

The Revolutionary Age

A Chronicle and Interpretation of International Events

Vol. I, No. 23

Saturday, March 22, 1919

Price 3 Cents

The Press as an Agent Provocateur

FINDING, apparently, that the campaign to discredit Bolshevism, waged with such persistency, particularly since the signing of the armistice, is not producing the desired results, the bourgeois press even though it has invariably been a lying and condemnatory publicity, given to Bolshevism has proven to be a double-edged sword and while, no doubt, many working people have been scared into antipathy, the majority of the workers, whose instinctive class consciousness has revolted against the absurdities daily displayed for their consumption, have become curious if not actually sympathetic towards the subject.

The rehash of the German atrocities with the substitution of Russian workers for "Huns" and Grand Dukes and gentle ladies for Belgians has not aroused the indignation expected, perhaps because after a time people become indifferent—even to the death of Grand Dukes. Consequently the press has had to search around for new ways of combatting the "menace." As before it underestimated the strength of the Socialist movement, now it runs to the other extreme and presents it as alarmingly strong. Flaring headlines "disclose" the eleventh hour discoveries of gigantic plots to seize the government of the United States by the organized forces of Bolshevism. The obvious implication of these stories being that were it not for these fortunate discoveries this country would have already passed into the hands of the Bolsheviks at least half a dozen distinct times.

All over the world Socialism is making gigantic strides, strides which even the ablest Socialist theorists and propagandists are unable to measure with more than approximate accuracy. The holocaust of war has aroused the class consciousness of the workers, and the examples set by Russia and Germany have done much to bring the toiling masses to a realization of their own potential power. The masses of the people are seething with unrest, strikes are flaring up all over the world, strikes that are real movements of the masses themselves and are often directed against the old-time leaders as much as against the capitalist class. The common people are awakening and asserting their rights to the fruits of their labors. America is not escaping this general unrest anymore than the countries of Europe, though as yet the labor disturbances in this country are more sporadic, less conscious and, in the main, confined to smaller issues than the European upheavals.

The brutality and ruthlessness of the master class are, however, forcing the issue. The assumption of power, the openly revealed determination to force down wages and the shameless attempts to utilize the returned soldier as a club for this purpose, the utter disregard of the war time promises and discharge of thousands of workers are producing a reaction which is projecting the class struggle in bold relief.

The ignorance of the bourgeois press regarding the Socialist and Labor movements of the world in general and of this country in particular has often been the theme of Socialist writers, but it is idle to pretend that this ignorance extends to the approximate numerical strength of the class conscious labor movement of this country. This ignorance is confined, for the most part, to Socialist theory. On actual conditions the capitalist press is well informed. Hitherto the newspapers have engaged in a conspiracy of silence where labor troubles were concerned; even within the past few weeks such momentous happenings as the Seattle and Butte general strikes received scant attention until they were over. Both these strikes were pregnant with tremendous possibilities, both partook of the aspect of the recent Irish and English strikes, which in addition to being of gigantic proportions were semi-political in character. In spite of the importance of these two strikes, involving tens of thousands of workers, the press kept comparatively silent, but within the past week labor troubles have sprang into great prominence. The *New York Evening World* announces in flaring headlines: "Plot Bared For Soviet Control of U. S.," the *New York Tribune* shrieks of "Reds" planning a "reign of terror" and all over the country the newspapers carry stories of a coming "Red coup d'etat."

In view of the fact that neither the "plot" nor the "reign of terror" proved to be anything but police stupidity in one case and an unemployed delegation visiting the Mayor of Buffalo in the other, it is reasonable to suppose that some ulterior motive lies behind this sudden change of front in the newspaper attitude. From a perusal of the stories dealing with these matters it is evident that in each case the events have been highly colored, colored, indeed, to such an extent as to lead the reader to believe that the Bolsheviks are a tremendous force, skilfully organized and only waiting the order to rise up over night and seize the government. The object seems to be to give the impression of great numbers behind these move-

disputes is the attitude of the soldiers and on this subject the press has remained silent. In practically every recent strike the employers have attempted to use the returned soldier or sailor as a scab and in almost every case they have been unsuccessful. In Seattle and Butte the soldiers and sailors were in active sympathy with the strikers and took their places on the picket lines in uniform. In the street car strike in New Jersey the soldiers and sailors paraded in sympathy with the carmen, and in the Lawrence textile strike the number of soldiers and sailors in the ranks of the strikers was variously estimated at from five hundred to one thousand, over two hundred having formed themselves into a "Strikers' Guard" to maintain order during the strike.

All these movements are mass movements, the workers themselves striking as a protest against intolerable conditions. The war was used to keep the workers on the job, the plea of national necessity overshadowing the grievances of the workers, but now the war is over and the people are looking for the fruits of democracy for which they fought and suffered, only to find that they are facing a period of unemployment, want and poverty. They are beginning to realize that while the owners of the factories made enormous profits out of the war, they are staring the grim spectre of unemployment, with all its attendant evils, in the face.

Against these conditions and the potentiality of these conditions the workers are protesting, striking, asserting themselves. The press has immediately labelled their protests "Bolshevism" and while the average worker may believe that the happenings in Seattle or Butte, two or three thousand miles away, were the work of a menace to society—Bolshevism—he knows the real conditions of his own fight and when he finds that it is also "Bolshevism" he immediately becomes very partial to the Bolsheviks.

The Soldiers and sailors, returning from the sacrifices made in the war, are finding that they are no longer heroes in the eyes of the employers unless they are prepared to become scabs on their own class. They are learning from the newspapers that instead of being heroes they are becoming a menace to society once they dare line up with their fellow workers in a labor dispute; they are also learning through other channels than the newspapers, through the agency of the policeman's club and the police court sentences, which invariably follow their appearance on the picket line. They are becoming used to being called Bolsheviks and I. W. W.'s, and these terms are losing their erstwhile terror. Conditions are forcing the soldiers and sailors to recognize that there is a class struggle going on in society and that they are part and parcel of the working class.

The press has howled "wolf" so often that its shriek is losing its terror, and as a result the press is now attempting to incite the workers into premature action by representing their every move as a revolution. Finding that slandering Bolshevism while at the same time it is forced to slander every protest made by the workers has only had the effect of connecting Bolshevism sympathetically in the mind of the people with their own struggle, the press is apparently determined to play on the emotion of the uninformed to the end that they may be betrayed into actions which will recoil on the heads of the masses of the people.

Labor's struggle for its "place in the sun" must come from the workers themselves, its actions must rise out of the needs of the people's masses, and its strength will lie in its ability to choose its own time to enforce its demands. The masses must develop a clear understanding of their position in society, must be the arbiters of their own destiny, the judges of their own strength. They must learn to judge the importance of the press reports of the activities of their class as they are already learning to know the real import of the movement that has broken down the slavery of the Russian workers and is even now struggling to burst the chains that the bourgeoisie, led by majority Socialism, would bind tighter round the workers of Germany. Action is coming in our own country; that mass action which cannot be provoked, but which is determined, implacable, irresistible.

Police Brutality in Lawrence

Serious rioting occurred in Lawrence on Tuesday as a result of a police attack on the strikers returning from the picket lines. On Monday a body of forty or fifty soldiers, the Strikers Guard, turned out on the picket lines. Their appearance apparently angered the police and the soldiers were dispersed, one of their number being specially picked out by the police and arrested.

On the way to the police station, after the other soldiers had gone, ten policemen set upon Ribando Francesco, the soldier in question, who has only recently returned from 18 months service in France with the 23rd Infantry. He was severely beaten about the head and shoulders, his eyes being injured, his teeth loosened and his back and shoulders bruised and cut from the blows of the clubs. After he was taken to the station, Francesco says, he was again beaten up by the police, this time, however, clubs were not used. When brought into court he was fined \$20.

News of the treatment received by Francesco so roused the strikers that they turned out in large numbers on the picket lines the following morning. On their return from picket duty the strikers were met by the police who, after the marshal had read the riot act, charged the workers. A fight ensued, over twenty persons being hurt and as many arrested.

In spite of this police intimidation the workers are determined to continue the strike until their demands are granted. Money is urgently needed, the strike having now entered its seventh week.

Send contributions to C. Silin, 885 Washington St., Boston, Mass.

ments and the inference is that the whole matter is a plan to lead some hot-headed irresponsibles into actions that will enable the forces of reaction to crush insurgent labor in blood.

The "plot" for Soviet control of the United States proved to be nothing more than a sensational account of a raid on the headquarters of a Russian workers' organization in which apparently every person in the building was arrested and dragged to police headquarters for examination. Out of one hundred and sixty-four persons thus arrested all but four were released in a few hours, there being absolutely no evidence against them. What purports to be the constitution and program of the organization is published and, of course, contains a clause relative to the "nationalization of women" which is invariably dragged into all news stories dealing with Socialist activity since it was introduced as evidence before the recent Overman Committee. Although the raid was conducted by the "bomb squad" the story fails to say how many bombs were discovered or what preparations had been made for the seizure of the state. In the Buffalo incident it finally developed that the whole affair consisted in a parade of a few hundred unemployed to the city hall. The account was interspersed with frequent references to the arrival of troops in Buffalo, though it omitted to mention whether the troops were to shoot the people for being out of work or whether they were to proceed against the employers that discharged the men and women in question.

One of the principle features of all the recent labor

The Revolutionary Age

A Chronicle and Interpretation of International Events

LOUIS C. FRAINA Editor
EDMONN MACALPINE Associate Editor

Contributing Editors
JOHN REED SEN KATAYAMA
N. I. HOURWICH G. WEINSTEIN
LUDWIG LORE

ISSUED EVERY SATURDAY

By Local Boston, Socialist Party
H. G. Steiner, Business Manager
885 Washington St., Boston, Mass.

