Preconceived Ideals or Material Conditions---Which?

The Driving Force Which Determines Social Changes and the Forms of the Social Structure.

A previous article in these columns dealt briefly with the question of the precise form which the Social Revolution is likely to take —as being the most immediate of those two issues over which Socialists and others do rage so furiously together to the great perplexity of the uninitated. The second of these two issues—the form and character of that state of Society which is destined to succeed Capitalism—I shall endeavor to deal with here.

This question has its roots in that timeworn, threadbare, utterly discredited but persistent idea that Society can and should be reorganized in accordance with some preconceived plan. For this reason it should be very cautiously approached by the Scientific Socialist and with a proper understanding of the speculative nature of any discussion which may arise from it.

It would, perhaps, be a very excellent thing, if it were possible, for a number of the wisest and most virtuous men of all nations to convene and map out a plan of an ideal state of Society—a society in which all those things which are objectionable to us should be conspicuous by their absence, and all those things which are considered desirable by us should be present in abundance—and thereafter proceed to reorganize Society in accordance with that plan. Quite a number of objections might be urged against such a scheme even if it were possible. For instance, it is hardly likely that we would be able to agree upon what things were desirable and what were not. But the main objection to the whole thing—and quite a weighty objection too, when one considers it—is that it simply can not be done. The Social Process does not work that way. The attainment of any ideals which some of us—or all of us for that matter—may hold is strictly limited by the material conditions obtaining from time to time.

In spite of the fact that the human animal stands at the head of all forms of life; in spite of the enormous advance made by all branches of scientific research; in spite of the fact that man has developed the ability to use, to a certain extent, the forces of nature he is still but a pawn in the game, and a mighty insignificant pawn at that.

We may try at times to flatter ourselves that what we do we do of our own 'Free Will.' When we do that we are like the Irish carpenter who slipped and fell from his scaffold and, to cover his confusion, explained that he had come down for some nails. 'Free Will' is a delusion. All Sociologists are agreed upon that. At the best we are able to understand, to some extent why we do what we do, but we are not able to determine our own actions much less the movements of Society. We act as we do not because we wish to but because we must.

The whole argument, in the final analysis, resolves itself into the difference between 'Idealism' and 'Materialism.' Idealism claims that the 'idea' is the only reality; that Ideals are the motive-force, as it were, of Society; that Society moves by striving after and working towards Ideals. Now, as a matter of plain fact, this theory is long since discredited. True it is still accepted, more or less unconsciously, by the great mass of unthinking people, but this is owing to the fact that they are deliberately and purposely kept in igorance of the real facts of the case. And they are kept in ignorance for no other reason than that it serves the interests of the ruling class that they should be ignorant of such facts.

Religion, which has always been and still is the greatest bulwark of ruling class privilege, takes its final stand on the basis of 'Idealism.' Remove this prop and Religion falls of its own dead weight. It is many years now since Marx and Engels formulated the Materialist Interpretation of History which drove the final nail in the coffin of 'Idealism,' but as the Holy Roman Church conspired to suppress the teachings of Copernicus, Bruno and Galileo—teachings which the whole world has long since acknowledged to be correct—so have all the churches conspired with the ruling class to suppress and ignore where they can not suppress the teachings of Marx and Engels—teachings which the scientific world knows to be correct in principle and which are yet destined to sweep religion and ruling classes into the discard together.

Materialism does not deny the existence of ideals in the minds of men, nor does it deny that these ideals exert considerable influence over their actions. But it does contend that ideals are but the reflexes of the material conditions under which we live and it is the material conditions and not the ideals which are the real driving force behind social movements.

This is one of those truths to realize which we must look below the surface. It is not apparent any more than it is apparent that the earth moves round the sun. It is a fact that Society does sometimes move in accordance with, or, rather, in the direction indicated by, certain widely held ideals. To the superficial observer this may suggest that these ideals constitute that force at the behest of which Society moves. Anyone who has seen a freight train 'backing up' might—if they were ignorant of such things—imagine, because the train moved in accordance with and in the same direction as the caboose, that therefore the caboose was pulling the train. To anyone informed on such subjects, however, it would be quite obvious that the real motive force was derived from the engine behind and that the movement of the caboose was but a reflex of the movement communicated by the engine to the body of the train.

So it is with the Social Process. Material conditions—the engine—are the real driving force. Ideals are but a reflex of that force. For instance; we live, and have lived for thousands of years, under different forms of society in which every man's hand is against his neighbor. None are free from the effects of this. Even the members of the ruling class are obliged to struggle with each other in order to maintain their position. What is the result? The most widely held Ideal for thousands of years has been 'The Brotherhood of Man;' an ideal condition where that state of affairs which has obtained for centuries, and which is becoming less and less tolerable, shall not exist. As far as striving after ideals is concerned we have been striving after that one for ages. Can any man honestly assert that we are any nearer to its attainment than we were, say, nineteen-hundred years ago?

The ideal of 'The Brotherhood of Man' is a beautiful one. It is certainly nothing to any man's discredit that he should hold it. But it should be understood that we can never attain to it or anything approaching it, so long as existing material conditions do not favor it. Wherefore, those who profess to aspire to and strive towards it would be better advised to devote their energies to the endeavor to modify, as far as is humanly possible, the material conditions under which Society exists. Our friends of the Cassock, the Cowl and the Surplice, and all those who are deluded by them, might give this a trial. They must expect, however, in such an event, to be very quickly taken in hand by their masters and ours and soundly spanked for their impudence. None know better than our masters how utterly futile is this striving after ideals, and none know better than they how much it is to their interests to keep us so deluded. What they do not seem to realize, however, is that in the grip of the evolutionary process they are as powerless as we.

The evolution of Society has been likened to an unhatched chicken. There comes a time when further development within the egg is impossible. The shell, which at first formed a protective covering, has served its purpose. It is no longer necessary, in fact has become a menace, a bar to further progress. It has become reactionary. The shell must be broken, the chick must win through to liberty—or die. So it is with Society. Development within a certain form proceeds until a point is reached where further development along the lines imposed by that particular form is impossible. When that point is reached one of two things must happen—like the chicken, Society must break open and discard the shell which retards its further development—or die. The death of the Social Organism is a possibility of such exceeding remoteness that we are justified in contending that, when that point is reached, **Society is going to break through its shell. That is Revolution.**

The typesetter is requested to leave a gap here so that members of the 'Citizen's League' may have time to catch their breath.

• • • •
• • • •

The chicken, however, does not break out of its shell because of any beautiful ideal it may have formed concerning what awaits it outside. It does not peck away at its hard covering because it chooses to do so of its own 'free will.' The chicken's beak is soft at first, and it probably hurts it to peck. But it does so because it must. Its existing condition has become intolerable.

And that, figuratively speaking, is the position in which Society finds itself today. Naturally, to we who realize how close at hand the Social revolution is, the question of what the subsequent Society will be like is one of absorbing interest. Nevertheless, those of us who have a proper understanding of the principles involved will enter very cautiously upon any discussion of it. Assuming—for the sake of continuing the analogy—something which is highly improbable, namely, that the chicken has some conception of what the outside world is like it is quite obvious that whatever that concept might be it could not coincide with reality for the chicken has had no experience of any world but that within its shell. But even a chicken, under such circumstances, would, we must admit, be justified in assuming that, at least, once free of its shell, it would not be subjected to those same intolerable conditions which were hindering its development.

So it is with us. We can not say what characteristics will mark post-capitalist society. But we can say which will not. We are not justified in asserting that the future Society will be Communism, Collectivism, Individualism or any otherism. But we may be sure that it will not be Capitalism. We are adrift on the sea of speculation when we commence to paint beautiful word-pictures of the future society. But we are on solid ground when we contend that, after the Social Revolution is an accomplished fact, economic class divisions with antagonistic interests and all those intolerable conditions to which such class divisions give rise will not exist.

Meanwhile, it might be as well to remember that the Social Revolution is not yet accomplished and there is work to do. The future will provide for itself out of the exigencies of the moment. We live in today.

C. K.

A MANY-LANGUAGED LEGION.

