THE RED FLAG

VOL. I. No. 1 SATURDAY, DECEMBER 28, 1918 Five Cents

They Are Still There!

By JOHN REED

AT the present time the Allied armies in Russia—American troops among them—are supporting three "Governments" at Archangel, Vladistock and Omsk. These "Governments," which are said to be "supported by the majority of the Russian people" (whoever they may be), have one characteristic in common; they stand for the return of Czardom. So that the Allies, who started out with the scarcely-disguised intention of "restoring the Constituent Assembly," and thus setting up a bourgeois Republic, now find themselves in the position of gendarmes of the Counter Revolution.

According to official statements of the American and Japanese governments, the objects of intervention in Russia were, protection of military supplies in Archangel and Vladivostock against German and Austrian war- prisoners, and assistance to the Czecho-Slovaks, who were presumably trying to leave Russia. The most "solemn and public" promises were given by both governments that they had no intention of "interfering in the internal affairs of Russia." But the British government, which was associated with the Americans and Japanese, stated through Lloyd George that the purpose of the intervention was to create "a center for the elements opposed to Bolshevism." And the French government, whose aims in Russia can least bear the light of liberal scrutiny, did not deign to publish them.

As soon as foreign troops landed on Russian soil, the Commissaire for Foreign Affairs, Tchitcherin, addresed a note to the Allied and American governments asking why no notice of intervention had ever been givn to the government, and demanding a bill of complaint.

"If the Allied and American governments have any cause for complaint against the conduct of the government of the Russian Republic," he said in effect, "we respectfully ask why it has not been called to our attention, that we may satisfy it. . . ."

When the armistice with Germany was signed by the Allied and American governments, Tchitcherin asked for an armistice with the Soviet government also.

Both these communications were ignored. It may be urged that neither the Allies nor the United States recognized or now recognize the Russian government. But for months all these governments carried on semi-official relations with Russia, have made demands on it again and again; and in March, President Wilson publicly addressed the Fourth Congress of Soviets as representatives of the Russian people. . . . Is the only conclusion posible from all this that the aims of intervention are so frankly imperialistic that any statement of them would be extremely compromising. . . . ?

Even those persons who were persuaded by the Sisson documents and other forgeries, and the subsidized propaganda of Miliukov's Ambassador in Washington, Mr. Bakhmetiev, that Lenin and Trotzky were German agents, must now be considerably puzzled. If it were true that the Bolsheviki in Russia were a tyrannical minority supported by German gold and German bayonets, the collapse of Imperial Germany would necessary entail the collapse of the Bolsheviki—just as it entailed the collapse of the Ukrainian dictatorship and the "National Council" of the Baltic provinces. But the defeat of Germany has merely strengthened the Russian Soviet government. Only the most credulous will be able to swallow the accusation of the capitalistic press that the Kaiser, defeated in Germany, is still ruler of Russia!

One of the armistice terms imposed upon Germany requires that the indemnity paid by Russia to Germany must be surrendered to the Allies—to hold in trust for some future Russian government. This government, of course, must be acceptable to the Allies. There remains in Russia no force with any power except the force of the Black Hundreds — the Dark Forces against which the Russian people revolted in March, 1917, to the applause of the liberal world; any other government set up in Russia must immediately fall, for the Russian "moderates" and "liberals" have no following whatever.

This is clearly shown by the history of the various so-called "Governments" which have been set up and supported by Allied troops. These governments—the governments of the North, at Archangel, the All-Russian Provisional Governments at Ufa and at Omsk, and the Siberian Government at Irkutsk, centered about certain reactionary delegates to the Constituent Assembly—Tschaikovsky, Avksentiev, Zenzinov and others; men who were too conservative even for the "moderate" Socialist parties to which they belonged under Kerensky's regime.

It is a proof of the power of the Bolsheviki over the masses of the people, and a justification of the dispersal of the Constituent Assembly, that these "liberals" and "Socialists" were forced to depend for their fighting forces upon renegade Cossacks and Chinese mercenaries under outcasts like General Seminov, Horvath and Gurko, and Admiral Kolchak; upon the Czecho-Slovaks, the Japanese and the Allies. . . . And as was natural in such a situation, even the Allied and American troops could not save these "governments" from being overthrown by the Russian riff-raff they had evoked to fight their battles.

The pressure upon the Russian Soviets has been terrible. The Allied diplomatic representatives in Moscow, it seems, made use of their diplomatic privileges to plot counter-revolution and even the blowing up of bridges and munitions work, after the pattern of the Kaiser's hirelings in this country. Armed attacks have failed. Deliberate and concerted efforts are being made to starve the Russian people into submission. In answer to this the Russian Soviet government, while Allied troops were actually shooting down Russian peasants by the thousand in the North and on the East, treated subjects and citizens of the Allied nations and the United States with the greatest consideration. And in all this time they have left no stone unturned to make peace—even, according to dispatches offering reparation for property confiscated or destroyed in Russia, and for repudiated debts.

Shall the United States be a party to what, after all, has inevitably taken on the significance of an attempt to restore the Russian Czar?

FAMINE IN RUSSIA

A striking light is thrown on the cause of food difficulties which are experienced by Soviet Russia, by a letter written on September 4th by M. Rene Marchand, the well-known "Figaro" correspondent in Russia, to M. Poincare, the original of which has been discovered during a search made in his house by the agents of the Extraordinary Commission for Fighting the Counter Revolution, and which is now published by the Moscow "Isvestia.' 'In the course of his letter, M. Marchand deplores the fact that—"Of late we have allowed ourselves to be drawn exclusively into a fight against Bolshevism thus engaging, without any advantage whatsoever to the interests of the Entente, in a policy which can have no other result than intensifying unnecessarily the sufferings and despair of the Rusian people, to aggravate the existing anarchy and to accentuate the famine and civil war as well as the party feuds."

M. Marchand then reports a secret conference at the American Consulate-General at the end of August last, which was attended, in addition to the American Consul-General Poole, by all the other representatives of the Allied Governments and by himself.

"I then learnt that the British Agent was preparing the destruction of the railway bridge over the river Volkhoff. A glance at the map will show that the destruction of this bridge would be equivalent to the delivery of Petrograd to death by starvation. The British agent added the information that he had already made an attempt to blow up the Tcherpoff Viaduct which would have had the same disastrous effcet on the food supply of Petrograd. The conversation then turned on the subject of the destruction of the various railway lines. One of the agents mentioned that he had secured the valuable assistance of the railway employees, who, however, were opposed to destruction on a large scale; the corrupted employees were only prepared to assist in th blowing-up of trains carrying war materials. I do not want to dwell upon details but I am profoundly convinced that these were not isolated acts on the part of individual agents. But even if they were isolated acts their effect would be equally pernicious; they are calculated to draw Russian into an endless and even bloodier political fight and to deliver it to inhuman sufferings by death and starvation. Moreover, the sufferings would affect almost entirely the poor and the middle classes of the population, while the richer people and the bourgeoisie would always be abie to find the means of escaping to the Ukraine or abroad."

M. Marchand notes that throughout the conference not a single word was uttered about fighting Germany, and expresses his profound conviction that the Soviet Government would not call in Germany to its assistance.

BERLIN SOVIETS TO ESTABLISH AN ARMY

COUNCIL OF PEOPLE'S COMMISSARIES CLAIMS SOLE RIGHT TO DECIDE UPON NUMBER AND STRENGTH OF VOLUNTEER " NATIONAL GUARD."

Amsterdam, Holland (Monday)—The Council of People's Commissaries in Berlin has signed a law for the formation of a volunteer national guard for the maintenance of public order and safety. The law provides that the guard shall be solely under the Council's control, while the latter also has the sole right to form detachments of the guard and fix their number and strength.

The guard, which is to be pledged to support the Socialist and democratic republic is to be outside the framework of the army, and the volunteers composing it are to choose their own leaders.

Nov. 15 Paris "Matin" said : "Let us avoid the formation of a Bolshevist *bloc* in central Europe. To prevent it, let us erect a barrier between Russia and Germany. *Let us send an army to Danzig.*"

Wages and High Prices in Russia

By M. BRONSKY.

ONE of the most important questions in the economic life of a country is that relating to the struggle against the high cost of living. The wages of the workers do not keep pace with the high cost of living which is moving forward with terrific speed. No matter how much wages are increased the price of the articles of prime necessity increase much more swiftly. The increase of wages is not moving parallel with the growth of high prices, but it moves by jumps, under the pressure of struggle, strikes, threats, and all sorts of administrative demands.

During the period of eight months of the bourgeois revolution in Russia, the workers obtained a number of changes in the scale of wages, and in this manner they met the high cost of living; they tried to insure themselves against a return to the old, terrible conditions of labor and wages by "tying" the capitalist with "regulations" for a definite period of time.

