Ten Minutes' Talk With the Workers *Capitalism---The Basis of Colonialism*
French Politics

THE RED FLAG

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

OL. 1 NO. 31 VANCOUVER, B. C., SATURDAY. AUGUST 30, 1919 FIVE CENTS

WHO OWNS IRELAND?

(From the "Labor Leader," By Casey.)

Increased scientific production to benefit or bol-er up Capitalism leaves me quite cold.

So long as nations are privately owned, the only titude for the working class is an attitude of volt.

Private ownership is responsible for last Sunday's ondrous harvest of the sea at Grimsby being rted away as manure instead of being utilized to ed the starving continental workers and people ho need fresh food at home.

Private enterprise dumps an army of 100,000 men to Ireland to overawe a population of 4 3-4 mil-on people, who simply desire to be left alone. ancy up-to-date field kitchens being driven rough the street by splendidly groomed horses, cottish regiments marching by with fixed bayonets impress poor, half-starved folk who have never ceived a living wage in their lives; folk who wer in mean, wretched cabins, where three sods turf smoulder in open fireplaces!

Rotten earthen floors, thatched roofs where the ater percolates through on wet days, whilst the noke fills the death-trap of a living room, making ildren sore-eyed and old women cough up their sides! Thousands of one-roomed, vermin-infested ens, which the labors of Hercules could not anse! Rows of houses with simply an open vity as fireplace, and not a vestige of either oven rate or hob! I have seen better houses at Seidis iord, in Iceland, than some of the miserable huts have entered in Ireland.

If 700 years of British rule can produce such rot-n results, then it is high time that the people of eland had a chance to see if they can do better. The population of Mulhausen, even under Hun ule, doubled in fifty years, but the population of eland under English rule has decreased by over ur millions. At this rate of progress, Ireland in nother fifty years will be simply a pleasure resort r a few lords, captains of industry, and fox hunt-s, and the original inhabitants will have been iped out. . . .

TAKE THEM WITH A GRAIN OF SALT!

When reading newspapers and periodicals, it hould be kept in mind that they thrive by featur-g the abnormal. For the truth of this compare e actual normal humdrum workaday life of any wn or village, with the abnormalities featured in e press. It is because many people have taken e press reports of the Soviet administration as pical of the normal in that administration that ey are so astounded that it is still in existance d capable of resisting and repelling the com-ned capitalistic armies for two years even when eighted down by the previous economic and poli-cal breakdown under the Tzarist regime. That e Bolshevist regime, to date, has surmounted ccessfully these unexampled obstacles should be fficient to discount most of the reports in the kept" press as mere capitalist propaganda.

WALL STREET'S S.O.S.

Vanderlip Proposes to Write Off the Allied Debts to Save Capitalism

(By J. T. Walton Newbold, Glasgow "Forward.")

FOR some time past there has been ominous plaints arising in the financial organs of London and New York concerning the ever more difficult problem of reorganizing the interchange of commodities and services between the United States and Europe. The wonderful prosperity which the American moneyed interests have been experiencing and anticipating as yet to become more memorable has shown itself as something illusory in character and more than questionable in its advantage. From "a debtor nation" such as the United States was in 1914, she has become a creditor or, rather, her banking houses have become creditors, to the whole of the Allied nations. She has become enabled to retain her gold within her borders, to replenish her supplies by imports from or liens on London and Paris, to write off her indebtedness to these monetary centres and to establish enormous claims upon them for future payments for munitions, stores and food stuffs sent across the ocean on account.

One-third of the world's gold has made its way to America, and some £400,000,000 lies in the vaults of the 12 Federal Reserve Banks. Europe's desperate need has proved to be America's marvellous opportunity. By the end of 1915, Britain had virtually ceased to be a creditor of the United States and was becoming her debtor. From September of that year until the entrance of the United States into the war, the private financiers of America were lending billions of money to the Allies to enable them to purchase war-supplies from American contractors. American money-lenders were providing the armies of right and liberty with vouchers for vast war-stores and taking in exchange the IOU's which, for the time being, were all that Britain and France could render in payment. This process went on for another year, when, the situation becoming desperate, a highly-placed British statesman was sent over to the States to acquaint the American banking fraternity of the imperative necessity of America doing something more than merely lend private money. The American money-lenders were given to understand that the Allies' resources were almost at an end and that unless help came from America, that the war must stop. That meant not only signal defeat for the cause of Liberty and Democracy, but British and French insolvency so far as Wall Street was concerned. Indemnities would need to be paid to Germany and the American idealists would lost their principal as well as witness the defeat of their principles. The stability of the American financial and industrial system was at stake.

The American capitalists required to forego for the time their gigantic plans for the conquest of the markets of the world deserted by Britain, France and Germany, and mobilize their money, material, and man-power to secure the Cause of Freedom as well as to make safe the billions of dollars which they had lent and which they saw themselves in dire risk of, finally, losing.

The United States entered the war in a frenzy of patriotic fervor and of emotional ecstacy. The hireling newspapers and publicity agents of Wall Street trumpeted the new Jehad and fired their readers and auditors to unparalleled efforts of increased production and prodigal outlay of money. The American Government now assumed responsibility for financing the war. It raised enormous loans to equip armies and fleets as well as to afford unlimited credit to Britain, France and Italy.

By May of 1918, our indebtedness to the United States Treasury amounted to about £750,000,000, and since that time further huge sums have been

(Continued On Page Two.)

THE OLD ORDER AND THE NEW.

(From the "Dial.")

Out of the war to end war has come the peace to end peace. With the passing of time, sorrow for the failure of the first-named enterprise tends increasingly to lose itself in elation over a second failure— over the sheer inability of the peace-makers of Paris to put everywhere into practice their plan for the partition and the exploitation of the world. Liberals who support the Treaty and the Covenant have said that these documents do not anywhere provide means for the suppression of internal movements for industrial and social revolution. It does however appear that an alliance has been perfected between Great Britain, the United States, France, Japan and Italy. And it is likewise sufficiently plain that this alliance has as one of its chief objects the partitioning, among its members, of the more backward portions of the earth, now called mandatories. To the calloused occidental mind there is nothing very terrible about this scheme of things, familiar already under the name of colonial exploitation. Indeed it begins only now to appear that a system evolved for application to backward peoples, is already being applied, in its essence, to forward nations also. It has always been an international crime for a people to have great possessions and a dark skin, but only recently has it been considered equally heinous to have advanced ideas and to act on them. Conceivably a communist revolution might have occurred somewhere in Europe in ante-bellum days; but only in a world remade by the war and ruled by the League are red Russia and black Rhodesia subjected to the same treatment. A backward country tempts capitalism to new gains, but a forward country threatens the very existence of the system that makes such gains possible. Thus the hope of the world today lies in Russia's resistance to the new Paris verdict, rather than in India's restlessness under an old sentence, and China's under a new one.

Ten Minutes' Talk With the Workers

(From the Glasgow "Socialist," July 17, 1919.)

Economic Crises.

TO most people it is a far cry from primitive savagery to modern civilization. Yet an examination into the origins of either our social institutions, our tools and machines for production, or ways of thinking on many matters will show that after all we have not much to brag about. It is now established beyond dispute that the most delicate instruments we use, as well as our language, religion, morals, domestic institutions, etc., have their roots or beginnings away back in those primitive times, thousands of years ago. There is no break in the chain. Everything which you see around you today represents in a more or less complex way the efforts of the race towards social progress and evolution. To realize this is one of the most important discoveries of modern times.

Roots of Social Progress.

You can readily understand that were we to simply live for the moment and take no heed for tomorrow, so far as ensuring our necessary supplies are concerned, and remembering that wage slavery is unable to give us security in our means of life, we should undoubtedly be reduced to the conditions of primitive savages.

How this principle or idea of "property," of using tools instead of relying on bare finger-nails, in short, of preserving the results of previous efforts to enable us to "carry on" for a time, became established, forms the groundwork of a great many books and makes a most fascinating subject for the study of man, or, as scientists call it, the study of anthropology.

Certainly, with the marvellous machines, implements and contrivances of all sorts at our disposal today there are great possibilities for leisure, luxury and social comfort. More, in fact than is enjoyed by you and me at the present time. Into that, however, we need not go for the moment.