Bundle orders 2c a copy, Subscription \$1.00 for
six months (26 issues)

The Reaction in Germany

THE majority Socialists in Germany, speaking through the Prussian War Minister, Colonel Reinhold, are unflinchingly defending their policy of merciful suppression. These are the gentlemen who are condemning the "terror" in Russia! The majority Socialists, through the Ebert-Scheidemann Government of the People's Butchery, have concluded an alliance with the most sinister elements of the old regime against the Spartacan Communists and the Revolution. The recent battles in the civil war have ended in a temporary victory for the Government. But a new revolution is developing; crushed, the Spartacan Communists garner new energy and resources from their defeat. There is a new revolutionary movement preparing to establish a Soviet Republic. The Government, accordingly, is still considering incorporating the Soviet Congress as the lower chamber of the parliament. But this compromise must accelerate the demand for a real Soviet Government. And, while the Ebert-Scheidemann Government uses murder and terror to crush the German Bolsheviks, they are trying to impress upon the Allies the idea that, unless Germany gets "good" terms, the Bolsheviks will conquer. It is characteristic of the Ebert gangsters to thus play the game of the old regime in all sorts of dark and unscrupulous ways. The revolutionary proletariat in Germany will yet act against this infamy.

Berne and the League

THE Berne Congress of the Great Betrayal, of the social-patriots and petty bourgeois Socialists, approved of the League of Nations on the basis of Capitalism. They, of course, wanted the League to be "democratic," a "League of peoples, and not of governments,"—as if that aspiration meant anything or could be realized while Capitalism controls the world socially, economically and politically. These social-patriots imagine they can influence events by words, instead of by means of the class power of the revolutionary proletariat. They will not influence the actual structure of the proposed League; but they will mobilize the unconscious masses in favor of a League that is a betrayal of the masses, a means of preventing the masses from engaging in the struggle for the conquest of power by the proletariat. The bourgeois League of Nations must necessarily be a counter-revolutionary instrument,—as is proven by the attitude toward Soviet Russia of the "Big Five" nations organizing it. There is a real need for a League of Nations; but it must be a League of Nations and not a League against the Nations,—and a real League can be nothing else than a League of Socialist Soviet Nations. The moderate Socialist, in this as in all great issues, is petty bourgeois, pacifist and reformist, and directly counter-revolutionary.

Unkind and Stupid

THE Berne Congress of counter-revolution elected a "commission" to go to Russia to "investigate" Bolshevism. But the French Government has just refused passports to this "commission of three." This is not only really unkind, but stupid. Here are men willing to do the dirty work of Capitalism; here are men representing a Congress which, through Kaustky, Eisner, Henderson, Braunting, Ramsay MacDonald and Renandel, denounced Bolshevism as the ruin of Russia and the enemy of Socialism; here are men who are willing to stultify Socialism and mobilize the masses against the Bolsheviks,—and the French Government refuses them passports!—and the French Government Congress, which was solid in its denunciation of the Bolsheviks, declared that there was no need of an investigation—precisely the attitude of the bourgeois reactionary; but they appointed the commission as a sop to the waverers; and then, after all, the report of this commission might be a means of fighting the Bol-

sheviki not alone in Russia, but, more important, in the nations and movements represented by these betrayers of Socialism. But then bourgeois governments are proverbially stupid; they often don't recognize their real friends, which in this case are the moderate Socialists. The answer of the Soviet Government to this "Socialist" investigation commission was blistering: *we will allow you to come to Russia and accord you the same courtesy that we would accord a commission representing any bourgeois government.* This should rouse a sense of shame; but the "Socialist" counter-revolutionary moderate is dead to shame.

The Wrong Campaign

IT is being realized that the bourgeois campaign in this country against Bolshevism adopted wrong methods and has proven a miserable fizzle. Says the New York Evening Post of March 18: "People have learned to shrug their shoulders about the Red Terror because newspapers that should have known better have poured crimson and vermillion over the original red. Insistence on the imbecile story of a 'communal ownership of women'—the product possibly of half a dozen disordered anarchist minds in a single district in Russia—has driven many people to regard everything printed against the Bolsheviks as lies." (In the same editorial the Post makes this excellent point: "Insistence must not be on the facts of the Red Terror, but the question whether the Red Terror is being used to build a new life or chaos.") But if the bourgeois campaign does not consist of lies and exaggerations, of what can it consist? The facts and the truth are with the Soviet Republic and the Bolsheviks; but the facts and the truth would arouse the sympathy and acceptance of the American proletariat; the bourgeois campaign must be one of lies and slanders, or else collapse. But it must collapse anyway, since lies and slanders are bound to bring their own refutation. It's a terrible dilemma for the ruling class.

In the Shops

THE campaign against American Bolshevism has curious and interesting developments. That there is a mighty Bolshevik upsurge among the masses is evident. The campaign clearly shows that the ruling class is impotent, ultimately, to tackle the Bolshevik problem, and will be crushed by it. The developments of this campaign reveal, not so much the material for immediate action perhaps, as the material out of which can be organized the iron battalions of the proletariat, by means of interpretation and clarification.

The problem is, how to direct and organize this Bolshevik upsurge in the masses? An indication is provided by a letter to the Boston Herald of March 18, written evidently by a reactionary workman in the shop. The correspondent says:

We in the factories feel the Bolshevism menace in the very air. It isn't hazy or indefinite or academic. It's real, organized and practical. The men are reading *The Revolutionary Age* as they eat their luncheon; they sing revolutionary songs at their work; they hoot and jeer as employers and visitors walk for a nation-wide strike to free Mooney; they post on their benches circulars calling for freeing of the "political prisoners." They have let it be known by underground methods that labor will not take the fifth Liberty loan; they have endorsed and financially supported the Lawrence strike, in defiance of its repudiation by organized labor in Lawrence and by the secretary of labor; they openly announce their intention of forcing a revolution and taking over control of industry.

The correspondent then proceeds to offer suggestions for action against these agitators. But these are unimportant—and stupid. The important thing is: *Agitation is proceeding in the shops, in the plants, where the workers think as workers.*

We know of groups of comrades in mills and shops who form small groups to finance agitation among their fellow workers. One group has distributed ten thousand copies of *The Revolutionary Age* twice in their plant, and two thousand Bolshevik pamphlets. This is being done in scores of places, and constitutes a splendid means of agitation.

Our agitation must converge on the mills and shops where the workers are employed. They may not come to meetings; they may not read leaflets distributed to them on street corners or at their homes; but literature distributed in the shop interests them, arouses discussion, is effective. The workers must be taught to think in terms of the industry where they are employed in its control of industry; our agitation will never develop into action until we can get the workers to close down tools, march out of the plants, get other workers to come out, go out into the streets, and develop the political mass strike of the proletariat.

Our Bolshevik policy must, while emphasizing the ultimate implications, adjust itself to the requirements of immediate action; out of this immediate action, if proletariat will develop the larger tendency of the moment, one of our immediate tasks is to arouse in

the proletariat the concept and the action of the political strike—a strike in which the workers use their industrial mass action for political purposes. The proposed general strike to demand the release of Tom Mooney would be of a partial political character; it must be converted into a real political strike to release all political prisoners. We must get the industrial masses into action; we must concentrate our energy upon the mills, shops and mine—preparing the final struggle.

Cottin's Defence

THE Anarchist who tried to kill Clemenceau, and wounded him—Emile Cottin—has been condemned to death by the French Government. The condemnation is universally approved by those who equally approve of the government assassins in Germany, but who protest violently against the "Red Terror" in Russia.

The summary condemnation of Cottin is a clear act of class justice. He did not kill Clemenceau—but he is immediately condemned to death. The assassin of Jean Jaures—Vilain—did kill Jaures; but he was not condemned to death; indeed, Vilain has not even been brought to trial. Almost simultaneously with the news that Cottin had been condemned to death comes the news that Vilain may be brought to trial soon. Is the French Government afraid of revelations, afraid that proof might be produced of the complicity of government agents in Jaures's assassination?

Cottin's act was an act of terror. The French Government has answered terror with terror. So be it. We do not object: it is the social war, the corrosive corruption of bourgeois society. But we do object to the vile hypocrisy of using and approving the white terror of the bourgeoisie and condemning the red terror of the revolutionary proletariat. We do object to the smug moral attitudes bourgeois society assumes in the matter of terror. It is true, terror is terror; but it makes all the difference in the world whether the terror is used to preserve a corrupt and corrupting social system, or whether it is used as a brutal but necessary factor in destroying the old order and creating the new.

The first statement of Cottin, printed elsewhere in this issue of *The Revolutionary Age*, is a valuable document in two aspects: the light it throws upon conditions in France, and the light it throws upon the psychology of the Anarchist.

Cottin's recital of the French Government's treatment of the Russian soldiers in France is terrible. It is a scathing indictment, a recital of the infamy that characterizes bourgeois reaction. We had suspected much, and heard a little, about the Russian soldiers in France; but the actual facts are more terrible than the rumors. The arrest of the Soldiers' Soviet formed immediately after the March Revolution; the secrecy concerning the fate of these men, probably condemned to torture and death; the arrests and executions of individual revolutionary soldiers; the massacre of detachments of Russian soldiers who refused to fight; the campaign to induce them to go to Russia to fight their own people and their own comrades, for the counter-revolution; the attacks made upon these soldiers by French troops to the strains of the Marseillaise; the imprisonment at hard labor of the members of the Soviet for refusal to accept the proposal to send the soldiers to Russia to aid the Czechoslovaks after Brest-Litovsk; and, most infamous of all, *the exile of 40,000 of these Russian soldiers to Africa as slaves*—all this, and more, is an immemorial indictment of class brutality, of the cold, merciless reaction that controls France. This is the government that refuses to associate with the Soviet Government, which it stigmatizes as "assassins" and "barbarians"!