But the "regulative" contracts are of value only when the prices on the products of consumption are more or less stable. As soon, however, as this stability disappears, when prices on bread, meat, butter, wood, rooms, clothes ,shoes, and other necessary articles are changed not daily but hourly, then these "regulative" contracts become obsolete and insufficient before the expiration of the time limit, and they appear to be only an obstacle in the struggle of the workers, rather than a weapon for curbing the capitalists. This brings a condition where, in spite of the contracts, the workers, here and there, demand an increase in wages in order to prevent their condition of life becoming worse.

It is clear, then, that to fight the high cost of living one must choose another path, and the increase of of wages at the present time, a time of paper-currency, does not guarantee the worker from the high cost of living. The oftener the wage changes, the more influence it has on speculation, on the increase of merchandise prices and it would have required a most strict and exact regulation of fixed prices in order that the increase of wages should not effect, in its turn, the worker as a consumer, in the form of an avalanche of high prices on all products of consumption.

The increase in wages because of the paper-currency circulation, the tendency of a sudden drop in the rate of the rouble, does not increase proportionally its purchasing power. As a matter of fact, the continuous jump in the high cost of living is chiefly the result of the dropping in the value of the rouble. The other side of this drop in the value of the rouble is speculation, the struggle against which must go simultaneously with other means of fighting the high cost.

And to fight high prices one must proceed from two ends at once: by raising the value of the rouble, its stability. and, on the other end, by the increase of real wages.

It is necessary, in short, to try to make things so that one could get more products for a rouble and that wages should not only be given in paper tender, but represent real purchasing power.

It is clear that this program of fighting high prices cannot merely go on within the boundaries of one factory, or one city, but is an economic program on an all-Russian scale.

We have already pointed out that to raise the value of a rouble can be only achieved by increasing the mass of products in the merchandise market.

And this is why the rouble drops in its purchasing power, because having been forced to issue paper roubles during the war in great quantity, we at the same time used up a great mass of products in the war.

Even now we shall be compelled to issue paper money, but our economic problem is the production of merchandise, necessary not for war,but for the requirements of the country. If these hundreds of thousands of workmen who work in the war factories, will begin to produce products for consumption or machines, which lighten labor and increase the productivity of labor; if these millions of soldiers who are listed in the armies, will return to productive labor,—then the value of the rouble will rise. For only then the supply of merchandise will be increased in comparison with the demand, only then will those who purchase products also be in some degree the producers of these products.

Thus, the most substantial means of fighting high prices, that is, to fight the decrease of the purchasing power of the rouble, is the increase of the country's productivity, by means of increase in the number of persons working on productive needs of the people's economy.

It is understood, that this path is long, and that one cannot expect in the near future apparent results. But this is the only path leading to the goal.

But the workers cannot wait. Their wage scale established a few months ago, can scarcely meet the systematic rise in the prices of products of first necessity.

It is necessary to take extraordinary measures in order, on the one hand, to safeguard the workers' families against a lack of products of prime necessity, and on the other hand, protect the country against industrial disorganization.

Especially now, political power is in the hand of the proletariat and peasantry, it would be folly and incompetence for the proletarian government to allow the closing of factories and plants, lockout and strikes, as a means of the economic struggle of the proletariat.

The strike is a method of struggle of the proletariat in bourgeois society, is a means of compelling the capitalists to make concessions, under the threat of holding up the source of profits—a method which costs the worker very dearly, and affects the whole of society. If the government now is in the hands of representatives of the working class, and if the class interests of the workers coincide with the interests of the whole of society, it would have been a crime on the part of the proletarian government to let the workers defend their interests by the costly and difficult way of strikes—the way of closing the factories.

We are face to face with the problem of solving the high cost of living from an absolutely different angle; owing to the unreality of the increase in wages it is necessary to provide the workers with these products which compose the greater part of expenditure in the budget of the workers's family.

In the first place are the expenses of subsistence: bread, meat, potatoes, butter, etc., further, the expenses for room rent, heating and lighting; then follow the expenses for clothing, shoes, underwear, etc.; and then expenses for cultural needs: schools, newspapers, books, medicines, etc. Thus, the nominal wage of the workers is divided into its component parts and must cover all the above-named expenses. If, instead, part of the money-wages is paid to the workers in products for which they spend their wages, and on the rest of the products to establish fixed prices,—then as a matter of fact the nominal rise of wages measured in roubles can be stopped, increasing its real power, and providing the workers with products of prime necessity. By organizing public restaurants for all categories of workers and their families, it is possible not only to lessen the burden on the workers' wives in preparing breakfasts, dinners and suppers (economy of labor and fuel); but it is possible to provide their subsistence and in fact to raise the purchasing power of that part of wages which is being spent for subsistence. The public lunch rooms which can be established at the factories, or in the working quarters, can actually increase wages materially, and not simply nominally in roubles.

In this manner could be solved the question of rent. Here, more radical means will have to be employed. The expenses for rent are going directly into the pockets of landlords who collect from the tenants the rents on the capital invested in building the house. This is one of the sources of the capitalist's profit, which less than anything else has the right to exist. The question of nationalzation or municipalization of houses is a question of the near future. The moratorium on the rents is only a temporary measure and must give way to municipalization of the houses and State monopoly of the city real estate. By instituting socialization (municipalization) of houses, we, in this way, decrease that part of the wages which is being expended for rent. Simultaneously with this the income of city and State will be increased (rents considerably lessened go to the city and State treasures); in this way the city and the State will be able to put into life such institutions (free schools, dispensaries, theatres, museums and so forth), which, in their turn, absorb great sums from the wages of the workers.

Only in this way is it possible to fight the high cost of living.

As a necessary form of the transition period and as a means of fighting speculation, it is necessary to establish fixed prices not only on the chief products of food, but also on products of consumption in general.

In a word, the struggle against the high cost of living by the proletarian-peasant government cannot tread the old path of increasing the nominal wage, but it must follow the path of establishing a real wage by providing all the working masses with the necessary means of consumption.

The above article, from the *Moscow Pravda,* was evidently written just after the Soviet government was established in Russia. How to reduce prices has a different application when the proletariat control the powers of production.

Increase your production until there is an abundance of products for consumption and prices fall! Impossible under capitalism with profiteering in production, for the capitalist curtails production by closing down his industry and perhaps diverts his capital to other fields when prices fall to the point where the returns on capital are affected.

Premier Lenine, Trotsky, and other prominent Soviet officials, in their addresses to the workers, have always stressed on the absolute necessity of raising productive power as the primary solution to the Russian problem. From many sources we hear of their surprising success in the face of stupendous obstacles, externally and internally, which have been thrown in their way.

The following clipping from the Vancouver *Province* of December 24, may serve as an instance corroborating what other reports say:

REAL RESTORATION.

London, Dec. 24.—Capping a growing wave of suspicion, evidenced in the Liberal British press during the past month, the *New Statesman* today makes the sensational announcement that Bolsheviki, supported now by many former opponents, are effecting a real restoration of Russian order.

The *New Statesman,* far from being an organ of the extreme Radicals, is regarded as being a sober element with a large circulation among Liberal intellectuals.

The article has undoubtedly heightened the spreading impression that the full truth has not yet come out of Russia.

Agitation is increasing in favour of compelling the government to state explicitly its attitude toward Russia. It is now regarded as practically certain this agitation will result in President Wilson being urged to declare his stand in the Russian situation during his visit here.

INDUSTRIES STARTING.

"Order is more thoroughly re-established in Russia now than at any time since the fall of czardom," said the *New Statesman.* "Food distribution is better organized than at any time during the whole war. Factories are rapidly starting up again as fast as raw materials can be obtained. Management of the factories by committees failed for obvious reasons. Management by the soviets with consultative committees of employees has been substituted with growing success.

"The Bolsheviki, though hampered by undesirable tools, are clearing the country of bribery and corruption. Terror has ceased. It has been greatly exaggerated. If Nikolai Lenine had not been in bed as the result of a wound there would have been no 'Tr-ror' in Moscow. There have been no executions in Moscow for two months. During the 'Terror' there were 400 executions, of which 60 per cent. were corrupt soviet officials. Inefficiency is being remedied by rapid recruiting from the educated classes.

"Any government established by us will need the support of foreign bayonets, as the Russian proletariat are thoroughly imbued with Bolshevism."

THE APPEAL OF THE FINNISH WORKERS.

The following proclamation, copies of which have y lately reached this country, was issued at Stock- n early in August by the Central Committee of Foreign department of the Finnish Workers' vernment.

gain we appeal to the workers in all countries. Comrades! htful is the fate of the Socialist workers in Finland. Four ths have elapsed since the defeat of the revolution, but still the hite Terror is raging in the country. It is obvious that the Finn- bourgeoisie intends to destroy all the organized Socialist workers, l the seventy or eighty thousand revolutionaries, who are now starving in detention camps in various parts of the country.