All hands are showing great determination to force "self-determination" (?) on Russia. A despatch in the Daily Herald says, "that the 7th Polish Division, which is being sent to Lodz, is commanded by Frenchmen. It is made up of former German Poles, together with Polish, English, French and American volunteers. The artillery is served by Austrian Poles sent from Italy." Three cheers for Imperialistic Internationalism.

Some Impressions of Siberia

The Editor has asked me to write a few of my experiences and impressions whilst in Siberia as a member of the C. E. F. (S), thinking they may be of interest to readers of the RED FLAG.

I must first state that, owing to the fact that I was stationed near Vladivostok during the whole of the time I was in Siberia. I can only speak from personal experience about that district. What I write about the rest of the country, and conditions therein, is from information obtained from various sources, from officers and men of the Russian Army, civilians, Czech-Slovaks, American and Japanese soldiers, from some of our own men who went into the interior, and from German Austrian and Hungarian prisoners of war with whom I came much in contact. I was very careful to compare and weigh all statements made by my various informants, and to take into consideration the prejudices likely to exist in their minds; and I consider that any statement made by me in the following article is as near the truth as it is possible for an outsider to get, as to what happened, and what is happening in Siberia.

With regard to the Expedition itself, I can only say that it was graft from beginning to end, an absolute waste of time, and a cause of unnecessary discomfort to the men. I was one of those unfortunates doomed to three weeks hell on the S. S. Protesilaus, where even the common decencies of life were lacking. Packed together in the depths of an ill-ventilated, gloomy hold, with no lavatory or toilet accommodation except on deck, (and these were frozen up the latter half of the journey,) it was little wonder that the majority of the men being very sick, the place stank like a sewer, and life became unbearable. The weather was rough, and one night, when one of the propellors broke, one of the hatchways was washed away, and we were flooded with water, which greatly added to our miserable condition. The food was as bad as they thought we would tolerate, and even this had to be fetched from the other end of the ship at the risk of being washed overboard whilst going along the icy decks. I myself, stood one evening in about one-foot of water, waiting for a pail of tea, with the ship bobbing like a cork, and the waves washing over me incessantly. That was some voyage, and none of us who were on board will forget it in a hurry. On arrival at Vladivostok, the temperature was about 20 below zero, which was the coldest weather we experienced. There was not much snow and very little fell afterwards, the sun shining brilliantly most of the time. We were marched to some barracks about eight miles east of Vladi, which had been built by the Russians. They were cold and bare the floors being of concrete, and most of the windows having broken panes of glass. There were huge heaters, but we were not able to have much fire in the heaters. For the first few weeks we had to pack water in pails a distance of about two miles, and in consequence there was a shortage of that necessity. However, on the whole, life was tolerable there. In April we were told that we should be returning to Canada either that month or the next. No reason was given, but most of us, being only too anxious to get back, did not worry about that. The whole expedition was absolutely unnecessary. We did nothing but useless drills and fatigues.

I was amused to read in the 'Japan Advertiser' sometime in February, a paragraph which, as near as I remember read as follows:

> "The people of Vladivostok are beginning to wonder why it is that so many foreign soldiers are allowed to remain in the country, eating up food which is so scarce, and so much needed for ourselves."

One can read a good deal in that little paragraph.

On the whole, we Canadians were made welcome by the Russians, and were treated with courtesy. I myself soon made friends and started to gain the information for the purpose of obtaining a signing up the situation as between the Bolsheviks and the counter-revolution.

The Russian peasant is a good-natured, peace-loving, industrious individual, the Doukobours being typical specimens. The Russian autocracy relied almost entirely on the Cossacks, and a few of the more warlike Russians for a permanent army to maintain them in power. Production, especially in the country villages and small towns, was carried on in a communistic manner. The Peasant belonged body and soul to the land owners, who treated them with the utmost cruelty and barbarity, a very well known fact. The contemptable inferiority of the "lower" classes, is an idea deeply rooted in the minds of Aristocrats but more especially in Russia, perhaps, is this idea openly acted upon. In the country, in the factory, in the army, one sees the peasant treated with injustice, ferocious cruelty and contempt.

When, therefore, the Bolshevik doctrine of "taking much" was preached, it was willing ears that listened. The communistic method of production was not a new idea to them. Freedom from the tyrrany of their oppressors was greatly to be wished.

Ninety-five per cent. of the votes were given to the Bolsheviks. Soviets were established, and a bloodless revolution was accomplished. The land was taken away from the owners and given, in some cases to the peasants and small holders, in others to the Soviets to hold in trust for the peasants. The toilers got the result of their toil for their own benefit. Schools were established in every place and all was going on smoothly and peaceably. But this was too good to last; the inevitable attempt of the master class to get back their power came.

Before going on to the counter-revolution I wish to mention the fact that all political prisoners and prisoners of war were liberated and given equal rights and opportunities with the Russians.

As showing the gradual increase in power of the proletariat, I will just give the wages of the soldier after each revolution.

Before the 1905 Revolution, 48 Kopeks, (25 cents) in 2 months.

After the 1905 Revolution, 56 Kopeks, (29 cents) in 1 month.

In war time these amounts were doubled.

After Kerenski Revolution, 40 Roubles $20-.80), in 1 month.

After Bolshevik Revolution, 15 Roubles, ($7.80), per day. This 15 Roubles being given to all, whether soldiers or civilians.

To return to the counter-revolution, the Czech-Slovaks, before the war, lived in Bohemia. They refused to fight in the Austrian Army, and at the beginning of the war gave themselves up to the Russians as prisoners, offering to fight with them against the Germans, their offer being accepted. With the revolution in Russia, and the treaty of Brest-Litovsk they found themselves amongst people who were at peace with Germany, which did not seem to please them. Since they could not go back to Austria, they expressed a wish to go to France to fight the Germans. Now the quickest way to France would be, one would think, via Odessa and Marseilles. But the Czechs asked permission to go across Siberia to Vladivostok, and from thence said to France. The Bolsheviks, for some reason, did not see their way clear to compel them to go the shorter route and gave consent, imposing certain restrictions as to the number of arms to be carried, which evidently showed that they were suspicious of them. It is perfectly plain from subsequent events that the trans-Siberian trip was instigated by the capitalists and land owners of Russia, and was backed by the Allies. No sooner had the Czechs got nicely spread over Siberia, than, almost simultaniously, they started a wholesale massacre of the peasants who for the most part were unarmed. Some of the Czechs justify this by saying that the Russians set upon them first, but I could get no evidence to support this. Other Czechs said that some German prisoners fired on them and set the ball rolling. On the other hand, prisoners who were in Urkutsk at the time, whom I questioned, stated that it was the Czechs who fired first on the Camp where they were, without any provocation whatever. Bearing in mind the fact that the Czechs seemed to bear an intense hatred to the Germans, and also that the trans-Siberian route was certainly a curious one to take, its seems certain that the Czechs themselves started the firing in order to start the counter-revolution. The savage barbarities committed by the Czechs and the Cossacks, who soon followed them into Siberia, surpass anything attributed to the Germans, and it is little wonder that the Bolsheviks retaliated. The members of the Soviets were shot, and anyone suspected of being a leader was arrested, and after a farce of a trial before a military tribunal, was also shot. A reign of terror was established and blood flowed like water. The Bolsheviks tried to organize an army, and have maintained a guerrilla warfare ever since, all the time strengthening themselves and gaining power. That they will ultimately triumph I have not the least doubt. The Russian peasants are Red to the core, and although overcome by treachery and cunning, know that the only way to freedom is through the re-establishment of Bolshevism. They are fighting for real freedom.

(To Be Continued.)

TRADES UNIONS IN GREAT BRITAIN AND NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL COUNCIL.

(Extracts from an Article in the "Christian Science Monitor," of July 4.)

LONDON, England.—The present writer was among the few—the very few—who found himself unable to gather enthusiasm over the setting up of the National Industrial Council, which, in the opinion of the experts of Labor problems, was the golden key to the paradise of peace wherein men labored and were content, confident in the hope that their grievances had but to be stated to be removed and that the representatives of Capital and Labor, sitting together on terms of equality, were the safest guarantee for the future welfare and harmonious relationships of the conflicting interests in industry.