These are terrible facts. And they must arouse protest and action in the class conscious proletariat. To the Socialist, they are a call to awaken and organize the proletariat, to develop that mass action out of which revolutions arise, and which alone is an answer to the bourgeois terror. To Cottin, the Anarchist, however, they were a call to individual action. And, as his own statement indicates, not revolution but revenge was the ideological impulse of his deed. There was in his mind, of course, the idea of revolution; but revolution under emotional impulse had merged into revenge. The feeling is emotionally conceivable, considering the infamous acts of the government of Clemenceau; but it is not a revolutionary feeling, it is the feeling of a man emotionally broken down by the stress of oppression.

Individual action may appear violently revolutionary; but when the actual test of the revolution comes, when mass action is the order of the day, then the man of individual action becomes reactionary, cannot adapt himself, since his *milieu* is completely different from that of the revolutionary proletariat in action. It is significant that, in Russia, virtually all the former terrorists, led by Savinkov and Burtsev, were and are still against the Bolsheviks; they are using the tactic of assassination against the members of the Soviet Government—are implacably counter-revolutionary.

Individual terror and violence as a theory is a petty bourgeois policy. The proletariat depends upon mass action to accomplish the conquest of power; and after this conquest, the revolutionary proletariat may resort to the use of mass terror, if necessary, in order to establish and protect the conquests of the revolution.

Whether these individual acts function in the development of mass action, is doubtful. The important thing is to impress upon the proletariat, not the ideology of individual action, but the ideology of revolutionary mass action, of mass effort and discipline. This is Bolshevik policy, the policy of revolutionary Socialism.

We cannot, considering the circumstances and the provocation, violently condemn a Emile Cottin—his was an heroic, if ill-judged act; but we can and must condemn his policy of individual terror as a tactic of the militant proletariat.

Balkan Mexico

THE imperialistic phrase, "Mexico is our Balkan peninsula," used by Theodore Roosevelt, is becoming very popular. It is instinct with the threat of aggression. Immediately after the armistice, there developed a violent imperialistic campaign against Mexico, a campaign having as its avowed object the conquest of Mexico by the United States, for American Imperialism. Scores of newspapers fulminated against Mexico; in the Senate, a resolution was introduced that would create antagonism against Japan and Mexico; and American finance-capital is preparing itself for the financial conquest of Mexico. In the epoch of Imperialism this necessarily means military and political conquest.

News reports are coming that "Mexican bandits" are again active on the border, threatening the lives—and property—of Americans. Villa again stalks through the press, sinister and merciless, as the pretext for developing feeling and action against Mexico. The Mexican government has acquired "stability" (largely by means of mercilessly suppressing radical labor), its finances are in excellent condition, law and order prevails; all this, naturally unpalatable to the imperialist, necessitates a new line of attack against Mexico in order to bring intervention and conquest, and the new attack consists of the charge that the Mexican government is "expropriating the property" of American citizens.

The adventures of American Imperialism in Mexico are characteristic and instructive. They cast a light upon the actual purpose of intervention and reveal it as a means of promoting finance-capital and Imperialism.

Under the regime of Porfirio Diaz, foreign capital secured a strangle hold upon the natural resources of Mexico, which are enormous, and of tremendous potential value. By means of bribery, the merciless suppression of the rights of the people and a complete refusal to recognize ordinary decency, the Mexican people were made the actual serfs of foreign capital. Millions of dollars were invested in oil wells, in docks and railways, etc., an investment which represented powerful financial groups and which weighed down upon the Mexican people. The corrupt government of Diaz combined with corrupt foreign capital to steal all that was of value from the Mexican people; "concessions" were granted to American investors, "concessions" which meant giving over control of the people's resources without any substantial return, actually stealing these resources.

Mexico's industrial future was mortgaged to international Imperialism, particularly to the Imperialism of the United States. There were two aspects of this situation which developed revolt against foreign capital; its merciless oppression of the Mexican workers, and the fact that Mexican Capitalism, the Mexican bourgeoisie, was expropriated, and could not really develop power while the basis of its power, the natural resources and the railways, were in the control of American Imperialism.

The Mexican revolution, while in its fundamentals a revolt of the peons against the landed aristocracy, was in one phase equally a revolt against the domination of foreign capital. The press of international Imperialism was hostile to the revolution, not only because it was destroying the immediate profits of foreign investors, but because it threatened the future supremacy of foreign capital. A terrific campaign, accordingly, developed in the American press for intervention in Mexico,—to prevent starvation, to restore order and protect humanity; precisely the sort of buncombe which is now being used to favor intervention in revolutionary Russia. But what international Imperialism was actually afraid of was that out of the revolution might develop a national Capitalism in Mexico, a homogeneous capitalist class which would threaten the supremacy of foreign capital and diminish its opportunity for plunder.

This is precisely what happened. The government of Carranza established itself firmly in power, and immediately developed a campaign against revolutionary labor and against foreign capital. Labor was "disciplined" by means of merciless repression and massacres during strikes. But it was much more difficult to discipline international Imperialism; although the war gave Carranza's government an excellent opportunity, which it used to the utmost. The purpose of this government was to destroy the strangle hold that foreign capital, particularly American, had upon Mexico's natural resources. This was accomplished by means of a clause in the Constitution, which provides that "all contracts and concessions made by the former government from and after 1870, which shall have resulted in the monopoly of land, waters and natural resources of the nation by a single individual or corporation, are declared subject to revision, and the executive is authorized to declare those null and void which seriously prejudice the public interest." Ownership in lands or waters may be acquired only by Mexicans "by birth or naturalization," and in Mexican companies subject to the sovereign authority and laws of Mexico; ownership may be acquired by foreigners "provided they agree before the department of foreign affairs to be considered Mexicans in respect to such property, and accordingly not to invoke the protection of their government in respect to the same, under penalty, in case of breach, of forfeiture to the nation of property so acquired." The purpose of these constitutional provisions are clear: they are means of establishing the national sovereignty of Mexico, and of Mexican Capital.

The provision stipulating that foreigners may own certain property "provided they agree before the department of foreign affairs to be considered Mexicans in respect to such property, and accordingly not to invoke the protection of their government in respect to the same," is of especial importance, and characteristic of the general purposes. Foreign investors use their particular national governments to secure special "rights" in the country in which they invest, and intrigue to have their governments secure political control of the country. The mechanics of Imperialism develop out of investments in "backward nations," the owners of which appeal for "protection," after which an imperialistic nation has the pretext for intervention and conquest. The Mexican government wants no interference from foreign governments; the fundamental law of Mexico must be supreme, and must control the investors. This is an important measure, which if realizable, would lower the ascendancy of foreign capital and promote the hegemony of the national Capitalism of Mexico.

In order to realize this sovereignty over Mexico's industry and politics, the government imposed a heavy tax upon the development of oil. American and British interests have about \$3,000,000 invested in the oil wells, and they unanimously agreed that the tax was "confiscatory." They appealed to Ambassador Fletcher, who after discussing the matter with the American State Department, transmitted a note to the Mexican government early in 1918, declaring the tax law "confiscatory," that it was "taking property without due process of law," and that "it becomes the function of the government of the United States most earnestly and respectfully to call the attention of the Mexican government to the necessity which may arise to impel it to protect the property of its citizens in Mexico divested or injuriously affected by the decree above cited. If Mexico insists upon the execution of the law, there can be only one result."

This is typical imperialistic diplomacy. It is the expression of a tendency which might provoke war with Mexico, and is precisely the policy which American Imperialism will more and more compel the government to pursue. According to the law of nations, the Mexican government is perfectly within its rights in the course it has adopted; but as this course would monopolize the natural resources for Mexican Capitalism and break the control of international Imperialism, it must be changed. Raw materials are a necessity of modern Capitalism; Mexico is bursting with raw materials which international Imperialism covets; and so there develops a new campaign for intervention in Mexico, potential of a new war and aggression. The campaign is proceeding actively.

Mexico is the American Balkans. The Imperialism of the United States considers financial control of Mexico—and of the American continents—absolutely indispensable to its plans for world power. The attitude that "Mexico is our Balkans" contains the threat of a new world war.

It is authoritatively announced that the League of Nations will be incorporated in the Peace Treaty and it is authoritatively announced that the Peace Treaty will not include the League of Nations draft. Does it really matter?

Bolshevikjabs

IT is no wonder that our opponents constantly refer to Bolshevism as an "insidious menace." The Methodist Church is in a fair way to be split wide on the question, if we are to believe the newspapers. Dr. Harry Ward, professor of Christian ethics in a Methodist University, it appears, has refused to sign the Bolsheviks and his reverend colleagues are out for his blood, metaphorically speaking of course.

We may shortly expect to see the formation of the Bolshevik Methodists and the anti-Bolshevik Methodists and perhaps even the charge that Lenin is a Methodist.

From reading the newspapers on the 17th of March one would be inclined to believe that the Irish are tremendously popular, but when we turn from the front page headlines and run across "O'Leary an Abol of Germany" we come to the conclusion that the popularity is not wholly unalloyed.

How is it that with the reports of the way the Majority "Socialists" in Germany are terrorizing their opponents and indulging in mass murders we don't hear anything of a reign of terror? Perhaps it is because it all depends against whom the excesses are aimed whether or not the executions constitute a "reign of terror." We may expect to hear little of the "Yellow Terror" while the Scheidemanns retain control, but when the Spartacans rise to power then the press will shriek about the "Reign of Terror" every time one of the German bourgeoisie stubs his toe.

The Yellow Terror of the bourgeois-Socialists of Germany has not yet drawn a protest "in the name of our common humanity" from the "neutral powers" nor is it likely to do so. The "Red Terror" has "horrorified" the world but it would appear that the world-horror was inspired more by the color than the terror.

We suppose the reason the French government refuses passports to the committee elected by the Bern Conference for the purpose of investigation of Bolshevism is that it is afraid that if these gentlemen went to Russia they would become contaminated or perhaps that they might be tempted to tell the truth. Regarding the first supposition we would like to assure the French government that there is absolutely no danger of such a committee becoming contaminated with Bolshevism. The Bolsheviks pulled off a revolution that these gentlemen knew was premature and unscientific, and after all it is a human weakness to be unable to forgive those who have proven one wrong.

