the days of 1848 and thereabout. The simile is applicable to Europe today, if we substitute flatter for scold.

Clemenceau mouths the most commonplace chatter about proverbial French politeness being exceeded by the Allies, and experts in peace, in war, in procedure, in law and jaw, debate and wrangle, harking back to the mud flats of ancient Egypt for precedent and practice, while the very stones of Europe cry out for Revolution. A terrible state of affairs everyone admits. But most people who have abundance of space reserved for circulating their ideas, in the public press, assume that it is a novel one. They seek to hide former revolutionary activity behind a cloud of words, as it were, as the Olympian Gods were wont to hide certain practices to which even Gods were not adverse, behind a rain cloud.

True, the blankets and feathers of a Mohawk Indian may hide the benign countenance of very respectable fathers of the American Revolution, but no amount of word juggling can disguise the fact, that the Boston Tea Party was the action of a "lawless mob," in fact when the workers of America got restless in 1881 certain college professors found it policy to denounce the lawlessness of the revolutionary fathers, who as a matter of actual fact, but for the hanging together of the colonial working class, would have hung separately, if I may make a slight correction in Franklin's famous witticism.

Remember, furthermore, the many glorious revolutions of England and France, where at times the bourgeoisie were not above starting a revolution at home, while their country was at war abroad. The Magna Charta, in whose memory our childish minds were bid to bend in awe, was wrested from a sovereign by armed force, while that sovereign was at war with France, and was restored or rather reaffirmed at least thirty times in five centuries.

The last Emperor of France, Napoleon III., lost his crown while engaged in a war with Germany, not by "constitutional methods" but by a "lawless mob." These facts certainly can not be unknown to the frantic individuals who are assisting the European "political servant girls" to mop up the revolutionary lava; not, it is true, with an old mop, but with a new ink ribbon. If by any chance they forget the rhapsodies of their schoolmarm, they cannot forget that "the poor fifty million" (per Dr. Dillon) "Russians left to the mercy of lawless Bolshevism," must themselves confess to certain "lawless practices" concerning the flight of one Nicholas.

But these were great events. I speak of past events now, participators in which were fortunate in making their revolutionary activity good. They live in the minds of their grateful countrymen; the theme of the poet, and the entire intellectual furniture of the politicians. Former successful revolutions were the bourgeois heaven. Present ones the bourgeois hell.

However, these glorious events of song and story and July celebrations were not the only revolutions the world has seen. Lurking in the pages of authorative historians, slave revolts might be traaced as far back as history can take us. These sporadic and isolated uprisings were repressed with the most cowardly brutality anywhere recorded of humankind. The means used for the slaughter were those calculated to destroy the maximum number in the minimum of time. No considerations of mercy ever ended the slaughter. Fear of pestilence through decay and putrefaction of dead bodies, too numerous for the living to properly dispose of, or actual apprehension for the supply of labor, were the angels of mercy, which detained the murderous madness of a weak and cowardly master class, driven insane by a brief exhibition of their slaves' tremendous power.

Omitting the great slave revolts of antiquity we read throughout Feudalism of sectional revolts drowned in blood. Some serfs conceive the anti-social, anarchistic, Bolshevist, unpatriotic concept that they will no longer sleep in straw piles and eat the food of hogs. All the social forces are used to blot such vile beastly creatures from the earth. But no fabulous monster of the demi-god period ever multiplied with more terrifying surety than does this same spirit of revolt. Stamped out in one place, the master has scarcely time to clean up the bloody mess than another outbreak demands his attention. From demanding conditions of existence equal to that of swine and getting them, the path of revolution, along which moves the "lawless mob," led the servile class through twenty centuries of slaughter and slavery, to houses and clothes and grub which belong exclusively to man. But throughout those twenty centuries the voice of the slave grows increasingly louder and his demands more intelligent.