From day to day the endless destruction of the organized workers continues. Hundreds die every day of hunger and disease. From day to day their executions go on, based upon decisions of special field court-martials., and instigated by the spirit of revenbe and class hatred on the part of individuals. In every detention camp the number of such murdered workers grows into hundreds upon hundreds. It is estimated that the White Terror in Finland has already killed almost as many people as lost their lives in the civil war—about 20,000 men, women and children; and this mad orgy of murder is not yet ended.

More than 100 field court-martials pronounce their sentences, life imprisonment, long prison terms, confiscation of private property of individuals. They are not treated as prisoners of war, but as ordinary criminals who are accused of murder, pillage, etc., the verdict covering all their acts from the time of the Socialist Government, and action taken in open warfare during the civil war. Arbitrary decisions of the courts and class hatred dictate the sentences.

The White Guards themselves say that the life of a Socialist is not worth that of a dog, and without any penalty anyone may kill a Socialist at any time.

Comrades, workers of all countries. Listen to the martyr outcry of organized labor in Finland. Let your voice be heard! The White Terror, which the Finnish bourgeoisie does not want to stop, intends to destroy the proletariat of Finland to the last man and woman. We appeal to that international solidarity which has been proclaimed so long. Urge your governments to take up the blood question of Finland!

Comrades in Russia, who yourselves have experienced the cruelties of the White Guards! Remember the fate of the revolutionary workers of Finland, and be ready to fight to the last drop of blood against the attacking enemies of the revolution; and arouse the workers in other countries in our defense(

Comrades in Scandinavia and in the Allied countries! Arouse a storm of protest against the executioners of the people of Finland! Spread the news about our fate to the people of the world!

Comrades in Germany and Austria! If our words reach you at all, we want to say to you, rise and put down your government. It was the German army which defeated the workers rule in Finland and which is now facilitating the reign of the White Terror. Do not say to us "Am I my brother's keeper?" It is better to die than to be an international scab and an executioner of the workers.

"The crucified labor of Finland appeals to its class comrades in all countries. You must prove in practice that international class solidarity does exist. Comrades and workers in all countries, listen to the martyr outcry from Finland!—New York "Nation," Nov. 30.

RUSSIA AND THE CZECHO-SLOVAKS.

A Stockholm dispatch of November 3, announced that M. Tschitcherin, People's Commissary for Foreign Affairs, had telegraphed to the Provisional Czecho-Slovak Government at Prague offering to allow the Czecho-Slovaks in Russia to return home if they would lay down their arms and guarantee their safety. On this point the following statement sen tout by Russian wireless on Nov. 1, is close up in forming. The statement is a good example of Russian official documents frequently communicated to the press by the British Government and printed in leading newspapers.

"The Russian Workmen's and Peasants' Councils' Government, which represents large masses of the working population of Russia, and which in all its actions has always expressed its will to defend the interests of the laboring classes, this Russian Government declares solemnly to the Provisional Government of the Czecho-Slovaks that never has it ever entered their minds to deliver the Czecho-Slovaks, who have found refuge in Russia, over to Austria-Hungarians."

This is a baseless affirmation on the part of the counter-revolutionary caluminators. At the beginning of this year the Councils' Government agreed with the French and English Governments as to permission for the Czecho-Slovaks in Russia to go to France, but months and months passed, and France, in spite of her promise did not furnish the ships for transporting these Czecho-Slovaks. In the meantime, agents of the French and English capitalistic governments led the Czecho-Slovaks into error, and subjected them to counter-revolutionary influences. They put at their head Russian reactionaries, agents of the infamous oldCzarist regime. All measures which the Councils' Government was forced to take against the Czecho-Slovaks were merely measures of legitimate defense against the counter-revolutionary movement, which aimed at the deposition of the people's authority in Russia. The many victories won by the Red army of revolutionary workmen and peasants of Russia over the Czecho-Slovak detachments and White Guards, prove that the Czecho-Slovak detachments are powerless to depose the revolutionary government of Russian workmen and peasants. The Councils' Government, in spite of the success of its forces, has no other wish than to terminate this useless shedding of blood, and declares to the Provisional Government of the Czecho-Slovaks that it is ready to allow the Czecho-Slovaks to cross Russia as soon as they have laid down their arms, and to give them a complete guarantee as regards security for their return home.

The Councils' Government wishes to enter into direct negotiations with the Provisional Government of the Czecho-Slovaks, with a view to elaborating the conditions for the return home of those Czecho-Slovaks who are willing to go back to the territories which are now under the authority of the Czecho-Slovak Provisional Government of Prague. The Councils' Government will thank the Czecho-Slovak Government for a reply."

(Signed) Tschitcherin,
People's Commissary for Foreign Affairs.
Moscow, Oct. 31, 1918.
New York "Nation" of Nov. 3th.

BOLSHEVIST TROOPS CONTINUE ADVANCE

The Christian Science Monitor, Dec. 19.

STOCKHOLM, Sweden (Wednesday)—A message from the Esthonian War Department to the Esthonian delegation here states:

"The Bolshevist forces are advancing on a wide front. The winter weather and condition of the roads makes defense difficult. Our small army is facing the Lettish Bolsheviki, who are 20 miles from Dorpat.

"They are likely to occupy the town before the German evacuation on Friday. We have evacuated Wesenberg."

An Open Letter to American Liberals

By SANTERI NUORTEVA.

Representative of the Finnish Workers' Republic.

THE letter that follows has been sent to a number of prominent American liberals with whom Comrade Nuorteva, as official representative of the People's Republic of Finland, has repeatedly had occasion to discuss the general situation in Russia and in Finland.

They have shown interest in and appreciation of the importance and difficulty of the problems which the peoples of the countries in question were called upon to solve.

Comrade Nuorteva addressed these gentlemen not purely and solely as a personal matter, but as exponents and representatives of a group that has preserved and embodies the best American traditions, without having become contaminated by the sordidness of machine politics—the liberals of America.

They must accept the responsibility that goes with their station as well as with their historical antecedents—either protest against what they cannot justify or become responsible as fully as if they had themselves done that which they failed to oppose.

Sir:

So it did happen after all. America, the "sponsor of the new freedom," America, the "founder of world democracy," is in Russia to-day, together with the Japanese, British, French and Italians, Colonel Semenoff, General Horvath and other Russian reactionaries, to destroy the Bolshevist revolution. That is what the intervention amounts to, all reassurances notwithstanding.

I don't know that I have any business to write to you about Russia. I don't know that you have any time or interest to spare to consider the world drama which is being played in the far East. I don't know whether your patriotic efforts at bringing about class harmony in America will leave you time enough to see how your government and other governments are trying their utmost to prove to the world in Russia that conflicting class interests never can be conciliated.

Yet, somehow, I cannot refrain from writing you these lines. The greatest crime the history of the world ever has witnessed is being perpetrated against the Russian people—under the guise of "helping Russia,"—a crime as much blacker than that of the German imperialists, as is a stab in the back from a man pretending to be a friend more repugnant than a blow in the face from a confessed enemy. The Germans were at least frank in their indecency. They never pretended "helping Russia." And in Germany even the despicable Scheidemanns had enough moral stamina to raise their voices in the German Reichstag against the brigand terms imposed upon Russia by the Brest-Litovsk "peace" treaty. German papers printed vigorous criticism of Germany's policy in Russia. Here nobody dares to say anything,—least of all you, the so-called liberals, who have been trying to persuade us, the "dogmatic Socialists," that class interests are not the paramount issue in the world war and that there is some guarantee to the democracy of the world in the idealistic aims of great individuals.

What are you doing in Russia, sir? I am saying *you*, because *as long as you have not raised your voice in protest, you are responsible for it along with all the others.*

Why did you go to Russia, and what do you expect to get out of it? You went there to"help the Czecho-Slovaks," of course! That is what the diplomatic declarations said. To help the Czecho-Slovaks to get out of Russia to fight on the western front. But aside from the fact that these declarations speak of the westward movement of the Czecho-Slovaks,—and nobody certainly imagines that the Czecho-Slovaks can go to the western front by moving westward from Siberia—you will remember that the intervention plans regarding Russia were laid long before the editors of the American papers learned how to spell the name of Czecho-Slovaks, or before they knew whether the Czecho-Slovaks were inhabitans of Africa or Australia.

Some time ago I saw a plan of Russian intervention, which was submitted to the State Department by some great defenders of American business and democracy. It was submitted last March, and it openly spoke of the necessity of finding a pretext for intervention in Russia. Very frankly it contemplated the possibility of inducing somebody to invite an Allied intervention. The Cadet Party was expected to do the inviting—even the Cadets did not dare openly to invite foreign intervention in Russia. The statement purporting to come from the Cadet Party, inviting Allied intervention, was fabricated in Paris by former Russian ambassadors and other adventurers who represented nobody but themselves. Even Kerensky could not be induced to plead for an armed intervention in Russia,

(*Continued on page* 6,)

A Problem in Tactics

By LOUIS C. FRAINA

THE great fact of contemporary history is the proletarian revolution in action. This great fact, the affirmation in life of the theory of Socialism, is now deciding the destiny of the proletariat, and of the world.