On the second matter we might say that the moderate Socialists, though they have sometimes fallen before the temptation of ministerial portfolios, have very successfully resisted the temptation to become revolutionists.

But perhaps the French Government is wiser than we were at first inclined to believe—maybe it thinks that if the Mensheviks could see their European prototypes they would immediately become converted to Bolshevism.

Strange are the ways of morality. The Committee of Fourteen that looks after New York's moral welfare is quoted to the effect that it "expected the police would detail women to walk the streets and if not properly accosted by men, to arrest the men under the law." It however omits to mention the ways in which it proposes to moralize the women who would accept such jobs.

Reaction and Finance in Russia

MORE and more the Allied intervention shows itself as not merely anti-Bolshevik, but as counter-revolutionary. All over the place the men of the old regime are "creeping out to see the sun again" and look to a return to power "in the baggage-wagons of the Allies." Even the anti-Bolshevik revolutionaries are taking alarm. The Omsk Government to which they pinned their faith has been overthrown by a military dictatorship. The reactionaries are coming more and more to the fore. And behind the reactionaries stand the financial interests whose object is the exploitation of Russia for the profit of Western Capitalism. There are schemes afoot for the formation of "chartered companies" which are to take over the running of whole branches of Russian industry. Finally, for the proper understanding of Allied policy in Russia, we commend a passage from the *Financial News*: "In the city it is realized that events are shaping more and more towards an international sovereignty over Russia, modelled on the British surveillance of Egypt. Such an event would transform Russian bonds into the cream of the international market." — *The Herald* (England)

Manifesto of the Left Wing Section of

THE members of the Socialist Party are entitled to an explanation for the issuance of this pamphlet by the Left Wing Section.

We are a very active and growing section of the Socialist Party who are attempting to reach the rank and file with our urgent message over the heads of the powers that be, who, through inertia or a lack of vision, cannot see the necessity for a critical analysis of the party's policies and tactics.

The official Socialist Party press is in the main closed to us; therefore, we cannot adequately present our side of the case.

In the various discussions that arise wherever party members or delegates assemble, both sides grow too heated for calm dispassionate judgment.

Therefore we have decided to issue our Manifesto and Program in pamphlet form, so that the rank and file may read and judge our case on its merits.

Comrades—and this is addressed to members of the party—the situation is such that a careful study of our position is absolutely imperative.

MANIFESTO

Prior to August, 1914, the nations of the world lived on a volcano. Violent eruptions from time to time gave warning of the cataclysm to come, but the diplomats and statesmen managed to localize the outbreaks, and the masses, slightly aroused, sank back into their accustomed lethargy with doubts and misgivings, and the subterranean fires continued to smoulder.

Many trusted blindly—some in their statesmen, some in the cohesive power of Christianity, their common religion, and some in the growing strength of the international Socialist movement. Had not the German Social-Democracy exchanged dramatic telegrams with the French Socialist Party, each pledging itself not to fight in case their governments declared war on each other? A general strike of workers led by these determined Socialists would quickly bring the governments to their senses!

So the workers reasoned, until the thunder-clap of Sarajevo and Austria's ultimatum to Serbia. Then, suddenly, the storm broke. Mobilization everywhere. Everywhere declarations of war. In three or four days Europe was in arms.

The present structure of society—Capitalism—with its pretensions to democracy on the one hand, and its commercial rivalries, armaments rings and standing armies on the other, all based on the exploitation of the working class and the division of the loot, was cast into the furnace of war. Two things only could issue forth: either international capitalist control, through a League of Nations, or Social Revolution and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. Both of these forces are to-day contending for world power.

The Social Democracies of Europe, unable or unwilling to meet the crisis, were themselves hurled into the conflagration, to be tempered or consumed by it.

THE COLLAPSE OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL

Great demonstrations were held in every European country by Socialists protesting against their governments' declarations of war, and mobilizations for war. And we know that these demonstrations were rendered impotent by the complete surrender of the Socialist parliamentary leaders and the official Socialist press, with their "justifications" of "defensive wars" and the safeguarding of "democracy."

Why the sudden change of front? Why did the Socialist leaders in the parliaments of the belligerents vote the war credits? Why did not Moderate Socialism carry out the policy of the Basle Manifesto, namely: the converting of an imperialistic war into a civil war—into a proletarian revolution? Why did it either openly favor the war or adopt a policy of petty-bourgeois pacifism?

THE DEVELOPMENT OF MODERATE SOCIALISM

In the latter part of the nineteenth century, the Social-Democracies of Europe set out to "legislate Capitalism out of office." The class struggle was to be won in the capitalist legislatures. Step by step concessions were to be wrested from the state; the working class and the Socialist parties were to be strengthened by means of "constructive" reform and social legislation; each concession would act as a rung in the ladder of Social Revolution, upon which the workers could climb step by step, until finally, some bright sunny morning, the peoples would awaken to find the Cooperative Commonwealth functioning without disorder, confusion or hitch on the ruins of the capitalist state.

And what happened? When a few legislative seats had been secured, the thunderous denunciations of the Socialist legislators suddenly ceased. No more were the parliaments used as platforms from which the challenge of revolutionary Socialism was flung to all

FOREWORD

The Manifesto and Program of the Left Wing Section of the Greater New York locals of the Socialist Party, printed in *The Revolutionary Age* of February 8, was amended at a convention of the Left Wing held in New York City February 16. It was a mass convention of the membership, with fraternal delegates from Local Boston and other locals. The final version of the Manifesto is printed herewith.

The convention also adopted two resolutions. One was a resolution endorsing *The Revolutionary Age*, which follows:

"Resolved, that *The Revolutionary Age* be endorsed by the Left Wing Section of New York, and that our Executive Committee take up the details of co-operation with the management of *The Revolutionary Age*."

The other resolution was on the "Amnesty Convention" which is to meet May 1:

"We denounce the action of the party's National Executive Committee in issuing a call for a so-called 'amnesty convention' in May, as a substitute for an emergency national convention and to baffle the will of the membership. This 'amnesty convention' is to be held by the party together with reactionary bourgeois 'liberal' organizations—but this issue, and all other issues, must be acted upon on the basis of the Socialist class struggle. An emergency national convention of the party is necessary. We repudiate the proposed 'amnesty convention'."

This manifesto has already been accepted by a number of locals of the Socialist Party. Communications should be sent to the Executive Secretary, Maximilian Cohen, 43 West 29 Street, New York, N. Y.

the corners of Europe. Another era had set in, the era of "constructive" social reform legislation. Dominant Moderate Socialism accepted the bourgeois state as the basis of its action and strengthened that state. All power to shape the policies and tactics of the Socialist parties was entrusted to the parliamentary leaders. And these lost sight of Socialism's original purpose; their goal became "constructive reforms" and cabinet portfolios—the "cooperation of classes," the policy of openly or tacitly declaring that the coming of Socialism was a concern "of all the classes," instead of emphasizing the Marxian policy that the construction of the Socialist system is the task of the revolutionary proletariat alone. "Moderate Socialism" in the hands of these parliamentary leaders, was now ready to share responsibility with the bourgeoisie in the control of the capitalist state, even to the extent of defending the bourgeoisie against the working class—as in the first Briand Ministry in France, when the official party press was opened to a defense of the shooting of striking railway-workers at the order of the Socialist-Bourgeois Coalition Cabinet.

"SAUSAGE SOCIALISM"

This situation was brought about by mixing the democratic cant of the eighteenth century with scientific Socialism. The result was what Rosa Luxemburg called "sausage Socialism." The "Moderates" emphasized petty-bourgeois social reformism in order to attract tradesmen, shop-keepers and members of the professions, and, of course, the latter flocked to the Socialist movement in great numbers, seeking relief from the constant grinding between corporate capital and awakening labor.

The Socialist organizations actively competed for votes, on the basis of social reforms, with the bourgeois-liberal political parties. And so they catered to the ignorance and prejudices of the workers, trading promises of immediate reforms for votes.

Dominant "Moderate Socialism" forgot the teachings of the founders of scientific Socialism, forgot its function as a proletarian movement—"the most resolute and advanced section of the working class parties"—and permitted the bourgeois and self-seeking trade union elements to shape its policies and tactics. This was the condition in which the Social-Democracies of Europe found themselves at the outbreak of war in 1914. Demoralized and confused by the cross-currents within their own parties, vacillating and compromising with the bourgeois state, they fell a prey to social-patriotism and nationalism.

SPARTICIDES AND BOLSHEVIKI

But revolutionary Socialism was not destined to lie inert for long. In Germany, Karl Liebknecht, Franz Mehring, Rosa Luxemburg and Otto Ruhle organized the Spartacus Group. But their voices were drowned in the roar of cannon and the shriek of the dying and the maimed.

Russia, however, was to be the first battle-ground where "moderate" and revolutionary Socialism should come to grips for the mastery of the state. The breakdown of the corrupt, bureaucratic Czarist regime opened the flood-gates of Revolution.

Three main contending parties attempted to ride into power on the revolutionary tide; the Cadets, the "moderate-Socialists" (Mensheviks and Social-Revolutionists), and the revolutionary Socialists—the Bolsheviks. The Cadets were first to be swept into power; but they tried to stem the still-rising flood with a few

abstract political ideals, and were soon carried away. The soldiers, workers and peasants could no longer be fooled by phrases. The Mensheviks and Social-Revolutionaries succeeded the Cadets. And now came the crucial test: would they, in accord with Marxian teachings, make themselves the ruling class and sweep away the old conditions of production, and thus prepare the way for the Cooperative Commonwealth? Or would they tinker with the old machinery and try to lose it on the masses as something just as good?

They did the latter and proved for all time that "moderate Socialism" cannot be trusted.