We stand at the end of the so-far travelled way and hear echoes of the strife long past; the Jacquerie in France, the peasants of England; high above the petty human suffering, we can hear the agonizing cry of that terrible defeat, of the fiendish acts which followed the slaughter and compelled the nobility to protest that a continuation would leave the country devoid of serfs

The wage workers of France are heard for a few days; again the peasants of England and the Jacques of France. Then comes the peasants' war of Europe, where the slaves of Bohemia establish a new society which resists the combined might of European chivalry. For a score of years the ever-changing cry is never wholly silent. It might be a scarce-heard whisper, a group of serfs in revolt against the petty landlords; stifled ere articulate, preserved in the whine of a bishop to a pope; as it might be the thunder roll of the great French Revolution, shattering the entire social structure and monopolizing the literature of a century.

But, as we near our epoch the cry assumes a distinct identity, it is no longer chaotic and unintelligible. It is not the cry of ignorance, weakly battling against unbearable conditions of life and overwhelming powers of coercion. It is the intelligent cry of a class grown rich in experience, powerful in knowledge, and constant in trial. It is the voice of the revolution.

Change is the one unchanging factor in human affairs. The instruments of labor we have used, from the stone hammer to the hydraulic press; the power we have utilized from the strong arm to the hydro-electric, have sung of revolution, have raised us from grovelling, panic-stricken multitudes shivering in the dark, with provender for but a day, to clear-brained social individuals, with provisions, did we own them, stored away sufficient for years. A button turned, floods our houses with brilliant light, a turn of a wheel provides us with warmth. The tremendous urge of this vast machine is towards revolution, and its voice cannot be drowned by the clicking of the typewriter, however vigorously pounded.

But revolution, own child of the machine, comes when it will come. No cosmic cop stands at the crossroads of social progress directing the traffic. Nor has any cosmic mechanic devised a "Little Ben" which, with one short blast, or one long, or a series of intermittent ones, will announce to slumbering social organisms that the hour of revolution has come. We loiter at the spot to which our forefathers strove mightily to attain. The machine has to affect ten million minds and, then, though the process may be painful, society has to strike its camp and move forward to more suitable hunting grounds. It has done so, many times, in the past. In the years which lie before the human family it will do so many times again.

J. H.

Unemployment and Alien Question

Canada, a land of boundless natural wealth, of fertile plains for grain-growing or horse and cattle-raising and of immense tracts of timber, coal and mineral resources; its great rivers, lakes and the waters of its seaboard are prolific fishing grounds, though capitalistic methods of exploiting this vitally important source of food supply is rapidly depleting and exhausting it. A country, continental in size, with thousands of miles of coast-line and splendid harbors, and with all this, only a scant seven-and-a-half millions of a population.

And yet, see what problems the capitalistic forms in which we move provide for us.

Unemployment stalks through the land with all its accompanying evils and it is predicted that we are only at the beginning of a period of industrial depression, unprecedented in its nature. The returned soldiers are back to an overstocked labor market and the competitive struggle for a diminishing number of jobs is on in all its sordidness. Fratricidal war amongst the wage-workers is proclaimed the only solution and the flames of racial prejudice are fanned to intensify the suicidal strife.

Boundless natural wealth combined with the tremendous accomplishments of modern science and invention in the means and technique of production at the disposal of its population. And yet, because we must wait on the market, wait on profits, wait on the class which owns, the class which does not own must fight like famished dogs over a bone, fight each other on the over-crowded labor market of, save the mark, our twentieth-century civilization, like the carrion eaters of the jungle who snap and snarl and worry each other when prey is scarce. The irony of the contradictions of capitalism, the tragedy of its vicious circles.

What is to be done? Drive the aliens out of industry, it is said. To what? That may solve the unemployment problem for some at the expense of others, but the problem remains in all its ugliness. And, where are the moralists who shrilled so indignantly over other matters but a short time ago. All silent, the time-servers bankrupt of courage. This time it does not pay.

There is no solution to the unemployment problem under capitalism. Unemployment and poverty are its own children and flow from it as effect from cause. There are no ends to its vicious circles by the route of sectional conflicts amongst the working class. Only a working class conscious of itself as a class with a mission to solve, sooner or later, all problems of capitalism by establishing a new order of social ownership of the means of wealth production and production for use, so that, not markets and profits, but the needs and the consumptive capacity of the people shall be the aim and purpose of productive labor.