. . . . Although the necessity for prompt action was recognized at the time, and the work of the joint committee was carried through with an eye on the calendar, over two months have slipped by, and the council has not yet been formed. Why this delay in setting up a body of whom so much was expected in the way of creating the conditions for industrial peace? Does the opposition come from the employers in those trades that are badly organized and for which it was admitted by the most powerful unions that the recommendations, if given effect to, would do so much?

Council Prospects Doubtful.

. . . . It is exceedingly doubtful if the industrial council will be established; and if it does see the light of day, it is extremely doubtful if it can allay the industrial unrest which appears to be daily gathering strength.

At the annual meeting of the Transport Workers' Federation, held at Swansea in Whit week, Mr. Harry Gosling, the president, said that it was a subject for congratulation that they had decided to hold aloof from the industrial conference, which was, in the opinion of their executive, simply a temporary expedient to frustrate the workers' demands.

No! the industrial unrest is far too deep-rooted to be appeased by the promise of a council upon which Labor shall be represented, to advise the government. Labor's immediate demand is for an opportunity for employment with reasonable security for continuity. It objects to having the stalking specter of unemployment, with its misery and degradation, constantly in the background.

The "Associative" Principle

ITS INFLUENCE ON THE STRUGGLE FOR EXISTENCE IN NATURE AND IN SOCIETY

(Continued From Last Issue.)

II

CO-OPERATION AND DIVISION OF LABOR.

MANY species of animals, as is well known, practice co-operation and even some degree of division of labor. This is particularly true of many orders of insects, such as ants and bees, in whose societies associative organization and specialization have been so long established as to appear a permanent inheritance if one may so speak. The immediate ancestors of man were, no doubt, gregarious, at least to the extent of co-operation for mutual protection, social intercourse and for the procuring of food. In human society, however, it would be long before any advance was made on simple co-operation, for the reason that simple labor does not admit of any division. In such labor, for instance, lifting a rock or, in rowing those participating will all go through the same movements. The advantage gained consists in a result that could not be obtained by one man working alone, or in a gain in speed or efficiency. This form of organization characterizes very primitive society and is known as "simple co-operation" or "simple associated effort."

Primitive Division of Labor Based on Sex.

Probably the earliest form of true division of labor is that based on sex. It is obvious that the sex function of women, childbearing and rearing would have economic effects. These effects as a matter of fact, were much more comprehensive, more extensive than a consideration of modern society would suggest. It is probable that women were the first basketmakers, weavers, potters and even agriculturists. On the other hand, the men would do the fighting, hunting, building and take charge of the flocks and herds. It is, however, a delusion born of modern sentimentalism, to say that primitive man chose for himself the nobler occupations and compelled the woman to perform the meaner tasks. There is every reason to believe that no such idea ever entered the head of savage man and that we have a very natural and simple case of division of labor.

Simple Division of Labor By Occupation Appears.

As a further development we find growing up the division of labor by occupation. The tribe had to have a medicine man whose particular business it was to hold intercourse with the spirits, to charm away disease, to control the weather and so on. From this individual have descended the whole class of priests, parsons, preachers, doctors and physicians, etc., all more or less parasitic in their nature, and all bearing abundant traces of their ancestry. The advent of slavery accentuated a division, no doubt already in existence, between those whose part it was to work and those who governed and administered the affairs of society. In the ruling class we find a gradual differentiation into executive, military, priestly and legal castes, with the philosophers and teachers as hangers-on. Among the workers there goes on a process of specialization on craft lines. We have the workers in metal, subdividing into blacksmiths, goldsmiths, armourers, workers in silver and bronze: the stonecutters, builders and hewers: the workers in wood, the miners, farmers, vine-dressers and herdsmen. At the same time we find a localization of industry on account of climatic or other reasons. These two factors, specialization and localization, acting in a system of private property, now well-established, necessitate the exchange of commodities. This brings into being other classes, the merchants, those engaged in shipping and transportation, the bankers and money changers.

Under the guild system, the craft lines are very strictly drawn, every member is bound to his calling, and the guilds are very exclusive and jealous of their rights and privileges. Handicraft is now in its flower; the craftsman owns the simple tools he uses and produces a complete article. Nor is there as yet, any distinction between artizan and artist.

The Machine Age—Subdivision of Labor—Consciously Extended.

All this however, is changed with the coming of machine age—of capitalism. Up to that time the social division of labor had been natural and spontaneous, from then on it was more and more consciously applied. The phenomenal development of the capitalist system was the result of the technical division of labor along with the growth of the machine which is its concomitant. Under the technical division of labor the worker no longer produces a complete article. As all industrial labor consists merely in a series of movements, this series may be broken up into simple operations, which may be assigned to different workers in such a way that no worker performs more than one of them, and that always the same one. In watchmaking, for instance, instead of one man making a complete watch, it now requires some 300 to organize efficiently a watch factory. I understand that, in a well-organized factory, it takes 113 people to make a pair of boots.

Advantages Gained By Subdivision of Labor.

It will be well, about here, to see in what consists the gain to be derived from this system, what particular advantages it possesses, especially for capitalism. The economists generally set forth these advantages as follows:—

Firstly—there is a saving in time, the worker performs one operation with the same tool continuously and no time is lost passing from one operation to another.

Secondly—there is a gain in skill, or rather dexterity; the worker continuously performing the one operation, attains, through practice, an extraordinary speed.

Thirdly—there is a gain in adaptation—that is to say, that the tasks can be distributed according to the strength and capacity of the workers. All sorts and conditions of men, women and even children of tender age find a place at the machine. The men of brains and ability become captains of industry, statesmen and whatnot.

Fourthly—there is the gain in the use of machinery made possible by the division of manufacture into simple mechanical acts, which can be readily performed by a machine. As a matter of fact, the invention of machinery is stimulated in this way. Again, there is economy in the use of the tool which can be kept continuously employed.

Fifthly—there is the fact that more or less unskilled labor can be employed; a long term of apprenticeship being no longer required.

An International Economy Based On Division of Labor.

We have, as a result of all this, an enormous increase in the productivity of labor. This, however, is of no advantage to the manufacturers unless the goods can be sold. Hence the demand for foreign markets. This brings us to the highest development of the division of labor—the international. As we have already seen certain parts of the world are adapted for the production of particular commodities.

For climatic reasons we find that such articles as tea, sugar and coffee are produced in India, Cuba or Brazil which naturally specialize in such products. Other parts of the world contain mineral deposits and export the produce of their mines. Natural facilities for the production of power stimulates manufacture in other countries and so on. All of which is bringing about world-wide co-operation and division of labor and creating a world market. This state of things, of course, has its limitations and disadvantages, which we shall consider in our next.

GEORDIE.

ECONOMIC UNITY AND POLITICAL DIVISION

(Continued from Page Three)

advent, required energy and enterprise and initiative, but little else. They possessed these qualities in a supreme degree; they developed their continent with almost incredible rapidity and skill. In the course of their progress, almost against their will, they have been driven into the position of arbiters of the world's destiny. They may hesitate for a time, they may be reluctant to undertake the responsibilities of the League of Nations, but the power is unavoidably theirs. With the power comes responsibility, however, they may hesitate to assume it; and from sense of responsibility to love of dominion is unfortunately a fatally easy step. The United States, having the opportunity of ruling the world, is almost certain, before long, to acquire a taste for doing so.

The sources of American power, so far as can be seen, are not merely momentary. It is true that, at the end of the war America has certain special advantages: unimpaired wealth, few casualties in spite of large numbers of trained soldiers, a newly-acquired fleet of merchant ships, and an opportunity of securing naval supremacy. But apart from temporary advantages, there are others of a more permanent sort, which seem likely to increase rather than diminish: an invulnerable territory, the possibility of complete economic self-sufficiency, with a more rapidly increasing white population than any other single State; full of all the qualities that promote national strength. No other State can compete against the combination of felicitious circumstances. Whatever America may vigorously desire, the world will have to accept. So long as America is content to believe in the Liberal ideas of 1776, so long not only Bolsheviks or Spartacists, but even conventional Socialists, can not hope to maintain themselves for more than a moment in any important country: their existence will be inconvenient to American capital, and therefore, through the usual channels for educating public opinion, odious to the American nation. We in the older countries where opportunities are fewer, and "la carriere ouverte aux talents" is less all-sufficient gospel, are turning more and more towards co-operation as against competition, Socialism as against plutocracy. A Labor Government is likely in this country at no distant date; France and Italy may well follow suit. But nothing that we can do will be secure or stable while America remains faithful to the creed of ruthless individual competition.