What is worth noting, however, at present, is the arrogance, audacity and, need we say, impertinence of present-day rulers to claim all these social achievements as theirs exclusively. Not only so, but to base their claim to mortgage future generations of our class, thereby making us helots, on the grounds, forsooth, that these achievements are the products of their brains!

Claims of the Pharisees.

It would be only necessary to state these claims to you for their absurdity to be revealed were it not that very clever writers—some of them unfortunately belonging to our class—are employed by our masters to teach such false doctrines that unsuspecting and unlettered workers may be confused or deceived.

Taking advantage of the workers' weakness in the knowledge of economics, these pharisees and charlatans ascribe the marvels of modern productive methods to some inherent and magic power of "Capital." And then having subtly associated the powers for producing wealth with these things which are the property of the rich capitalist class, they, with more subtility, credit the owners of capital with the powers of their property and in this way build up an excuse for profit-taking or exploitation.

Thus the principle of subdivision of labor, i.e., dividing a certain job into a great many parts and giving each worker a certain part to do, or some workers doing agricultural work while others do manufacturing work, and so on—a principle as old as the human race is held in these days by the literary and oratorical rogues I have just mentioned to be the fruits of capitalist brains applied to industry.

"Time" a Factor in Economics.

They talk mysteriously about "time" as a factor in production. You, however, have only to reflect for a moment on the energy you have spent during the week or to take a look at the fruits of your industry and then the contents of your envelope on Saturdays to see by comparison that it would require more than "waiting" to make up the difference. It is a very nice theory which first robs the workers of any control over their own affairs by making them wage-slaves, then demands a toll on the grounds that he has to "wait" before he can get a job. That indeed is what the "waiting" or time idea comes to.

The Idea of Faith.

Another of the economic crudities of our aforementioned charlatans is the idea of "faith." As you know, things are produced for profit, i.e., to be sold. The business of our modern capitalists, and it is a fine art, is to find customers or buyers. But in the nature of things of the profit-making system, all buyers are not just prepared to pay. When a customer or buyer is found who is not in a position to pay he gets the commodities on "faith" or, as economists say, "credit." The credit is extended over a longer or shorter period according either to the bone-fides of the buyer or to the general state of the market. Here in passing let it be noted one of the reasons for your newspaper containing so many bankrupt cases, embezzlement cases and cases of fraud generally. The idea of faith becomes readily translated into the idea of fraud, since by deceiving your neighbor appears the quickest road to get rich, which is the highest ideal of our materialistic capitalist.

Basis of Industrial Crises.

Our penny-a-liner charlatans mistake the shadow for the substance and think that if only there is sufficient faith all will be well. He has not the slightest knowledge of the basis of industrial crises. He fails to see that crises are not produced because of lack of faith, but that there is no faith because the markets are stagnant. Markets become stagnant when ever there are more sellers than buyers, a circumstance which periodically occurs. At such a period everyone seeks to realize their assets into hard cash. Accordingly demands are made all round for obligations to be fulfilled. These demands sometimes overtake banks, who are unable to pay over, with the result that a financial crisis ensues. It is to stabilize the banks and ensure confidence that the recent amalgamations have been taking place in the financial world.

Indeed such is the basis of combines and trusts, whether of industry or finance. But it is all in vain. So long as production is carried on for profit there is bound to periodically result a "glut" or "crises" on the markets of the world. The trusts may seek and in a measure be successful in regulating the supply and demand for given products They can not avoid the convulsion that accrues from time to time, because the markets, both home and foreign, become congested. Only when production is regulated and ordered upon a basis of social well-being instead of private aggrandisement can we escape the anarchy and jungle conditions of capitalism.

T. B.

WALL STREET'S S. O. S.

Vanderlip Proposes to Write Off Allied Debts to Save Capitalism.

(Continued From Page One.)

borrowed. Fully £1,000,000,000 is now owing to the United States, and upon that there has to be paid interest year by year. Not only that, but the sum has to be repaid. It is not a gift. It is, merely a loan.

Quite recently the head of the greatest financial house in America, the National City Bank of New York, suggested to a Senate Committee the possible wisdom of writing off the entire Allied indebtedness to the U. S. A. as "a bad debt," or, as he inferred, the shouldering by the U. S. Government of this liability incurred in Freedom's Cause.

This hint has been received by the world's money press with considerable alarm. It savors too much of "Bolshevism." Once "repudiation" or cancelling of debts begins there is no knowing where it may end.

Mr. Vanderlip's suggestion is startling, coming, as it does, from the financial agent of the Rockfeller interests, from the head of the biggest banking company in the whole world. It is comprehensible, however, when one remembers the fact that the National City Bank is the financial copingstone of American industry and export trade, and that the United States manufacturers are alarmed at the prospect of Europe repaying its debt in manufactures, whilst United States agriculturalists, mineowners and timber corporations dread its liquidation in raw materials from British and French Colonies and Dependencies. America is an exporting country, and her whole future as a prosperous capitalist nation depends on her ability to maintain an ever-expanding export trade.

The Banker's Magazine for February, quoted the Washington correspondent of the Morning Post as reporting:—

"How this (interest) charge is to be met is a problem now occupying the attention of American business men and bankers. For this amount to be paid in cash is practically impossible, because debtor nations can not allow themselves to be drained of their gold, even if they had it, which they have not. In lieu of gold the indebtedness must be discharged in commodities; but that means, on the part of England, France and Italy, flooding the American market with their manufactured goods, which America will not tolerate. . . . It sounds paradoxical, but it is nevertheless true, that too much wealth, as one of the after effects of the war, makes the United States not only a menace to the rest of the world but also a danger to herself. That menace, of course, not in the political or military sense, but financially and economically, is threatening to disturb international equilibrium, and at home is resulting in inflation and continuing to keep up the high prices."

Now, we read in the Investor's Review (21-6-19) that an urgent meeting has been held in the parlor of J. P. Morgan & Co., in New York, attended by all the representative bankers of America, at which it was decided to form a syndicate to lend £800,000,000 to stabilize European industry. Only in this way could Europe possibly continue to make such purchases in the U. S. A., as would maintain the necessary volume of U. S. exports. In other words, the American capitalists are compelled to lend £800,000,000 of commodities to Europe to prevent an immediate falling off of American export, an immediate slowing down of American industry, a paralysation of American production, and a collapse of American Capitalism.

At the end of six or eight months they will have to find a new palliative or accept the steady drift of Western Europe and of America to Social Revolution.

No wonder the Investor's Review comments:—

"The wisdom of the world bankers is not equal, we fear, to the solution of the debt-puzzle. Palliatives they may invent and apply, and palliatives serve but to increase the destructive virulence of the disease."

Capitalism is in extremis. It approaches the Universal Catastrophe. Let Labor concentrate upon the necessary work of preparing itself to take over control of the means of production and distribution and to direct these to the supply of the needs of the working community.

HE FINAL ARGUMENT IN THE NEW ORDER.

The case of Syria is one more instance to show hat we are still far from that new international rder which gives first place to self-determination. Neither England nor France seems primarilly conerned with what the Syrians think about Syria. rance bases her claim on the Sykes-Picot Treaty f 1916. But a year earlier there had been a treaty rawn between England, France and Russia, for a ettlement in Asia Minor. England's present claim eems to be that the collapse of Russian imperialism akes both agreements invalid. This point of law rance can not admit. But England has a better ase than that. On her side it is the one argument hich more than any other wrote the territorial erms of the Peace Treaty. It was her troops that onquered Asia Minor.—"New Republic."

EDUCATIONAL CLASSES.

The season is approaching for educational classes. Everyone should begin now to read up. The general ciences and in particular philosophy, history and olitical economy should be studied by every ocialist. The problems of the present order are ot so simple as they at first appear, are in fact omplex, and baffling when attacked with little nderstanding. Therefore let us educate ourselves nd the members of our class so that they may move isely into the new order. Can we, throughout the ominion, co-ordinate our efforts in a standardized ducational program. A page in the "Red Flag" iven to questions and answers on points raised in he classes might be a great help, especially if the ourse of the studies were under a regulation comon to all. Send in your suggestions.