"Moderate Socialism" was not prepared to seize the power for the workers during a revolution. "Moderate Socialism" had a rigid formula—"constructive social reform legislation within the capitalist state" and to that formula it clung. It believed that bourgeois democracy could be used as a means of constructing the Socialist system; therefore, it must wait until the people, through a Constituent Assembly, should vote Socialism into existence. And in the meantime, it held that there must be established a Government of Coalition with the enemy, the bourgeoisie. As if, with all the means of controlling public opinion in the hands of the bourgeoisie, a Constituent Assembly could or would ever vote the Socialists into power!

Revolutionary Socialists hold, with the founders of scientific Socialism, that there are two dominant classes in society—the bourgeoisie and the proletariat; that between these two classes a struggle must go on, until the working class, through the seizure of the instruments of production and distribution, the abolition of the capitalist state, and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, creates a Socialist system. Revolutionary Socialists do not believe that they can be voted into power. They struggle for the conquest of power by the revolutionary proletariat. Then comes the transition period from Capitalism to Socialism, of which Marx speaks in his "*Critique of the Gotha Program*" when he says: "Between the capitalist society and the communistic, lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. This corresponds to a political transition period, in which the state cannot be anything else but the dictatorship of the proletariat."

Marx and Engels clearly explained the function of the Socialist movement. It is the "moderate Socialists" through intellectual gymnastics, evasions, misquotations and the tearing of sentences and phrases from their context, who make Marx and Engels sponsor for their perverted version of Socialism.

PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SOCIALISM

At the present moment, the Socialist Party of America is agitated by several cross-currents, some local in their character, and some a reflex of cleavages within the European Socialist movements. Many see in this internal dissention merely an unimportant difference of opinion, or at most, dissatisfaction with the control of the party, and the desire to replace those who have misused it with better men.

We, however, maintain that there is a fundamental distinction in views concerning party policies and tactics. And we believe that this difference is so vast that from our standpoint a radical change in party policies and tactics is necessary.

This essential task is being shirked by our party leaders and officials generally.

Already there is formidable industrial unrest, a seething ferment of discontent, evidenced by inarticulate rumblings which presage striking occurrences. The transformation of industry from a war to a peace basis has thoroughly disorganized the economic structure. Thousands upon thousands of workers are being thrown out of work. Demobilized soldiers and sailors find themselves a drug upon the labor market, unless they act as scabs and strike-breakers. Skilled mechanics, fighting desperately to maintain their wage and their industrial status, are forced to strike. Women, who during the war have been welcomed into industries hitherto closed to them, are struggling to keep their jobs. And to cap the climax, the capitalists, through their Chambers of Commerce and their Merchants and Manufacturers' Associations, have resolved to take advantage of the situation to break down even the inadequate organizations labor has built up through generations of painful struggle.

The temper of the workers and soldiers, after the sacrifices they have made in the war, is such that they will not endure the reactionary labor conditions so openly advocated by the master class. A series of labor struggles is bound to follow—indeed, is beginning now. Shall the Socialist Party continue to feed the workers with social reform legislation at this critical period? Shall it approach the whole question from the standpoint of votes and the election of representatives to the legislatures? Shall it emphasize the consumers' point of view, when Socialist principles teach that the worker is robbed at the point of production? Shall it talk about

the Socialist Party of New York City

the Cost of Living and Taxation when it should be explaining how the worker is robbed at his job?

There are many signs of the awakening of labor. Strikes are developing which verge on revolutionary action; the trade unions are organizing a Labor Party, in an effort to conserve what they have won and wrest new concessions from the master class. The organization of the Labor Party is an immature expression of a new spirit in the Labor movement; but a Labor Party is not the instrument for the emancipation of the working class; its policy would be in general what is now the official policy of the Socialist Party—reforming Capitalism on the basis of the bourgeois state. Laborism is as much a danger to the revolutionary proletariat as "moderate" Socialism; neither is an instrument for the conquest of power.

CAPITALIST IMPERIALISM

Imperialism is the final stage of Capitalism, in which the accumulated capital or surplus of a nation is too great to be reinvested in the home market. The increased productivity of the working class, due to improved machinery and efficiency methods, and the mere subsistence wage which permits the worker to buy back only a small portion of what he produces, causes an ever-increasing accumulation of commodities, which in turn become capital and must be invested in further production. When Capitalism has reached the stage in which it imports raw materials from undeveloped countries and exports them again in the shape of manufactured products, it has reached its highest development.

This process is universal. Foreign markets, spheres of influence and protectorates, under the intensive development of capitalist industry and finance in turn become highly developed. They, too, seek for markets. National capitalist control, to save itself from ruin, breaks its national bonds and emerges full-grown as a capitalist League of Nations, with international armies and navies to maintain its supremacy.

The United States no longer holds itself aloof, isolated and provincial. It is reaching out for new markets, new zones of influence, new protectorates.

The capitalist class of America is using organized labor for its imperialistic purposes. We may soon expect the capitalist class, in true Bismarckian fashion, to grant factory laws, old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, sick benefits, and the whole litter of bourgeois reforms, so that the workers may be kept fit to produce the greatest profits at the greatest speed.

DANGERS TO AMERICAN SOCIALISM

There is danger that the Socialist Party of America might make use of these purely bourgeois reforms to attract the workers' votes, by claiming that they are victories for Socialism, and that they have been won by Socialist political action; when, as a matter of fact, the object of these master class measures is to prevent the growing class-consciousness of the workers, and to divert them from their revolutionary aim. By agitating for these reforms, therefore, the Socialist Party would be playing into the hands of the American imperialists.

On the basis of the class struggle, then, the Socialist Party of America must re-organize itself, must prepare to come to grips with the master class during the difficult period of capitalist re-adjustment now going on. This it can do only by teaching the working class the truth about present-day conditions; it must preach revolutionary industrial unionism, and urge all the workers to organize into industrial unions, the only form of labor organization which can cope with the power of great modern aggregations of capital. It must carry on its political campaigns, not merely as a means of electing officials to political office, as in the past, but as a year-round educational campaign to arouse the workers to class-conscious economic and political action, and to keep alive the burning ideal of revolution in the hearts of the people.

POLITICAL ACTION

We assert with Marx that "the class struggle is essentially a political struggle," and we can only accept his own oft-repeated interpretation of that phrase. The class struggle, whether it manifest itself on the industrial field or in the direct struggle for governmental control, is essentially a struggle for the capture and destruction of the capitalist state. This is a political act. In this broader view of the term "political," Marx includes revolutionary industrial action. In other words, the objective of Socialist industrial action is "political," in the sense that it aims to undermine the bourgeois state, which "is nothing less than a machine for the oppression of one class by another and that no less so in a democratic republic than under a monarchy."

Political action is also and more generally used to refer to participation in election campaigns for the immediate purpose of winning legislative seats. In this sense, too, we urge the use of political action as a revolutionary weapon.

But both in the nature and the purpose of this form of political action, revolutionary Socialism and "moderate Socialism" are completely at odds.

Political action, revolutionary and emphasizing the implacable character of the class struggle, is a valuable means of propaganda. It must at all times struggle to arouse the revolutionary mass action of the proletariat—its use is both agitational and obstructive. It must on all issues wage war upon Capitalism and the state. Revolutionary Socialism uses the forum of parliament for agitation; but it does not intend to and cannot use the bourgeois state as a means of introducing Socialism: this bourgeois state must be destroyed by the mass action of the revolutionary proletariat. The proletarian dictatorship in the form of a Soviet state is the immediate objective of the class struggle.

Marx declared that "the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery and wield it for its own purposes." This machinery must be destroyed. But "moderate Socialism" makes the state the centre of its action.

The attitude towards the state divides the Anarchist (Anarcho-Syndicalist), the "moderate Socialist" and the revolutionary Socialist. Eager to abolish the state (which is the ultimate purpose of revolutionary Socialism), the Anarchist and (Anarcho-Socialist) fails to realize that a state is necessary in the transition period from Capitalism to Socialism; the "moderate Socialist" proposes to use the bourgeois state with its fraudulent democracy, its illusory theory of "unity of all the classes," its standing army, police and bureaucracy oppressing and baffling the masses; the revolutionary Socialist maintains that the bourgeois state must be completely destroyed, and proposes the organization of a new state—the state of the organized producers—of the Federated Soviets—on the basis of which alone can Socialism be introduced.

Industrial Unionism, the organization of the proletariat in accordance with the integration of industry and for the overthrow of Capitalism, is a necessary phase of revolutionary Socialist agitation. Potentially, industrial unionism constructs the basis and develops the ideology of the industrial state of Socialism; but industrial unionism alone cannot perform the revolutionary act of seizure of the power of the state, since under the conditions of Capitalism it is impossible to organize the whole working class, or an overwhelming majority into industrial unionism.

It is the task of a revolutionary Socialist party to direct the struggles of the proletariat and provide a program for the culminating crisis. Its propaganda must be so directed that when this crisis comes, the workers will be prepared to accept a program of the following character:

- (a) *The organization of Workmen's Councils; recognition of, and propaganda for, these mass organizations in the immediate struggle, as the form of expression of the class struggle, and as the instruments for the seizure of the power of the state and the basis of the new proletarian state of the organized producers and the dictatorship of the proletariat.*
- (b) *Workmen's control of industry, to be exercised by the industrial organizations (industrial unions or Soviets) of the workers and the industrial vote, as against government ownership or state control of industry.*
- (c) *Repudiation of all national debts—with provisions to safeguard small investors.*
- (d) *Expropriation of the bank—preliminary measure for the complete expropriation of capital.*
- (e) *Expropriation of the railways, and the large (trust) organizations of capital—no compensation to be paid, as "buying-out" the capitalists would insure a continuance of the exploitation of the workers; provision, however, to be made during the transition period for the protection of small owners of stock.*
- (f) *The nationalization of foreign trade.*

These are not the "immediate demands" comprised in the social reform planks now in the platform of our party; they are not a compromise with the capitalist state, but imply a revolutionary struggle against that state and against capitalism, the conquest of power by the proletariat through revolutionary mass action. They imply the new Soviet state of the organized producers, the dictatorship of the proletariat; they are preliminary revolutionary measures for the expropriation of capital and the introduction of communist Socialism.