DIED—At the General Hospital, Vancouver, B. C., Comrade George Whitehead, aged 78.

A Voice Out of Russia

(Continued from Page One)

nificant group of adventurers, behind the backs of whom there are foreigners? The people, or generals? The decision is clear.

The Soviet government has found it difficult to bring the economic life of Russia back to normal. The peasants have received the land, but remain without agricultural implements, nails, and textile goods. The workmen have obtained control over production, but remain without bread and without coal. Production itself has slowed down. The most important factor in this situation is the isolation of Russia. She is practically excluded from the world exchange. She is now like a besieged fortress, a fortress which the enemy wants to take, if not by force of arms then by hunger. By what right? For what? It is said that we have committed two sins: first, we do not want to pay the debt to France. Yes, in principle we do not consider ourselves responsible for the Czar's loans, because part of them were expended for the oppression of the Russian people. But practically we do not refuse to discuss this matter—this is quite clear from the note of Tchitcherin of October 26. Second, it is being said that we have betrayed the Allies. In my opinion the Allies have betrayed us and are now dividing among themselves the booty which was promised to us. But we do not protest against this. Proclaiming a peace without annexations and contributions, Russia has renounced her participation in the division of any booty. But having sacrificed for the Allies 7,000,000 of her sons, she is justified in demanding that she be left alone. But let us assume for a second that we are guilty of breaking a treaty; then what about Italy who broke the treaty with the Central Powers? She is being complimented on it!

But we also have a third sin, of which people do not speak aloud: we are weak, but our land is rich—why not make use of it? I understand this perfectly well. Together with England we partitioned Persia and only a short while ago we dreamed of the partition of Austria and Turkey. And now we are being partitioned! I understand it all. I understand the English and French very well, but I cannot understand the Americans at all. We owe you very little; we have no treaties with you and never had any, and in the division of Russia you do not intend to participate. Why then do you keep your soldiers in Russia? The interests of the United States do not conflict with the interests of Russia. More than that, no other country is more interested in the realization of the ideals of the freedom of the seas and the league of nations, which your president is faithfully upholding in Europe, than Russia. All our seas are not free. Our government is most of all international. Moreover the interests of exchange between Russia and America at present should be mutual. During the war the United States has tremendously developed her production, and she needs foreign markets. Russia could be one. She needs goods. She cannot of herself increase production and stimulate industry. Yet we have plenty to pay with; our natural resources are enormous. The question of how to utilize these resources in order to pay for your goods may be decided upon by mutual understanding and discussion either in Washington or in Moscow, but surely this cannot be decided by mutual destruction in the swamps of Archangel. The Soviet government has attempted many a time to begin such discussions.

This argument is usually disposed of by referring to the Bolshevik danger. First of all, the responsibility of power has compelled the Bolsheviki to become more moderate. Second, the Soviets and the Bolsheviki are not one and the same. The Bolsheviki at the present time dominate the Soviets—to a great extent because of the policy of the Allies. Yet, fearing Bolshevism, you are cultivating it. More than that, by your actions you justify its ideology. As far as the philosophic side of the question is concerned, we differ from the Bolsheviki in the matter of natural impulses. The Bolsheviki say that such impulses are only class interests. We, realizing that class interests are the most important interests of mankind, nevertheless believe that mankind has other interests: religious, moral, rational and esthetic. At present this point of view is being subjected to a difficult trial. There is some ground for your accusation that the Bolsheviki are serving the interests of one class only. But what about those who attempt to tighten a steel lasso around the neck of Russia, those who forget that she came to this condition fighting with the Allies and for the Allies—whom are those interventionists serving? The class interests of the propertied class or the ideal of justice? Is it really possible that these ideals are only a myth?

—George V. Lomonossoff.

"Æ." ON THE NEW ORDER IN RUSSIA

[Below we reprint from the "Voice of Labour" a letter written by "Æ." to Wm. O'Brien, Secretary of the Irish Labor Party, and intended to be read at the Mansion House meeting. It is a noble tribute from the ablest of living Irish writers and economists of the constructive order to the most brilliant of successful revolutionists of all time, and is as the voice of the most western hailing the most eastern people of Europe.]