We are thus brought back to the point from which we started: the economic unity of the world. The Labor Movement must be international or doomed to perpetual failure; it must conquer America or forego success in Europe until some very distant future. Which of these will happen, I do not profess to know. But I do know that a great responsibility rests upon those who mold progressive thought in America: the responsibility of realizing the new international importance of America, and of understanding why the shibboleths of traditional Liberalism no longer satisfy European lovers of justice. The only right use of power is to promote freedom. The nominal freedom of the wage-slave is a sham and a delusion, as great a sham as the nominal freedom which the Peace Treaty leaves to the Germans. Will America, in her future career of power, content herself with the illusory freedom that exists under capitalist domination? Or will her missionary spirit once more, as in the days of Jefferson, urge men on along the way to the most complete freedom that is possible in the circumstances of the time? It is a momentous question; upon the answer depends the whole future of the human race.

BERTRAND RUSSELL.

Distribute Socialist Literature

WHAT is Scientific Socialism? It is the method of scientific research applied to human society and its problems. It is also the theoretical expression of the Proletarian Movement.

Karl Marx and Frederick Engels were its founders. They collaborated in formulating and elaborating its three cardinal principles, by the instrumentality of which society's historical progress and its tendencies are revealed and the structure of capitalist society explained

The Materialistic Conception of History

These three principles of Scientific Socialism are: First—the Materialistic Conception of History, by means of which we are directed to look into the material conditions of men's existence for an explanation of their historical development and their moral, intellectual and political life generally.

The Marxian Law of Value

Second—the Marxian theory of the Law of Value in the economics of the capitalist system of production and exchange. The statement of this law is that over a period of time, commodities exchange, equal value for value, and that this exchange value is based on the socially necessary labor involved in their production, measured by time.

This theory involves the consequential conclusion that the fundamental exploitation of the working class takes place at the point of production and not at the point of exchange, i.e., sale. The conclusion is consequential, because it determines that sound, scientific working-class political principles are revolutionary and not reformist to the capitalist or bourgeois order of society.

The real exploitation of the working class takes place at the point of production because the workers' labor power is a commodity. It is bought and sold on the labor market and its price is called —wages. As with all other commodities, it sells on the basis of its cost of production, in its case this resolves into so much food, clothing and shelter etc., sufficient to keep the working class in existence as a working class and in numbers sufficient to meet the needs of production. The products of one part of a day's labor will represent the value of a day's labor power expended, and the products of the rest of the day are surplus values, or the profits, of the capitalist class. In other words, the values created, over and above those representing wages, are surplus values which constitute rent, interest, and profit, accruing to the capitalist class as owners of the means of social production. It is a vital consideration to the working class, that because of the commodity status of their labor power, that they can never escape, as a class from the economic laws of a commodity market, its competitions, its fluctuations and uncertainties nor from the poverty, anxieties and servilities consequent upon their economic bondage to another class, until the wages system of exploitation in the interest of that class is abolished and the means of production are socially owned and operated for the benefit of all.

The Class Struggle

The third principle of Scientific Socialism is the Marxian theory of Class Struggles, which is deduced from an enquiry into the history of political society through its various stages, and from an analysis of the structure of our present form of society

The Materialistic Conception of History shows that all the great historical struggles in society have been class struggles, which at bottom have had for their cause the conflicting economic interests of the contending classes. It also shows that the basis of all social progress lies in the development of society's economic powers, and whatever politcal progress has been made has been due to the victories of the class whose interests were in harmony with the economic forces, which are ever seeking for full and free expression and development.

Even the bourgeois students of history admit the truth of the class struggle theory in so far as the past is concerned, but deny its validity for the present-day because they hope that their class will escape the fate of former ruling-classes. Scientific Socialists, however, maintain that the principle still holds good. In this opinion they are fortified by the examination of the structure of present society and into the economics of its method of production, not to speak of the striking line up on social questions. History and the Marxian analysis of the capitalist system of production complement and support each other for the contention that the class struggle for political power still goes on, now, as in the past, because the economic basis for it is here in the class-property nature of the means of production, because there is a class who own the means of existence of the whole of society and another class who own nothing except their power to labor.

The above is but a rough inadequate sketchy presentation of the principles of Scientific Socialism. The writer merely seeks to draw attention to them. For a fuller and more complete exposition, read the following literature. Pass it around among your fellow workers. Knowledge is power.

SEND FOR

The Communistic Manifesto, at the rate of $8 per 100. Single copies 10 cents.

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

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

Wage Worker and Farmer . . $6 per 100. Single copies 10 cents.

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

Socialism, Utopian and Scientific. Single copies 15 cents. Wholesale price, later.

Postage Paid.

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

Clippings From the Press

THIS WILL MAKE YOU THINK.

No Italian Munitions for Russia.—(From London "Common Sense.")

According to the Avanti, the Seamen's Federation has extracted from the Ministry of Transport a promise that the ships of the Italian Mercantile Marine are no longer to be employed for the transport of soldiers or war material against Soviet Russia. The question was raised in connection with the Fedora, whose crews struck. The Minister has undertaken that after discharging the present cargo of munitions at Gibraltar, the Fedora" will be used for normal traffic with the understanding that she will not be employed further in the transport of troops and war material to Russia, and that the crew will not be disembarked in a foreign country." The Ministry asks the captain of the port to arrange with the British authorities for the immediate departure of the Fedora.

The matter is not likely to stop here. Italian Labor has for long been in a restive state, as is not surprising, in view of the appalling food prices and general shortage. Two months ago the Italian ambassador at Washington declared that Italy was in a state comparable to that of Russia before the Revolution, and nothing has occurred to make the situation easier.

A strike of considerable extent broke out in Rome last week, and by Saturday it may develop into a general stoppage. There is already a general strike in Naples.

A HATE PEDDLER DEFEATED.

Havelock Wilson met short shrift for his German boycott scheme last month at the Swansea Conference of the Transport Workers' Federation. He was beaten on two votes by majorities of 213,000 to 67,000, and 218,000 to 72,000. Thus another hope of the capitalist class is disappearing, of keeping the world's working class divided.

Lines Up With Federation Du Travail on General Strike Against Intervention In Russia.

PARIS, July 9.—The functionaries congress, representing over 300,000 minor officials and public employees, has passed a resolution instructing its federation to arrange a method by which it can associate itself with the general labor federation's manifestation on July 21.

The Italian Government has decreed that profiteering is illegal, but only after a desperate people had begun to exact vengeance themselves. Here arises a nice point. When did profiteering become wrong? To those taking refuge in the legal code, it was when the Government made it so. Others will say that if it is wrong known then it was always so. Upon the latter theory the action of the Government endorses the action taken by the rioters. Or was it just sailing with the wind.

HANDS OFF RUSSIA SAYS MANCHESTER.

According to a Daily Herald Correspondent, Manchester definitely launched a movement on June 22, against intervention in Russia, and also against military and industrial conscription in Great Britain. Committees were struck off to handle the nation-wide campaign. "Let Manchester rally the British Isles," was the slogan of the meeting.

On Robert Smillie rising to address the meeting, men and women leapt to their feet, waving hats and handkerchiefs and cheering wildly. Someone hailed him as "First President of the Republic of England."

He stigmatized British action in Russia as our greatest crime and declared that any action was justified in ending it.

The meeting broke up with the singing of the "Red Flag" and it was never so heartily sung before in the Free Trade Hall.

WHAT IT WAS ALL ABOUT.

(From an Article By H. N. Brailsford.)

"Peace and Amity."

The traditional treaty used to begin with the declaration that the late enemies purpose in future to live in "peace and amity," and went on; as a rule, as a provisional measure, to bring into force again the commercial treaties existing before the war. This Treaty does nothing of the kind.