And the great fact of contemporary Socialism is that this proletarian revolution proceeds by means of an implacable struggle between Socialism and Socialism, between mutually exclusive conceptions of Socialism.

The uncritical Socialist rhapsodizes over the coming of Socialism in Russia, over the "Socialist" Republic in Germany; Socialism is conquering! But which Socialism—what conception of Sociailsm?

The proletarian revolution is in action in Germany, has been for one year and a half in action in Russia; and the most unrelenting enemy of this revolution, the enemy behind whom skulks the forces of Capitalism and reaction, is Socialism itself, or rather that "majority" Socialism which dominated the International before the war and betrayed Socialism during the war by transforming itself into an ally of social-imperialism.

In developing its action against Capitalism and Imperialism the revolutionary proletariat met a staggering surprise—the opposition of Socialism. Shaken by the impact of revolutionary events, and verging on collapse, Capitalism built its last line of defense—an alliance with the moderate, opportunistic "majority" Socialism. The real struggle in Russia, the real struggle in Germany now, is not between Socialism and Capitalism, but between Socialism and "Socialism," between revolutionary "minority" Socialism and petty bourgeois "majority" Socialism. The proletarian revolution against Capitalism and Imperialism is equally a revolution against the old moderate, petty bourgeois Socialism; the decisive phase of the Revolution and the decisive phase of the coming reconstruction of international Socialism—a fact which the American Socialist press either completely ignores or camouflages.

In Russia, in March, 1917, Czarism was overthrown and a bourgeois republic organized. Immediately antagonism developed between bourgeois and proletarian, between Capitalism and Socialism. Shaken by revolutionary proletarian action, by the determination of the proletariat to break through the breach created in the old order for action and the conquest of power, the bourgeosie concluded an alliance with moderate Socialism, with the "Socialism" of Cheidse, Plekhanov, Tseretelli, the Socialism of the Mensheviki and the Social-Revolutionary Party. What was this Socialism? In substance, in tactics, ideology and immediate purposes, it was identical with the majority Socialism that dominated the International during the war (and which is still dominant, except in Russia, Germany and Italy). It was this Socialism that was dominant in Russia before the Revolution, that captured the immagination of the Socialists of the world, that was considered the real expression of the Russian Socialist movement. This Socialism concluded an alliance with the bourgeoisie, by means of a "coalition government;" it opposed the coming of the proletarian revolution, acted by all means in its power against the revolutionary proletariat. After the proletarian revolution, in spite of all, conquered power, after a new Socialist state of the unified Soviets was organized, this "majority" Socialism stayed in the opposition, and elements of it, such as Maslov and Tchaikovsky, made agreements with international Imperialism for armed intervention—against the Soviet Republic, against the Russian masses, against the proletarian revolution! The decisive struggle in Russia was the struggle between revolutionary proletarian Socialism and moderate petty bourgeois Socialism.

A parallel course is being pursued by events in Germany. The "majority" Socialism of Scheidermann, Ebert & Co., of the Social-Democratic Party, of that party which before the war (and even now, in some quarters) was considered the exemplar of a Socialist Party, did all in its power to prevent action against the war and the government, to prevent the coming of a revolution; this "Socialism" intrigued against the proletarian revolution in Russia, trying to use it in the nationalistic interests of Germany, crushing the efforts of the masses to act in sympathy and solidarity with revolutionary Russia; and ten days before the mass action of the German proletariat flared up into the Revolution, this "majority" Socialism issued a proclamation against revolutionary action, against even strikes and demonstrations hostile to the government- But the revolution came; and now the "majority" Socialism of the Social-Democratic Party, the model of moderate Socialism everywhere, opposes the completion of the revolution, through its slavery to the petty bourgeois democracy of the Constituent Assembly it promotes Capitalism, tries to stultify the revolution within the limits of petty bourgeois action and reforms, is the real enemy of the revolution, the last line of defense of Imperialism and Capitalism in Germany. Simultaneously the pure (in type, but not in spirit) "Menshevik" Socialism of the "centre" Independent Socialists, of Haase & Co., acts equally against the revolution, by wavering between Scheidemann and Leibknecht, between petty bourgeois Socialism and proletarian Socialism. The democratic, parliamentary republic is organized in Germany, but instead of the struggle to transform this bourgeois republic into a Socialist republic, moderate Socialism in Germany, as in Russia, engages in the counter-revolutionary struggle to prevent this transformation!

Why?

All sorts of arguments are made to explain, or condone, the attitude of moderate Socialism in Russia. The war, say some; but why, now that the war is over, should moderate Socialism still act against the Soviet Republic? The Mensheviki and the Social-Revolutionists, say others, did not think a proletarian revolution could be accomplished; but why, after the revolution was accomplished, should the tendency of moderate Socialism still oppose the Soviet Republic, often in alliance with the bourgeois counter-revolution and international Imperialism? But the great argument of the Russian Mensheviki and their petty bourgeois Socialist supporters everywhere, is that Russia was industrially undeveloped, economically unripe for Socialism, the proletariat not strong enough to make a proletarian revolution and introduce Socialism. Socialism, say these perverters of Marxism, requires a highly developed Capitalism, ignoring that the coming of Socialism implies a series of international revolutionary class struggles in which proletarian class power decides the issue. Revolutionary Socialism in Russia was determined not alone in a struggle for the proletarian revolution in Russia, but for the proletarian revolution in Germany, and in Europe. Still, considering Russia alone, there was a deceptive color of truth to the argument that industrially undeveloped Russia was not prepared for a proletarian revolution.

But now consider Germany. Germany, industrially, is the very antithesis of Russia. If any nation in the world is industrially prepared for Socialism, it is Germany; a completely industrialized unit, in which the peasantry is a minor factor and the industrial proletariat at least one-half the population. Germany is a small country, territorially, close-knit by concentrated industry, in which concentrated industry controls. It is inconceivable that industry in Germany itself, under Capitalism, could develop any greater measure of maturity. Even the perverters of Marxism would admit that Germany, objectively, is ready for Socialism. *And yet, in spite of this difference with Russia, moderate petty bourgeois Socialism pursues in Germany the identical policy of moderate Socialism in Russia, is against the proletarian revolution, against Socialism in fact.*

Why? It is clear, it is incontrovertible, considering the dissimilarity of industrial conditions in Russia and Germany, and the similarity in policy of moderate Socialism, that there must be a general policy, one fundamental tactic, that each possesses and which determines them in a counter-revolutionary course.

It is not a question of individuals, or of their personal motives and character; but of the tendency they represent.

What this fundamental tendency is, is apparent upon considering that the issue that split Socialism in Russia and Germany, was the issue of "All power to the Soviets!"—the issue of state power; the issue, the old bourgeois state or a new proletarian state?

The fundamental tendency of moderate Socialism, which is at the same time the cause and the effect of its petty bourgeois ideology, the basis of its compromising tactics and opportunism, and the reason it avoids the real industrial struggle and rejects mass action, is the conception that the coming of Socialism is a process of introducing measures of socializatic, on the basis of the bourgeois parliamentary stat Petty bourgeois, moderate Socialism considers th "democratic" parliamentary state as the centre of it activity, the instrument for the coming of Socialism. Parliamentary action is the decisive instrument of action; nationalize industry after industry, perfect the "democracy" of the state, secure a parliamentary majority—and then comes Socialism!

This policy, clearly would determine moderate Socialism in Russia and in Germany in a struggle for the democratic parliamentary state. If the democratic state is the instrument for the introduction of Socialism, then the real struggle is to establish the democratic parliamentary state—which was precisely why moderate Socialism in Russia and in Germany was dominantly interested in the parliamentary state, adherents of bourgeois democracy.

But this policy of moderate Socialism has another aspect—if the state and parliamentary action are considered decisive, then the "co-operation of classes" becomes imperative. Socialism becomes the concern of all the classes which must unite in the introduction of Socialism—which was precisely the policy formulated by the German Social-Democratic Party in its Wuerzberg convention in 1916. This circumstance develops the corrupt, compromising, counter-revolutionary ideology of moderate Socialism.

Out of this policy emerges necessary and relentless opposition to "All power to the Soviets!"—to a dcitatorship of the proletariat. "All power to the Soviets!" implies a new state—but moderate Socialism believes the old parliamentary state is the instrument for the introduction of Socialism; proletarian Socialism implies the one-class state, that the introduction of Socialism is the concern of the proletariat and the proletariat alone—but moderate Socialism believes in the democratic state "of all the classes" and that the introduction of Socialism is the concern of all the classes, a process of class co-operation.

The fatal, un-proletarian character of this policy of moderate Socialism is not very apparent in normal times, except on the problem of unionism; but it becomes as clear as crystal in the Revolution, necessarily reveals its counter-revolutionary character. And all other defects of moderate Socialism are simply an expression of this fundamental tendency, this petty bourgeois policy.