OUR LITERATURE.

he Communist Manifesto, at the rate of $8 per 100. Single copies 10 cents.

anifesto of the Socialist Party of Canada . . $6 per 100. Single copies 10 cents.

lave of the Farm . . $6 per 100. Single copies 10 cents.

he Present Economic System, by Professor W. A. Bonger . . $6 per 100. Single copies 10 cents.

ocialism, Utopian and Scientific . . Single copies 15 cents. $13 per 100.

Wage Labor and Capital . . $8 per 100. Single copies 10 cents.

Capitalist Production, being the first nine chapters of Vol. I. Marx's Capital . . Single copies, paper cover, 50 cents; cloth bound, $1.00.

Ten Days That Shook the World, By John Reed, 2.00.

Kolchak, Autocrat and Tyrant. The actual story of Kolchak and his methods told by an American official recently returned from Siberia. With this is included, Anti-Bolsheviks and Mr. Spargo, by William Hard. Taken, with apologies from the July 9 "New Republic" . . $6 per 100. 10 cents per single copy.

Postage Paid.

Make all Money Orders payable to C. Stephenson, 01 Pender Street East, Vancouver, B. C.

"TEN DAYS THAT SHOOK THE WORLD."

(By John Reed.)

John Reed was in Russia during the Bolsheviki evolution and this book records his observations. e is a journalist, thus a trained observer but beides this he had the advantage of understanding he historical nature of the forces at work. Price, 2. Postage paid.

Subscriptions to the "Red Flag," $1.00 for 20 ssues.

French Politics

THE following extracts are from an article on French politics in the August 20, "New Republic." The writer of it is very desirious of a peaceful way out of the present crisis in French affairs, but seems doubtful after considering various factors. He points out that the state of mind of the rank and file of both army and navy are by no means reassuring to a government which counts on force to repress popular movements and gives many instances of revolts in those forces. And in addition to this, he shows the economic, financial and labor situation as continually growing worse. We also might point out that France probably possesses, in the financial oligarchy which dominates French bourgeois policies, the most reactionary ruling class in the capitalist world. A not very favorable factor for peaceful progress.

"For some time, Le Matin, the paper with the second largest circulation in France, has carried on a violent campaign against Clemenceau, and in favor of Briand. Important radical papers such as L'Oeuvre and Bonsoir, though not Socialist, have anathematized the government incessantly. And naturally the Socialists have continually harassed it.

In the face of such failures and such opposition, in the face of repeated predictions of an early collapse, in the face of a grave economic and financial crisis, of high prices and popular unrest, it is surprising the government still endures. Clemenceau's position has for four months been very weak, and it appeared that only his relation to the Peace Conference kept him in office. One has only to see an important session of the Chamber of Deputies to realize that the government is actually unpopular. Then why does he remain now that peace is signed? Very likely because the deputies are afraid of endangering their position with the electorate; they lie low, play politics, wait for the election and in the meantime dance to the tune of the government fiddle—all but the ninety or one hundred of the extreme left.

And who will replace the government when it goes? Barring a revolution, it will not be these ninety or one hundred Socialists. They expect their members to increase to one hundred and fifty or two hundred in the next election, and in the meantime will participate in no ministry not predominantly Socialist.

For the next government the betting is on M. Briand, who headed a ministry for some time during the war, as well as before it, and again burst into prominence some months ago with a vigorous speech on electoral reform. Since then he has hovered in the background, with the chances strong that he might assume the reins of government at any time. He is an astute politician of the Lloyd George type willing to cater to whatever element of the Chamber supports him.

But even in the event of a new ministry, no violent general change of policy is to be expected. There are circumstances which make a peaceful change of government seem likely, and tend to counterbalance a more revolutionary trend. We must remember that France has come out of the war victorious, even though the victory be pyrrhic, even though the government's activity has consisted chiefly in giving anaesthetics—not in curing the patient,—an activity illustrated by the 14th of July "Fete de la Victoire," when four million francs were spent in festooning Paris and impairing the natural beauty of the Champs Elysees by a double row of ornamental poles draped with flags and electric lights. So are the people encouraged to think only of the magnificent triumph of France, "the state on the frontier of civilization, guarding the liberty of the world," as the reactionary press glibly asserts.

Along with this sedulously encouraged intoxication of victory goes the natural reaction which follows war, the psychology of a "patriotism" that represses liberal thinking, and takes the form of branding as "pro-German" and "Bolshevist" every attempt to remove the fetters of a reactionary win-the-war cabinet, or to improve the condition of the workers.

But more important and permanent than these factors, is France's large peasant population, patriotic, fundamentally conservative owning its own land, prosperous during the war, and prosperous now under the regime of high prices. So traditionally conservative are they that most of the troops used to quell popular disturbances in Paris are from the farming districts. Yet of these factors which might counteract the revolutionary situation, the only tolerably stable one is the contented peasant on the land. For before long the glamor of victory will wear off, "patriotism" will fade as the people begin to realize their frightful economic and financial position, and as the government more and more conclusively manifests its helplessness before the crisis. Taxes will become heavier, the cost of living higher.

The high cost of living—this chief cause of popular revolt, and prime condition of revolution—has already had ominous results in France. The present situation is so serious that there have already been riots in Paris, shops broken into by exasperated women. This tense situation has only been aggravated by the strikes for shorter hours and higher wages, which have given reason to employers for putting up the prices of their goods. Realizing this vicious circle of increased pay and increased prices, the Confereration Generale du Travail some weeks ago made a considerable advance in its theories, and concluded that its aim should be, not simply increased pay and shorter hours, but "the total reorganization of the system of production and distribution."

"Total reorganization"—a people's bitter discontent smouldering in France today, may easily turn "total reorganization" to revolution. The cities as in all such cases, are the most restless. The seaports, Bordeaux, Marseilles, Brest and Toulon, are hot beds of radicalism. Today it is no longer a case of "Paris against the rest of France," but of industrial centres such as Paris, Lyons, Lille, taking the lead and the others following.

A TESTIMONY TO BOLSHEVIK STRENGTH.

Meantime, it is interesting to learn from Mr. Wm. T. Goode, the special correspondent of the Manchester Guardian on the Esthonian front, who has succeeded in penetrating the Bolshevik lines and travelling through Pskoff to within 290 miles of Moscow, that:

> The story that the peasants refuse to work the land is in this sector quite untrue. The crops are vast in excellent order, and nearly ripe." . . "The railways are well-managed and the permanent way and stations are in good order. . . It is a triumph of organization, pointing to able and constructive administration, both of the railways and the military. The private shops in Ostrov are largely closed, but there are two stores of the Soviet, formerly co-operative stores. A bath costs nothing. The theatre is open and is packed with townsfolk.
>
> The whole appearance of this countryside is so different from the fantastic descriptions given in the west that the shock of disillusion is great. The general impression I gained is that the governing administration is a strongly organized communistic system, changing according to force of circumstances. The weak points are the land question and the unwilling conscripts, but the ring of enemies only stiffens the internal resistance and helps Bolshevism.
>
> "Petrograd will never be taken by the North Russian Corps, nor Moscow by Kolchak or Denikin."

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

Subscriptions to "Red Flag" . . . 20 issues $1.00

SATURDAY.....AUGUST 30, 1919

S. P. of C. and Organized Labor

BECAUSE well-known members of the Socialist Party of Canada are active in organizing the O. B. U., an impression appears to have got abroad among those not acquainted with the platform of the party, that there is some connection between the two bodies. This impression is a false one and we would recommend as a corrective, a perusal of both the Party platform and the Party manifesto as statements of its principles and policies.

In this article we will endeavor to give a brief outline of our Socialist position and also our attitude to the O. B. U. and labor organizations in general.

The Socialist Party of Canada is a political organization of Revolutionary Socialism. Its political functions are the education of the members of the working class into a knowledge of their class position in modern capitalist society. They also advocate the capturing of the Powers of the State, by the working class for the purpose of turning the present capitalist class ownership and control of the means of production and distribution into the collective ownership and control of society as a whole. The Party's educational activities chiefly consist in the circulation of literature, the holding of meetings and of educational classes on history, philosophy, economics, etc., and, wherever deemed advisable, the contesting of parliamentary elections, always making it clearly understood that the latter is done for propaganda purposes and that only votes for the abolition of capitalism are sought for.