During the war, when a critic asked me in debate what I supposed it was about, I used to answer, "I will tell you when we can read the Peace Treaty." What empires fought for is what they demand at the end. Our capitalistic society has demanded colonies and ships, and the ruin of its rival.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

SUNDAY, JULY 13

At 8 p.m. Sharp

EMPRESS THEATRE

Corner Gore and Hastings

Speaker: J. Kavanagh.

THE RED FLAG

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

Published When Circumstances and Finances Permit By The Socialist Party of Canada,

401 Pender Street East, Vancouver, B. C.

Editor ..... C. Stephenson

SATURDAY ..... JULY 12, 1919

Who Needed the Strike?

THE end of the great war came at last. Its insatiable market was closed and the readjustment of industrial and commercial operations to the normal conditions of a peace market became imperative. The thread of the economic life must be picked up again that had been dropped in 1914, but under different conditions. When the war broke out a serious economic crisis confronted the world. Some countries, Canada for one, were already badly affected by the shock. Overproduction the economists diagnosed the crisis.

The world market was glutted with the products of labor commercial and industrial stagnation had set in and unemployment was assuming proportions, ominous to the statesmen, and desperate to the proletariat. But the war came, a hell devised ransom, and we were saved from we know not what. And now we are in the same predicament again, a market incapable of absorbing all the products that the productive forces of the world are capable of putting on to it. A limited market means intensifyed competition. Indeed we have been warned by the inspired press that we were entering a period of the fiercest commercial competition that the world has ever seen. And that if Canada was to hold her own and her industry live and thrive, that costs of production must be reduced. That we must work longer hours and harder and for less wages. That is how the wage workers are to solve the capitalist dilemma.

The workers, however, were in no hurry to do these things. They were barely making ends meet anyway. During the war, although the rise in wages had been far outstripped by the rise in the cost of living, yet wages had become fixed and standardized when the labor market was more favorable than it is at present, and organized labor having grown in strength was acting as a counter check on the depressing effect of a glutted labor market.

What were the capitalist interests to do?

Also, organized labor bodies, scenting danger, were cutting adrift from the International and were falling over each other to get into the O. B. U., grasping hold of it as a superior weapon for the struggle with the capitalists.

What also was the "foreign" Gomper's Machine, Gideon Robertson and all his hosts of old line trades' union beneficeries to do?

What were the big and little interests of the bourgeoisie who live on the backs of the workers and the parasitic labor fakers and the honest and ignorant reactionaries generally, to do?

They soon let us know.

The strike in Winnipeg was engineered. A recognized principle of collective bargaining was refused. Some of the employers in Winnipeg conceded that the demands of the men were fair, but they said they had been told by the banks that they would be refused loans "if the prices of business increased." The "word" had been sent out from the center of control.

The sympathetic strike commenced, and much howling ever since ensued about the dishonesty of breaking agreements. But we hold that when it is a question of helping a brother in need and a question of a contract with a capitalist to stay on the job, that the former is the holier obligation.

We are all familiar with what followed. The arrest of the strike officials, the raiding by the police, all over the Dominion, of Labor and Socialist Halls, and the private residences of those known to be active in the labor and socialist movement, in order to find materials to justify the arrest. And following on this, the organized attempt to intimidate those unions who had cast in their lot with the O. B. U. and to frighten others from joining. Also, the blacklisting, the firing, the refusal of employment to all O. B. U. members.

Well! the capitalist interests know their friends. So shall we. The rats will have to come out in the open.

Force, Force—Always Force

WE have discovered something. That is, President Wilson has discovered it—for us. It is some thing we have long suspected, but the preponderence of opinion contrariwise held our suspicions in check. In duty bound we had to read Wilson's speech, so we happened on the discovery in black face type, which suggests that the editor of the "Province" also made a discovery.

The desire of one nation to dominate other nations and having no other means than armaments and alliances has "lain at the heart of every arrangement of Europe—of every arrangement of the world—that preceeded the war. Restive people have been told that fleets and armies which they had toiled to sustain meant peace; and they now know that they had been lied to; that the fleets and armies had been maintained to promote national ambitions and meant—. They knew ambitions. They knew that no old policy meant anything else but Force, Force—Always Force."

So there we are; where are we?

We are curious as to what the people knew these armies "meant." The President is somewhat abrupt there. But we have been lied to, and the old policy meant "Force, Force—Always Force." Very fine!

Of course, the new policy means peace, justice and brotherhood. Who says so? Wilson, Lloyd George, Clemenceau, Orlando. That's very fine too. But the trouble with the human animal lies in a constitutional ineptitude to prosper on words. Peace, justice and brotherhood, represent certain states of being, of law and of ethics. If it were a question of color, of distance, of weight, we could proceed to visualize them. If the Big Four told us that the future world policy would be Red, or four feet to the yard, we would know that "Force, Force—Always Force" would be absent.

What is justice?

In justice to his dynasty—Czar Nicholas II, killed and wounded 5000 workers who were peacefully presenting to him a petition in October, 1905. In justice to the British Empire, Lord Cromer had some Egyptian villagers of Denashawe, hanged flogged and imprisoned, for daring to resist some British tourists who were shooting their pigeons. In justice to American womenhood, President Wilson permits the most atrocious outrages on the negroes of the United States, and Kolchak sends his Death Trains through Siberia in justice—to justice. All this too is very fine. So if the Petrograd worker—or Egyptian Fellahs, or the American negro, has another sense of justice, who shall decide which is just, which unjust? "Force, Force—Always Force."

You must understand that a color say, red, denotes the same to all normally constituted humans, or bulls. It may excite widely divergent sentiments, but the normal, that is, the average, will pronounce it red, though they may shake their tails and ears and froth at the mouth. No one ever had to go into a court of justice, or a field of battle to emphasize and make good his concept of the color—red.

When Omar, writing in the twelfth century tells us that he———

"Sometimes thinks that never blows so red
The Rose as where some buried Ceasar bled;"

he speaks to us in terms which we and he apply to the same physical manifestation notwithstanding the eight centuries which divide us. King Richard, the Lion-heart, and Omar had the same concept of red, but did Omar consider it just that Islam should suffer under "the iron hoof of hostile faces," because the Crescent had supplanted the Cross in Jeruselem? Richard did! Bishop Langdon and Pope Urban II, at the same period had no diversity of views as to the color of a "filthy hat." The cardinals hat was red, no one would deny that, as to its being filthy, that was dependent upon whose sister, wife or daughter was violated. But Langdon and Urban had a mighty quarrel over the "justice" of the cornerstone of our British greatness, the Magna Charta. And "Force, Force—Always Force" was advocate, judge and jury. So Popes Urban II and Benedict XV, would clearly pronounce a cardinals hat red but Urban would have had any son of a shoemaker or priest "put to death mercifully and without shedding of blood" who had dared attempt the grossly sacriligious "injustice" of settling the fate of Europe. Pope Benedict XV, sees nothing unjust about it. Urban had the force, Benedict has not.

"We see then that justice as a concept of ethics, is different to red as the name of a color. And this for a very good reason. Justice implies an ethical relation between human beings, color, connotes, a physical characteristic of something.

Justice is implicatory of some social state, and can only appear with property, physical properties are independent of and anterior to Society. But justice appears long after mankind collected together in bands. Wherever justice manifests itself, someone is injured, not in an ethical, but in a physical sense. Suppose we start a One Big Union, Sammy Gompers has his booze allowance threatened, that is an injustice. Suppose we advocate a General Strike, the Bankers' Association see poor collections ahead that is an injustice to the widow and orphans who own shares in those institutions. So they whip all their dependent creditors into line—to oppose injustice. Suppose they, by the machinery under their control, seize the strike leaders at four queu M, and jail them, that is an injustice to the strike leaders, and to the great body of workers.

Someone is injured physically every time justice is applied. Therefore, we have a dual justice.

Who then shall decide which is the just and which the unjust. The Lord maketh his rain to fall on both. That is, providing they don't live in Southern Alberta during the wheat growing season.

Hitherto, President Wilson says, Force, Force—Always Force has been the dread arbiter. But the future is bright with the light of another and "juster" method.

