THE RED FLAG

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

VOL. 1 NO. 6 VANCOUVER, B. C., SATURDAY, MARCH 1, 1919 Five Cents

Through Dictatorship to Democracy

By KLARA ZETKIN

[Translated from the "Frauen-Beilage" (Woman's Supplement) of the Leipziger Volkszeitung by Eden and Cedar Paul.]

IN a recent article entitled "Democracy versus Dictatorship," Comrade Kautsky opposed the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry as it has been established in Russia by the Bolshevist overthrow of the state authority. He expressed his dissent from the views of those Socialists who have contended that in existing circumstances this dictatorship is historically justified. Substantially Kautsky's opinions are identical with those recently published by Martoff, a Menshevik comrade, in his writing "Marx and the Problem of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat." My answer to Kautsky's criticism of the Bolshevik runs as follows:

The use of the strong hand is the essential characteristic of Bolshevist activity. This is not ideal, but unavoidable. It may be contrary to the prescriptions of democracy, and yet it sub-serves the interests of democracy. If for all who live in Russia, democracy is to become an energy-diffusing Socialistic reality, the Bolsheviks cannot escape the necessity of sacrificing, as a transient measure, the rights of certain individuals and a certain social groups. That this should happen is an inevitable feature of historic evolution. Democracy is of a two-fold nature, being simultaneously means and end of historic evolution. As end or goal of historic evolution it may come into conflict with itself as means of historic evolution. The dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry in Russia bears the insignia of this contradiction. Plaintive voices from Russia, the criticisms uttered by the adversaries of "Bolshevism" in other lands, assure us that since the Bolsheviks attained to power they have everywhere infringed and sacrificed democratic principles. Democracy, we are told, has repeatedly been given the go-by, in the dissolution of the constituent assembly, in the deprivations of civil rights announced in the Soviet constitution, and in the declaration of the mass terror. Doubtless! But without such infringements could the revolution have been saved, could it have been carried a stage further, could the revolutionists have continued to work for Socialism, which alone guarantees democracy for all? This is the crucial question, and for me the answer is self-evident, considering the circumstances attendant upon the Russian revolution.

I hold that the dissolution of the constituent assembly, far from involving a sacrifice of democracy, made democracy more effective. No doubt that assembly had been elected upon the basis of a democratic suffrage, but the elections had taken place before the bourgeois watchwords, and the bourgeois-Socialist programme of compromise, had lost their allurements for the broad masses of the workers. They had taken place before the decisive historic moment in which the November revolution and the acceptance of the Soviet government by the organized workers, peasants, and soldiers, had effectively condemned as "partial and inadequate" the programmes of the two opening phases of the revolution and of the parties that had put these programmes forward. It should be added that, during the opening periods, the economic and social power of the possessing classes was still sufficient to exercise considerable influence upon the electoral results. The constituent assembly could not possibly be regarded as an unfalsified expression of the opinions and the will [illegible] workers. In so far as in Russia we can sp[illegible] a popular will, that will was indubitably [illegible] porated in the decisions of the Soviets. W[illegible] provisional Soviet government to abdicate [illegible] power in favor of the will-o'-the-wisp dem[illegible] of the constituent assembly? Was the Sovi[illegible] ernment to entrust the work of revolut[illegible] bourgeois hands, to hands that were itch[illegible] fetter, nay to strangle, this unruly intru[illegible] was the power to be handed over to the [illegible] revolutionaries, who had proved too weak t[illegible] tect the revolution? To take such a step [illegible] have been no less foolish than criminal.

There is another point to consider. The revo[illegible] tion had not arrested its progress at the goal [illegible] a bourgeois revolution. Transcending any such aim, it had revealed the titanic figure of a proletarian revolution, of one aiming at Socialistic reorganization. If they accepted parliamentarism, the Bolsheviks would accept an institution which, however important, is of very limited value; an institution which even in times of peaceful evolution has proved obviously inadequate to the needs of the proletarian struggle for emancipation; an institution which, adapted to the requirements of [illegible] must necessarily fail to meet [illegible] whose purpose is to sub- [illegible] deniable that the prole- [illegible] dvantage that can be [illegible] tutions. But par- [illegible] tutions which a [illegible] take over and [illegible] revolutionary [illegible] Soviets, [illegible] tive and [illegible] organization [illegible] cratic [illegible] ministrative and [illegible] is undeniable tha[illegible] Soviet constitution [illegible] that thereby [illegible] excluded from the [illegible] to forget that th[illegible] provisional, that t[illegible] the period during [illegible] proletariat and th[illegible] persist. The constitu[illegible] this matter. The d[illegible] coming of New Russia, are not yet so far advanced as to enable the Soviet government with one stroke of the pen or with [illegible] mighty blow to abolish private ownership of the means of production. In Russia, the knell of private property has not yet sounded, the hour for the expropriation of all expropriators has not yet struck. Minorities still possess economic power and social power, can still use and misuse these powers against the overwhelming majority of the workers. Is political power to be superseded, to enable them to pursue their egoistic aims in defiance of the interests of the community at large? Let us clear our minds of phrases; let us cut loose from formalities; let us cease to reiterate the shibboleth that "the masses have the right and the power" to counteract the anti-social machinations of the possessing minorities. Is it not obvious that in reality things will be very different when economic freedom and economic equality have endowed the entire nation with spiritual freedom and maturity? Who would not laugh at a military commander so unwise as to send artillery and shells as a gift to the hostile army? Yet the Bolsheviks are supposed to have committed a deadly sin in that they refused to arm and equip the reactionary minorities for the struggle against the revolution. This too at the very moment when revolution and counter-revolution were at life and death grips; when the counter-revolution was not merely supported by all the reactionary energies of Russia, but was being furnished by the Allied governments with troops, money, and moral support.

The dissolution of the Constituent Assembly, the use of forcible measures against opponents, the declaration of the mass terror—these are bitter fruits of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry. They must be regarded as measures of military necessity. "A la guerre comme a la guerre." When you are making war, make war. The Bolshevik leaders of revolutionary Russia are engaged in a war of unparalleled significance. Here the moral and political standards of everyday life fail us. On this colossal stage,

(Continued on Page Three)

CHANGE IN ALLIED POLICY TOWARDS RUSSIA

[Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 20]

PARIS, France (Wednesday)—Whether rightly or wrongly, a certain stiffening in the attitude of the five-power council towards the Russian situation is put down to Mr. Winston Churchill's visit to Paris. It is the impression that the powers have arrived at the conclusion that a much firmer policy is needful with regard to the Bolsheviki, and a statement is also made that President Wilson himself was leaning very much to that view before leaving the French capital.

Nicholas Tchaikovsky, president of the Archangel government, now in Paris, declares that in refusing to go to Prinkipo, his government rendered the Allies a service, by preventing a slur on their prestige at the moment when they were setting up a government of justice in the world.

Another "Monitor" special from London reports that plans for united anti-Bolshevik government have been completed.

SOCIALIST PARTY OF CANADA

PROPAGANDA MEETINGS

SUNDAY, MARCH 2, 1919

At 8 p.m. Sharp

EMPRESS THEATRE

Corner Gore and Hastings

Speaker.....J. Kavanagh

The Background of the German Revolution

By LOUIS C. FRAINA

IV.

(Concluded from Last Issue)

The spirit of revolutionary action during October was spreading rapidly all through Germany, among the proletariat and in the army. But the Social Democratic Party, the majority Socialism of Scheidemann, Ebert & Co., did all in its power to prevent a revolution—in accord with its counter-revolutionary policy and traditions. On October 17 the Executive Committee of the Social Democratic Party issued a declaration against revolution: "All this agitation by confused, irresponsible persons, using Bolshevik revolutionary phrases, who are trying to rouse the workers to strikes and demonstrations against the Government that would have no sense nor object at present, makes it more difficult to bring about peace and a democratic Germany. . . . As the authorized representatives of the Social Democratic Party have always declared, we wish to transform the political structures into a democracy and our economic life into Socialism by means of a peaceful change. We are on the road to peace and democracy. All the agitation for an attempted revolt runs counter to this road and serves the cause of the counter-revolution." (My italics.) And this, just at the moment when the proletariat was on the verge of bursting forth in that elemental revolutionary action that shattered the autocracy, and made a breach in the old order through which the proletariat could break through for action and the conquest of power! The language of this counter-revolutionary declaration was used in Russia against the Bolsheviki by moderate Socialism: it is characteristic and universal. This hesitation, this utter lack of audacity and revolutionary initiative, this horror of proletarian mass action characterized the Social Democratic Party before the war, and characterizes its majority during the war, and characterizes its policy during the Revolution, when the German proletariat is accomplishing great things, and Frederick Engels' prophecy of thirty years ago might come true—that out of the next general European war would emerge Socialism. Their theory becomes life, and they contemptuously reject life itself. . . .