The Party takes that stand against all reform parties, because its membership, though recognizing the inescapable necessity of a constant struggle by the workers against the encroachments of capital, also recognize that that struggle is unending and without solution so long as the capitalist system exists. They point out that, the period of permanent reform, can only begin when the workers have obtained control of the powers of the State, upon which the process commences, of transforming the capitalist system of production for profit into a system of production for use.

As a revolutionary Socialist Party, the Socialist Party of Canada can have no affilliations with any non-revolutionary party even though professedly Socialist or with an organized labor body whose function is to assist its members to bargain to better advantage for wages and conditions of work. We hear much, especially from the United States, of revolutionary industrial organizations, but this party holds that an industrial organization can not be called revolutionary, because in order to cover an industry it must take into its ranks individuals with all kinds of political opinions antagonistic to the social revolution. It is not that which is in the preamble, but that which is in the heads of the membership that counts.

We have the authorative opinion of Karl Marx, that if the workers failed to resist the encroachments of capital that they would be reduced to a mass of broken wretches. Needless to say, a mass of broken wretches are unlikely material to undertake intelligent action for the building of a new society. Marx held the above opinion not alone by cursory observation, but in addition through a life time of exhaustive enquiry into the mechanism of the capitalist system. Consequently, socialists, as individuals, take their part in the affairs of the unions. Anxious for the progress of the working class movement as a whole, they have a keen sense of the reactionary separatist influence on the workers of the craft form of organization, as well as its growing in compatability with the late modern industrialization of large scale production and the ineffectiveness of a craft union in coping with the centralized control of the capitalists. That the Socialists were not the only ones who were dissatisfied was manifested in the instant and favorable reception accorded the proposed formation of the O. B. U. by the majority of the organized labor movement in Canada. And that result was a sufficient refutation of the charge that it was a scheme conceived and foisted onto the workers in Canada by a few Reds. There has long been great dissatisfaction with the A. F. of L., and the relative merits of the craft and the industrial form of organization have been discussed for a generation in all parts of the world. Before the O. B. U. was formed, however, the strike in Winnipeg was forced on the workers, the Government stepped in and the triple alliance, the capitalists, the State, and the A. F. of L., came out into the open to combat the new movement. Circumstances were favorable for the triple alliance, for they had the insurgents exhausted after a long strike, a number of their officials in gaol and more important still, an overstocked labor market in their favor. Nevertheless, what the triumvirate have won in the material sense they have more than lost in moral prestige. Such defeats for the workers, are really victories at this stage of development.

In keeping the Socialist Party of Canada clear of mere bourgeois reformist politics and of entangling alliances with other organizations, political or industrial, the members hold that the Party is better able to concentrate on a sound scientific educational programme. But this does not mean that it views without interest the struggles of the workers on the industrial field, for even the struggle over wages has its significance. In Vol. 1. Capital, page 152, Marx says that "the class struggles of the ancient world took the form chiefly of a contest between debtors and creditors, which in Rome ended in the ruin of the Plebian debtors. . . . In the Middle Ages the contest ended with the ruin of the feudal debtors who lost their political power together with the economical basis on which it was established. Nevertheless, the money relation of debtor and creditor that existed at these two periods reflected only the deeper-lying antagonism between the general economical conditions of existence of the classes in question."

The class struggle of today takes the form of a struggle between the wage working class and the capitalist class, but the class struggle is not in the wage relation, not in the transaction of buying and selling labor power. Nevertheless, the antagonism engendered in that transaction may often develop into such course of action as may call into the open that hidden but uninterrupted struggle which arises from the deeper-lying antagonism between the economical conditions of existence of the propertyless wage working class and the property-owning capitalist class.

HANGING THE KAISER

Moral Responsibility.

This doctrine of moral responsibility is one capable of wide extension. Under it Mr. Lloyd George, Lord Northcliffe and Mr. Bonar Law could not well complain if they were indicted as responsible for a conspiracy to prevent the opening of peace negotiations in the year 1916, with the result that nearly 500,000 Englishmen were killed or maimed. It is difficult to see how those accused could do other than enter a plea of guilty to the charge of consciously prolonging the war. Their plea in mitigation of sentence would be that they honestly believed that thousands of other people's lives should be sacrificed in order to ruin the German State in the interests of British capitalism.

One remarkable feature of this war has been the conscription of Englishmen to defend a foreign State, namely, France, which has shown itself incapable of protecting its own independence by force of arms. In the war that is proceeding against the Russian Soviet Government there has been no declaration of "a state of war," nor has there been any due assent to the military policy now being pursued against the Russian Soviet Government by the British Houses of Parliament. In the absence of any "state of war," the Ministers responsible for this policy, in my judgment, could be indicted for treason-felony, as the legality of the war and the provision of supplies for the war could be most strenuously disputed.

Try Them All.

After the decision in Heddon vs. Evans, the doctrine of moral responsibility has most serious implications for the Secretaries of State for War, the members of the Army Council, and the generals commanding in the field from 1914 to 1919. Mr. Churchill recently declined to state the figures of military executions which had taken place on all fronts during the war; presumably because their total would shock and astound the country, while there would be a clamor for a most searching investigation into the conduct of those associated with the policy of murder by Field General Court-martial. In the case of the military executions of boys under eighteen years of age, all officers and persons parties to the convictions and executions would be guilty of murder, as there is no color of justification under the regulations for imposing the extreme penalty in such cases. A Commission of Enquiry into the military prisons abroad and into the nature of the punishments inflicted would show without doubt that the clause in the Bill of Rights, which is not repealed by the Army Act, the Defence of the Realm Acts, or the Regulations thereunder, against torture has been infringed by the military authorities so that the toll of executions might be somewhat reduced but the terrorism of military law maintained. In my view, all these officers and statesmen would find it difficult to answer an indictment charging them with acting in excess of their jurisdiction and with gross cruelty in connection with military punishments. Also the shooting of men on the field of battle without pretence of trial is murder under the Common Law of England.

A Committee of Inquiry into the conduct of the Home Office officials entrusted with the powers of deportation and internment would disclose how gravely the persons interned or deported under the orders of the Home Office have been oppressed. It is sufficient to state with emphasis that the grossest corruption has accompanied the administration of these regulations by the officials themselves.

C. H. Norman, in the "Glasgow Socialist."

THE "FREE" UNITED STATES.

From the land of the free to the south, we have received a circular appealing for funds for the defense of many hundreds of I. W. W. now confined in gaol. The circular relates a tale of horror. Many of these men have been upwards of two years in gaol, under the most spirit destroying conditions, without a judgment so far being rendered against them. A large number have died and many of those who remain are now broken in body and mind. Funds for the relief and defence of the prisoners should be sent to Thomas Whitehead, 1001 West Madison Street, Chicago, Illinois.

The Last Peace Offers of the Bolsheviks

(The Bullitt-Steffens Mission.)

Edward Bing, correspondent of the United Press at present in Budapest, has obtained, by wireless, a long interview with Trotsky on the interior and exterior situation of the Soviet Republic. The Daily News of July 5 gives a report at length of Trotsky's answers to the various questions, but we confine ourselves to that relating to the question of peace between Russia and the Entente.

Asked as to the attitude of Bolshevist Russia to the Entente, Trotsky said:

"The ordinary Russian citizen does not believe that Soviet Russia is at war with Kolchak, Denikin and the bourgeoisie of Finland and Poland. These groups are almost insignificant and are destined to disappear very soon, even without our help, were they not supported by foreign groups. Russia is fighting a defensive war against the imperialisms of England, France and the United States. These three countries copy literally the methods of the Hohenzollerns, and shelter behind fictitious 'Governments.' They themselves violate the much-talked of 'self-determination of small nationalities.'"

Is the Soviet Government ready to treat of peace with the Entente? asked Bing.