Revolutionary Socialism, Marxism, completely repudiates the attitude of moderate Socialism on the problem of the state. Marxism projects, and revolutionary experience confirms, that the proletariat can not simply lay hold of the ready-made machinery of the bourgeois state and use it for its purposes; this machinery must be destroyed and a new state organized—the state of the organized producers, of proletarian dictatorship. Marxism conceives the introduction of Socialism as the process of one class, determined by the struggle of one class—the proletariat; all other classes, in the final test, are necessarily counter-revolutionary. It is imperative, accordingly, that the revolutionary proletariat annihilate the "democratic" state "of all other classes" in favor of the new proletarian state. And what is this new state? It

is simply the state of the organized producers—the working class; dispensing with the reactionary parliamentary forms and fraudulent democracy of the bourgeois state. The bourgeois state is an instrument of class rule, the authority of one class over another, its army, police and bureaucracy instruments for the terrorism of the proletariat. It is upon the basis of this new industrial state, with industrial and not territorial constituencies, that Socialism can be introduced. The complete political expropriation of the bourgeois is the necessary preliminary to his complete economic expropriation. The first concern of the revolutionary proletariat, accordingly, is the conquest of the state power by mass action, the annihilation of the bourgeois parliamentary state, and the organizing of a new proletarian state functioning temporarily as a dictatorship of the revolutionary proletariat. This state is the state of the organized producers — the state comprised in "all power to the Soviets!" Revolutionary Socialism in Germany and in Russia, instead of using the revolution, the breach in the old order, to "perfect" the "democratic" state, the completion of the proletarian revolution and the organization of the new proletarian state—a policy which alone can realize Socialism.

And, in terms of simplicity and life, this problem is comprised in the class struggle and life itself.

This great issue split Socialism in Russia and in Germany; it is decisive. It has many vital aspects; the relation of parliamentary action to all forms of proletarian action, the necessity of developing the dynamic mass action, of the industrial proletariat, the rejection of "class co-operation" under any and all conditions. To us in the United States, the problem of state power and its correlative aspects are instinct, for one thing, in the problem of industrial unionism. In the coming reconstruction of Socialism the problem of state power will play a decisive role.

The general policy comprised in the revolutionary attitude to the problem of state power is not realizable in an actual revolution alone; it affects the policy of Socialism and is realizable in general forms under any and all conditions, in the piping days of peace and in the stern days of revolutionary struggle.

Clippings From the Press

BRITISH GUNS FIRE ON BOLSHEVIST LINE

Stockholm, Sweden, (Tuesday)—A communication from official Esthonian sources announces that the British squadron was given an enthusiastic reception on its arrival at Reval. Representatives of the Esthonian Government put out to sea to welcome the Britsih ships and the quays were thronged with cheering crowds, whlie, later, many people offered the British sailors who came ashore, bread and salt as a token of welcome.

Subsequently an official Esthonian communique announced that the British squadron had bombarded the Bolshevist lines behind Wesenberg.

On the Asserien front, it is added, the enemy advance has been arrested, although on the Pskoff front, he continues to make progress.

Meanwhile mobilization of the Esthonian army is described as progressing satisfactorily, the Allied support having encouraged the population.

Meanwhile, a member of the Danish Legation, which reached Stockholm from Russia on Sunday on its way to Copenhagen described the situation in Petrograd as rapidly growing worse ,and said that the Bolsheviki were reliably credited with the intention of evacuating Petrograd, owing to the allied action.

Nijnl Novgorod is mentioned as the Soviet Governments future headquarters, and the Bolsheviki are said to intend increasing the Red Army from 1,000,000 to 3,000,000 men.—Christian Science Monitor, Dec. 18.

FINNISH DELEGATES LEAVE.

STOCKHOLM, Sweden (Wednesday)—Petrograd messages state that Professor Hirm and Dr. Toerngrem are leaving for Paris to represent Finland's interests at the Peace Conference.

TROOPS IN CHARGE AT KIEV.

Amsterdam, Holland (Monday).—A Kiev message via Berlin states that the town was occupied on Saturday by troops of "the Director," which consstis of Messrs Vinitchenko, Petlyure, Schwetz and Reivsky.

Mr. Setman has abdicated and the Cabinet resigned. The message adds that complete order prevails and is being maintained by the Directory's troops.

WHICH?

With the purpose of assisting in "the development of Siberia," the Japanese Economic Relief Commission has announced its intention of forming a corporation "to obtain mining and forest concessions from the Russian authorities and exploit the natural resources in Siberia."

Shares will be subscribed by the Manchurian Railway, the Eastern Asia Industry Company, the Sino-Japanese Commercial Corporation and other interests."—The "Nation" Dec. 14.

All for democracy of course! That is why the Soviets are anathema in that their program calls for the natural resources to be exploited by the people, for the people.

AGITATION IN SOUTH AMERICA.

Montevideo, Uruguay.—There has been a steady increase in Bolshevist agitation in Brazil, Uruguay and Argentina in the last two months, and it is reported that councils have been formed by workmen in co-operation with the police. At Rosario, Argentina, a council of this nature has called a strike.—*Christian Science Monitor,* Dec. 18.

BOLSHEVIKI CLOSE EMBASSY.

AMSTERDAM, Holland (Wednesday)—According to official reports, the Russian Bolshevist authorities ordered the offices of the Polish diplomatic representatives in Petrograd and Moscow to be closed down and sealed about the middle of November, and Mr. Zarnowski, councilor of the legation was arrested. Polish protests remained without effect as did those of the Danish consulate.

BOURGEOIS COUNCIL ACTIVE.

ZURICH, Dec. 23.—The Bourgeois Council has called a Congress of Bourgeoisie from all parts of Germany for January 5, according to a Berlin dispatch.

From New York "Nation" of Dec. 14.

It is many a century since Erasmus of Rotterdam wrote his "Praise of Folly." Our European "Special Correspondents" are adding a few supplementary chapters. For more than a year they have been telling us about the wickedness of Lenine and Trotsky, the traitors who sold their country for German gold. At last we began to believe this story, together with accounts of the suffering of that noble popular hero, Karl Liebknecht, who was slowly dying in an imperial jail for having dared to raise his voice against Prussian militarism.

And now with a single touch of Cleo's magic wand, the scene is changed. Militarism is dead. The great prophet of a joyful war enjoys the windy privacy of an island of the dreary Zuder Zee. Lenine and Trotsky, slain countless times by assassins' bullets, are alive and seemingly prosperous and content. Liebknecht, as leader of a radical group of socialists, has become an object of Allied denunciation. This week he is accused of having sold his country for Bolshevik money. If we understand the matter aright, the Teutonic millions that first corrupted Russia, have returned to Berlin and are now corrupting the German Republic. Unless these millions come to rest the world will continue in a state of turmoil.

ALL-RUSSIAN CONGRESS HELD.

LONDON, England (Wednesday)—The Admiralty issues per wireless press a Moscow Government wireless stating that an all-Russian congress for general military instruction was inaugurated on Dec. 15. The message further reports a discussion on theatrical questions held under the presidency of the people's commissary for public instruction, and states that instruction in dramatic art has been organized throughout the country.

ANTI-SOCIALIST POGROMS.

The red flag and the red neck-tie have been the chief excuse for these outbreaks.

They are spurred on by a press which can no longer stir the blood of its readers by attacks upon German language newspapers and uninterned aliens, or demand the execution of the first German spy to be caught.

To attack Socialism and sympathisers with the Soviet Government of Russia is the latest pastime of the newspapers that have been seeking to enlarge their circulation by preaching hate and bitterness. As the "Nation" has pointed out, heretofore, the progress of these anti-socialist pogroms is due in large part to our insularity. Few Americans are aware that long before the war, socialist influence was strong in many governments abroad, and that the period has long passed when it was considered good sport in Europe to assail socialists as destroyers of society. The "Nation" holds no brief whatever for their economic doctrines, but it does believe that the time has come in America to treat them with respect, to give them freedom of the platform and seriously to consider whether they can contribute anything to the creating of that better world for which we are all longing.

It looks with the utmost regret upon any attempt to suppress them by force, and it is firmly of the belief that anti-red-flag laws and violent physical assaults upon the advocates of socialist doctrine will serve only to increase the number of its adherents and make the movement more bitterly hostile to our government. The experience of other countries has abundantly shown the self-defeating character of every attempt at the suppression of opinion by violence.—New York "Nation."

FINNISH PROJECT CRITICIZED.

STOCKHOLM, Sweden (Wednesday) — The Stockholm's Tideningen, commenting in a leading article, on the statement of General Mannerheim, the new regent of Finland, that the Aland question must be solved by a policy of conciliation, declares that this means the trampling down of Aland's inhabitants' desire for a union with Sweden, to which General Mannerheim is notoriously opposed.

The paper complains that General Mannerheim has misrepresented the Aland question to the European public by suppressing the fundamental fact of the Aland population's firm desire for union with Sweden.