17 Rathgar Avenue, Dublin,
November 14, 1918.

Dear O'Brien: I hear that a meeting has been arranged in Dublin at which some form of recognition or salutation to the Russian Revolution will be made. I hope the mists which have obscured that mighty upheaval will soon be cleared away and the real character of the revolution made known. I have no doubt that much to be regretted or deplored has taken place, but I have come to the conclusion, partly from personal statements made to me by people who were in Russia during the revolution, and from confirmation of their statements, which have been made public, that the stories of violence and bloodshed have been greatly exaggerated. A Canadian acquaintance who was in Russia for four years, returning this summer, told me that he had seen since his return minute, precise, and detailed accounts of massacres and the destruction of buildings in Moscow. "I was there at the time," he said, "and there was not a single shot fired and the buildings were intact." Colonel MacCormick, President of the American Society of Engineers, who witnessed the Revolution, wrote this spring in a New York paper that nine-tenths of the stories of outrages and murders were pure inventions of the old regime, and they were circulated by the German Government, accepted by the Allied Press, and this helped to increase the gulf between Russia and the Allies, which it was the aim of the German Government to widen. Even if these stories were true, this could be said in extenuation, that the autocracy kept the people of Russia ignorant and they could not be blamed much if they did not act with wisdom. The Russian peasants and workmen were regarded by the ruling classes as little above the brute, and were treated accordingly, and if men are treated as brutes it is too much to expect when aroused they will act with gentleness. The leaders of the Revolution had the heritage of a country desolated by war and wrecked economically by a corrupt and inefficient bureaucracy. Swift action was necessary if worse was not to happen, and I doubt whether any government—English, French, or German—in a similar position, would have dealt more mercifully with minorities which obstructed them. It is said the Revolution is not democratic, that general elections were not held to give moral sanction to the new regime. This is a strange criticism arising, in countries like our own where a practical dictatorship has been established since the war began, where the most revolutionary changes were made without any reference to the electorate. When victory is sure our rulers begin to think of elections, and in Russia no revolutionary leader has made any pretence that the existing system of Workers' and Soldiers' Committee could be permanent. When the revolution is safe they will act as our own rulers, who have waited until victory was secured before they spoke of seeking the approval of the country.

We do not know enough yet to praise or blame the leaders of the revolution in respect of their dealing with those who opposed them. But we do know enough from dispassionate observers to see that heroic efforts are being made to reorganize Russia, to build up a new social order on democratic and co-operative lines. . . . These developments are not noticed in the press here, which selects all that is sensational, whether accurate or rumor, and ignores the work of reconstruction. I have read papers which in the same article denounced Lenin and Trotsky as paid agents of Germany, and also commented on the disastrous effect of their propaganda on the morals of the German soldiers and workmen. These men could hardly be paid by the German autocracy to undermine its influence over its own people. On the eastern front Trotsky and Lenin, the men of ideas, won against Hindenburg and Ludendorf, the men with guns. We beg to suspect that the "Daily Mail" for once allowed truth to be printed in its columns when its correspondent in Russia wrote that, strange as it might appear to people in England, Lenin and Trotsky were men of real intellect, and probably knew more about international politics than Mr. Arthur Balfour. We can see over the smoke of conflict the scaffolding of the new Russia arising. The conflict over its foundations will pass, but the building will be continued, and the democracies in other countries should see that their governments allow the Russian people to work out their own destiny. Even those who are enemies of the Revolution have to admit that ninety per cent. of the Russian people are supporters of the present government. And no League of Nations, however armed with self-righteousness, could have a moral right to overturn the social order in a country which is supported by the people themselves. We do not hear of Russians rising in masses against the rule of the Soviets, but of Czecho-Slovaks, Japanese, and other foreigners deputed to punish the Russian people for their crimes against humanity. Their crimes I believe to be twofold. They desired to be at peace when the rest of the world was at war, a very serious offence, as we in Ireland know. They also desired to have economic democracy when the Great Powers had got no further than a desire to make the world safe for political democracy, and were, I believe, even a little dubious about that state of society, though experiment has proved that pure cultures of capitalism can be cultivated in a political democracy and develop there with the rapidity of bacteria in a jug of Dublin milk.