Trotsky replied: "On this subject exact information can be obtained from Mr. William Bullitt, representing Secretary of State Lansing, and Mr. Lincoln Steffens, who have come to Russia on a mission of peace. Mr. Bullitt is in this regard more than competent, for he has participated in negotiations of which I know only because I have been informed as a member of the Soviets. The Russian Press has published the text of a treaty of peace of which both the representatives of Soviet Russia and the diplomats of the United States, representing Wilson and Lansing, have approved. Wilson has been overruled, as he has on many other matters. Clemenceau has had the word. He has exerted himself to maintain anarchy in Russia and to terrify French public opinion with the spectre. England and the United States have given in to Clemenceau, and Italy, is now out of the game. We declared openly to the diplomats that we are ready to make peace even at the cost of great concessions, and we hope at the same time to prove that to Clemenceau and his accomplices that the only European army which grows in strength is the Red Army of Workers and Peasants."

This is the declaration recently made by Trotsky. Now to which treaty does he refer? We know of none, yet he says it has been published in the Russian Press.

But we do know of a radio sent about a month ago from Moscow to Budapest, where the history of the Bullitt-Steffens mission was described as:

"Peace proposals have been brought by Mr. Bullitt, Captain Petit and the journalist, Steffens. The Soviet Government, at the express demand of Bullitt, has reluctantly refrained from immediately publishing them.

"But now, after this has fallen through, and in view of the constant attempts of the Allies' Governments to overthrow the Soviet system and continue this bloodshed, the Soviet Government publishes the conditions.

"They have been drawn up by Wilson, Colonel House and Lloyd George, and brought to us by Bullitt.

"The Allies invite all existing Governments in Russia to a new peace conference on a basis accepted by all the Allied powers, and the details of which would be fixed later. The Soviet Government made some modifications which were accepted by Bullitt. The official invitation should have been received by all on April 10 last.

"Then the Allies, who never had the intention of signing peace, to hide the real reasons for the continuation of the war from their people, and in the

(Continued On Page Eight.)

Notes on Winnipeg Trial of Labor Officials

What Is Sedition and Conspiracy?

It seems clear that many publications regarded as acceptable by great universities will have to be thrown to the discard if the claim made by some of the detectives of the R.N.W.M.P. are substantiated by the Trial Court. For instance, the Communist Manifesto is on the shelves of Oxford and Cambridge Universities, and has been there since 1888, and yet it is used against the accused as evidence of conspiracy. They sold it openly and this proves that they were conspiring to overthrow the state.

Mr. Coyne read an extract from the end of section 2. This refers to revolutionary measures that must be taken by the workers if they are to get control.

Mr. McMurray objected to an extract only being read, since this was modified greatly by preceding and subsequent statements. Mr. Coyne, however, insisted that the passages he had read governed the aspirations of the accused today.

This was later re-opened by Mr. Lefeau, assisting defence counsel, who went somewhat fully into this particular pamphlet to show the injustice of taking extracts and drawing conclusions therefrom.

He asked Sergt. Reams if he had read the preface, and if he knew the author. Reams said he had read but very little of it, but had marked the passage read by Coyne. He knew the author was a German.

Mr. Lefeau asked him, "Would it surprise you if I told you that the author was a cotton manufacturer living in England?" Reams said, no, he would not be surprised.

Lefeau showed that the pamphlet was written before the French Revolution of 1848, and that the preface had been written by Engels in 1888 after that revolution. Then he went on reading, "NO STRESS IS LAID ON THE REVOLUTIONARY MEASURES AT THE END OF SECTION 2." The times had changed and many of these measures, then considered revolutionary, were now the law of the land.

Then he turned to the section and read the list of subjects classed by Marx as revolutionary. Compulsory education for every child was one of them.

Reams said he had not seen this section.

Then Lefeau read on. "That passage would be greatly modified today. Section four has become antiquated because the political situation has been entirely changed. The old political parties have been obliterated."

Reams said he "might have seen this, but even if it was not revolutionary in itself, it was a good starting point for stuff that was revolutionary."

Under cross question, Reams said he would not accept the responsibility for Mr. Coyne reading this as a fair sample of the pamphlets he had put in.

Lefeau then stopped reading, and claimed that he had read enough to show the unfairness of reading extracts. All should be read or none.

Those Bolsheviki Funds.

This controversy revived the letter published by Senator Robertson with the advice of counsel, as being a letter written from one Berg in Alberta, to R. B. Russell in Winnipeg.

In this letter as published by Senator Robertson in the daily press, Russell was said to have received "Bolsheviki Funds." Then a whole sentence in the letter that explained the expression "Bolsheviki Funds" had been omitted. This sentence said that $250 had been sent by one of the miners' unions, and they would send more as soon as they could to help the O. B. U. The miners' unions, then, were the Bolshevists. But the Senator, the minister of labor, a minister of the crown, had left out the qualifying sentence. Mr. McMurray said that if this was by design it was remarkable, and unpardonable.

What purpose could there be, he wanted to know, if it were not to influence the public against the accused. Whatever the purpose, the single case condemned the practice of reading extracts only.

Socialism Defined.

"How would you define socialism?" Sergt. Reams was asked. His reply was, "Socialism is getting something for nothing. Those who have nothing want to get something from those who have."

This will likely be a new definition to many, but the sergeant insisted that this is what the revolutionists were urging, and this is what was preached in the Labor Church.

He said he was making enquiries into the "cause of unrest," and "how far the propaganda of the Socialist Party of Canada had ramified," so he reported only what he considered seditious utterances to his superior.

There was an "underground channel going on that doesn't appear on the surface," but what the propaganda was he could not express in concrete terminology. It is not vague, however, it is there, it is semi-concrete.

A number of the Winnipeg Citizen's committee testified at the trial that a delegation of that body went to meet Senator Robertson at Fort William on his way West. No wonder the Minister of Labor was so quick in branding the strike as a Revolution.

• • • •

Challenging a ruling of the court, a lawyer for the defence pointed out that the magistrate had been reading from American law and not British. He replied that he didn't care what they did in the U. S. A., or in Australia or elsewhere, he was in Canada.

• • • •

Take up collections at your union meetings, picnics and at the workshop.

Send all money and make all cheques payable to A. S. Wells, B. C. Federationist, Labor Temple, Vancouver, B. C.

Collection agency for Alberta: A. Broatch, 1203 Eighth avenue east, Calgary, Alta.

Central Collection Agency: J. Law, Secretary, Defence Fund, Room 12, Labor Temple, Winnipeg.

Contributions will be acknowledged through Labor and Socialist Press.

Lawyers for the defence in Vancouver, Bird, Macdonald & Earle.

• • • •

Because of discrimination against contributors, whose names have been published as sending in moneys for the defence fund, acknowledgment in future will be made by mail.

Receipts to date have been $3985.93, and expenditures, $2054.75.

THE FREE (?) PRESS.

The purely bourgeois element, business and financial elements, have absolute control of the press and this control is decisive in obtaining a majority approval. That is well-known, why evade the fact? Freedom of speech is a legal fiction, because, where there is not an equal opportunity to be heard, it can not be said to exist in reality.

THE SHAME OF CANADA.

(From the "Western Labor News.")

Solomon Pearl Almazoff is a free man. Boiled down the case against him amounts to this that at a meeting to discuss social reform in a purely theoretical argument he used the expression "We must have bloodshed." (meaning at the instance of the ruling class.) This was seized upon and reported by a police spy as an incitement to violence and revolution, said police spy being described by the man who was making a merit of not deporting Almazoff to certain death on the strength of his evidence, as unfamiliar with the English language, and "an alien not of the highest type."

The Truth About Russia

(From "The Workers' Dreadnought.")

By M. Phillips Price.

THUS two great social institutions have sprung up in revolutionary Russia—the political Soviet and the economic Soviet. The duty of the former is to protect the Republics from internal and external counter-revolution. The duty of the latter is to build up under the protection of the former the new social order. Once the danger of foreign intervention is removed, it is possible that in Russia the political Soviet will reduce its functions, and that the power in the land will pass to huge economic syndicates working under the control of the Central Council of Public Economy. The latter body is something like the Central All-Russia Professional Alliance, except that it concerns itself only with production, distribution and exchange on a public basis and has nothing to do with the internal affairs of the different industries, which belong to the syndicates. When the new social order is really guaranteed from foreign counter-revolution, the political conflicts which have been raging in Russia since the Revolution will gradually die down. The struggles between the Bolshevik theory of "Immediate World Revolution" and the Menshevik theory of "Labor Coalition with the Bourgeoisie" will give way to others. Then will arise the delicate problem of how to adjust the interests of the whole community to the claims of the different workers' industrial syndicates, so that private capitalists conquered in the October Revolution, shall not reappear again in a more insidious form. All this, however, belongs to the future.