But the masses were in motion, the class struggle had flared up implacably, the agitation of the Spartacan Socialists and many of the Independents accelerated the march of events. On November 4, the government of Prince Max and Scheidemann issued a proclamation, boasting of the deeds of the army, of universal suffrage, of democracy in Germany—with the Kaiser still in power. But on November 7, 8 and 9, the first anniversary of the proletarian revolution in Russia, the German revolution became an accomplished fact. The German fleet was seized by mutinous sailors; sailors at Kiel acted in favor of the revolution, organized Councils of Workmen, Soldiers and Sailors; and when a government "Socialist" delegation arrived at Kiel to give orders, the delegation itself was given orders to bring back to Berlin. The revolution marched into action at Hamburg, where artillery was used in street battles. Everywhere the proletariat turned to its own revolutionary activity, strikes developing into demonstrations, and demonstrations into revolutionary mass action, Councils of Workmen and Soldiers being organized as the instruments of the revolution.

The government was ignored, the existing Socialists and union organizations were ignored; the proletariat turned to mass action and the characteristic instruments of the proletarian revolution, the Councils of Workmen and Soldiers. In spite of all and everything, the German proletariat, by means of characteristic Bolshevik methods, accomplished the first stage of the German revolution.

From Kiel and Hamburg the revolutionary movement spread rapidly. In Berlin, enormous demonstrations broke loose, soldier deserters being particularly active. The Council of Workmen and Soldiers in the industrial district of Chemnitz on November 9, at 2 a.m., issued the following proclamation in The Volkstimme:

"On with the struggle for freedom, bread and peace! Workers and Soldiers in the industrial district of Chemnitz:

"The undersigned council of the workers and soldiers of Chemnitz has this night taken into its hands the military and political power, as has already been done in the strategic, decisive districts of Germany.

"The Council of Workmen and Soldiers guarantees the maintenance of order and public safety.

"The stopping of work may take place only at the order of the Workmen's and Soldiers' Council.

"Everyone, therefore, go to his place of work until further directions are received. The means of communication and all official business must be continued until orders to the contrary from the Workmen's and Soldiers' Council.

"He who leaves his post without permission will without consideration be called to account also each official who attempts sabotage or who through negligence in service harms the public welfare.

"The military power of command is in the hands of the Council of Workmen and Soldiers. All orders from other sources are to be ignored. The council will take the necessary measures for the provisioning of the people, and that no stoppage in the distribution of food shall occur.

"Therefore, each be unafraid. Today, at 12 noon, in the Central Theatre, in the Kaumannischen Vereinshaus and in the Neuen Stadt-Theater, meetings of workers and soldiers will be held at which the situation will be discussed.

"The provisional Workers' and Soldiers' Council will be elected and will be given authority to direct all necessary action.

"The taking over of affairs will follow through a definite workers-council after its election. This election will take place in the course of the coming week. These have the right to vote, all citizens of both sexes, who have reached their 18th year or have done army service.

"The aim of the Workers' and Soldiers' Councils of Germany is the establishment of the German Socialist Republic.

"Long live the fraternal union of soldiers and workers!

"Long live revolutionary discipline!

"Long live the world revolution!

"Long live the people's emancipation, Socialism!

"Long live peace!

"The Council of Workmen and Soldiers in the industrial district of Chemnitz: Fritz Heckert, Max Muller, Corporal Max Stein—Executive Council in power."

The revolution conquered: the Kaiser fled to Holland; a new "democratic" government was organized—Imperial Chancellor Prince Max appointing the "Socialist" Ebert as chancellor. But the first stage of the revolution was simply the first, and not the last; the accomplishment of the first stage of the revolution indicated the fundamental problems, but did not solve them. The first victory was comparatively easy; but the second, the real victory, the definite accomplishment of a proletarian Socialist revolution, still to be accomplished was indicated in a speech by Karl Liebnecht delivered on November 20: "Did the bourgeoisie while in power permit you to have a voice in the government? No! Then the workers must not permit it to have any say now. We need a government of soldiers and workmen, a government of the proletariat, which will not have to bow down before the entente. There must be no dickering with entente imperialism. We will dispose of that just as we did with German autocracy. The revolution is also bound to reach the entente countries, but we, who made the Russians waste a whole year, are insisting that the revolution break out in England and France within twenty-four hours." A dictatorship of the proletariat, the definite initiation of Socialism, an alliance with proletarian Soviet Russia, a revolutionary war if necessary and the struggle for the international revolution—these are aspects of the second revolution, indicated by Liebnecht and by life itself.

VICTORY BALL SCENE

Hundreds of people visited the Tower at Blackpool on Saturday to inspect the damage which had been done by soldiers at the Victory Ball the previous night. The trouble arose out of a decision, afterwards rescinded, not to admit troops.

Not only did the invaders smash an elaborate awning fitted with electric lights at the front entrance, wrench a door off its hinges, and break several sheets of plate glass, but they smoked all over the building and did considerable damage to a new set of rich carpets by throwing burning cigarette ends on them.

The soldiers and their girls took possession of the floor shortly before midnight and danced in coats and boots among the guests in charming ball room dresses. Some of the ladies entered into the fun of it and danced several lancers and foxtrots with the soldiers, who were happy and good-tempered. When once they had got into the building the invaders raided the refreshment buffets and despatched almost everything eatable and drinkable.

The ball was continued until 2:30, and as anyone could walk in and help himself to all that the 15s ticket guests enjoyed, the ballroom buffets and luxurious sitting-out places became packed with a motley crowd, the soldiers certainly sang, "Me and My Girl."

Early in the morning there was a rumor that some of the men had been arrested, and trouble again threatened. The mayor and a corporal, however, drove to the police station and inspected the cells, afterwards reporting to the men at the Tower that there had been no arrest.

A military inquiry is to be held.—Weekly Mail, Cardiff, Wales.

Weighty Considerations From English Tory Press

"London Saturday Review," Jan. 18

"As we have no reason to believe the dispatch published by L'Humanite a forgery, we must thank M. Pichon for having administered a well-deserved rebuke to Mr. Balfour. It is simply shocking that the British Foreign Office should have proposed to admit to the peace conference a representative of the Russian Bolsheviks. The message of congratulation from the House of Commons to Kerensky on the deportation of the Tsar was bad enough; but not so bad as the proposal to admit to the company of decent men a wretch whose hands are red with the blood of his murdered countrymen, whose pockets bulge with stolen bank-notes, and whose very clothes are probably stripped from some corpse in Petrograd. The French government very properly replied to this cynical suggestion from our foreign office that it would neither recognize nor negotiate with criminals."

SOCIALISTS OPPOSE REQUEST OF FINLAND

[Special Cable to The Christian Science Monitor From its European News Office]

COPENHAGEN, Denmark, (Sunday)—The Finnish regent, General Mannerheim, is understood to have abandoned his visit to Copenhagen, owing to the hostile attitude of the Norwegian Socialists, who resent the policy of the Mannerheim regime toward the Finnish Socialists. Swedish Socialists also demonstrated against General Mannerheim on his arrival in Stockholm.

THE SHOP STEWARDS

[From a Labor Correspondent]

[Manchester Guardian, Jan. 30]

The shop stewards' movement, as we know it now, is a growth of the war period. A number of trade unions had shop stewards before the war, but they were quite minor delegates of the unions with practically no functions beyond looking out for new members in the shop and seeing that existing members kept their contributions up to date. During the war not only have the functions of the pre-war shop stewards grown enormously but, side by side with the official shop stewards recognized by the unions through their district committees, there has grown up a class of unofficial shop stewards not recognized by and often not attached to any particular union. The line between official and unofficial stewards is, however, by no means hard and fast, and often it is difficult to say whether a particular steward is recognized or not.