We would admire to see it. But in the meanwhile it appears to our suspicious nature that this "juster" method is reserved for Huns and baby-slayers. And for home application, the good old homely medicine will still suffice, "Force, Force—Always Force."

Just to keep our terms clear, not the packet variety which was responsible for the happy nature of Sunny Jim.

J. H.

Up to a week ago the "kept" press was saying that it was the "Reds" who were the cause of the Winnipeg strike. Now the Vancouver "Sun," in an editorial on Wednesday, says that the steel firms were responsible for it. The "Sun" can guess again. Also it can save the butter when dealing with working class affairs. It cuts no ice. We respect the open and consistant enemy, but.....

The American Press has now fallen foul of "our Ally" Japan. Some old familiar phrases are being polished up for use again.

Economic Unity and Political Unity

(From the New York "Dial," June 28.)

By Bertrand Russell, English Publicist.

THE political unity of the world, which is the avowed aim of the League of Nations, may or may not be achieved in the next few years; indeed, any but a very bold optimist must decline to the view that it will not. But the economic unity of the world has been furthered by the war to a very surprising extent. Conditions are, of course, still abnormal, but we may expect much of what has resulted in the way of international economic government to remain for a long time to come. Certain Powers, notably the United States and the British Empire, control the supplies of food and raw material sufficiently to be able to decide, thoughout the greater part of the civilized world, who shall starve and who shall have enough to eat, who shall be allowed to develop industries and who shall be compelled to import manufactured goods. This power is the result partly of geographical advantages, partly of armed force, especially at sea. Financial strength also plays its part, but is a result of geographical and military superiority rather than an independent cause of dominion. If Germany had won the war, it may be assumed that indemnities would have fundamentally altered the balance of financial strength.

The necessity of rationing supplies has created, unavoidably, an international way of dealing with problems of distribution. Those who control international distribution have a degree of power exceeding anything previously known in the history of the world. The growth of industrialism in the century before the war led most nations to become dependent upon foreign countries for supplies indispensable to life or at least to prosperity. Cessation of foreign supplies would mean inability to support the actual population in health, as it has meant in Germany. Consequently it is impossible for any European nation to return to economic independence except through a period of intolerable hardship, involving death or emigration on a large scale. Only extreme heroism prolonged through many years would enable a continental country to free itself from the economic dominion which has resulted from the war. This economic dominion has given to the world as regards material things, a new unity and a new central authority.

But while material unity has been more or less accidentally achieved, unity in any higher sense has not been even approached. The League of Nations, so far from being world-wide, is in effect an alliance of America, Britain and France, with Italy as a somewhat doubtful hanger-on. Japan, which is nominally a member of the League, is mainly engaged in the attempt to absorb China—an enterprise by no means calculated to win the effection of America. From the Pacific to the Rhine, the League of Nations, appears as an enemy or a master, not as a free union of equal democracies. The world is thus divided into three groups; the Western nations, the outcasts, Germany and Russia, and the Yellow Races among whom the Japanese are masters and the Chinese unwilling servants It is in such a world that the League of Nations is to make its debut.

The distinction of capitalist and proletarian has been made familiar by the writings of the Socialists. But this distinction has now taken a new form: there are capitalist and proletarian nations. Russia and Germany are proletarian nations, the former still on strike, the latter probably about to make a sullen submission. By the economic provisions of the Peace Treaty, it is secured (as far as such things can be) that Germans shall, for an indefinite time to come, be very much poorer than inhabitants of the Western democracies. They are to do specfied work for the capitalist nations, obtaining presumably wages, but not profits. They are to be deprived of an enormous proportion of their ships, coal and iron, and in every way prevented from competing with our trade. If they nevertheless do find ways of making money, they are to be deprived of what they make in order to provide reparation for the war. Their national situation, in short, is to be as similar as possible to the individual situation of a wage-earner in a capitalist community. Their reward for accepting our terms is to be that they are to have enough to eat to support life; their punishment for rejecting them that their numbers are to be reduced by starvation until they submit. (This is a slight exaggeration of our generosity. At a moment when large numbers of German infants are dying for lack of milk, the Peace Treaty demands the surrender by Germany of a hundred and forty thousands of milch-cows.) In industrial disputes, we are accustomed to subjugation of strikers by these means. But it marks the growth of economic ways of thought that the methods of labor disputes should be applied in dealing with a vanquished nation.

As to Russia, it is as yet impossible to know what will happen. It is conceivable that, by sufficient determination, Russia may succeed in becoming economically self-sufficient. If so, war-weariness may compel the Allies to abandon the policy of intervention. But if Russia is not willing to face the hardships involved in an economic boycott, or if the Allies can raise sufficient armies to occupy the centres of Bolshevik power, it will become necessary for the Russians, as for the Germans, to submit to our terms and accept whatever form of government we may think good for them. The Germans were informed that we should be more lenient if they expelled the Kaiser; probably the Russians will soon be informed that we shall be more lenient if they restore the Tsardom. In that case, no doubt, they like the Germans, may be granted a peace of justice and mercy, not of revenge. The peace terms seem to me to combine justice with mercy.—The Bishop of London.) But if they persist in Bolshevism, we may discover what it is the Germans have been spared as a consequence of their adoption of democracy.

We see, in two cases of Germany and Russia, the two purposes for which the power of the sword is being used, namely (a) to extort economic advantages; (b) to impose a form of government other than that desired by those upon whom it is imposed. I do not wish to blame in any way the individuals who are carrying out these two purposes. I believe that many of them are completely blind to what is really happening; they feel that Germany, as the disturber of the peace, must be rendered harmless, and that Russia, as the perpetrator of endless atrocities against the well-to-do, must be forced to adopt again the "civilized" government which it enjoyed before the Revolution, whose much greater atrocities they forget because the capitalist press did not exploit them. Others though they may see and regret the evil that is being done, accept it as inevitable in order to inaugurate the League of Nations; and in the disarmament of Germany they see the first step towards universal disarmament. Many others, again sincerely believe that it is the business of a statesman to think only of the interests of his own country; they feel themselves in the position of trustees, and regard "sacred egoism" as their duty. For all these reasons, it would be foolish to attach moral blame to those who direct the power of the Allies. Like everybody else, they are products of circumstances and systems. We have to understand their action, and to form an opinion as to whether it is for the good of the world; but if our opinion is adverse, we must go behind the men to the system which has produced them, and ask ourselves whether, under that system, anything better could be expected.

The capitalist system of industry, whatever its merits, has not been found conducive to perfect harmony between capital and labor. It is hardly to be expected that its extension to international relations will produce harmony between States or that Germany and Russia will be filled with ardent love for the Western nations during the next few years. They may be powerless in a military sense, just as labor organizations are; but, like labor organizations, they may find other ways than war by which their grievances can be forced upon the attention of their masters. I do not wish to be misunderstood when I speak of "grievances:" what I am saying is wholly independent of the question whether they are justified in feeling grievances. I say only that they will feel them, and that in fact their economic position will be less fortunate than ours, as a result of their defeat in the war. And this situation is not one likely to inaugurate a period of international amity, or to realize the dreams of those who died in France believing that our aim was to destroy militarism and establish universal freedom.

It is economic considerations mainly that have caused the severity of the peace terms and the implacable hostility to the Bolsheviks. (Those who think the hostility to the Bolsheviks is due to their atrocities are putting the cart before the horse, and are failing to realize how their own horror of these atrocities has been stimulated. The Tsar's government was guilty of many more and much worse atrocities, but it was not to the interest of the capitalist press to make our blood boil about them.) Economic consideration of this sort are inseparable from the capitalist system. Probably every allied nation, as a whole, will be worse off economically if Germany and Russia are ruined than if they are prosperous, but many individual capitalists will profit by the removal of competitors, and these individuals, through the press, have power to mold public opinion. Moreover, under the existing economic system competition is the very air we breathe, and men come to feel more pleasure in outstripping a competition than in the absolute level of their prosperity. If, by slightly impoverishing ourselves, we can very greatly impoverish the Germans, we feel that we have achieved a valuable result. This state of mind is so bound up with capitalism that we can not hope to see it effectively removed while capitalism persists.