Russia has advanced by giant steps along the new road, in spite of all the wounds inflicted on her by the war and the foreign intervention. Young and energetic, untrammelled with the century-old conventions and traditions of an older, more archaic civilization, she has a clear field in which to begin the work of reconstruction. The private exploiter no longer exists in Russia today. If he was unwise, he fled to Paris and London to plot counter-revolution. If he was wise, he entered the service of Soviet Russia and is now receiving an ample salary, according to his knowledge and skill in industry. Throughout the length and breadth of the Russian plain, the struggle is still going on between those peasants whose ideals can not go beyond cornering corn and holding it up for famine prices while the towns are starving, and the proletarianized laboring peasants, who have learnt in the school of adversity that only by collective labor, by communistic production and distribution can a new and juster society be created.

Soviet System Versus Democracy.

Everywhere in Russia now the organs of the new form of society are found in the two types of Soviet. Upon these political and industrial unions only those who labor by muscle and brain can elect and be elected. In order to obtain a vote, therefore, a man or woman must be organized in order to be thus organized one must do some form of productive work. This is the first essential of the Soviet system. The second essential is that the Soviet should be elected, not territorially, but industrially. This is the real difference between a Soviet State and a Democratic State. A Democratic State recognizes no economic divisions in the electorate. Everyone is regarded as a part of what is vaguely called "the people." How impracticable a democratic parliament is for the modern industrially specialized form of society, the following example may show. A metal worker, let us say, lives next to a railwayman, on one side, and an accountant on the other. All three have special economic interests for the understanding of which exact professional knowledge is required. Each of them, if he was to draw up a programme of his demands at a given moment would have different claims to make for the protection of his particular economic interest. In a Soviet State each would have these interests put forward through the economic syndicate, of which he would have to be a member, and the central union of the syndicate would then consider them in relation to the whole economic production of the country. In times like the present, when the fight with the counter-revolution is still going on, the syndicate would have to consult with the political Soviet and obtain its sanction also. But the point is, also, that the whole Soviet organization is so arranged that the economic apparatus which is able to represent the workers' special interests and can reconcile them with the interests of the whole community is at hand. In a democratic state exactly the reverse is the case, for here the workers' industrial organizations have no political power, and can only advise a body which is brought into being by a scattered electorate. Thus the three types of workers I take above are in a Democratic State only able to elect representatives for one district in which their economic interests are swamped in thousands of others. Candidates are put up by party caucuses which work on a territorial basis, and these candidates can not possibly represent all these interests at the same time. The Democratic election to a parliament, in fact, is nothing more than a device to deceive the workers by dividing them into artificial constituencies on the basis of which they can not possibly unite and draw up a common social and economic policy. This can only be done through the development of the industrial unions as described above.

Perhaps the greatest advantage of the Soviet, however, is that it is capable of being continually re-elected. The workers can withdraw their delegates and elect again at will. Thus the Soviets are always a reflection of the opinion of the workers at the given moment. This was most clearly seen in the case of the All-Russian Congress of Soviets in January, 1918, and the Russian Constituent Assembly, which met in that same month. The former, elected only a short time after the election for the Constituent Assembly, gave a large Bolshevik and Left Socialist-revolutionary majority. The Constituent Assembly, however, was elected on a candidate list made up in the Autumn of the previous year when quite different parties were in the political arena, and when the important split between the Left and the Right Wing of the Social-revolutionary party had not yet taken place. The result of the Constituent Assembly election was a majority for the Right Socialist Revolutionaries in which the Left Wing was hardly represented at all. For in the few weeks that elapsed between the drawing up of the list of candidates for the Constituent Assembly and the elections for it, an entirely new political situation had arisen. The Soviet Congress reflected this change, and the Constituent Assembly did not. Therefore, when the Allied Governments say that there must be in Russia a body which represents all the Russian people in a Constituent Assembly, before they can recognize the Russian Government, they are really saying that they want a government which will be put in power by scattering all the economic forces of the Russian workers, and which will become an empty shell within a short time of its election.

I would add one final word of appeal to the working class of England and France. Do not listen to the tales of horrors which the bourgeois press of Western Europe tells about the Russian Revolution. I say, because I know, that the starvation and misery from which the Russian people are suffering is due, not to those who are building up the new Socialist form of society, but to those who for three years drove Russia in an exhausting war, and then sent armed forces to invade her territory, and cut off her food supplies, and the raw materials of her industries. The Russian people appeal to all the world for peace. They long to establish the normal economic exchange between East and West Europe which alone can make good the destruction of the four years' war. Raise the blockade, they say; send us the technical advisers without which we can not restore our industries, shattered by the war. Soviet Russia is ready to pay handsomely for the services rendered. If the workers of England and France are still content to leave private financiers to control the relations between their countries and Russia, Soviet Russia will raise no objection but will treat with their financiers and satisfy their wants in so far as they do not involve the reduction of the Russian workers and peasants to the slavery that they lived in under Tsarism. If on the other hand English and French workers take these matters into their hands they will find in Bolshevik Russia a friend and an ally. They will at all times be welcome in the territories of the Republic, which are as safe for those engaged in honest labor as in any state of Western Europe or America. An immense field will be open to them to assist their Russian comrades with the technical advice which only they can give. On the other hand, they can learn many things which will be new to them in that wonder land that lies between Europe and Asia. Let us tear out the pages of the past! Let us write a new page in the history of the future!

Lenin---The Personal Leader ---Face to Face With His Followers

(From the September "Metropolitan.")

LENIN'S philosophy could not convince any American like Robins. Robins came back from Russia more anti-socialist than when he went. But he also came back knowing that Lenin's philosophy is indeed a philosophy and that it can not be countered by pretending that it is nothing but blood and wind. It challenges Americanism with a genuine challenge. It does not merely reject the basis of Americanism. It brings forward a strongly competitive basis of its own.

Lenin, of course, frankly, was not talking about consciences or about majorities. But neither was he talking about nothing. He was talking about vitalities, economic vitalities. He was saying:

The working-class is today the vital economic class in Russia. Through that class we will make a Russian Government better than the Czar's or Kerensky's, because it will be more vital, and better than any political government anywhere, because it will be economic. And this system, by example, will penetrate and saturate the world.

Such was Lenin in talk.

One day, back in Petrograd, when the Germans were advancing, Robins went out from his hotel to walk along the Nevsky Prospekt. He made toward the Neva. There was a crowd of people gathering there at a corner. Robins saw that they were reading a placard, spread on a dead wall, and that they were greatly excited by it. He joined them. This placard, in purport, said:

"Lenin has absconded to Finland with 30,000,000 roubles in gold from the State Bank. The Russian revolution has been betrayed by false leaders. But there is hope now for Holy Russia. The Little Father is coming back. The Grand Duke Nicholas Nickolaievitch is advancing from the Crimea with 200,000 brave true Russian soldiers who will save Russia from the Bolshevik traitors."

Robins turned and hurried back to his hotel to get his sleigh. He drove to Smolny, and waved his card at the door-keepers, and ran up stairs. In the corridors were crowds of commissioners and clerks and guards, running, shouting, and running again, getting ready for something very immediate. Machine-guns were being unhooded. Their cartridges were being run into them. The crowds, with the guns, surged over to one side of the building.

(Continued On Page Seven.)

LENIN—THE PERSONAL LEADER—FACE TO FACE WITH HIS FOLLOWERS.

(Continued From Page Six.)

Robins looked out from that side across the yard of Sholny, toward the Viborg—the Viborg workmen's quarter.

Two streets came from there toward Smolny They were black with two streams of armed workmen flowing against Smolny. They would overwhelm Smolny and clean it out and then flow to the front against the Germans. Such was the cry.