Yours sincerely,

GEO. W. RUSSELL.

UKRAINIANS WILLING TO TALK TO ALLIES

PARIS, Feb. 11.—The Ukrainian Soviet Government has announced that it is willing to accept the invitation of the Allies to the proposed conference of Russian factions, according to the Temps, but it considers the date fixed, February 15, too near at hand.

The government also expresses a preference for holding the conference at Paris instead of Prince's Islands. It is understood, however, that the French Government, which originally transmitted the invitation through its wireless service, has since been trying to get an agreement that hostilities will cease all over Russia and adjacent countries, including Archangel, before the conference assembles.

Otherwise, it is stated, the Entente governments will not consent to confer with the Soviet representatives.

The Background of the German Revolution

By LOUIS C. FRAINA

IV.

The First Stage of the Revolution

LENIN was right—Russia's separate peace did not end the war or give German Imperialism the victory. The war flared up more intense and violent than ever, and more intense became mass agony and starvation, more intense became the economic and political crisis, more intense became the awakening of the masses and the revolutionary struggle for peace.

In May, 1918, German Imperialism staked all on one desperate offensive, and lost. Instead of peace, the unparalleled butchery brought more misery to the German proletariat. The revolutionary unrest developed more acutely. Great industrial strikes broke loose, in spite of the union bureaucrats' appeal to the strikers to "be calm" —particularly in the Essen regions. The Kaiser made a speech to the Krupp workers, warning them of the horrible results of revolution in Russia. The soldiers were uneasy, and mutiny spread. On August 5, German soldiers at Reval, "corrupted" by Bolshevik propaganda, disarmed themselves to show they were tired of war. The telephone wires were cut, and at meetings held the same day speakers denounced war. The cry was: "Enough of bloodshed! We do not want to fight any longer!" Two hundred soldiers were arrested. At Felline, in Livonia, at the end of July, trouble started in the garrison, which thereupon received orders to place itself in readiness for the western front—an order never executed. Detachments sent to enforce the order joined the rebels and, singing revolutionary songs, they all marched to the railway station, divesting themselves of military insignia. Upon their arrival at Meisekull depot, they met detachments coming from Perman and Weissenstein on their way to the western front. After a meeting, the new soldiers divested themselves of military insignia and dispersed with cries: "Enough of war! Peace and bread!" Revolutionary Socialists in Bremen issued a pamphlet declaring that not only the Scheidemann majority Socialism, but also the Independent Socialists of the Haase type, were simply adepts in radical phrases while avoiding deeds; the international Socialists and Communists insisted upon revolutionary action.

All this, spread all over Germany, arousing the consciousness of the masses to their misery and the necessity for revolution. . . .

The German offensive collapsed, and the Allies assumed the offensive; the war became still more hopeless. Then came the break in Bulgaria, where, according to all reports, Bolshevism was rampant; then came the break in Austria, where again Bolshevism was rampant. The revolutionary masses in Bulgaria compelled Czar Ferdinand to make a counter-revolutionary peace to save the dynasty: but the dynasty is no more. A new government asked for and secured an armistice. Germany was isolated. . . .

But still Germany might have waged war for months and years to come, according to experts, if Revolution had not broken the power of the government and of the imperialistic machine. During October, the revolutionary crisis in Germany emerged definitely into action. The Socialists of the Spartacus Group, representing revolutionary Socialism, Bolshevism, issued the following appeal:

"Workers, awake! The dreams of world domination of German Imperialism have vanished into smoke. On heaps of corpses, in seas of blood, they wanted to establish that domination. Vain are their efforts! The sword cannot forever rule the world. In one night everything has collapsed. The shameless traffic with the destiny of the peoples of the East has brought its fruits: it forced the peoples of the West to unite for defense.