In this war-time development, so far as it has been described above, there is no revolutionary break with established trade union methods. The break came when the shop stewards, first on the Clyde and subsequently in most of the principal centres, joined together to form not only works committees in particular works but also workers' committees covering all the works in a district. Committees of stewards in a particular works are often recognized by the trade unions and negotiations are now in progress for their recognition by the employers on a national basis, but workers' committees are always purely unofficial bodies.

The Workshop Basis

These workers' committees have usually been dominated by men of "industrial unionist" views. These men have continued to belong to their various trade unions and, as a rule, to work for amalgamation among them on industrial lines, but during the war they have repeatedly taken action in calling strikes without the consent of the union executives, which have been unable to do so owing to the operation of the Munitions Acts. In the minds of most of the advanced elements in the shop stewards' movement the right basis for industrial action is a workshop basis, and organization in the labor movement should, in their view, be built up on an all-grades workshop basis. Most hope to achieve this by a transformation of the existing union machinery, and work for this transformation within their unions; but they also seek to develop workshop organization apart from the unions, both as a lever for bringing about amalgamation and as a means of securing control over industry.

Late in 1917 negotiations were entered into between the trade union executives and the employers for the recognition of shop stewards, and an unsatisfactory agreement providing for partial recognition was accepted by some of the unions, but not by the A.S.E. Since then negotiations have been proceeding for a wider measure of recognition, including recognition of works committees, but these are not finally concluded.

Recognition Not Wanted at Present

The unofficial shop stewards' and workers' committee movement on the whole repudiates recognition at present, holding that it will hamper freedom of action and will mean a surrender to craft unionism. Recognition, these elements hold, is only desirable in an industrial union. For the present they prefer to remain entirely unofficial, without restrictions and without responsibility. A minority but only a small minority, has the idea of completely overthrowing the existing unions and substituting for them a new organization based upon the unofficial work-shop movement, but the vast majority works for the transformation of the existing unions and expects to find in them, when they have been transformed by amalgamation and include all grades, skilled and unskilled alike, a full form of recognition which will make workshop organization the basis of the whole industrial structure.

The unofficial shop stewards' movement, as a whole, seeks the overthrow of capitalism and the realization of the workers' control over industry. The most active section are the industrial unionists of the Socialist labor party, but they are only a small minority of the whole, and there are many different theoretical points of view represented in the movement, while the bulk of the adherents have hardly a definite theoretical point of view at all. Workshop organization has come naturally as the result of war-time experience, and is certain of an important permanent place in trade union machinery, but there is no likelihood that the existing unions will be overthrown, though there is every chance that there will be the big amalgamations among them, and that the shop stewards and workshop organization generally will receive full recognition in the future structure of trade unionism in the engineering and shipbuilding industries.

THROUGH DICTATORSHIP TO DEMOCRACY

(Continued from Page One)

individual measures and individual phenomena are dwarfed into insignificance. The drama is one of overwhelming historic import, and it must be accepted or rejected as a whole. Who wills the end, must not shrink from the means. A proletarian revolution aiming at socialism cannot be effected, without a dictatorshipp. Above all is this true under existing conditions in Russia.

The ungracious critics of our Russian friends do not, indeed, absolutely reject the idea of dictatorship on principle. What they take amiss is the character of the dictatorship in Russia. Karl Kautsky endeavors to prove that dictatorship and democracy must go hand in hand. The dictatorship must not sacrifice democratic principles but must realise them. The dictatorship must be an effluence of democracy. It must subserve the will of the majority and the interests of the majority. According to the critics, neither of these requirements is fulfilled in Russia. The small Bolshevist minority, we are told, employing brutal and forcible measures, constrains the overwhelming majority of Russians to accept Bolshevist policy. This policy, far from safeguarding the revolution, endangers the revolution; far from advancing socialism, compromises socialism. This is the kernel of the critical onslaughts, which are directed at a mark beyond "Bolshevism," which aim at clarifying, at revising, the theory of the dictatorship of the proletariat. We are given chains of logical inferences, attempts at a new outline of the concept of dictatorship, as contrasted with the old theory, which is rejected as "blanquist" or "jacobin." The arguments are, of course, peppered with appeals to Marx and Engels, and with quotations from these authors. I have carefully read the expositions, but my general outlook upon the question, upon the application of the doctrine to the special case of the Russian revolution, and upon the part played by the Bolsheviks in that revolution, remains unchanged. I am, in fact, an impenitent sinner. As concerns the contentious questions of our own day, what does it matter whether the historic phenomena which Marx witnessed during his lifetime led him to modify his conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat; what does it matter if, having at first been inclined to a "jacobin" outlook, he subsequently came rather to adopt an "evolutionist and parliamentary" view? With all due deference to Comrade Martoff's wide knowledge of Marxist theory and to the indisputable acumen with which he applies that theory, we may none the less feel inclined to challenge his deductions, and the way in which he contrasts his interpretation of Marx with the dictatorship assumed by the Bolsheviks. But even if we believe Martoff to be right concerning Marx's opinions and concerning the applicability of those opinions to the Russian situation, there is one simple fact still to be remembered, and it is that historical evolution was not arrested when the pen fell from Marx's hand.

Since that day, the capitalist economy has not merely grown, but has exhibited entirely new phenomena, phenomena of notable importance. To enumerate a few of these, we have: formation of rings, trusts, and syndicates; the assumption of the premier place in industry by iron and steel products in place of textiles; the revolutionary transformation effected by improvements in electrical technology; the interlacements of industrial capital, commercial capital, and banking capital to constitute financial capital, and the world-wide dominion of the latter, etc. In the home policy and the foreign policy of all the more highly evolved states can be traced the influence of a further developed and maturer capitalism. Although on the surface the amenities of life may seem to have improved, the class struggle between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie has in reality been intensified. Among the struggling classes we see a medley and a confusion of impulses towards far-reaching settlements, and dread of such settlements, of great schemes and little deeds. The dominant classes are increasingly inclined to cling to the fugitive political past. We note the decay of bourgeois parliamentarism, and its more and more obvious incapacity to assist the proletarian struggle for freedom towards decisive issues. Above all we are impressed by the mighty expansion of imperialism, with its insatiable thirst for world dominion, with its overgrown armaments, its colonial undertakings and its wars, its extremist policy of exploitation and oppression alike at home and abroad.

Who dares maintain that in face of the developments of the last decades, Marx, an out-and-out revolutionary thinker, would not have modified his conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat in accordance with the teaching of towering facts? If we assume Comrade Martoff to be right as to the theory Marx held more than forty years ago, can we not rest assured that Marx would have revised that theory had he been alive today? To Marx, theory was something greater than a means for elucidating the world; it was a means for transforming the world. But for this very reason, he never regarded his theories as eternal and immutable truths to which reality must conform; for him, reality always remained the object of research, the thing to be conscientiously investigated, the thing from which his theories were acquired, and in accordance with which his theories must in case of need be modified. I am confident that at this juncture Marx's conception of the dictatorship of the proletariat would display remarkably little similarity with the meek and lowly ideal, the ideal of those who aim only at harmony and at the co-operation of all persons of "good will," the ideal which bashfully simpers at us from the expositions of the adversaries of Bolshevism. Marx's revolutionary intelligence was as keen as a sword; his heart glowed with revolutionary fire; his revolutionary will was hard as steel. Marx was ever a revolutionary fighter, a man of action, and I cannot believe that he would be found today among the critics of Bolshevism.

On paper "the dictatorship of the prolearíat" and "the ideal of complete democracy" may be linked with the simple copula. In the world of reality, it is otherwise. The historic essence of dictatorship is dominion—stark, coercive dominion. Without infringing the prescriptions of ideal democracy, without infringing the rights and interests of minorities, it is as impossible as the quadrature of the circle. The historic justification of the dictatorship of the proletariat lies in this, that the dictatorship is exercised in the interests of the enormous majority of the population, and that it is no more than a means of transition, for it aims at suspending itself, at rendering itself impossible, at realizing the ideal of democracy—a free people, in a free land, living by free labor.

Our anti-Bolsheviks deny that the extant dictatorship in Russia possesses these justifications. They declare that the Bolshevik dictatorship is the work of an inconsiderable minority of dogmatists and fanatics who, in the interests of nar-

(Continued on Page Six)

THE RED FLAG

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

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

401 Pender Street East, Vancouver, B. C.

Editor ..... C. Stephenson

SATURDAY.....MARCH 1, 1919

Lest We Forget!