PROGRAM

1. We stand for a uniform declaration of principles in all party platforms both local and national and the abolition of all social reform planks now contained in them.
2. The party must teach, propagate and agitate exclusively for the overthrow of Capitalism, and the establishment of Socialism through a Proletarian Dictatorship.
3. The Socialist candidates elected to office shall adhere strictly to the above provisions.
4. Realizing that a political party cannot reorganize and reconstruct the industrial organizations of the working class, and that that is the task of the economic organizations themselves, we demand that the party assist this process of reorganization by a propaganda for revolutionary industrial unionism as part of its general activities. We believe it is the mission of the Socialist movement to encourage and assist the proletariat to adopt newer and more effective forms of organization and to stir it into newer and more revolutionary modes of action.
5. We demand that the official party press be party owned and controlled.
6. We demand that officially recognized educational institutions be party owned and controlled.
7. We demand that the party discard its obsolete literature and publish new literature in keeping with the policies and tactics above-mentioned.
8. We demand that the National Executive Committee call an immediate emergency national convention for the purpose of formulating party policies and tactics to meet the present crisis.
9. We demand that the Socialist Party repudiate the Berne Congress or any other conference engineered by "moderate Socialists" and social patriots.
10. We demand that the Socialist Party shall elect delegates to the International Congress proposed by the Communist Party of Russia (Bolshevik); that our party shall participate only in a new International with which are affiliated the Communist Party of Russia (Bolshevik), the Communist Labor Party of Germany (Spartacists), and all other other Left Wing parties and groups.

Red Week in New York City!

Under the auspices of the New York Conference of the
RUSSIAN SOCIALIST ORGANIZATIONS
Benefit of

"The Revolutionary Age"

and
"Novy Mir"

Manhattan Lyceum, 66 East 4th Street

PROGRAM

Monday, March 24, 7-30 P. M.

CONCERT AND MEETING

Speakers:

John Reed, N. I. Hourwich, G. Weinstein,
Louis C. Fraina and Jim Larkin
B. Gitlow, Chairman

ADMISSION FREE

Tuesday, March 25, 7-30 P. M.

CONCERT AND STEREOPTICAN VIEWS OF LIFE IN REVOLUTIONARY RUSSIA

Admission 50 cents

Wednesday, March 25, 7-30 P. M.

CONCERT AND BALL

Admission 50 cents

Thursday, March 27, 7-30 P. M.

CONCERT, AND PART TWO OF THE STEREOPTICAN VIEWS

Admission 50 cents

Labor Conditions in Japan

By Sen Katayama

SINCE the recent rice riots the workers of Japan have been steadily asserting their power. In spite of rigid police rule and the use of troops in strikes, mass demonstrations are occurring more and more frequently. Demands for higher wages are being made not through the agency of labor organizations but by direct action in the form of mass strikes and labor riots which have proved very effective in the majority of cases.

Owing to the fact that the Japanese workers are forbidden to organize in labor unions they are forced to resort to strikes, sabotage and rioting to improve conditions, and in these struggles they are learning over night what their Western comrades have learned only through many decades of agitation. Since the outbreak of the Russian Revolution the spirit of revolt against the oppressive government in general and the greedy exploiters of labor in particular has been gathering strength until it burst forth in the recent rice riots and the continuous strikes and labor riots. There are still nearly six thousand workers in prison throughout the country who were arrested in the rice riots. Many have been tried and condemned to long periods of imprisonment and many are still in prison awaiting trial.

All over the country the bureaucratic regime and its supporters are crying loudly for the punishment of the rioters to the very limit of the law. By this means the bourgeoisie hopes to intimidate the workers from striking and rioting, but the effect is only to increase the spirit of revolt among the people's masses. The workers of Japan have already glimpsed the power of mass action in the rice riots and the recent strikes, and the struggle will continue. The readjustment of Japanese industry from a war to a peace basis will cause greater suffering and unemployment than was the case during the readjustment periods following the wars of 1895 and 1905, for Japan's present industrial conditions are more advanced, more centralized and have many more people dependent upon their continued operation. It is estimated that over a quarter of a million will be thrown out of work in Tokio, Osaka and a few other large cities during the present crisis. Already there are many unemployed in the in-

dustrial centers of the country and as the workers are unorganized the employers will cut down wages and dismiss the workers at their will. But this will itself bring further resistance from the workers and will develop the necessity of mass action in a wider sense than it has already been applied in the demand for higher wages. Thus the whole situation is helping the workers to awaken to the real situation—and they are awakening.

The bureaucrats, terror-stricken at the recent rice riots, while advocating the severest punishment for the ring-leaders of the riots have been attempting to organize labor unions dominated by the employers. These paternal labor unions are mostly taken up by retired army and naval officers as a lucrative means of livelihood. Among these so-called labor organizations the most widely known, and to a certain extent well established, is the "Friendly Society of Labor"—Yu-Ai-Kai which is supported by the bourgeoisie. The president of the Friendly Society of Labor is Mr. Bunji Suzuki, a graduate of the Tokio Imperial University, who has been twice present at annual conventions of the American Federation of Labor as the honorable fraternal delegate of Japanese labor.

He crossed the Pacific in a first class cabin, travelled in a Pullman and stayed at first class hotels in America. He was enabled to do this because he came to America in reality as the private secretary of Baron Shibusawa whose patronage of the Friendly Society of Labor has been the chief reason for its peaceful existence under the Imperialist-capitalist governments of Okuma and Terauchi and the present plutocratic government of Hara. He has been truly styled the "Gompers of Japan." The only difference between the two is that Suzuki's Friendly Society is not by any stretch of the imagination an organization of labor. Its so-called members consist of subscribers to a monthly magazine largely edited and contributed to by bourgeois writers who invariably and pedantically preach that out-worn theory—"the identical interest of capital and labor."

It is reported in the Japanese press that Bunji Suzuki is again coming to America on his way to Paris

to attend the international Labor Peace Conference. He will not attend the International Labor and Socialist Conference for he is the deadly enemy of Socialism. He has publicly declared that he will stake his life to crush Socialism in Japan. His real attitude to the labor question, which is borne out by his actual work in Japan, is to compromise between capital and labor. He opposes strikes and never was either a strike leader or adviser. When a strike does occur he attempts to step in and bring about a compromise, a compromise which is invariably in favor of Capitalism.

We, the Socialists, of Japan, are opposed to the methods and tactics of the Friendly Society of Labor. It is directly detrimental to the cause of labor, it poisons and kills the manly spirit of the real labor movement in Japan particularly among the young workers who read its paper. Just now the Japanese intelligentsia are attempting to interpret the labor and social phenomena of Japan and pacify the awakening workers by government permitted labor movements that will abandon the strike and the economic boycott and become the obedient servant of the employers.

But the great mass of the Japanese workers are rapidly awakening to a realization of their power and are making themselves felt in strikes and riots. The present economic situation of the workers is making them far wiser and more powerful than the pedantic Japanese intelligentsia. Japan is fast approaching a stage where the workers will assert their rights to the control of their own affairs. A close contact with the Russian Bolshevik revolution is being evidenced everywhere and though the government is trying to shut out the ideas of Bolshevism the workers are practising the tactics that enabled the Russian workers to conquer power. Socially Japan is a steam boiler without a safety valve, sooner or later an explosion will occur. The government is shutting every month of freedom, freedom of the press and assemblage is denied to the workers and Socialists. The best indication of the coming social revolution in Japan is the rapid building of bastilles and the increasing jailing of the workers and poorest peasants. As sure as day succeeds night these bastilles must fall before the mighty wave of Bolshevism that is sweeping on to Japan.

Cottin's Defence — "Why I Tried to Kill Clemenceau"

I WANTED to kill the man instigating a new war. I am an anarchist, a friend of the people, Germans not excluded, a friend of mankind and brotherhood. These words deeply penetrate into the heart of every man. Clemenceau is a tyrant, and a tyrant of the highest degree. Clemenceau is making the fighters for the popular cause rot in the free prisons of France. Clemenceau is the greatest enemy of the great free-thinking people. No wonder he is called "Tiger." But he is not a tiger—he is a man. Prior to the March revolution in Russia there were sent to the French front many Russian soldiers—the figure varying between 100,000 and 300,000 men. Reliable information it is impossible to obtain. They replaced English and French troops in the most dangerous sections of the battle line; well supplied with arms and provisions they took the place of a large number of the Allied troops, which were sent to police different sections of France.

Unexpectedly the revolution in Russia broke out. Russian soldiers immediately began to be insistent in their demands, and created a Soviet of the soldiers' deputies, which was arrested in its entire personnel. Nobody knows of its fate up to the present. This did not stop the Russian soldiers; they protested as a single man, and refused to advance. Their superiors were infuriated and began to threaten, but nothing could shake the Russians. At the council of the generals and colonels of the old regime, the tyrant-rulers, it was decided to take the Russians off the firing line and intern them behind the bars of the camp for the interned. They were recognized as enemies. But that was not the end of the sufferings of the Russians. Terrible conditions, executions of the Russians, the conscientious soldiers—nothing could shake the firm attitude of the Russian soldiers, who had scented the fire of the revolutionary flame in their native land. They categorically refused to obey. Detachment after detachment was sent to the rear guard camps, where they awaited their fate.