"Everything is falling. On the field of battle —defeat after defeat: in Flanders, the Balkans, in Palestine. The alliance of the Central Powers, that was to serve as the means to world domination by Germany, has failed completely. Hardly had the robbers ended their quarrels over the spoils—Germany and Austria for Poland, Austria, Turkey and Bulgaria for Rumania, Germany and Austria and Austria and Bulgaria for the Dobrudja—then Bulgaria leaves the coalition, and concludes a separate peace with France and England. The German people do not want world domination, they do not want war, they want peace. But already German soldiers are being driven from the western front in order to force Bulgaria to continue the war. The German proletariat, which has nothing to eat, whose wives and children suffer and languish—this proletariat must now take the Bulgarian proletariat by the throat and force it to fight!

"Thus the ruling clique in Germany tries to retain power. It feels the ground slipping. It is bankrupt: bankrupt on the field of battle, bankrupt in external and internal policy. The hairs of the masters are standing up in fright at the consequences of their criminal military adventures. A shiver runs through their body at the very thought of the awakening of the tortured and deceived proletariat, at the thought of the people's judgment."

The old government, apprehensive of events, feeling the surge of proletarian awakening, snatched at the prestige of Socialism to bolster up its power; and invited Scheidemann and two other majority Socialists into the Cabinet—again to deceive the masses. Scheidemann & Co. accepted with alcrity this counter-revolutionary task. The Spartacus appeal continues

"At this very moment the government Socialists, the Scheidemanns, offer their services to sustain the tottering power of the German bourgeoisie. At this hour of potential world revolution, they are busy with petty bargaining attempting to secure a few ministerial seats—they stand ready to save the situatian for the imperialistic bourgeoisie, force the people to wait longer for the war's end, to prolong the slaughter of the peoples. They want to patch up things, to blur the class character of capitalist rule and Prussian reaction, in order to make these acceptable to the people.

"What were the conditions under which the government Socialists consented to do lackey's service? The solemn repudiation by the German government of annexations and indemnities! Yes, at this moment, when English and French field guns are making efforts not to allow the German Government to secure annexations and indemnities! There is still more: suffrage reform in Prussia! Yes, at this moment, when universal suffrage, because of the shameless role of the Reichstag during the war, has become an empty husk. And these lackeys of the bourgeoisie did not even demand that the Reichstag should sit continuously. Thus they express their readiness, in return for a few contemptible ministerial portfolios, to act in the comedy of a "reformed" Germany in order to defend the rule of the capitalists against the action of the people. This is all that "reforms" mean.

"Our task consists precisely in this, that we must destroy this agreement against the proletariat and the future of Socialism. Everything is now at stake. Down with Prussian reaction and the rule of Capitalism! The problem now is to secure an immediate and permanent peace! But to secure permanent peace this is necessary: the destruction of militarism, the rule of the people, and a republic. The German proletariat must become the master of the situation. Onward, under the flag of Socialism! Long live the Revolution of the international proletariat!

"We must not look forward to the victory of Anglo-French Imperialism. If military might should dictate terms of peace, then lost will be the cause of freedom and Socialism. No matter which guns are victorious, whether German or English, the working class everywhere would have to pay. International reaction and militarism, if they are victorious, will fasten upon the working class chains ten times heavier than the old.

"The proletariat of all countries must end the slaughter by means of revolt. The revolutionary proletariat alone can dictate terms of peace in the interests of freedom and Socialism.

The hour to act has come. The English and the French workers may follow the German workers. Onward, German workers and soldiers, male and female! Forward to the battle for freedom, for an immediate peace and Socialism! Onward to the brotherhood of all peoples under the flag of free labor! Down with the class rule of the bourgeoisie! All power to the proletariat! Long live the international Revolution of the proletariat!"

The entrance of Scheidemann & Co. into the capitalist government did not abate the revolutionary crisis: it developed more acutely. Everywhere the proletariat turned to revolutionary mass action. The government—"Socialist" farce of a "reformed" Germany did not deceive the masses. Freedom for Karl Liebknecht was demanded, and granted by the frightened government, by a brutal government trying to prove itself "good." A great demonstration was arranged for Liebknecht in Berlin, huge masses welcoming him and his revolutionary utterances, while they acclaimed the Socialist Republic and sent their fraternal greetings to the Russian Soviets.