We have been assured that the Allied forces are to be withdrawn in the spring. But how far performance will conform with promise, time alone will tell. One thing at least is certain that the promise of withdrawal has been given unwillingly and under pressure. The malignant will to evil purpose, is still there, cheated. Do not let us forget that.

At the best, by the most liberal minded, intervention is only regarded as a tactical mistake. Should the proletariat of the Allied countries be lulled to sleep or indifference on this matter, by promises, they are doomed to a rude awakening. The reactionaries have only been baffled temporarily. In fact rumors and stray news pieced together indicate that the promises of withdrawal are so much camouflage and that preparations are still going ahead for an invasion of Russia next summer, under one guise or another.

The press, ready and willing tool of the interests, will furnish and is furnishing the material for educating the uncritical and ignorant populace.

The "Montreal Gapette" of February 20 assures us, by the word of its correspondent in Paris, that the Allied forces are not to withdraw from Russia. France and Italy, he reports, are in favor of military intervention in Russia, to **fight Bolshevism** and to restore **law and order.** Great Britain, the United States and Japan, we gather from his article, are opposed to farther intervention, but they cannot in honor to their friends in Russia retire from the positions they now hold.

The positions they now hold: north, south, east and west of Russia; Vladivostok, Archangel, etc., etc., its chief ports and gateways to the outside world. Yes! Positions! Positions for encircling the struggling republic with the steel lassoo of an economic boycott. Positions, that will provide convenient bases, for what? Convenient bases for the friends of Tzarism and foreign concessionaries and anti-Soviet intriguers generally.

The latest reports are that the Allied forces are marching down from Archangel. The truth is the promise of withdrawal is not worth the paper it is written on. Should Soviet Russia in weakness falter, or its friends outside forget their duty towards it, another entry will be made on the long, hellish list of capitalistic infamies.

Let us hear Senator Hiram Johnson of California, addressing the United States senate, on Tuesday, January 28, as reported in the "Congressional Record."

He said in part:

"Russia, Mr. President, is a marvelous country. It contains one-sixth of the earth's surface, with fertility of soil and wealth in mineral resources surpassing those of any other part of the earth. This Soviet government to which our president for us spoke so kindly, begged us for economic aid and wished to make us the most favored nation. We, in the rigidity of our virtue, though asking the aid of the anarchists in our midst, with the Bolsheviki over there, and though publicly proclaiming our friendship and our love, would not accept the proffer. Weak and vacillating, stupid, and ignorant has been our policy with Russia. We solemnly promised we would not intervene, and then, prating of our love for the Russian people, we did intervene. Prating about guarding stores at Archangel, we advanced from 100 to 300 miles from that port, took and burned little Russian towns, and upset little Soviet governments. In the name of protecting military supplies, which were offered to us again, and again, and again, and which we could have had for the asking, we shot down Russian peasants, and our boys are shot down by them. The senator from Nebraska insists our only purpose in landing at Archangel was to protect the stores. Our only advance beyond Archangel was to prepare military bases. He is wrong. We were marching down from Archangel—and the facts will demonstrate it—that we might make conjunction with the Omsk government and might perfect the ring of steel which we had thrown around interior Russia, and which was starving innocent women and children. The senator from Virginia gravely speaks of the German menace. What German menace since November 11? Are our people's children to be lulled into repose by such stuff as this? The very learned and logical senator from Colorado tells us that we are not making war upon Russia; that Russia is making war upon us. Apparently his argument seems to be that if the Russians had not resisted when we advanced into their territory there would have been no conflict and no killing. What a strange and fantastic doctrine is this! If an army landed in New York, marched to Buffalo, and the people in central New York resisted and fought them, by that fact, then, New York was making war upon the invading army and the invading army was innocent of wrong. The French are under no illusions in this matter.

They are for intervention, and they believe they are intervening upon a small scale, too small, as they put it now. They make no pretense that they wish supplies guarded. They wish Russians killed and another government set up. What hypocrisy upon our part to say to our people, and to the Russians, in our pronunciamento last year when we commenced our intervention, that we contemplated "no interference with the political sovereignty of Russia, no intervention in her internal affairs, not even in the local affairs of the limited areas which her military force may be obliged to occupy, and no impairment of her territorial integrity, either now or hereafter." No sooner had we landed at Archangel than we shot the Soviet government there existing out of town and set up a governmnet of our own. No sooner did we go into the interior than everywhere we found a local Soviet we shot it to death and set up our own mode of government. Then we tell our people that we intend no interference with the internal or local affairs of Russia!"

The senator's speech in which he quoted editorials from the Manchester "Guardian" and the Springfield "Republican" takes up nine pages of small print in the "Record" and constitutes a comprehensive and a scathing indictment of the policies of the Allied governments towards Russia. It is significant that our press has been silent as the grave about it. Senator Johnson concluded his speech as follows:

"I think I can with equanimity observe the servile part of the press apply to me for this speech the now familiar epithet of Bolsheviki. Its indiscriminate application is illustrated by a New York administration paper designating prohibitionsts as the Bolshevki of America. My appeal today will find no response with those newspapers and great men who preach anarchy when they demand killing and hanging out of hand; but it will have its answering approval with the inarticulate mass who ask but justice and the same honesty in governments as in men, it will find its echo in the hearts of the common folks whose sons and husbands in frozen Russia are paying the price of our government's wrong and broken faith, and I am content.

"Why did we enter Russia? I answer, for no very good reason; and we have remained for no reason at all.

"What is our policy toward Russia? I answer we have no policy. We have engaged in a miserable misadventure, stulifying our professions, and setting at naught our promises. We have punished no guilty; we have but brought misery and starvation and death to the innocent. We have garnered none of the fruits of the victory of war, but suffer the odium and infamy of undeclared warfare. We have sacrificed our own blood to no purpose, and into American homes have brought sorrow and anguish and suffering.

"Bring the American boys home from Russia."

And so speaks a good American liberal. But—the world's proletariat strikes yet a higher and a nobler note. Its fierce, menacing, strident demand is, Hands off Soviet Russia!

"The Red Heart of Russia"

By BESSIE BEATTY

[The Century Co., New York]

BOOKS like whiskey are not always as the label describes them. Take Ruskin's "The Crown of Wild Olive," a title suggestive of something noble, some high human labor accomplished some high point of endeavor attained and rewarded with a simple crown of wild olive, as being most suitable to the high purpose and great benefits of the achievement. Opening the book we find it filled with foulness. It deals with work, traffic and war.

Miss Beatty's book holds no such snare between its covers. It is the Red Heart of Russia laid bare; Red in the modern, indeed in the nineteen hundred and nineteen sense; working class hopes and aspirations, working class struggles, defeats and successes. Red stands today for all that enslaved labor strives for, beyond what an affrighted master class can grant and exist. The Red, which democratic Australian states have banished from the streets as signals of traffic danger; the Red which New York abhors, so that, rather the garb of Adam before God made him breeches, that the most sumptuous sartorial achievement topped by a red tie.

Miss Beatty has a right to speak of the Red Heart of Russia, she looked upon it with her own eyes. Of course this will be no recommendation to certain futile ranters, who have gazed upon it from a window in Hastings street, Vancouver, the Strand, London, or any such street where do congregate that tribe of scribblers who earn their from five to a hundred bucks weekly, by stupid falsification of working class matters. These gentlemen and ladies of course command a greater audience than Miss Beatty can, for which reason we recommend her book to all who work for wages, this includes the poor creatures mentioned above. We regret having to include this vile tribe among the working class, but regrettable facts must be accepted.

Arriving in Petrograd in June 1917, the author was just in time to witness the demonstration of power in July by the Bolsheviki, also the disintegration of the Russian army and the organization of the Battalion of Death.

We read her account of these women soldiers with amazement. Russia had millions of men at the front without weapons and no means of obtaining them, unless some of their comrades who had arms were killed. Yet the hysterical bourgeois government headed by Kerensky had the effrontery to send girls of fifteen and women of forty-five to attempt the impossible. They were equipped with the strongest and surest poison known, so Skridlova, one of them, told Miss Beatty, and the commander ate sardines out of the can, seated on a bunk, and kept one of the batralion busy keeping her blouses clean. There is the usual war story of a handful of these women, taking trench after

(Continued on Page Five)

(Continued from Page Four)

trench until forced to retreat from lack of reinforcement. This story is told of every unit that ever went to battle, and suggests a stock-in-trade lie.