Amsterdam, Holland (Monday).—A Stockholm report from Reval states that the British and Esthonian governments have concluded an agreement placing all ports and means of communication in Esthonia under British control. A British squadron consisting of three cruisers, three destroyers, and six submarines, reached Reval on Tuesday..—*Christian Science Monitor,* Dec. 18.

(*Continued from page* 3.)

and now he, who was your hero two months ago, is ostracised by "respectable society." And so the interventonists had to resort to political trickery, which would be comical if its consequences were not so tragic. "The population on the Murman coast" has invited you to take Archangel! The population on the Murman coast, forsooth! Some illiterate Lapp fishermen and a handful of intellectuals—truly true representatives of Russia! Later the interventionists succeeded in bringing to Archangel old man Tchaikovsky and a few other members of the dissolved Constitutional Assembly, which forthwith was proclaimed as the "legitimate government" of Russia in the declaration issued by Allied representatives at Archangel. But in Vladivostok not even that much could have been accomplished ,as far as the local population is concerned. In the face of an Allied armed occupation, Vladivostok in the municipal elections gave an overwhelming majority to the Bolsheviki. The workers struck in protest against Allied occupation in Vladivostok, and your papers triumphantly declare,—after having said for many days that the strike would not materialize, as most of the workers would not strike,—that the strike is a fizzle, *as the Allies have been successful in replacing the strikers with Chinese workingmen.* "Fighting for democracy"—by arraying coolie labor against Russia! "Not interfering in internal affairs of Russia,"—yet arraying one group of people against another!

What are you doing in Russia, sir? Don't you think that people have eyes to see and ears to hear with? Who invited you to Vladivostok? Was it Colonel Semenoff, a discredited Czar official, and General Horvath, a notorious swindler and adventurer at the head of a few thousand troops composed of Chinese riff-raff, saloon keepers, gamblers, and other adventurers of the "wild east," who valiantly rose "in defense of civilization" because the workers' rule in Siberia was putting an end to the unspeakable social condiitons in the towns of the far "wild east?"

If your purpose is to get the Czecho-Slovaks out of Russia so that they may fight Germany, why don't you send them to Finland to fight the Germans there? Why are you not similarly interested in aiding the Finnish workers, who are now in Russia in an attack upon the German masters of Finland? The British Government gave assurances a few days ago to the Finnish pro-German White Guard Government that it would not encourage "any group of factions in Finland." Did this declaration mean, if anything, that the British Government under no circumstances would encourage the anti-German workers of Finland to fight against their masters? But when in Southern Russia the Cossack General Krassnoff, armed and supported by German troops, makes an attack against the Soviet Russia, his activities are being hailed in the press as a part of the "work of liberation in Russia." How can you explain that paradox? We are told over and over again that this is a war for democracy and against German militarism, yet it seems that in Finland the blackest reaction, and German reaction at that, is being encouraged and the democratic anti-German masses discouraged, while in Russia the workers' republic, which is anti-German and democratic, is attacked, and any one is encouraged who is against the Soviets, whether he be an anarchist, a monarchist, a reactionary pro-German junker or a so-called liberal.

All this is of course clear and understandable if you judge it from the point of view of the philosophy of the class struggle. Socialism is a greater enemy to the existing order than German militarism. But you will not admit that ,or at least you have not openly admitted it. But if you do not admit it, then the policy you advocate in Russia is the most chaotic, irresponsible and ridiculous the world ever saw.

The truth about Russia does not reach us to-day; you do not realize what the Soviets are accomplishing. When the work of the Soviet Government does become known it will most likely result in bitter criticism of interference. But the present policy of making criticism punishable cannot last forever. The war will end; and then will come a time when uncensored speech once more is a fact. There will be years and centuries of human life after the war is over, during which the historian will be permitted to judge the events of to-day without the prejudice of passion and without the will to distort, due to economic interests.

What, then, will be the verdict on your present Russian policy?

Even now many facts are becoming known which cannot be explained away. We have been told that the antipathy of the Allied nations toward the Soviet Government is due to its "subservience to German occupation" and to the "betrayal at Brest-Litivsk." But do you know, sir, or do you not, that some time before the ratification of the Brest-Litovsk peace treaty by the Soviet Government, the Government of the People's Commissars showed concrete willingness to continue the war against Germany and wanted to know to what extent it could expect co-operation from the Allies in the task of the reorganization of the Russian army? How will you explain the absence of an answer to this proposition of the Soviet Government? Do you know that last winter, just before the German advance in Russia, Trotsky earnestly requested co-operation in taking away big guns from the Russian front so that they should not fall into the hands of the Germans? In spite of Trotzky's efforts the Germans took the guns and transported them to the western front. About the same time the Russian Government requested aid in the form of a few hundred British naval officers to take charge of the Black Sea Fleet so that a plot engineered by Russian reactionary officers aiming to deliver the Black Sea Fleet to the Germans should not materialize. They were not successful in obtaining the requested help and a large part of the Black Sea Fleet was delivered to the Germans by Russian reactionaries. And the crowning madness of all this is that the press accused the Bolsheviki of having delivered those guns and that fleet to the Germans!

I have knowledge of scores of similar incidents which all prove that the Soviet Government was extremely eager to co-operate with the Allies in every possible way against Germany, but without success.

Why?!?

In order to be a fair as possible and to give the benefit of the doubt to the Allied representatives I shall admit as a possible reason for their action that they never expected the Soviet Government to stay. The above related incident regarding the guns on the eastern front took place at a time when the Allied representatives, misled by Russian counter-revolutionarists, were sure that the Soviet Government would be overthrown in a few days. They apparently hoped that a new eastern front could be established by the Cadets, which would require the presence and use of the big guns. But if that was the reason for their otherwise inexplicable action in the matter, it only shows their utter lack of understanding of the real relations between the political forces in Russia. The same will be the historic verdict in all other cases where there was no attempt made to use the Soviets against Germany.

Another excuse may also be advanced. Starting out with the theory that the Bolsheviki were paid agents of Germany, the Allies naturally suspected every approach on the part of the Bolsheviki as an "effort to obtain information for the German army"! But even that is no excuse at all. For more than a year the press has been shouting that Lenine and Trotzky are paid agents of Germany—but *never has a shred of real evidence* been offered in this respect. Certain "documents," I understand, were printed in "Le Petit Parisienne." The actual fact, however, is that these so-called documents are *proven forgeries,* which were in the hands of the bitterest enemies of the Bolsheviki during the Kerensky regime, and could not be used because of their obvious forgery and falseness.

On the other hand there are innumerable proofs of a willingness to co-operate with elements whose only "merit" is their opposition to the Soviets but who otherwise are openly co-operating with the Germans. Much is this respect has been shown in the attitude toward the Finnish White Guard, towards the pro-German Ukrainian bourgeoisie and toward the Milukov faction, which is co-operating with Germany and now has squarely declared itself for the restoration of monarchy in Russia. Much more could be shown if all the facts were known. Above I already referred to the assurances given by the British Government to the White Guard Government of Finland, who have sold themselves body and soul to the Germans—that the British Government never would support any rebellious faction in Finland against the present Government.

How in the name of common sense can you then expect that any sane person, who is acquainted with the facts as they are, could for a moment believe that the main reason for intervention in Russia is to recreate opposition to Germany? The story about the Germans in Siberia, who are fighting the Czecho-Slovaks, is altogether a product of hysteria or a deliberate misrepresentation. Last April, at the request of Trotzky, Allied representatives went all through Siberia to confirm rumors circulated already at that time about armed German prisoners acting on behalf on behalf of the German government. The Allied representatives did not find anything of that kind, and their findings must be known to the Allied Governments.

Why all that talk about the necessity of liberating the valiant Czecho-Slovaks and permitting them to proceed to the western front? The facts about their case are that the Soviet Government was doing all in its power to allow the Czecho-Slovaks to get away from Russia. Trotzky offered them passage by way of Archangel. For some reason that offer was not accepted. The stories about their having been attacked in Siberia while on their way to Vladivostok may be easily interpreted otherwise than as an attempt to prevent their leaving Russia. The eastward moving Czecho-Slovaks of course obstructed the transportation of foodstuffs along the Siberian railroad to Russia. It is easy to understand that the necessity of feeding Russia came in conflict with the desire of the Czecho-Slovaks for unhindered passage. Yet I am sure that whatever difficulties arose in that respect, they could have been straigntened out between the Soviets and the Czecho-Slovaks, if they had been left to settle it themselves. It is obvious that the local population was incited against the Czecho-Slovaks by Germans as well as by Russian reactionaries, who saw in the conflict between the Czecho-Slovaks and the Soviets a potential nucleus of an interventionist adventure.