I do not despair of the world; I do not think it impossible that the idealistic aims which inspired many of those who fought in the war may in time be achieved. But I think a lesson is to be learned from President Wilson's failure, and the lesson is this: The removal of international rivalry, and the growth of real co-operation among all civilized nations, is not to be attained while competition, exploitation, and the ruthless use of economic power govern the whole machinery of production and distribution. It is scarcely to be expected that the relations between States will be immeasurably more humane than the relations between individuals within a State. So long as the whole organized machinery of the State is used to defend men who live in luxury on the labor of others, and to obstruct those others in attempts to secure a more just system, the natural assumptions of men who possess authority can scarcely be such as to restrain them from a ruthless use of force in their dealings with hostile countries. International justice and lasting peace are not to be secured while capitalism persists.

It is especially in America that belief in fundamental economic reconstruction is needed. America has always stood for the ideas which are now known as "Liberal." In 1776, these ideas, as embodied in the Declaration of Independence, represented the Extreme Left, just as much as Bolshevism does now. But even the most advanced ideas can not be allowed to stand still for a century and a half without finding themselves outstripped by later comers. Liberal ideas are admirable in circumstances which allow a prosperous career to any tolerably vigorous person. Americans with an immensely rich and fertile continent waiting for their

(Continued On Page Six.)

Attitude of Allied Diplomacy Towards Bolshevist Regime

The second installment, written by William Hard, of the experiences in Russia during the Bolshevist regime of Col. Raymond Robins, head of the American Red Cross mission, appears in the Metropolitan Magazine for July.

We extract from it the following:

The Russian army was helpless and hopeless, yes. But could some support be got from the Allies? Would the Allies promise to intervene with help, with some sort of help, if at Moscow the Russian Soviets, instead of ratifying the peace, (of Brest Litovsk,) should repudiate it?

A memorandum was written. In it an inquiry was addressed to the Allies. Their answer belongs to the third chapter of our diplomacy in revolutionary Russia. In this second chapter there was simply the memorandum itself. It asked the Allies what they would do in certain circumstances.

The Allied Diplomatic Circles Guess Wrong Again.

But Lenin already suspected what they would do. So did Trotsky.

Trotsky had said to Robins one day:

"Haven't you Americans got a Russian Railway Mission, of Americans, somewhere?"

"Certainly."

"Where is it?"

"Nagasaki."

"Gone to Japan?"

"Yes."

"What's it doing there?"

"Eating its head off."

"Why don't you send it in here?"

"Why, Mr. Commissioner, you know there are many Americans—"

"Yes, they think I'm a German agent. Well, now, suppose I am. Just assume, for argument, that I am. You admit I have never told you I would do a thing and then failed to do it. My motives may be bad, but my actions go with my promises. Is that right?"

"Yes."

"Well, then, out of some motive, which you may assume to be bad, I am willing to share the railway system of Russia half-and-half with the United States; and if you will bring your Railway Mission into Russia I promise you that I will give its members complete authority over half the transportation of all the Russia of the Soviets."

"What do you mean—half?"

"I mean this:

"I will accept anybody you Americans want to name as your railway chief and I will make him Assistant Superintendent of Russian Ways and Communication, and his orders will be orders. Then, as well as we can, we will divide all our available transportation facilities into two equal parts. You will use your half to evacuate war supplies from the front and to carry them away into the interior, so that the Germans will not be able to get them. We will use our half, you helping us, to move our food supplies from the places where we have a surplus to the places where we have a deficit. You see?"

"Clearly. You want us Americans to reform and restore your railway system for you, so that it can carry food successfully and so that you can feed your people and keep your Government going."

"Yes. But I propose to pay you in precisely the coin you most need and want. Colonel Robins, have you ever seen a gun-map of our front?"

Trotsky unrolled it before him. It showed some six hundred miles of locations of cannon and of shells—nests of cannon, dumps of shells, usable stuff, quantities of it, the material leavings of a once mighty army. It showed cannon that had never been fired—cannon new and of the latest type, with their shells beside them.

"There it all lies," said Trotsky. "It's of no more use to us. Our army does not fight in any more foreign wars just now. Lenin says the Germans will advance. If they do, they will take all that stuff. We can not move it back. We can do small things on our railways now, but not big things. Most of our technical railway managers are against us. They are against the revolution. They are sabotaging the revolution. Our railways are headless. The whole point is: our railways need new heads. Will you supply them?"

"I'll inquire."

"But be sure you make this clear: My motive, whether good or bad, is entirely selfish. I get a reorganized and effective railway system for Soviet Russia. And your motive so far as I am concerned, is entirely selfish, too. You save a mass of munitions from all possibility of falling into the hands of the Germans. You get a benefit. I get a benefit. Mutual services, mutual benefits, and no pretenses! What do you say?"

"I'll find out."

So again Robins ran to diplomatic circles with what he thought was good news and again it was received without interest. Again he heard the wisdom of the palaces. The peasants were really rising now. Lenin and Trotsky were really falling now. The real Russia, the Russia loving the whip, the Russia loving the strong man, Kaledine, Alexeiev, somebody, was asserting itself. Up from the Ukraine. Up from the Don. Up from the Urals. No use bothering with Lenin and Trotsky. No use at all.

So those guns and those shells remained where they were, and so the Germans took them and made use of them on the bodies of Frenchmen and Englishmen and Americans in the March drive and in the June drive of 1918 on the Western front; and Lenin and Trotsky were still standing.

Lenin and Trotsky came to think that the Allies would never co-operate with them for any purpose. They came to think the Allies would co-operate with any sort of White government sooner than with any sort of Red. They came to think that the Allies were not so much interested in saving Russia from Germany as in destroying the Red government at Petrograd. They thought too much, but they had much reason.

In Russia, in the territory of the old Russia, along its eastern frontier, there had emerged three governments. There was one in Finland. There was one at Petrograd. There was one in the Ukraine. The one at Petrograd was Red. The other two were White. In all three regions there was a struggle between Whites and Reds. It was the same struggle, involving everywhere the same fundamental social issue.

In Finland, the French gave formal recognition to the White government. It was a "law and order" government. It was fighting and killing Trotsky's and Lenin's Red Guards. It was a "good" government. It at once called in the Germans and accepted German troops and turned Finland into a German dependency.

In the Ukraine, the Allies gave the White government their active favor and support. This government also was a "good" and a "law and order" government. It also was fighting Lenin's and Trotsky's Red Guards. From Allied money it received an official present of 130,000,000 francs. Four days later it called in the Germans and filled the Ukraine with German troops; and, of its own free will, not under foreign compulsion, but purely for domestic Red enemies, it turned the wheat fields of all southern Russia into German wheat fields and Odessa into a German port.

The government at Petrograd, among these three governments, was the only one that was Red, but it also showed another difference. It was the only one that never called in German troops against its domestic enemies and also the only one that at any time ever did Germany the slightest harm. It did it the prodigious harm described by General Hoffmann. It rotted the fibre of imperial loyalty out of a whole section of the German army and out of a whole section of the German population.

But this Government was as weak in physical power as it was strong in propaganda. Its army was dissolved—dissolved by economic and moral exhaustion ensuing upon intolerable effort. The American Committee on Public Information, which co-operated with the Bolshevik Government in propaganda but then became one of the Bolshevik Government's bitterest enemies, said, nevertheless:

"Russia fought on to utter exhaustion, and her army yielded only when the power of further effort was gone."

In these circumstances, looking at the three governments and observing that the Government at Petrograd was by far the largest and by far the most important, what did we do?

To the Government at Petrograd we refused to give any officers for keeping goods from going into Germany, and to the Government at Petrograd we refused to give any railway experts for the restoring of the railway system and for the transporting of munitions away into the interior and away from the Germans; but to the governments of Finland and of the Ukraine immedately thereafter outrightly pro-German, we gave diplomatic support and even military physical support in combats with the soldiers and with the friends of the Government at Petrograd. In the Ukraine, serving the Ukrainian White Government, officers appeared and munitions appeared from Allied sources and under Allied orders.