Anyway this despicable attempt to shame the Russian men into continuing a useless struggle, was a failure. Driven from their last refuge, behind women's skirts, the Russian bourgeoisie soon showed its incompetency, and the working class were forced to take control.

In July, Lenin and Trotsky led the armed factory workers and some sailors in a demand for the Soviets to take over all power. In the riots which followed it was demonstrated that the workers had not yet realized the utter failure of the bourgeoisie and intelligentsia. The Workmen's and Soldiers' Council refused to take power. "The riots," says Miss Beatty, "were significant chiefly because they introduced the Bolsheviki to a world that was soon to know much more of them, and because they foreshadowed events to come."

There are some good sketches of prominent Bolshevists in this book. Peters, whom the great lying press identified with Peter the painter of the Sidney street fiasco and whom they credit with signing death warrants all day, keeping both hands busy, is a young Lett, with a London accent. His early days were spent on the farm of his father, who was a small landowner in the Baltic provinces, "a Grey Baron." He became a revolutionist while at school, and with some comrade published a paper, the teacher sent a copy to his parents, whereupon he received paternal chastisement. At fifteen he left home and travelled over Europe earning his own living. When the March revolution broke out, instead of being a fugitive from British justice, Miss Beatty tells us "he was holding an excellent position as manager of the import department of a large English mercantile company. He wore a frock coat on Sundays and walked out with his English "missus" and his little girl, in the height of order and respectability."

Mrs. Pankhurst appears on the screen for a moment, and is credited with some others not named, as declaring "that only Korniloff could save the situation." So Korniloff marched on Petrograd, perhaps in obedience to this expressed wish, perhaps to something more explicit. He came with wild Cossacks; a desperate and determined man.

Miss Beatty was advised to seek safer quarters. She did not. (Compare this with the action of the man Sisson who introduced the notorious and discredited Sisson documents to America, who, as Col. Robbins says, "fled in terror from Petrograd.") After a day of alarming rumors and a night pounding a typewriter, she was aroused at five a.m. by loud knocking. She found the hotel full of armed sailors. In reply to her anxious questions in English came the hearty chorus from the sailors "Nechevo," (don't worry). Kerensky has showed his incapacity, "a thousand sailors had taken possession of the hotel, examined passports, searched rooms and arrested fourteen officers. They were not from Korniloff or Kerensky, but from the government behind the government —the Soviet. The Workmen's and Soldiers' deputies had decided to take things into their own hands and arrest all officers whom they suspected of counter-revolutionary tendencies."

While Kerensky was denouncing Korniloff as a traitor, the Soviets were working night and day in the munition plants and preparing to entrench the city. During this sweaty haste on the workers part, we catch a glimpse of Breshkovskaya, the old lady who gave Hawthornthwaite an excuse to shew some uncomfortable sentiments and to purify himself in the eyes of the undefiled. She went among the soldiers begging them to stand by Kerensky; she did this day and night.

The Great Man came, but his wild Cossacks instead of fighting fraternized with the Soviet troops. "The only shot fired was that with which one of Korniloff's officers killed himself." Kerensky was unable to give a satisfactory account of this melodrama and as the workers found the government making bargains for their enslavement, they were compelled to consider taking over governmental powers themselves.

"The Korniloff adventure paved the way for the Bolsheviki revolution." From these September days Petrograd was like the nervous old fellow who lay awake awaiting the removal of the second boot of his roommate. Every time the lights went out or a door banged "everyone in Petrograd automatically jumped to the same conclusion: it has come!"

Our author on a chill November day reached for the desk telephone and got no answer. A week previous she dined with an Englishman and sat next to "Baron B," while the Tsar was toasted and "the Englishman (pity we have not his name) introduced the baron as follows, "He helped to stop the retreat from Tarnopol on the south-western front, you ought to have seen him lining up those deserters before a firing-squad. He made quick work of the bloody cowards." The baron was optimistic. His only fear was that the Soviet would not take over the government. So the afternoon the telephone refused duty she met "Baron B." and he remarked, "We have got them on the run this time." Whatever the bold baron meant, next morning when Petrograd awoke the city was in the hands of the Bolsheviki. The factory workers organized as the Red Guard commanded the streets, captured the telephone exchange, the War Hotel, (where Miss Beatty stayed) the state bank and the general staff.

The council of the republic was meeting at the Marinsky Palace. Some Sailors entered, "one stepped up to President Avksentieff. 'Stop talking! Go home!' he said, 'there is no council of the republic.'" The council looked at the sailor boys once and departed.

The second All-Russian Congres sof Soviets was shortly to meet in the Smolney Institute and fighting was going on spasmodically here and there. Miss Beatty attended the congress, while the meeting delayed its deliberations from five to nine o'clock, then to be informed that the Mensheviki were still in caucus. We are told that "for once Russian patience seemed to be about to reach its limit." Within an hour a steady booming came from the Neva. The sailors were shelling the Kerensky government at the Winter Palace. At this moment Trotsky arrives and we have another of those sketches which makes this book more than merely interesting, "The attention of the crowd to———the most talked of human being in an age of spectacular figures." (P.P. 194-195.)

The election gave the Soviet congress into the hands of the Bolsheviki.

Lenin and Zenovieff lead the new executive, having just that day come out of hiding. Trotsky took his place as chairman and announced the business of the convention. The Mensheviki indignantly demanded that the firing on the government cease. Martoff, one of the Mensheviki, proposed the appointment of a committee for negotiating with all parties to prevent bloodshed. The resolution was passed. For reasons beyond the power of an American newspaper correspondent to discover, Trotsky allowed all kinds of trivial questions to be discussed and ere the matter could be settled in the convention it was settled in the streets.

Miss Beatty, like the Russian proletariat, becomes more and more a Bolshevist, the more plain the incapacity of all other groups becomes evident. What ever anyone might believe or desire to see, one great fact stood out, the Bolsheviki were being forced to take control and were doing so with a thoroughness and dispatch which left no question of ability and willingness.

With the victory, all those hangers-on of capitalism, which for some reason not clear are termed the intelligentsia, withdrew from all executive and administrative posts. Even the telephone girls quit. The working class alone put over the stupendous revolution. We read of Peters coming to Miss Beatty to have "The Degree of Peace" typed. They did not have stenographers, but they put it over and that was sixteen months since. And the worst that can be said of them is that Trotsky has his finger nails manicured.

"The Day of Shame" chapter should be especially regarded. It recounts the betrayal of the boys who were training for officers in the army. Some of the army officers told them that Kerensky was coming at the head of an army, and organized them to seize the telephone exchange and the War Hotel; they supplied them with pass words and the seal of the Military Revolutionary Committee with which they were enabled to surprise the guards at these posts. When the Red Guard advanced to the attack, these officers disappeared, leaving the boys to fight it out alone. They acted like the bourgeoisie always do when forced to fight alone, like curs. The Red Guard at the instance of Rhys Williams, spared their lives.

There is a world of material we could discuss, the wine pogroms for instance, when the bourgeoisie attempted to set the proletariat mad drunk by making known the whereabouts of the wine cellars. How the Soviets broke the bottles and pumped the wine into the Neva with the fire engine and hose. Three hundred thousand bottles in one cellarage.

"The Brigands Peace of Brest-Litovsk." When deserted by everyone except their own faithful working class, the Soviets were forced to a peace which they at least sought to avoid and the great lying press has never ceased to yelp about it. While Finland and the Ukraine signed the most disgraceful peace of all time and all countries and the great lying press never dropped an ink spot, not enough to dot an I, because by that peace the workers were crushed in those countries.

All these things will be found in "The Red Heart of Russia," and are valuable to us because they come from an eyewitness, who was antagonistic by nature and culture to the Bolsheviki. They foreshadow to some extent who are likely to help the propertyless and from all appearances, we can count our own noses and rest content with the quota. But at that we have enough and enough is enough. The Soviet was the only suitable administration and promises to remain so for some time.

This book of Miss Beatty's will be one of the few books on the war that is likely to command attention in the future. If it is any comfort to her we predict that through her eyes, in the future the people of a classless society, will gaze upon the first successful attempt at freedom made by the slaves of capital. J. H.