When the Kerensky government had fallen, the sympathy of the Russian soldiers was on the side of the Soviets of Workers and Soldiers' Deputies. But in spite of that some of the detachments of the Russian army still fought on the front lines. Russia signed the Brest-Litovsk treaty, and those troops that were under the influence of the revolutionary patriotism under-

We publish below a statement by Emile Cottin after his arrest following his attempt upon the life of the French Premier.

stood and decided to leave the struggle. The last detachments refused to go into action, basing their claim on the fact that they were neutral citizens; they understood the reality of the war. Their main demand was to return to their native land. This request and then demand—the French premier, Clemenceau, ordered suppressed. The order of the French government was obeyed immediately, and many Russians, true sons of the cold valleys of Russia, fell before the bullets of the treacherous weapons of those cunning politicians. Many were wounded. Clemenceau's order "not to spare bullets" was executed according to all the rules of military tactics. With waving flags the battalions of the free republic returned from the places of their crime accompanied by the sounds of the "Marseillaise." A few days afterward a colonel was sent to the camp where the irreconcilable Russians were kept, who delivered a fiery speech. He spoke of revolution, of everything, and finished by an appeal to enlist into the army to fight against the Bolsheviks. Twenty thousand men believed these fables telling them that Russia was in danger and decided to save Russia. They were formed into detachments and were sent to the nearest military camp in order to be attached to the Czecho-Slovak army. The rest, tens of thousands of men, as one man, decidedly and determinedly answered: "The Russian people have concluded peace; they might have made a mistake, as you said; yet you treated us cruelly even after the downfall of the Czar's regime, and therefore we demand to be sent to our native land; there on the spot we will deliberate as to what must be suppressed for the Russian people."

The French authorities became enraged, and having caught the leaders of the military Soviets sent them without trial to hard labor, to an island prison, located not far from Bordeaux. The rest were exiled to places where no crow flies. After that a dishonest reaction was instituted; the Russian soldiers were tormented to the extreme. Then, having tormented them sufficiently, and enjoyed it enough, the Premier ordered irreconcilable Russians to be sent to Africa. Forty thousand men were sent there. While they were being sent into slavery there came unexpectedly a Russian

colonel, decorated from head to foot with the Czar's medals, and facing the rows of soldiers responded to the order of Clemenceau with the following words:

"My boys, it would truly be a great mistake if we consented to go to war against our fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, and the whole Russian people. First of all what we need to do is to return to Russia, and there we shall see what government we Russians shall defend.

"You are sending my boys to slavery under the hot ray of the African sun. Send me also with them, for I believe exactly the way they do."

Clemenceau's order was obeyed, and forty thousand Russians for their fidelity to the popular cause were sent to slavery in the African plantations of the French.

Last November, after the armistice with Germany, tens of thousands of war prisoners were liberated, among them many Russians. As a stream this human wave rushed in the direction of the Allied lines en masse, passing the outposts and blockhouses. The Russians were in a terrible condition, beaten, wounded, and bare-footed. They did not resemble men at all, but rather apparitions. Having reached the American lines they were stopped, given American uniforms but were forbidden to proceed farther. Where are they, what is the matter with them? There is no information. Where they are—martyrs—remains a secret. Their number reaches between 10,000 and 15,000 men.

Many refugees passing the battle line found themselves in cities where they were caught and told: "You have no right to live in this country. You must return to Russia, and enlist in the Czecho-Slovak army. You must fight against the Soviets."

"We cannot do it," replied the Russian prisoners of war. "We must be sent to Russia and see the people at work. There on the spot shall we see whom we must defend."

I am an anarchist, a friend of the people, not excluding Germans, a friend of mankind, of the brotherhood of man.

That is where the heart of man lies. That is where lie the spirit of protest and revenge. I lifted my hand; the protest of the shot resounded, and the "Tiger" was wounded.

Imperialism — the Final Stage of Capitalism

By N. Lenin

Translated from the Russian by Andre Tridon

(Continuation)

THE German economist Kestner has devoted a special treatise to the struggle between cartels and "outsiders," that is between organizations and concerns who remain independent. Kestner entitled his book *Compulsory Organization*, but should have called it "Compulsory Submission to Monopolistic Combinations." It is most instructive to pass in review the various up-to-date and civilized instruments of warfare which monopolies use in order to bolster up their organization: 1.—Curtailement of the supply of raw materials; one of the most efficient ways of compelling independents to join the trusts. 2.—Curtailement of the labor supply by means of agreements with the workmen whereby the latter will only hire themselves to members of the trust. 3.—Curtailement of the means of transportation. 4.—Curtailement of sales. 5.—Agreements with retailers who are to buy exclusively from the trust. 6.—Price-cutting by agreement, to drive out of the market all independent dealers who refuse to submit to the trust's dictations may be sacrificed in making sales below cost; for instance in the benzine industry prices were cut at times from 40 to 22 marks, almost 50%. 7.—Curtailement of credit. 8.—Boycott.

We are no longer witnessing a struggle between small and large concerns, between old-fashioned and forward-looking concerns. We actually see monopolies throttling all those who are unwilling to submit to their absolute domination. This is the way in which the bourgeois economist Kestner views the process: "In the field of purely economic activity we notice an abandonment of commercial activity in the former sense of the word in favor of new forms of organization and speculation. The greatest measure of success is no longer attained by the merchant who, by dint of technical skill and commercial sense, is best able to satisfy the requirements of his customers, and, so to speak, to bring forth a demand which is in a latent stage, but to the man with a genius for speculation, who is above all things able to take into account or to discover the various threads of organization, the possible connections between certain enterprises and certain banks."

Translated into human language, this means: The development of Capitalism has proceeded to the point where the production of merchandise is no longer the fundamental function of business, where it is already shorn of its importance, and where the big prizes go to men with a head for financial tricks. The concrete basis of all these tricks is the socialization of production, and the enormous advance made by mankind which has conditioned that socialization only serves to fill the speculators' pockets.

We shall now see how the reactionary critics of capitalistic Imperialism dream of a return to free, "peaceful" and "honest" competition.

"The constant rise in prices caused by the organization of trusts," Kestner writes, "is only noticeable thus far in the case of the most important means of production, coal, iron, etc., but it is not noticeable in the case of finished products. The resultant increase in profits has been limited to the industry supplying the means of production. We may add that the industry producing raw materials, not finished products, not only makes larger profits, owing to the organization of trusts, at the expense of industries turning out finished products, but assumes toward the latter industries a dictatorial attitude which was unheard of under the system of free competition."

The words I have italicized allude to facts which bourgeois economists are so loath to admit, and from which the partisans of modern opportunists, with Karl Kautsky in the lead, are trying to escape. Domination and its concomitant oppression are the characteristic trait of the latest phase in the development of Capitalism, they are the unavoidable corollary of the formation of all-powerful economic monopolies.

Here is one more example of the way in which trusts conduct their warfare. Wherever the main sources of raw materials can be easily placed under one control, trusts are easily organized and monopolies established. But it would be a mistake to assume that monopolies do not establish themselves in branches of industry the raw materials of which can not be easily cornered. The materials necessary in the cement industry can be found anywhere on earth. Yet that industry is strongly concentrated in Germany. The cement factories have been united into local syndicates: the South-German, the Rheinisch-Westphalian Syndicates, etc. Their products fetch monopoly prices, from 230 to 280 marks per carload, the cost of production being only 180 marks. Cement stock pays between 12% and 16% in dividends, and we must not forget that the geniuses of the world of speculation reap large profits in addition to dividends.

In order to discourage competition in an industry which is so profitable, the monopolists resort to all sorts of stratagems. They spread alarming rumors about the unfavorable conditions obtaining in the cement business; anonymous advertisements appear in papers, which read: Capitalists, don't invest your funds in cement stocks. They buy independents out of the field, giving them some sixty, eighty or one hundred and fifty thousand marks for their plants. (16) Monopolies force their way in everywhere, regardless of the means that must be employed, from a bribe to make a competitor quit to an explosion of dynamite.

Bourgeois papers, always ready to applaud Capitalism, are full of stories of panics forestalled by trusts. The truth is, however, that the growth of monopolies in certain fields of industry accentuates still more the chaotic ways, the lack of system and responsibility characteristic of capitalist industry. The privileged position in which the most strongly organized industries, the coal and iron industries find themselves, creates even more erratic conditions in other industrial fields, as Jeidel, the author of one of the best books on the relations between the large German banks and industry, is compelled to admit. (17) "The more developed industry becomes," to quote Liefmann, a staunch defender of Capitalism, "the more readily it turns to risky undertakings, sometimes in foreign fields, to undertakings which demand years to mature, or which have only a local importance." (18)

Greater and greater risks attach to the giant combinations of capital which spread all over the nation and even beyond its borders. And at the same time the accelerated development of technique brings in its wake more and more elements of irresponsibility, a greater chaos, panics. Mankind will witness in a not remote future," Liefmann writes, "profound revolutions in the technical field, which will be felt even in national economy." He alludes, of course, to new electrical devices, the flying machine, etc., and he adds: "As a general rule, in such times of radical changes, speculation is especially reckless."

Crises of all kinds, especially in the economic field, but in many other fields too, will in turn accelerate the tendency to concentration and monopoly. Here is a most illuminating interpretation from Jeidel's pen of the crisis of 1900, which, as we know, proved to be the turning point in the history of modern monopolies:

"The crisis of 1900 called into existence, besides gigantic undertakings in the main branches of business, many other undertakings of an antiquated form of organization, independent concerns, which rode the crest of the rising industrial tide. Shrinking prices and a diminishing demand beguiled those independent undertakings while it barely affected the large combinations and that only for a short period.

"As a consequence, the crisis of 1900 caused infinitely more industrial concentration than the crisis of 1873; the latter operated of course a certain elimination among the strongest concerns; but the average technique being what it was then, that crisis was not likely to endow with monopolistic characteristics the concerns which had successfully breasted the storm.