Trotsky made this fact the peroration of his angriest and greatest speech—the one in the Third Congress of Soviets at Petrograd in January. He saw the Russian Soviet Government attacked equally by the Allies and by the Germans. He ended: "And at this very moment, while the French Ambassador sits at Petrograd, we see French cannon, directed by French officers, shooting our comrades on the plains of Bessarabia."

In that atmosphere Trotsky conducted his diplomacy, and in that atmosphere Lenin went to Moscow to attend the Fourth All-Russian Congress of Soviets and to debate the Peace of Brest-Litovsk. Robins, under orders from the American Ambassador, went to Moscow, too. He had now seen another chapter of our diplomacy.

He had seen it consist of a stifled indoor contradiction. He had seen it consist of staying in Russia and of being unfriendly to the existing Russian Government. So he had seen it come to the conclusion described by General William V. Judson, when Military Attache of the American Embassy, in a letter to the American Ambassador. General Judson said:

"All American aid to the Russian people is at a standstill, while the German emissaries are everywhere, working day and night in the interests of the enemy."

Robins clung though, to his last hope. Lenin and Trotsky had written that memorandum. He awaited, they awaited, in Moscow, the reply from London, from Paris, from Washington.

("Bolshevist Russia" will be continued in the August Metropolitan.)

MANIFESTO OF THE SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

A statement of the theories and conclusions of Scientific Socialism.

$8 per 100 10c per Copy

Postage Paid.

Propaganda meetings every Sunday in Empress theatre, corner Gore and Hastings, 8 p.m.

The "Associative" Principle *Economic Unity and Political Unity*
Some Impressions of Siberia

THE RED FLAG

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

VOL. 1 NO. 25 VANCOUVER, B. C., SATURDAY, JULY 12, 1919 FIVE CENTS

PASSING IT UP TO OLD-FASHIONED DIPLOMACY —BELA KUN TO THE ALLIES

PARIS, Tuesday.—Bela Kun has forwarded to M. Clemenceau the following reply to the latter's second Note:—

"The Hungarian Republic of the Soviet declares frankly and openly, and without hesitation, that not only will it comply with the demand of the Associated Powers immediately to discontinue hostilities, but that it has already in all respects complied with this demand

"We are not the cause of the continuation of bloodshed, but the troops of the Czecho-Slovak Republic, who, taking advantage of the fact that at the behest of the Allied and Associated Powers, we at once suspended war operations, took the offensive which we could only repulse by counter-offensives with the object of making it hereafter impossible for them to continue their advance. We point out that as the Roumanian Army did not recommence its attacks, we did not make a single forward advance in territory occupied by them.

"In order to effect the recalling of the troops and the evacuation of the territories without bloodshed we have today invited the governments and commanders-in-chief of both Czecho-Slovakia and Rumania to send to our general headquarters or some other place military delegates fully empowered to lay down the formalities of evacuation in mutual agreement with your chief command.

"We desire to point out that, contrary to the declaration of the Allied and Associated Governments, according to which conquest can not form the basis of the frontiers of the new States these frontiers appear to us to be drawn solely by the right to the strongest.

"It is absolutely impossible to create normal economic life and production within these frontiers because it is impossible to ensure the very subsistence of the population living in the territories thus limited. We hoped to be given the opportunity to prove before the Peace Conference the truth of this assertion.

"We wish to emphatically state one point: viz., that under such conditions even a system of government as solidly founded as our own could hardly prevent the struggle for existence within these frontiers from degenerating into a war of each man against his neighbor. We ask you kindly to take the necessary steps with the Governments of Czecho-Slovakia and Roumania.—Exchange.

"BELA KUN."

AUSTRALIA.

As showing that the disturbances in Queensland are due to economic causes rather than to "Red" propaganda, we quote the following from an exchange: "The stoppage of shipping is causing a famine in North Queensland, and the government has commandeered all flour at Charters Towers." Mines are closed down and the products of labor are stacked up and the warehouses are full, yet the people are starving.

An Appeal for Defence Funds

SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA
401 Pender St. E., Vancouver, B. C.,
Dominion Executive Committee,
July 10, 1919.

Comrades:

Funds are urgently needed for the defence of those men arrested in connection with the late strike troubles in Canada. The preliminary trial is undergoing numerous postponements, while the police are combing the whole Dominion in an effort to discover evidence; documentary and otherwise, to be used in the trial.

The charges against the labor officials are at present seditious libel and seditious conspiracy, though the Crown Prosecutor announces that this will be subject to alterations. The Federal Government has retained six of the leading legal firms of Winnipeg for the prosecution, and that action may be taken as evidence that no effort will be spared to secure convictions.

W. A. Pritchard, R. B. Russel, George Armstrong, R. J. Johns, are all members of the Socialist Party of Canada. The funds raised, however, will be used to cover the defence of all those arrested. The loyal support of the workers is due to these arrested comrades, because it is for working in behalf of the working class and voicing its needs and aspirations that they have incurred the enmity of the ruling class.

In addition to the case of the labor officials, a number of foreigners have also been arrested, we understand, under the provisions of the recent Act of Parliament, which the press reported as being rushed through both Houses of Parliament in twenty minutes. This new Act is a "blanket" measure, ostensibly aimed at the advocates of physical force for the overthrow of established authority, but designedly constructed so that very wide and unknown scope of application and interpretation of it is placed within the hands of the bureaucrats of the administration. Should the arrested men be convicted under it, precedents will be established which will effect thousands of others holding unorthodox economic and political views, and the last remnants of old established and bitterly fought for privileges of freedom of thought and speech will be swept away. The attempt to penalize these men constitutes a blow at the working class movement towards a better state of things. This blow can only be met by contesting thoroughly the validity of the charges in the courts of law. Every present indication points to it that the trial will be the most important and far-reaching in its consequences which has heretofore effected the labor movement in Canada.

A large sum of money will be needed. The expenses it is estimated, will run into five figures. Due to the long continued strike, union treasuries and the strikers individual funds are either depleted or exhausted. Also there are a large and growing number of unemployed who will be unable to contribute. Consequently, it is the more necessary that those more fortunately circumstanced should contribute to their utmost.

We, ourselves, can only reach a few of those in whom this appeal would find a response. Help the cause of the arrested men and the working class in general, by acquainting others of this need for funds. Please, each one do your very best, and that quickly.

Send all moneys, if possible, by cheque, money order, postal note or by registered letter to the respective treasurers of the following collecting agencies:

British Columbia Agency:—Victor Midgley, Postoffice Drawer 879, Vancouver, B. C.

Alberta Agency:—A. Broatch, 1203 Eighth Avenue East, Calgary, Alta.

Central Collection Agency:—E. Robinson, Secretary Trades and Labor Council, Winnipeg, Man.

Contributions will be acknowledged at a later date through the Labor and Socialist press.

C. STEPHENSON.
Secretary D. E. C. Socialist Party of Canada.

ITALIAN SEAMEN AND RUSSIA

The "Daily Herald," (England), gives in full the story of how the Italian Seamen's Federation have declared a boycott of all ships carrying munitions for the war against Soviet Russia. In their resolution they state:

"All the crews of the Italian steamers are disposed to go to prison or sink to the bottom of the harbor with their steamers rather than allow themselves to contribute to the defeat of the Russian peoples revolution.

"We are convinced that such a defeat would mean the defeat of Labor everywhere. We invite all other Labor organizations, especially seamen, to boycott all steamers chartered by international capitalism against the Workers' International, which is massing now its Red vanguards on the battlefields of Revolutionary Russia."

GREECE REFUSES TO FIGHT AGAINST SOVIET

"L'Humanite," May 22, 1919. It is a well-known fact that Greek troops constituted a large part of the Entente forces in Odessa and in the Crimea. A Russian wireless of May 19 announces the refusal of Greece to continue to fight against Soviet Russia, as follows:

"The Greek Admiral in Sebastopol has assured the representative of the Red Army that henceforth Greece will not participate in the operations against Bolshevik Russia. Previous to his departure he called with other diplomatic representatives on the President of the Revolutionary Committee and repeated his assurances of Greek sympathy for Soviet Russia. In their private conversations the Greek representatives condemned in strong terms the Entente's action in forcing the Greeks to participate in operations against the Red Army."