Upon the development of the revolutionary crisis in Germany, the Soviet Government issued a proclamation to the German proletariat offering them help in making their revolution, and an army to co-operate, if necessary, in a revolutionary war against Anglo-French Imperialism and for the world revolution. Lenin took the initiative, and said to the Soviet Executive Committee: "The revolutionary crisis in Germany shows either a revolution begun or a revolution inevitable in the near future. Placing Scheidemann & Co. in the government will simply hasten the revolutionary explosion. We had decided to have an army of one million men by spring, but we shall now need an army of three million."

(This Article Will Be Concluded Next Week)

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.

THE RED FLAG

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

VOL. 1 NO. 5 VANCOUVER, B. C., SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 1919 Five Cents

A Voice Out of Russia

The following is the concluding portion of an article published in the New York "Dial" of Jan. 2 this year. The first part of the article covers the economic conditions prevailing in Russia and the development of the political situations there up to the Bolsheviki taking control.

We publish this because it is the testimony of a Russian of the "Right Social Revolutionary" wing, which at first bitterly opposed the Bolsheviki program, but who, by the logic of events, has been led to ally himself with them as the only constructive political force in Russia:

. . . . One way or another, fourteen months ago the power was transferred definitely and finally to the Soviets, with the Bolsheviki as the dominating political power. And thus came their turn to decide the vital questions of war, state, and economic organization. The question of the war they decided to solve immediately. They disclosed the secret treaties showing imperialistic war aims of the Entente, at the same time offering the Allies a general democratic peace. The latter did not even answer! And this fact is of utmost importance, because it arouses serious doubt as to who was betrayed by whom—whether we have betrayed the Allies, or the Allies have betrayed us. Not having received any answer, the Soviet government started pourparlers for a separate peace. It could not possibly have acted differently. It was impossible to wage war further: the army had run away, the railroads had come to a standstill. Nevertheless, when the predatory tendencies of the kaiser became evident, the Soviet government delayed the ratification of the peace treaty and entered into negotiations with the Allies, promising to re-establish the Russian front if the Allies would come to their aid. The Allies did not accept this proposal, the sincerity of which can hardly be doubted. Lenin was obliged to present the Brest-Litovsk peace treaty for ratification to the Congress of Soviets. At that moment, as far as I am concerned, the question as to who betrayed whom was finally understood and decided. Upon presenting the peace treaty for ratification of the congress, Lenin did not deny it was humiliating. But at the same time he insisted that his humiliation was temporary, that the German revolution was not far away. Many did not believe it at that time, but now the German revolution is an accomplished fact.

As far as state organization was concerned, the Soviet government decided that at that time the question could be postponed. Russia was in the throes of a social revolution and in the midst of a struggle with internal and external enemies of the new order. Russia is being built by the plain people, by the peasants—slowly, firmly, and without any definite plan. To foretell into what forms this rebuilding will finally shape is utterly impossible. It can, however, be definitely said that the present rebuilding of Russia is not the last word of the Russian revolution. The word "Soviet" will probably remain with us forever. The Russian people grew fond of it. It was also adopted in Germany, but the meaning attached to this word will be perfected in the future. However, it must be kept in mind that the controversy which split Russian society into two uncompromising camps does not pertain to its meaning. This controversy does not formally touch upon the ideology of the future, but solely concerns the tactics of the present. The adherents of one camp say that it is first necessary to shape Russia into a definite political form, to establish a permanent government and to let it decide social problems slowly; that it is beyond the strength of the Russian people to accomplish a social and political revolution at the same time; that it is necessary to be satisfied for the present with the political revolution alone, and to bring about the social reforms through evolution. More than that, representatives of this camp insist that our people are young and "dark"; that the time has not arrived for them to decide their own destiny; that the people do not know what they need, but that they, the representatives of the radicals and the Socialist Intelligentsia, do know. Therefore they are the ones to govern the "dark" people, to educate the people to prepare the people for self-government.