REPORTS ON RUSSIAN WOMEN ARE DENIED

[From The Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 17]

BOSTON, Mass.—Mme. Catherine Breshkovsky, who is to be a guest and speaker at the dinner of the Massachusetts Woman Suffrage Association at the Copley-Plaza on Tuesday evening at 7:30, has asked her biographer, Miss Alice Stone Blackwell, to emphatically deny the report that in Russia women are compelled to accept husbands chosen for them by the government. "One or two small soviets proclaimed some such foolishness," says Mme. Breshkovsky, "but nobody would obey. It was not proposed for all Russia, and it was never carried out anywhere." Mme. Breshkovsky also attacks the story that women have been made "common property," or that the government puts any compulsion upon them in matters of sex. "Women have more freedom in Russia now than they ever had before," she says.

"As Mme. Breshkovsky is strongly opposed to the Bolsheviki," says a statement from the headquarters of the Massachusetts Woman Suffrage Association, "her denial of this particular accusation against the present regime in Russia may be accepted as conclusive; and the anti-suffragists, if they are honest, ought to stop quoting it as an example of the horrors that follow where women vote."

Propaganda meetings every Sunday night, 8 p.m., Empress Theatre, Gore and Hastings.

Clippings From the Press

FOLKESTONE AND AFTER*

A great silence has fallen upon the capitalist press. The Folkestone and Osterley affairs made good copy for a day or two. Then they—and the men's case—were dropped quietly. The impression was given that everything was settled and the men satisfied by breezy speeches by generals and mayors. Papers which had been among the most prominent in criticising demobilization delays began urging the men to be "steady" and assuring the country that the prime minister was seeing to everything.

What are the facts?

On Wednesday of last week the Folkestone delegates were in London in communication with the war office authorities. They got soft words, but no satisfaction. They saw a member of parliament, who tried to arrange a meeting with the prime minister. He told them later on that Mr. Lloyd George would like to see them, but that General Sir H. H. Wilson wouldn't consent. So they sent their demands in writing to the premier. They also sent them to the papers; but somehow or other they didn't get published.

Here they are:

Demands to Apply to All Branches of the Service

1. All men on leave in England from overseas who are in possession of a contract to be demobilized immediately without returning overseas.
2. Demobilization according to length of service.
3. Demobilization to be in equal numbers of home and oversea men of each year.
4. No discrimination in favor of married men.
5. Discrimination (within the same year) in favor of men with jobs to go to, irrespective of whether they held those jobs in 1914 or not.
6. Maintenance for men without jobs to be furnished at the standard rates for the jobs which they followed before enlistment.
7. All men over forty-one to be automatically discharged at once.
8. In order to utilize to the full the available transport for demobilization purposes, leave should only be granted in exceptional cases.
9. Demobilization to take place at depot nearest the man's home.
10. Army of occupation pay to be raised to Colonial rates.
11. Men in the army to be given the right to appoint a standing committee to act as advisers to the war office on service matters affecting the welfare of the men—e.g., demobilization, pay, discipline, victualling, etc. These men to be freely elected by the men.

So far there has been no reply. Why not?

The Folkestone Pledge

Moreover, we understand that the promise to the men at Folkestone by the G.O.C. Eastern Command and by two other generals is not being kept.

The men were promised that all of them whose papers were in order or who were over forty-one should be demobilized at once, and that the others should have furlough until recalled, for the purpose of getting their papers in order.

Now we learn that some of them, on presenting their "contracts" duly stamped by the Employment Exchange, are being told by records that they must go back to France.

The hide-the-truth policy of the press is an incredibly foolish one. The government and the public will do wisely to face the facts. The discontent is by no means allayed. The grievances are unredressed. And any attempt to burke the question or to evade the issues will be very keenly resented.

Through the Sailors' and Soldiers' Union the men are appealing to organized labor for support. They ask the unions to take up their case and to see that justice is done to them. They want resolutions passed—and passed immediately—in support of their demands. They want active industrial support for their claims and for the discharged men's charter in case the government remains obdurate. But the first thing at the moment is that labor should, through its every means of expression, show the government that it is solidly and vigorously behind the men of the services; that there is complete solidarity between soldiers and workers.

Meetings

Arrangements are being made by the Sailors' and Soldiers' Union for meetings to urge upon the government the demands of the serving men and the charter of the discharged.—London "Herald." Jan. 16.

---

*The mutiny at Folkestone broke out on Jan. 3 and had its simultaneous counterparts, amongst the troops, in other places, Dover, Osterley Park, Shortlands, Sydenham, Grove Park, Shoreham, Kempton Park, Park Royal, Aldershot, Maidstone, Chatham, Bristol, Fairlop and even, according to The London "Herald." of January 11, spread to a detachment in London supposed to entrain for Salonika.

A MUTINY COURT-MARTIAL

Red Flag Hoisted on Patrol Vessel

At a court-martial at Devonport last night a leading seaman and seven able-seamen were charged with joining in a mutiny on the 13th of January, not accompanied by violence, on H.M.S. Kilnride, a patrol vessel.

The seamen inquired about the ship's watches, and, being informed three would be "worked," asked that there should be two. They demanded to see the captain, who refused to receive them. The seamen consequently refused to go to sea. Anchor was weighed by a lieutenant and a coxswain, assisted by the engineroom staff, and a midshipman took the wheel. Later the captain went ashore to report the matter, and in his absence it was noticed that the regular flag had been hauled down and a red flag was flying from the mast-head.

The commanding officer admitted that there was insubordinate feeling aboard, but denied that it was due to his treatment of the men or to his disparaging remarks concerning them.

The leading seaman was acquitted, one able-seaman was sentenced to two years' hard labor and dismissed from the service; three others received one year's hard labor, and three more ninety days' detention. — Manchester Guardian, Jan. 30.

SOCIALISM IN THE BULGARIAN CABINET

[Special to The Christian Science Monitor]

PARIS, France — L'Humanite declares that Socialism is making great progress in Bulgaria. The long war, following the Balkan wars, has, it is stated, brought about the downfall of the imperialist policy of the bourgeois parties, and the discontent among the masses who have been mobilized for six years and suffer acutely from the economic distress is very great. This discontent made the Malinov government resign, and the new Teodorov ministry represents a serious advance toward the Left. It contains two deputies who represent the peasant democracy, Draquiv and Bakelov, and two Socialists, the well-known leader Yanko Sakesov, and Djidrov, who belong to the Right wing of the Socialist Party. The Socialists of the Left were violently opposed to this participation of their comrades in the ministry. Their program, formulated last November at the Narodni Dom (Maison du Peuple) at Sofia is of a very sweeping character. . . . The proclamation ends by acclaiming the proletarian revolution now in progress, with the cry of "Long live Socialism."

TERRORISM IN——?

The New York "Nation" of February 22 reports that three hundred and seventy thousand American soldiers have been court-martialed since the war started and court-martial sentences have been revealed which shock the whole country. "For trivial infringement of military command, soldiers have been ordered to be shot or thrown into jail for life."

THROUGH DICTATORSHIP TO DEMOCRACY

(Continued from Page Three)

row-minded partisan conceptions and a narrow partisan policy, desire by the brutal exercise of force to constrain the enormous majority of the Russina people to swallow the Bolshevist prescriptions now and for the future. Whence do those who hold such views derive the certainty that the Bolshevik policy is that of an inconsiderable minority of Russian workers and peasants? In my opinion, the number, the loudness, and the passion of the attacks on the coercive rule of the Bolsheviks should not make us over-estimate the extent or the importance of serious hostility to the policy of the Soviet government. It is an old experience, and one readily explicable, that, in the struggle of faction, minorities which are greatly outnumbered are apt to display peculiar violence. It is for them a natural need to convince the world that in spite of defeat they have power and are in the right.