Robins drew back from his window and worked his way along a corridor of dense panic toward Lenin's private office. He looked in.

Lenin was there. He was receiving telephone messages from the front. He was receiving personal reports from couriers. He was writing orders and sending them out. He was working without pause, as usual, and, as usual, without haste. He seemed quite unaware of any crisis.

Robins was thrust into the room by shouting men behind him who cried to Lenin: "The order to fire!"

Lenin jumped to his feet. For just one moment he, too, was excited. "No! No!" he said. And again he said "No! No!" angrily. "Shoot them? We will talk to them. Tell their leaders to come in."

Somebody went to tell them. Lenin went back to his messages and his orders. The leaders of the mob began to come in and began to fill Lenin's office—workmen—in workmen's clothes—each with a bayoneted rifle in his hands and with a magazine pistol at his waist—workmen—soldiers—the men Lenin had to rely on—the armed Revolutionary proletariat—the nucleus of the future Red Army of Lenin's Russia. They grounded their rifles. Somebody said to Lenin: "They are here." The outer door was closed.

Lenin rose and walked toward his visitors.

"Comrades," he said, "you see I have not run away. Comrades, I was fighting for the Revolution before some of you were born. I shall be fighting for the Revolution when some of you are dead. I stand always in danger. You stand in more danger. Let us talk frankly."

He put his hands in his pockets and walked up and down and meditated and spoke:

"Comrades, I do not blame you for not always trusting your leaders. There are so many voices in Russia today! I wonder that you have trusted us as much as you have.

"Among honest Revolutionists today there are two voices. One of them is right. One is wrong.

"Many comrades say:

"'You must go to the front and fight the Germans and die fighting. You must die fighting for the Revolution.'

"They do not pretend, these comrades, that you are willing to fight for anything except the Revolution. But they say, and they say truly, that the Germans are against the Revolution. And so they say: 'Go and fight the Germans.'

"I do not say so. I say:

"'You are the new army. You are the only army of the Revolution. You are the beginning of it. What will happen if you fight the Germans? The old army is not fighting. It can not fight. It is exhausted. Only you, with the Revolution in you, want to fight. You know what will happen. You will fight. You will die. And the soldiers of the Revolution will be dead, and the Czar will come back.'

"Would that be dying for the Revolution? Comrades, when we die, let us die really for the Revolution. Let us die when by dying we can win victory for the Revolution.

"Comrades, my voice is right. They tell you I will make a shameful peace. Yes. I will make a shameful peace. They tell you I will surrender Petrograd, the Imperial City. Yes. I will surrender Petrograd, the Imperial City. They tell you I will surrender Moscow, the Holy City. I will. I will go back to the Volga and I will go back behind the Volga to Ekaterinburg; but I will save the soldiers of the Revolution and I will save the Revolution.

"Comrades, what is your will?

"I will give you now a special train to the front. I will not stop you. You may go. But you will take my resignation with you. I have led the Revolution. I will not share in the murder of my own child.

"Comrades, what is your will?"

"Lenin! Lenin! Lenin!" The room held no other sound. "Comrade Lenin! Comrade Lenin!" It was a judgment delivered. Having delivered it, the judges picked up their rifles and marched out of the room and down the corridor, still delivering their judgment. "Comrade Lenin."

Such was Lenin face to face with his followers. Such was Lenin the personal leader.

Capitalism---The Basis of Colonialism

(By W. A. Domingo, Editor, Negro World, in the "Messenger," a Radical Magazine for Negroes.)

THE various colonial empires of the world are maintained by force and trickery and are devoid of altruism in any shape or form. The motivating influence that brought them into existence was the intention of a better armed race or nation to reduce weaker races and nations to the point where they would be compelled to directly or indirectly produce wealth for the benefit of the dominant class of the "Mother Country." The true basis of all empires is economic in spite of the fact that apologists for colonial expansion exhaust all their ingenuity to assign moral intent to countries whose imperial rule is based upon openly exercised,or slightly veiled force. This is as much true of the frank and brutal imperialism of Rome, Germany, France, Spain, Japan and Great Britain as it is of the less visible imperialism of the United States. The former countries, more ingenuous than the latter, in acquiring new territory rarely, if ever, attempted to cover up their intentions with hypocritical cant or resort to the outward forms of a "purchase;" they usually took whatever they had the power to seize and explained the conquest afterwards.

A very natural question to ask is: "Why do countries have colonies?" This is easily explained. In the first place because of the capitalistic development of most "civilized" countries the vast majority of the population have been expropriated from the land and live in cities in ever increasing numbers. In the cities, because of the wonderful productivity of modern machines more goods are produced than can be bought up by the population of the producing country, hence the need for outlets in foreign countries. This condition makes foreign markets necessary. The only markets that can absorb any appreciable portion of manufactured goods are located in such countries as can not or ARE NOT PERMITTED to develop industrially. To safeguard and insure a market against competition from other industrially developed and exploiting countries, political control of the market is essential. Hence the imposing of the rule of the industrially developed exporting country upon the industrially undeveloped and importing country. However, sometimes the prospective colony may have infant industries of its own—enough to supply its own needs—or it may have ambitions to become self-sufficient. In such cases the "Mother" or exploiting country ordinarily effectuates the death of the existing industries or renders the ambition to create new industries, stillborn. This is illustrated by the manner in which the weaving and other industries of India were killed in the interest of English manufacturers and by the way in which the Jamaican government (which is dominated by English officials appointed from Downing street, London) strangled the soap factory in Kingston some years ago.

The first reason for colonies is to provide safe markets for the surplus commodities of the "Mother Country."

Secondly, because of the needs of modern industry and the inability of manufacturing countries located in temperate regions to produce them, tropical products such as copra, rubber, coffee, cocoa, balata, pissava and hides have to be imported. In order that the supply will be steady and uninterrupted, political control of the source is necessary. This control manifests itself in the form of preferential tariffs between the colony and the "Mother Country." It explains the insistent demands of the Unionists of Great Britain for a preferential tariff with the colonies and the reason why Cuban imports into America are given a substantial rebate of customs duties.

The second reason for colonies is, therefore, to insure the Mother Country a safe and regular source of supply of raw materials.

Thirdly, because of the contradiction of modern capitalist civilization, instead of machines being a boon to the workers they have proven to be a curse. In all industrialized countries vast armies of unemployed exist who have been created by the man being displaced by his creature—the machine. These unemployed men and women serve two purposes. One, by their pressure on the factory gate to reduce wages to the lowest point of subsistence; two, by their ever-increasing numbers enlarge the proletarian population, thereby making of it a portentous menace to the system that created it. So as to avoid the latter phase from becoming too dangerous, the Mother Country, that is, the class that controls it, needs some place to which the "surplus" population can be conveniently exported. Hence, the various efforts to send unemployed Europeans to Australia, Canada, South Africa, New Zealand and other temperate countries. Germany, who came on the colonial field late, had to yield to this imperative economic law even though political control of her exported subjects was lost when they went to colonies of other exporting countries or to sparsely populated sovereign countries like Brazil. This in a measure explains the dual citizenship laws of Germany.

The third reason for colonies is to find congenial territory to which to export the "surplus" population of the Mother Country.

The fourth and last important reason for colonies is the intention to create sinecures for inpecunious sons of the Mother Country, who by virtue of lineage and tradition belong to the class from which bureaucrats are largely recruited. This last reason which is the visible manifestation of actual political control of colonies serves a dual purpose. First, it serves as a guarantee that the colonial government, dominated by sons of the Mother Country, will not be diverted into economic and political activities and alliances inimical to the interests of the land of their birth; and, next, by paying huge salaries and enormous pensions to these officials, substantial amounts are yearly extracted from the colonies and exported to enrich the Mother Country. To sum up: All Empires, no matter how seemingly benevolent, are based upon force and maintain the structural form of a central, manufacturing, exporting and exploiting "Mother" country, whose influence radiates to the "colonies" through her possession of a merchant marine, political control and expropriation of the natives. These bases of influence in their turn have behind them power in the form of an army and navy.