The representatives of the opposition camp, on the other hand, insist that their experiences with the first two provisional governments and especially with the third—the Omsk government, which is now dormant in the pocket of Kolchak—is sufficient warning not to repeat mistakes. Their deep conviction is that the Russian people are interested most of all in social reforms and demand these reforms immediately by revolutionary means. Yes, the Russian people are "dark" and uncultured, but they possess a natural common sense. They will acquire their knowledge in the process of reconstruction. Without the Intelligentsia they cannot possibly get along, but they want to select from the latter those who are willing to serve them, and not those who want to govern them against their will. The "darkness" of the Russian masses naturally obstructs the tempo of the Russian revolution. I repeat, Russia is being rebuilt by the peasants—slowly, firmly, and without any definite plan. In this process of rebuilding much has to be broken down. It is also true that it is beyond the power of the Russian people to accomplish both political and social reconstruction. Now the Russian people are busy with the construction of a new social order, and when this shall have been crystallized into definite form, they can begin the political construction of Russia.

It can be foretold already that for the new social conditions new political forms will be required. It may also be predicted that neither the French nor the American clothes will fit the free Russian peasant; it will be necessary to sew special Russian clothes of new cuts. And such work requires time and care: "Measure the cloth seven times and cut it once," says an old Russian proverb. And history confirms it. Of all the constitutions that were ever written on our planet, the most flexible one has proved to be the Constitution of the United States. Written in 1787, with seventeen amendments, it is alive today. But it must not be forgotten that it was written in 1787, eleven years after the declaration of Independence. Why then ask of Russia that she write her political constitution in definite form only one year after the revolution, a revolution deeper than that of 1776? It may be retorted that social reforms require just as much care; that they also cannot be decided in haste. I perfectly agree with this, but I also understand that the Russian people do not care to wait any longer and do not trust the "masters." No words are strong enough to convince me to the contrary. To back one's arguments with Japanese bayonets and English machine guns is just as criminal, in my opinion, as to assassinate one's own mother. And all the outcries of the interventionists—that this is a "democratic" way of helping Russia—are mere hypocrisy.

When one and one-half years ago the monarchy was overthrown in Russia, I, as well as many others, believed that Russia could not cope with the political revolution, war, and the social revolution at the same time. It was true. We were thrown out of the war, and for this we had to pay with the Brest-Litovsk treaty. But we are confronted with an accomplished fact and we are powerless to turn back the wheel of events. We have lost the war, but in social progress we have taken tremendous steps ahead. And now the question is—What are we to do? Insist that the social revolution is untimely? Shall we, together with the reactionaries and Czarists, liquidate all the gains of the revolution and assist the French and English in dividing Russia among themselves? Or shall we, with our opponents from the Left, defend Russia and the revolution from her internal and foreign enemies? As far as I am concerned, there can be no question, and that is why, while remaining a Moderate Socialist, I sincerely and conscientiously believe that I must serve Russia under the Soviet banner.

There is still another point to be considered. We may not fully agree with the Soviet government; we may doubt the possibility of realizing some of its ideals, but we can hardly deny the fact that it is consistent and clear in its demands. The opponents of the Soviet government have no platform whatsoever and they cannot have any. They represent the most picturesque conglomerate: side by side with old revolutionists we see former officials of the Czar's police; side by side with noble dreamers we see the faces of criminals; side by side with monarchists we see anarchists—all of them are united in their mad desire to overthrow the Soviet government; and the old English diplomats, who are operating behind their backs, have finally realized that such a union is not stable and that it must be replaced by a whip.

And so the Siberian khedive Kolchak has appeared on the horizon. He began his political career with the arrest of the members of the Constituent Assembly, with the reopening of the vodka factories, and with the reintroduction of the Czar's rules against Jews. So the question is as follows: Kolchak or the Soviets?—The dictatorship of the working people, or the dictatorship of an insig-

(Continued on Page Three)

SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

SUNDAY, FEB. 16

At 8 p.m. Sharp

EMPRESS THEATRE

Corner Gore and Hastings

J. SMITH ..... Speaker

J. LIVINGSTONE ..... Chairman