And so we have been compelled to witness a tragedy, which the historian of the future will regard as one of the most pathetic events in the history of revolutions. The Czecho-Slovaks,—themselves rebels,—most of them originally in sympathy with the Russian revolution, most of them Socialists, desiring to establish their international independence by revolutionary means,—are being used by those who promised them national independence, and who profess adherence to the principle of self-determination of nations, as the hangmen of the Russian Revolutionists. Never has a rebellious people, striving for independence, been asked to pay a more horrible price. If the present plan of reactionaries in Russia is to materialize for the moment, if the Czecho-Slovaks meet with success in putting down the Russian revolution and to establishing there a bloody reactionary monarchy, and if they as the Judas-pay for this work are to receive the independence of Bohemia, can't you see that future generations will haunt that "independent Bohemia," built on the corpses of the greatest revolution in the world, down to the deepest hell as betrayers and traitors to liberty and progress? But still more possible is another outcome. Either the Czecho-Slovaks will successfully perform the work they are asked to do to-day, and, having re-established reactionary monarchy in Russia, will find reaction and monarchism strengthened in Austria as well—and never will get the price anticipated by them, or—they will not be successful in their plan and will be cast aside just as you are ready to cast aside Kerensky to-day.

(To be continued.)

Is It Peace or More War?

By WILLIAM STEWART.

I think it is about time attention was directed to the utterances of a gentleman named Mr. Leslie Urquhart. He is described as being "at the head of large Siberian mining enterprises," and on the strength of that commendation evidently considers himself qualified and entitled to advise the British people as to what should be their policy and conduct towards Russia. If the British people allow their government to act upon this gentleman's advice, they will probably find that they have only come to the end of one war to begin another similar to that in which the nation was involved against the French revolutionists, a war which may be equally discreditable and disastrous.

How far Mr. Urquhart is qualified to give advice may be judged from the fact that so long ago as 12th December, 1917, speaking as chairman of the Irtysh Corporation, Ltd., he declared: "The Bolsheviks are on the point of collapse; Russia is rising again; the country is coming back to common sense, and the sufferings of the deluded masses this winter will finally complete their downfall, and that of all other extremist elements, *to my mind this is certain and bound to take place very soon.*" That was eleven months ago. The Bolsheviks were on the point of collapse. And now, on 7th November, 1918, the Bolsheviks are apparently so far from being on the point of collapse that Mr. Urquhart thinks it necessary to advise the Allies almost in so many words to declare war against the Bolsheviks. His summing up of the situation means, in his own words, "openly arraying ourselves against the Bolsheviks and treating them for what they were, the exponents of a creed fatal to all we had ever known as civilization. This again implied armed force, a great Allied effort from the Murman coast, from Siberia, and through the Dardanelles"; and further, "a force overwhelming relatively to any possible operation that the Bolsheviks or Germans could offer could be sent by the Allies to the south of Russia and to the Caucasus." A nice little missionary programme which the happy people who have been rejoicing over the coming of peace will do well to ponder over, and which, taken in conjunction with Mr. Churchill's naive suggestion that it may be necessary for the British forces to police Europe, opens up quite an exciting prospect for the democracy of this country. In a word, it means *war*. While the peace bells are ringing! War to suppress revolution. It is Pitt and Castlereagh's policy over again, a policy which had its reflex at home in the violent suppressions of every kind of civil liberty. And this is the cool proposal of Mr. Leslie Urquhart, who is so little capable judging of the nature of the forces at work in Russia that he thought the Bolsheviks were on the point of collapse eleven months ago.

To his audience in Glasgaw last week Mr. Urquhart presented an alarming and lurid picture of Russia under the Bolshevist. Well, I suppose no one imagines that Russia is at present an earthly paradise. It has too recently emerged from bloody war, and from even bloodier Czardom, for that. For that matter Great Britain itself is not a superlatively comfortable country to live in. No country is under Capitalism. It is all a matter of comparison. With what are we to compare Russia's present state? With the conditions under the Romanoffs? or with its problematical condition after the Irtysh Corporation and its like have begun fully to exploit its resources for the advantage of foreign dividend hunters? And if the Russian people are minded to try to establish Socialism without passing through all the stages of the Capitalistic purgatory, what right have we to interfere? We, who have the memory of the child labour and the sweating system, and who still live in Capitalism's slums. I hold no brief for Bolshevism. I think that probably it would not be a suitable kind of government for this country—though a continuance of parliamentarism such as we have had during the last four years may compel us all to remodel our conceptions of the science of government—but I agree with Mr. Asquith that it is not our business to prescribe to other countries their form of government. I think that applies to Russia, even though it may be true as Mr. Urquhart says, that "Russia and Siberia open a field for commercial and industrial development greater than any other country in the world." For that very reason I would leave Russia to the Russians. Under Socialism they will develop their country in their own good time and for other purposes than the enrichment of people who have not the slightest intention of either working or living in Russia, and for whose interests I do not think it is the duty of this country to go to war or to maintain armed expeditions. Now that the war with Kaiserdom has ended, now that the German people have agreed to the wishes of *our* rulers and have established a democratic form of government, I think we are entitled to a long, long period of peace. And I suggest that the first duty of British democracy should be to demand the withdrawal of British troops from Russia. If the Irtysh Corporation want a war, let them raise their own troops. A shareholders' battalion would make a good beginning, with Urquhart as Colonel—or Drum Major perhaps. The armament shareholders of all countries might be invited to join up. A proper cosmopolitan hell-fire legion for the maintenance of permanent and universal anarchy."—From The Forward, Glasgow, Nov. 16.

One-Big-Union Wins New Victory

VICTORIAN LABOR CONGRESS UNEXPECTEDLY INDORSES THE PLAN FOR ALL AUSTRALIA—ACTION IS THE RESULT OF TACTICAL MANEUVER.

Christian Science Monitor, Dec. 18.

Melbourne, Vic.—Having secured at the Congress of Victorian unions held to deal with the proposals for closer unionism, a victory as overwhelming as it was unexpected, the advocates of "One-Big-Union" for Australian labor unions are pushing forward with the formation of the new organization, which they claim will end in the establishment of the industrial cooperative commonwealth. As has been pointed out in The Christian Science Monitor, the One-Big-Union advocates had already carried the adoption of the scheme at a conference of New South Wales unions but looked for the Victorian congress to decline sanction to the proposal which would have the effect of postponing it indefinitely. The One-Big-Union advocates were at work for months past among the Victorian unions, spreading their propaganda, but even when the congress was assembled it looked as though the numbers were against them. An astute move by Mr. B. Mulvogue, leader of the One-Big-Unionists, however, led to victory.

Two schemes were officially before the congress—one providing for the linking up of Victorian unions into federation, this being the proposal of the moderates; and the other for One-Big-Union for Victoria, the proposal of the militants. The unions had already taken ballots in regard to these schemes and had instructed their delegates accordingly. Realizing that many of the delegates, while personally favoring One-Big-Union, would be compelled by instructions to vote for the federation scheme, Mr. Mulvogue dropped his own scheme of One-Big-Union for Victoria and moved that the congress affirm the necessity of forming One-Big-Union for all Australia. As this proposal had never been discussed by the unions, delegates claimed a free hand and after forceful debate the resolution was agreed to on division by 111 votes to 34.

A remarkable scene was witnessed when the division took place. Seated upon the minority side of the Chamber were the representatives of the old form of craft union, many of which organizations are controlled from Great Britain—realizing as they saw the benches opposite filling with the representatives of such unions as the Building Trades, Australian Workers Union, Railway Workers and others, that unionism, as they had understood it, seemed vanishing in Australia. Triumphantly cheering and singing "Solidarity Forever" (an I. W. W. song), were the men who assert that the mission of unionism is to abolish the capitalistic system and that this can be achieved by "repeated assaults on the citadels of capitalims."

The galleries were packed with members of the Revolutionary Socialist Party and there was a sprinkling of men at one time familiar on I.W.W. platforms, who hailed the result of the vote with enthusiasm. A peculiar feature of the division was the fact that the Australian Workers Union delegates voted solidly in favor of One-Big-Union, though in reality their organization views the proposal rather indifferently. Its leaders point out that they already have the machinery for One-Big-Union without creating more. However, as the organization has advocated One-Big-Union it cannot consistently oppose and it will, therefore, fall into line with the new organization. This is another point won for the One-Big-Union men, as the Australian Workers Union is the most powerful in Australian unionism.

Although the One-Big-Union men have secured an initial triumph, the decision of the conference has yet to be debated by the unions individually, and from some organizations, such as the painters and plumbers, the One-Big-Union proposal is already encountering hostility. However, as the One-Big-Union has now gathered beneath its banner a majority of the unions in the two most important states and has secured the support of the Australian Workers Union and the transport unions, the claim of its advocates that when the organization is put into working form it will be powerful enough to compel the smaller unions to come in willy-nilly, seems well founded.

WHAT WE MUST DO.

PARAPHRASED WITH APOLOGIES TO THE "NATION."