Colonialism, therefore, is a product of Capitalism which may be defined as that system of wealth production and distribution that is based upon a favored few living off and at the expense of the oppressed many. With the death of capitalism in the Mother or Central Country, will come the collapse of imperialism and its train or murder, high taxes, poverty, oppression and exploitation in the Colonies.

The Term "Wealth" as Used in the Science of Economics

"LABOR produces all Wealth." So runs the familiar formula. There are many people, however, who are of opinion that this statement is incorrect and that it should read: Labor, applied to natural resources, produces all wealth. Now this, of course, supplies additional information but the addition interferes with the simple directness of a statement which, without it, is correct as it stands. It will be observed that the verb "to produce" means a bringing forth from already existing material and does not imply creation. If I were to say that labor creates all wealth, I should be guilty of a misstatement, for the simple reason that man can not create either matter or energy. He can only bring about changes in form or location.

Suppose we turn the phrase round so that it reads: All wealth is produced by labor. You will observe that we say "all" wealth. This clearly limits the meaning of the word "wealth" to those objects that are produced by labor. Now, the word "wealth" is derived from the Anglo-Saxon word "weal" and is a collective word applied to all those things that contribute to health, happiness and well-being. Words, such as this, which have in general use a very wide significance, are generally productive of considerable confusion when imported into any science such as political economy. This is because, for the sake of scientific precision, it is found necessary to limit the meaning of such words to one thing or group of things. We are committed, by the phrase we have been considering, to definition of wealth as **consisting of the aggregate of those objects or things which have been produced by labor and are either necessary, useful or agreeable to man.**

This definition, it will be seen, excludes many things commonly referred to as "natural wealth," such as mineral deposits and virgin land or forests, as well as many other things of the same nature, not generally considered in this connection at all, for instance, the air, the light and heat of the sun and the natural forces. These things constitute what we may call the **constant factor** in production and are provided spontaneously and freely by nature; in recent economic language they are called **free goods**, as distinguished from **economic goods**, which form the substance of wealth, and only become the material for economic science when they become subject matter for human labor and thus a factor in production.

Inasmuch as wealth is generally reckoned in terms of money this latter appears to many people to be the sole form of wealth. The money-commodity itself, of course, is wealth, but notes and bills are not, being merely devices for exchange. Nor are mortgages, stocks, shares and bonds. These latter are only claims upon wealth and their creation or extinction does not affect in any way the existing quantity of goods. On the other hand, the term wealth includes not only material objects but other things not so tangible, such as electrical and mechanical power, labor-power and personal services of one kind and another. These things are the product of labor, are useful and are bought and sold as such. The term wealth also includes many things that, from an ethical point of view, might not, by some, be considered either useful or desirable, for instance, beer, cigarettes, diamond tiaras or patent medicine. John Ruskin, for example, approaching this subject from a sentimental point of view, would class as wealth only those things which can be shewn to be conducive to the health, happiness and well-being of humanity on the highest ethical and moral grounds. He would, therefore, include food, clothing and housing of a wholesome and substantial kind, good music, books and pictures; sunshine, flowers and scenery. I suppose one might reasonably include the grace of God. On the other hand, he would exclude all such things as adulterated and shoddy goods, jazz music, chromo-lithographs and paper-bound books, classing these as "illth." Now, I find myself heartily in sympathy with the sentiment here expressed. Political economy, however, is not concerned with that aspect of the question. It is, no doubt, quite proper to draw such moral lessons as we find proper from our conclusions but the investigation itself must be conducted in a manner free from prejudice.

Adam Smith defines wealth as the annual produce of land and labor. J. S. Mill emphasizes this important point: that the bulk of wealth is produced annually. This, of course, it must be, seeing that it is consumed at practically the same rate. Even constant capital only subsists by perpetual reproduction. This point of view appears to me to be of peculiar importance. We see that the wealth of the world consists of a stream of products brought into being by the collective effort of the producing class. The indiyidual members of society appropriate and consume such shares of this stream as they can secure by virtue of the legal claims they may possess under the prevailing system of ownership. It is thus possible to express wealth in terms of **income** distributed as rent, interest, profit and wages. This view, I admit, is not strictly accurate but is true of an increasingly large proportion of the wealth of modern society.

GEORDIE.

• • • •

Erratum: In last week's issue, (Aug. 23.) the article on Exchange by "Geordie," contains a typographical error. In the classification of paper money (No. 2) Jiduciary should be spelt Fiduciary. (Dictionary gives it, Lat. fiduciarius, from fiducia—confidence, trust.

THE LAST PEACE OFFERS OF THE BOLSHEVIKS.

(Continued From Page Five)

hope of crushing Russia, the invitation was never sent."

The Eleven Conditions of Peace.

"Here are the principal clauses of the treaty:

"An armistice to be declared on all Russian fronts, while the delegates discussed the following conditions:

(1) All Governments constituted on the territory of the ex-empire will continue only till the people concerned decide on which Government they wish.

(2) Neither of these Governments to attempt hostilities against another.

(3) Raising of the blockade.

(4) Commercial relations to be resumed.

(5) All products already in Russia, and any which may come, to be accessible to all classes without any distinction whatsoever.

(6) All the Governments to grant a complete amnesty to their political adversaries, soldiers included.

(7) Allied troops to evacuate Russia.

(8) Simultaneous reduction to a peace footing of both Soviet and anti-Soviet armies.

(9) All Russian Governments to recognize the debts of the ex-empire.

(10) Freedom of residence and liberty to travel to be accorded to all Russians on the full extent of Russian territory.

(11) Prisoners of war to be repatriated.

"England and the United States are to guarantee the observance of these conditions by France.

"Even though the Red Army was then on the point of capturing Odessa, the Crimea and the region of the Don, the Soviet Government was ready to accept these conditions, ready to accept the status quo, in the certain hope that the inhabitants of those parts of Russia not already under the system of Soviets will be ready, sooner or later, to overthrow their reactionary Governments."

The radio closed by saying:

"The publication of these proposals proves once again the hypocrisy of the Allied Governments, and exposes their lies when they said that the Soviet Government had refused to cease hostilities. The duplicity of the Allied Governments can have only one result—to close up our ranks more solidly than ever, to fight the alliance of great and little Imperialists, who wish once more to enslave the peasants and workers of Russia."

Humanite, July 8.

THE AMENDED IMMIGRATION ACT

The New Jurisprudence.

If the law as laid down by the judges is sound, which there seems to be no reason to doubt, then the legislature has prescribed certain acts and opinions and created a method of dealing with them with which the old established law of the country has nothing to do, and can have nothing to do. Trial by jury and proof in a court of record according to the rules of evidence, are dispensed with. An accused person can be subjected to an inquisitional examination and compelled to exonerate himself or be convicted if he fails to do so.

The holding of opinions subversive of constituted authority and membership in societies alleged to hold such opinions as articles of association are among the most prominent reasons for the invocation of this law.

The classes of person directly affected by the law are aliens and British subjects not born in Canada. Very easily by the use of another statute all naturalized citizens can be brought under its operation.

The penalty is deportation.

This principle of legislation was introduced to prevent questionable citizens of other countries from coming into Canada and for catching such if they slipped in and sending them back. It has since been extended as to the individuals it covers and the character of the offences it deals with, for the purpose of getting rid of obnoxious trade union officials and labor agitators.

There is no apparent limit to the period of detention without even examination before a board.

Opinion is divided as to the future development of this experiment in legislation which is new in the British Empire at least. Some think that it is hardly dangerous, and may lead to a complete subversion of liberty. Others, on the contrary, consider that law and order are in such grave danger just now that this legislation, if anything, requires extension and strengthening. A great many are chary of expressing any opinion as they fear that to do so might bring them under the provisions of the statute and lead to personal discomfort. Most, however, think that the law will be largely a dead letter and that most accused persons will be accorded the favor of a legal trial. A few say to let it alone, the law will be a handy weapon when they get into power. This puts them on the same level of citizenship as the men who secured the passage of the law.

The arrested Russians before the Immigration Board in Vancouver are being defended by Bird, Macdonald and Earle. Send your contributions to the General Defence Fund.

Propaganda Meeting, Empress Theatre, corner Gore avenue and Hastings street, Sunday, 8 p.m. Doors open at 7:30 p.m.