Who will deny that many of the workers, numbers of the peasants, and above all most of the intelligentsia, neither share the views nor endorse the policy of the Bolsheviks? None the less, a very large proportion, if not the majority of those proletarians and peasants who take an active interest in political matters, support the Bolsheviks, and the same is true of the social revolutionaries of the Left. This opinion is confirmed by the fact that those who are, it is alleged, in an infinitesimal minority, though reproached with errors, deeds of violence, breaches of principle, and so on, have retained power for a considerably longer period than that for which the provisional governments of the two opening phases of the revolution held sway. Moreover, this has taken place under conditions of almost unprecedented difficulty throughout the terrible ordeal of the peace of Brest-Litovsk, and in face of the ever-present menace of famine. The anti-Bolsheviks may say what they please, but the mere use of force cannot account for the perdurability of the Soviet government—which has lasted for longer than is usual in time of revolution. No minority whose power rested only upon force could continue in such circumstances and for so long a time to sit on bayonets. The persistence of Soviet rule, which, the confident prophets assured us, could not possibly last more than a few weeks, enables us to infer with certainty that this government is supported by the broad masses of the Russian people. The Bolsheviks and the Left social revolutionaries who co-operate with them, constitute the stalwart framework of the Russian revolutionary army. Through their readiness for action, through their capacity, they inspire confidence in the masses and rally the masses to their support. The need for dictatorship shows us, indeed, that the number and importance of the opponents of the Soviet government must by no means be under-estimated. Power must be used to repress power. Our hope is that the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry will maintain itself long enough to abolish itself when it has fulfilled its function and reached its goal. For whereas during the two opening periods of the revolution the path of the governments led from the fine ideal of democracy to the harsh and cruel reality of dictatorship, the path of the Soviet dominion will lead from the harsh and cruel reality of dictatorship to the beautiful and realized ideal of democracy.

Russian Peasantry and the Revolution

By R. REYNOLDS BALL

[Mr. Reynolds Ball was working in Samara with the Friends' Reconstruction Committee. His experience of the revolution differs from that of most writers; because they have viewed it mainly from Petrograd or Moscow, he from the rural districts of the East and from the Caucasus.]

MY experience in a country district of Russia between December, 1916, and May, 1918, enabled me to see the revolution somewhat otherwise than the press has described it.

From the angle of vision of the town, which is also that of the press, there were two revolutions, in March and again in November. From the angle of vision of the country there was one revolution.

It must be remembered that where we talk of economic reconstruction the Russian talks of economic release.

The new order is, as it were, always at their door ready to come in. The Russians' Utopia belongs so closely to the institutions of their instinctive life that in a sense it is always there. It is only waiting to be called to birth. The signal of revolution came as a bolt from the blue in March, 1917, it took the people by surprise, and it came during a time of war when men are more than at other times hypnotised by the power of centralized political government; but from the first there was no misunderstanding as to what revolution meant. It was something that lay close to their lives, and was in the fullest sense of the word economic.

People Before Politicians

A scene witnessed in a village soon after the revolution of March, 1917, illustrates the attitude of the peasants and the reactionary policy of the politicians.

The peasants had determined to demand "the land for the people," and an emissary of the government had come down about it. A village meeting was called, and with encouragement no doubt from the legal advisers, the very simple claim for the land was formulated at some length. In all there was seventy demands. The emissary, of course, was sympathetic, very sympathetic, but he said, how could the government deal all at once with seventy demands. Let their demands be written down and they would be dealt with in due time. These things could not be seen to at once when there were so many other things to be done.

The people were not "having any" of this. To the best of my memory it was during the summer of 1917 that the confiscations were carried out on all the larger estates, and that responsibility of government, was taken on by the peasants. I do not wish to build too much on what I happen to have seen or not seen, but if it be once granted that the revolution was essentially in its nature and from the first an economic revolution, one thing is clear about the Summer and Autumn of 1917—the people had gone ahead and the Politicians were in the rear.

This was an impossible situation. It was impossible for a revolution to go on without leaders, and, more than that, the situation was false. The nominal leaders were far worse than none. It was this situation that the so-called second revolution had to put right.

Now there is one thing which Liberalism instinctively distrusts, and for which Liberal institutions make no provision, that is leadership, so that to many it has seemed that leadership is inconsistent with democracy. But this was not the view of the Russian revolutionists in this critical summer and autumn. What constituted the call to leadership was this situation which I have described, the political menace in the rear of an economic revolution.

What was wanted was a new instrument of authority. To some representative assembly might commend itself. But was it really necessary to elect an assembly for the whole of Russia, when the bottom had fallen out of the centralized state which Russia had been? Was it necessary to establish a central assembly in order that it might bring about devolution? These were the questions which might pertinently be asked if the issue had not been perfectly clear of itself. There was to hand, in existence, an instrument of executive authority in the Soviets. It was not yet proved what the Soviets could do, whether they could carry on the work of government for all Russia, whether they were as closely related to the instinctive political life of the people as they seemed to be; but one thing was certain, if the constituent assembly were given power no one would ever know what the Soviets might or might not have done, for they would effectively cease to exist. If the Soviets claimed to wield authority for the people, now or never was the time for them to take the power and rule. Events were to show whether the Soviet government had an answer to those scribes who asked "by what authority they did these things."

Everybody knew what the people wanted; what wanted doing indeed was clear enough to all; the question was could anybody do it and who?

What man and what government was going to be found to make something far more difficult than were—namely, peace.

To sign a peace, such a peace as the Germans would demand, on the face of it meant suicide to any government who should undertake the task. How could a government survive such a peace?

Why Confidence Came

Even Trotzky and the majority of the government fought shy of that peace at the last minute, but Lenin insisted. The peace was signed. It was as the government from week to week and month to month proved that it could survive the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, that the people learnt that they had a leader.

And never did the country want authoritative support from the town—the people from the government, more than they did then.

Having gone ahead as they had done, the country became nervous. Political government, as they knew, was something at best they could not trust, and it was something which they could never understand. What they did understand were their own communal institutions, but these had been allowed no authority in the political life they had hitherto known. It was the adoption of the Soviet form of government at the centre of Russia which gave them assurance. It corresponded to something they knew. Sometimes a new nomenclature can be as effective as a new law.

The name Commissar came into use at this time throughout Russia. It was the title indifferently of a minister of state and it was the title of the president of the local meeting, the executive Soviet of a village.

The continuous development and establishment of the Soviet government in Russia, which was accomplished in the spring and summer of 1918, is the measure of the growth of confidence of the people in their leaders.

I do not mean that the people who felt this confidence necessarily agreed with their rulers.

For instance, I had a conversation with a Tartar in the Samara government in April, who explained to me the politics of his village. The village, almost to a man, did not agree with the Bolshevik land policy. Yet he admitted to me one thing—it was only the Bolsheviks who had had the power and determination to make the peace which had to be made.

Significant Facts

I did not press him further, but it was significant that his village was conducting its business without any disturbances, and that no bitter resentment seemed to exist over the confiscation and redistributions of property, and that all this was being done through the forces of Soviet government under a Commissar who was one of the few Bolshevik members of the village. This means that a village, even when it does not agree with the Bolshevik leaders, can live under them in confidence.

THE DEAD HAND

[By Scott Nearing]

A little group of old men, spokesmen for the five great powers, is assembled about the green table at Versailles. All but one of these men were born before the Franco-Prussian war. Most of them had grown to middle life before the capitalist world entered its present stage of financial imperialism. These old men meet four or five times a week for a few hours. Most of their days are spent in offices, in private committee rooms, and in secret sessions where they seek to re-establish the world as they knew it in their youth and early manhood. They resemble children, trying to reclothe a tree with dry leaves blown about by autumn winds.

The representatives of the great powers who meet around the peace table are very,very old. Five of them were born before 1850. Ten were born between 1850 and 1859. Six were born between 1860 and 1869. Only one a Frenchman, Andre Tardieu, was born since 1870. The oldest man in the delegation is Clemenceau. He is 78. Four of his conferes are over 70. Fifteen are over 60. Twenty-one out of 22 are over 50. The peace conference is a conference of old men.

The modern economic world was born between 1870 and 1880. The latest phase of capitalism, financial imperialism, has come into being during the years when these men, educated in a previous age, were so busy with the many details of public life, that they could not see and understand the changes that were taking place about them. They speak the language and think the thoughts of the 19th century.

Today these old men sit around the green table —spokesmen of a dead epoch; representatives of a by-gone era. About their heads the lightning of revolution is playing. Russia, Germany, Austria, Argentina, Chile, Peru, Italy, England, Luxemburg and Poland are in open revolt against the capitalism and imperialism for which they speak. The old men fidget, gesticulate, grow excited, make propositions and counter propositions. They talk and act as though they were still directing the world. They do not know that their day has passed and that the darkness is settling around them. With childish simplicity they speak to one another as though it were the dawn.

The dawn is breaking, but not around the peace table.

FRENCH TRADE UNIONIST ARRESTED

PARIS, Wednesday.