We are told that this was a war for democracy: very well, by its fruits we shall know it. It is for us to trace and note how near the democrats come to their professions. We were told that this was a people's war: very well, from now on it is for us to note the results, good or ill, which accrue to the people. We are told above all, that it was a war for liberty; very well, it is for us to note the precise outcome of political, economic and social liberty under it.

We are told, finally, that this war was not due to conflict of economic interests. We have been sternly forbidden to view that it was in any sense a banker's or capitalists' war. Very well, it is now our function to point out from time to time the marks that differentiate its practical outcome.

Having fought a war for democracy we shall now find out whether it is worth the enormous sacrifice. This having been a people's war we shall see how much the people will benefit by it. This war for liberty having been won by the people for democracy, we now start, or should do so, on a new era.

Our shackles and chains of pre 1914 will now drop from us——?

The Chief Task of Our Day

By N. LENIN.

Poor thou art, rich thou art,
Strong thou art and weak thou art,
Oh Mother Russia!

The history of mankind is at present passing through one of its greatest and most difficult crises, a crisis with a tremendous—without exaggeration it may be said—with a world-wide liberating significance. From war to peace, from war between beasts of prey, who have sent to the slaughter millions of those toiling and exploited, with the object of securing a redivision among the strongest of the robbers, of the spoils already acquired—to a war of the oppressed against the oppressors for freedom from capitalist oppression; from the abyss of suffering, pain and hunger to the shining communistic society of the future, to general wellbeing and permanent peace;—it is no wonder, at the most acute points of such a tremendous transformation, when round about the old is going to pieces with frightful noise and crash, while in indescribable pains the new thing is being born, that some men's heads should be turned, that others should be seized by despair, and that others should seek relief from actuality, which is at times too bitter, in the shade of fair, enchanting phrases.

Yet it was necessary to feel vividly what was occurring, to live through, in the most excruciating and painful manner, this sharpest of all the sharp turns of history, lifting us out of imperialism into the communistic revolution. In a few days we destroyed one of the oldest, most powerful, most savage and barbarous monarchies. In a few months we passed through a series of agreements with the bourgeoise, of living down of *petit bourgeois* illusions, for which other countries have required decades. In a few weeks, after having overthrown the bourgeoise, we defeated its open opposition in a civil war. In a victorious, triumphal progress of bolshevism we have passed from one end of our great country to the other. We have raised to liberty and to independent life the lowest sections of the toiling masses that have been oppressed by Czarism and by the bourgeoise. We have introduced and strengthened the Soviet Republic, a new type of government, immeasurably higher and more democratic than the best of the bourgeois-parliamentary republics. We organized a dictatorship of the proletariat, supported by the poorest peasants, and inaugurated a widely-planned system of socialistic reconstruction. In millions and millions of workers in all countries we have awakened the faith in their powers and kindled the fires of their enthusiasm. We have sent out in all driections the call of the international workers' revolution. We have thrown down the gauntlet to the imperialistic robbers of all countries.

In a few days an imperialist robber, falling upon us unarmed, has cast us to the ground. He has forced us to sign an incredibly oppressive and humiliating peace—our punishment for having dared, if only for one short moment, to free ourselves from the iron bonds of the imperialistic war. The robber strangles and chokes and dismembers Russia with all the greater fury, the more threateningly he perceives rising before him in his own country the spectre of the impending workers' revolution.

We were forced to sign a "Peace of Tilsit." There is no reason for deceiving ourselves as to that. We must have the courage to look right into the face of this bitter, unembellished truth. We must sound to the depths, completely, the whole abyss of defeat and humiliation into which we have now been cast. The better we understand this, the harder and firmer will become our will to free ourselves, to rise again from slavery to independence, our unbending resolve, at whatever costs, to raise Russia from her present poverty and weakness, to make her rich and powerful in the true sense of the word.

And this she may become, for we still have left enough territory and natural resources, to provide each and every one of us, if not with a super abundance, yet with a sufficient supply of the means of subsistence. We have enough, in natural riches and in labour-power, as well as in the stimulus, which our great revolution has communicated to our national productive forces—to create a really rich and powerful Russia.

Russia may become such if we cast aside all discouragement and all oratory, if we strain every nerve and tighten every muscle, if we understand that salvation is possibly only by the path of international socialist revolution, on which we have entered. To advance on this road, undaunted by defeat, to build up, stone by stone, the firm foundation of the socialist society, to work with untiring hand at the creation of discipline and self-discipline, at strengthening, at all times and in all places, the organization, the orderliness, the efficiency, the harmonious co-operation of the forces of the entire nation, a central supervision and control of the production and distribution of products—such is the path to power, whether it be power in the military sense or power in the socialist sense.

It is unbecoming for a socialist, when he has suffered a defeat, to protest his victory loudly or to droop into despair. It is not true that we have no other alternative than that between an "inglorious" (from the point of view of the *shlakhtzy*) death, which is what this terrible peace amounts to, and a "heroic" death in a hopeless war. It is not true that we have betrayed our ideals and our friends by signing the "Peace of Tilsit." We have betrayed nothing and no one, we have neither sanctioned or concealed a single falsehood; to no single friend and companion in misfortune have we refused all the aid in our power. A commander-in-chief, who withdraws the remains of his army, defeated, and afflicted with a panic flilght, into the interior of the country, who defends this withdrawal, in a case of extremity, with an intolerable and humiliating peace, is not perpetrating treason with regard to those sections of the army which he can no longer assist and which have been cut off by the enemy. Such a commander is doing his duty when he chooses the only way that is open for saving what can still be saved, consenting to no gambles, embellishing no sad truths in the eyes of the people, "giving up territory, in order to gain time," utilizing every breathing-spell, no matter how short, in order to collect his forces, in inorder to provide repose and healing for his army, which has become sick with disintegration and demoralization.

We have signed a "Peace of Tilsit." When Napoleon I. forced Prussia in 1807 to make such a peace, he destroyed all the German armies, occupied the capital and all the large cities, introduced his police system, obliged the vanquished to provide an auxiliary army for the conduct of new wars of conquest conducted by the victor, dismembered Germany, and concluded with certain German states alliances against other German states. Yet, in spite of this severe peace, the German people succeeded in maintaining themselves, in gathering their forces, and in attaining for themselves the rights of freedom and independence. To all those who are able and willing to think the example of the Peace of Tilsit—which was only one of the many oppressive and humiliating treaties forced upon the Germans at that time—shows clearly how childishly naive is the thought that under all circumstances a most cruel peace is the depth of degradation, while war is the path of heroism and salvation. Warlike eras have frequently shown that peace may often discharge the function of a breathing-spell for the gathering of forces for near battles. The Peace of Tilsit was the greatest humiliation of Germany and, at the same time, the point of departure for a great national awakening. Historical circumstances at that time provided no other way out than throu geois state; for, a century or more ago, h created by a small band of noblemen and of bourgeois intellects, while the great workers and peasants lay slumbering and u History at that time, therefore, moved wit slowness.

Capitalism has now considerably raised general, and particularly th t of the masses has shaken up the masses, has awakened the paralleled terrors and sufferings. The w celerated the march of history so that it no the speed of a locomotive. History is no the independent action of millions and t lions of people. Capitalism has reached t socialism.

And therefore, if Russia now can pass disputably is passing, from a Peace of period of national uplift, to a great war defence, the result of the transition will burgeooise state, but the international soci tion. We have therefore become, since O "defenders"; we are for the "defence of land," but the fatherland we are defen socialist fatherland, we are defending ou which is a section of the universal army o

"Hatred of the Germans; down with th —such was the cry and remains the cry dinary (i. e. bourgeois) patriotism. A "Hatred to the imperialistic robbers, hat talism, death to capitalism," and, togethe "We must learn from the Germans! Re to the fraternal union with the German w have been late in coming to our assistan wait for their coming, we shall gain tim come to our asisstance."

Yes, learn from the Germans! Histo zigzags and in roundabout paths. It so the German at present simultaneously p gether with savage imperialism, the b discipline, organization, harmonious co- the basis of the modern machine indust accountability and supervision.

And that is precisely what we lack. what we must learn. That is exactly wha tion must have in order to proceed from beginning, through a series of difficult victorious conclusion. That is exactly w sian Soviet Socialist Republic needs in o being poor and weak, and to become, rich and mighty.

ORGANIZE THE WORLD SAYS SMUTS.

London, England.—General Smuts, cently at a dinner givin in honor of the A ors in London, said that during the perio reconstruction after the war, when esse terials would have to be rationed, a Leag became not an ideal or an aspiration, bu tical necessity. Judging from experienc kans, he thought it might be expected future Europe would be in a more di with more danger of war, than had bee In the circumstances he thought it wou tive to create an international organizatio peace among the smaller states, even if sary to supervise their internal policing. the German colonies, General Smuts s of these were quite fairly and properly would have to be given to the British D had conquered them and whose future and security depended upon them. But colonies not so claimed, he thought a L tions could depute certain powers to hol ies provisionally until the question of disposal was settled.