The "Liberte" reports that the arrest of M. Midol, secretary of the Union of Employees of the Paris, Lyons and Mediterranean Railway, has caused great excitement among all railway men.

The "Humanite" today says that M. Clemenceau has made the following promises to the railwaymen's delegates:

All claims will be examined in a friendly spirit, and no action taken against those who struck momentarily on Saturday. Finally, although the proceedings against M. Midol cannot be stopped the conditions of his confinement wil be mitigated. —Reuter.

It was announced from Lyons and Nice that the employees of the Paris, Lyons and Mediterranean Railway struck on Sunday for fifteen minutes on the instructions of their union, as a protest against delay in dealing with railwaymen's demands.

Shop Stewards' Movement

In Part From the New York "Nation" of Feb. 22

The latest reports of developments in the British Isles, in the struggle between capital and labor, appear to us of such significance to the workers of all other countries as to warrant them in giving deep thought and careful consideration to any of the factors which have contributed towards those developments. And so we make no apology for including in this issue of the "Red Flag," two articles on the Shop Stewards' Movement. Besides, we, in this country, have our eyes fixed hopefully on Europe, for it seems as though it was there that the great struggle, of world emancipation from the domination of capital, is to record, on a large scale, its first definite victories for the laboring masses.

The article from the Manchester "Guardian" mainly explains the form and structure of the movement and the following, an extract from an article dealing with its philosophic point of view and political aspirations, is by a special correspondent of the New York "Nation." The writer devotes the preceding portion of his article to a review of the far-reaching results which sprang from the partnership between the trades union movement and the government, during the war. The first results of the partnership was the practical renunciation of "all the essentials of trade unionism, shop rules and regulations, union practices and customs, the right to strike and thus to enforce collective bargaining." The substance of trade unionism is gone. . . . On the whole, he considers, willingly sacrificed.

. . . . "The denunciation of trade unionism by the capitalists as a monstrous conspiracy to limit output, and the traditional complaint that trade union rules and customs are a wanton interference by the workers with industrial efficiency, have been properly enough denied by the workers." . . . These rules and customs, . . . "a negative control of industry," . . . "were practically their only safeguard against industrial serfdom. There was no alternative in the existing economic structure."

He deals with the pledges exacted from the government, guaranteeing return of the union privileges, temporally sacrificed in the interest of successful war and is of the opinion that there was no doubt of the intention and ability of the state to redeem, or that labor had the power to enforce the redemption of the pledges. . . . "And yet, in spite of this" . . . . "the difficulties of the restoration of the industrial" status quo ante "began in course of time to be appreciated." An article in the "Times" pointed this out and greatly alarmed the old trade union leaders, who took it as a sign of a capitalist plot. . . . . "They were unable to conceive of industry without trades unionism," and utterly failed to see "that both industry and the labor movement had already outgrown the restrictive power of classical trades union methods, and that the old negative control was obsolete."

"Meanwhile the revolutionary changes in industry, initiated by the war, made steady headway. First, there was an unprecedented industrial development. The effects of the war were tremendous. In three or four years the growth of industry was in many particulars greater than during the preceding thirty years. Second, the removal of trade union restrictions changed in many ways the very face of the labor movement itself. Demarcation lines were broken; women poured into industry; and "dilutions" practically robbed of their old meaning the terms "skilled" and "unskilled." And while the trade union leaders were repeating over and over again their warnings, that labor would demand and get back all and every one of their safeguards, the rank and file were trying to adapt the labor movement to the new conditions in industry. They were becoming less concerned about the formal restoration of the old trade union rules. New ideas were slowly growing in the shop; new centres of labor defence were being formed. While the central authorities of trade unionism were absorbed in political activity, the shop acquired new significance as the unit of industrial activity. New authorities sprang up and new leadership was developed out of the rank-and-file; and, though deprived of the old instruments of power, British labor was growing more buoyant and confident than ever before.

The first manifestation of the new spirit was the unrest in the spring of 1917. In a series of important strikes—the main feature of which was the obvious inadequacy of the causes alleged for laying down tools—British labor demonstrated its new conceptions and determination. The government and the community at large were much alarmed at the extent and character of this disturbance. A special commission was appointed to investigate the causes of unrest. The reports of this commission and the public discussion that followed showed clearly that the demand for the redemption of the government pledges to restore trade union rules was, so far as labor was concerned, little more than a question of principle. It became plain that future labor struggles would follow other aims than the restoration of purely restrictive trade union control. It was felt that new solutions of the industrial problem were developing among the rank-and-file, and it gradually became evident that the workers were bent on industrial control and self-government in the workshops.

The sequel of the labor unrest and the new ideas growing in the ranks of the workers was the appointment of the Whitley Commission, which in the autumn of 1917 made public its famous proposal for the creation of mixed industrial councils for the control of industry. The Whitley scheme is an attempt to satisfy the demands of the workers for a share in positive control, without changing the existing economic structure. It is the translation of the shop stewards' conception of industry into the language of capitalist production. The main difference between the Whitley scheme and the aspirations of labor is this: the Whitley council aims "to secure for the work people a greater share in and responsibility for the determination and observance of the conditions under which their work is carried out." This is exactly what labor wants. But it is not all. The shop stewards demand a share in the control not only of the workshop, but of industry at large. The aim of the movement is self-government both in the workshop and in industry as a whole; the ideal of the movement is the abolition of capitalist production and the organization of industry as a partnership between the state and labor.

Nothing could more strongly emphasize the unprecedented tensity of the British industrial situation than Lloyd George's speech in the House of Commons on the labor unrest. After enumerating the "legitimate" causes of unrest, such as a fear of unemployment, bad housing, over-crowding, and like evils, the prime minister strongly condemned the "illegitimate" causes—a "sedulous attempt to undermine confidence in trade union leaders." Such is the dramatic industrial and political situation of Great Britain. The trade union leaders are supported by the British premier and the Tory parliament against the rank-and-file.

It would be a mistake, however, to suppose that the shop stewards' movement is organically opposed to trade unionism. It is in opposition only to the negative and restrictive methods of the unions and to those leaders who oppose the invigorating of the movement with the real democratic spirit which animates the rank-and-file. The shop stewards consider themselves the harbingers of a new unionism founded on a new democratic basis of real equality for all workers. The basis of the new unionism is the workshop, which is the natural unit for labor amalgamation and industrial activity. The shop stewards are chosen by all workers in the shop, skilled and unskilled alike, irrespective of the particular craft or affiliation. The complete and final amalgamation of the workers in the shop is the first step towards the great industrial union, and the shop stewards' movement is the first step towards a real industrial democracy, to take the place of the present specious imitation.

NOW READY

A HANDY TEXT BOOK

on the economics of Capitalistic Production, being the first nine chapters of:

Vol. 1 **Marx's Capital** with the 32nd chapter on the **Historical Tendency of Capitalist Accumulation** included, also an extract from the preface to the same author's **"Critique of Political Economy"**, which formulates the materialistic interpretation of history.

Prices are as per the following quotations:
Post paid in all cases

Single copies, paper covers, 50c.

25 copies or more, paper covers, copy, 40c.

Single copies, cloth bound, $1.00 per copy.

10 copies or more, cloth bound, copy, 75c.

We await your orders, and we hope you will keep us busy, as success in this venture means much to the publishers' future efforts.

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

"THE KING'S PARDON!"

[To the Editor of "The Worker," the organ of the "Scottish Workers Committee."]

The undernoted is a copy of a letter I have sent to Sir James M. Dodds, Under Secretary for Scotland:

Sir—

Would you be so kind as to inform the Secretary for Scotland that I do not accept your assertion that "The King" has granted me a "Free Pardon." Not "The King," but the fighting workers of Britain have regained me my freedom, and a healthy fear of these workers has induced you and your friends to try this bluff of a "Free Pardon." All the time, however, you are trying to pester my wife and myself through your detestable spies, popularly called detectives. I welcome their attention, as it is a sign that you are foaming at the mouth at having to release me.

My immediate reply to that is a demand from the government through the Scottish office for one hundred and fifty pounds, the cost of recovery after my release last time and this, from the treatment in these prisons, Peterhead and Perth.

I made a claim last time for seventy-six pounds, and was refused. The new demand includes that sum, and this new demand I intend to insist upon until it is met by the next government or until the workers assume full control of the British Empire.

Yours sincerely,

JOHN MACLEAN.

(Other papers please copy).

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