"At the present day, the most monopolistic industries are the iron and electric industries whose technique is highly developed, whose organization is thorough, whose capitalization is enormous; next to them come machinery concerns, certain branches of the metallurgical industry, means of communication, etc." (20)

Monopoly is indeed the latest phase in the evolution of Capitalism. But our understanding of the power and importance of the modern monopolies would be quite superficial and inaccurate, if we did not realize the role played by banking institutions.

II.

The New Role Played by Banks

The primary and essential function of a bank is to act as an intermediary in effecting payments. Besides, banks transform inactive capital into active capital, that is into profit-earning capital, and they gather all sorts of moneys which they place at the disposal of capitalists. Owing to the development of the banking business and its concentration into a few establishments, banks have ceased to be mere intermediaries and have become powerful monopolistic concerns, controlling almost all the capital of all the small and large business enterprises, a large part of the means of

production and of the supply of raw material in one country or in several countries. This transformation of a large number of small intermediaries into a handful of monopoly-holders is one of the main phenomena in the transformation of Capitalism into capitalistic Imperialism. We must therefore study closely the concentration of business in the financial world.

In the year 1907-1908, the deposits in the banking corporations of Germany having a capital of over one millions marks amounted to seven billion marks. In the year 1912-1913, the amount had increased to 9,800,000,000 marks. Out of that additional 2,800,000,000 marks, 2,750,000,000 went to the fifty-seven large banks having a capital of over ten million marks. The following table shows the division of deposits among the large and small banks:

Percentage of Deposits: Nine large Berlin banks: 1907-8, 47%—1912-3, 49%; 48 other banks with a capital of over one billion marks: 1907-8, 22.5%—1912-3, 36%; 115 banks with a capital of from one to ten million marks: 1907-8, 16.5%—1912-3, 12%; small banks with a capital of less than one million marks: 1907-8, 4%; 1912-3, 3%.

The small banks are being crowded out by the large ones, nine of which gather in almost 50% of all the deposits. And we have not yet considered the fact that a large number of small banks are in reality mere branches of the large ones, but we will take that up later.

According to Schulze Gaeverning, out of a total of deposits at the end of the year 1913, amounting to ten billion marks, 5,100,000,000 marks were on deposit in nine large Berlin banks. Taking into account not merely the deposits, but all the actual banking capital, this author wrote: "At the end of 1909, nine large Berlin banks and their affiliated concerns controlled 11,300,000,000 marks, which is 83% of all the banking capital of Germany. The Deutsche Bank which, with its affiliated concerns, controls about 3,000,000,000 marks, is the largest and, at the same time, the most decentralized accumulation of capital in the world." (22)

Notice the expression "affiliated concerns," for this is one of the most important details of the modern concentration of capital. Large concerns, and in particular banks, not only absorb smaller concerns, but cause others to affiliate with them, they dominate them, make them a part of their group, which is the official term for that sort of thing; this is done through a "participation" in their affairs, by purchase or exchange of stock, loans, etc. Professor Liefmann has written a book of some five hundred pages on that form of financial operations, which unfortunately contains many trashy and unproved statements. To what extent that system of "participation" leads to concentration is shown clearly in a treatise written by Risser, a banking manipulator, on the subject of the large German banks. But before examining his data we may offer a concrete illustration of the "participation" system.

The Deutsche Bank Group is one of the largest, if not the largest, among the large banks. In order to estimate properly the threads uniting all the banks of that group, we must define the three degrees of "participation," in other words, the three degrees of dependence in which smaller banks stand in relation to the Deutsche Bank.

"Participation" in the Deutsche Bank

	First degree	Second degree	Third degree
Continuities	17 banks	9 out of 34	4 out of 7
Temporary	5 "	" "	" "
Occasional	8 "	5 " " 14	2 " " 2
Total	30 banks	14 out of 48	6 out of 9

Among the eight banks in the "first degree of dependence" we find three foreign banks, one Austrian bank, the Bank Verein of Vienna, and two Russian banks, the Siberian Commercial Bank and the Russian Bank for Foreign Commerce. The Deutsche Bank Group included then, in whole or in part, directly or indirectly, 87 banks; the capital of the bank itself and of the affiliated banks, of which the entire group disposes, amounts to between two and three billion marks.

It is obvious that a bank, heading such a group of other banks, and working in concert with half a dozen slightly less important banks, in order to carry out large and profitable financial operations, for instance to underwrite government loans, is no longer a mere intermediary, but constitutes properly a league of monopoly holders.

(To be continued.)

The Defeat of Germany and the Bolshevik Peril

By Nicholas I. Hourwich

WHO, indeed, defeated Germany? Who crushed the apparently invincible and iron might of her military machine, millions strong and tested in battles innumerable? Who drove Germany out of the ranks of the participants in the capitalist slaughter of the peoples, thereby ending the war? And, finally, who, in place of the military war, let loose or inspired the social-revolutionary war now raging in Germany, and which threatens to rage in other nations of the world?

Answers to these questions have been frequently made. But all these answers were given by "interested" parties, biased in their opinions, and each one of whom tried to secure to itself the credit for the defeat of Germany.

The Allies have ascribed this victory to themselves and their war chief, the French General Foch. According to the Allied version, General Foch was the real "revolutionary hero" responsible for raising the banner of the revolutionary uprising in Germany! True, the behavior of the "victorious" Allies and their armies in Germany was not in harmony with that version, since they used and still use all their resources to crush the Revolution in Germany. . . . But who, pray, except a few "tedious pedants," considers these small defections from the claims and the ideals of the Allies?

On the other hand, the Bolsheviki and their adherents have since the beginning assumed the credit for the revolutionary up-flare that smashed the German military machine by loosening into action the inert masses upon whose acquiescence that machine built its power.

Which of these claims is in accord with the facts? Who, then, defeated Germany?

In the newspapers the other day there was a statement by a witness whose testimony in this instance can be considered as disinterested and truthful, and which cannot be suspected. This witness is none other than General Hoffman, the head of the German delegation at Brest-Litovsk, who translated the oily words of the Austro-German diplomats into the brutal language of the sword; that General Hoffman who used the military power of Germany to crush helpless Russia, and was satisfied that he had. . . . As the representative of a conquered country, General Hoffman is naturally not particularly interested in whom to ascribe the cause of the defeat—to the Allies or to the Bolsheviki. Who secures the honor of Germany's defeat is of slight, if any, importance to him. Moreover, as a representative of the German bourgeois-aristocratic military caste, General Hoffman's inclination would undoubtedly be to ascribe the defeat to an opponent

"equal" to him and his class—and "his country;" to ascribe it the political and social system, to the opinions and principles, of the Allies (with whom he has a natural affinity, in fact), rather than to the modern "sans culottes"—the Bolsheviki. Indeed, according to the conceptions of the caste represented by General Hoffman, to be vanquished by an opponent "equal" to himself is less humiliating than being vanquished by an opponent occupying a "lower" social plane. Then this General Hoffman was a star actor in the campaign to defeat and crush the Bolsheviki. . . .

And yet it is General Hoffman who was compelled to admit the victory of the Bolsheviki. In an interview with Ben Hecht, the correspondent of the *New York Globe* and the *Chicago Daily News*, General Hoffman said:

"Germany was not beaten on the western front. Neither Marshal Foch nor Field Marshal Haig nor General Pershing defeated the German armies. Germany was defeated by an upstart named Lenin.

"You ask me what I consider lost the war for Germany. My answer is *Bolshevism*. I will tell you the exact moment that marked the beginning of the end. It was when General Ludendorff telephoned me at the headquarters on the eastern front from France to sign peace—peace with any Russian able to write his name.

"But immediately upon signing with the Bolsheviki we discovered that we had been conquered by them instead of having conquered them. *Our victorious army became rotten with Bolshevism. Our military machine became the printing press of Bolshevik propaganda. We did not dare to send a corps of the German Bolsheviki to the western front. What is worse: thousands of Bolsheviki entered Germany. It was Lenin and the Bolshevik propaganda that defeated Germany, undermined our morale and stirred up the quack Socialists in the country.*" (My italics.)

Replying to the rather naive question of the correspondent as to whether the German military machine was harmed by Scheidemann's "Socialistic propaganda," General Hoffman answered:

"No! Scheidemann was all right. Russian agents did it and German fanatics like Liebknecht."

That the admissions of General Hoffman are not prompted by a secret sympathy for the Bolsheviki can best be judged by his "recipe" for German salvation, proposed to the American correspondent:

"Exterminate Bolshevism with an iron hand and much more energetically than Herr Noske is doing."

Nevertheless, General Hoffman was forced to confess that *the Bolsheviki have crushed the German military machine.*

Bourgeois society will not admit officially the truth of General Hoffman's confession; but it knows that it is true. General Hoffman admits in words that Bolshevism was the menace; bourgeois society, in France, England, Italy and the United States admits it in deeds.

The war produced Bolshevism as a mass movement; and this mass movement is producing the war against capital.

If the likening of Bolshevism to an "epidemic disease" implies a disease among the workers, there is another disease among the propertied classes, and that is *Bolshevikphobia*. The "red-Bolshevik" menace pursued the German military machine—"the conquerors of Bolsheviki Russia;" it is now pursuing the American moneybags, who are stricken with terror. Legislators, meek "priests of God" and newspaper scribes are all bending their frightened imagination upon this problem. The word Bolshevism, recently strange and foreign to the American, now appears constantly in the newspapers as an *American* problem.

In its fit of "Bolshevikphobia," our bourgeois society seeks the "medicine" to end the red menace. It is highly significant that all the "medicines"—whether prepared in an elaborate political laboratory or by the provincial wiseacre—resemble remarkably the legislative measures, of evil memory, of the Czar's regime. Apparently the United States intends "to begin where Russia left off." . . .

Consider the proposals. Here is a bill against "anarchists," unanimously approved by the Senate Judicial Committee. This bill, under threat of imprisonment and \$5,000 fine, forbids the display of flags or the distribution of printed or written works "symbolizing or propagating the overthrow, by force or violence or by physical injury to personal property or by general cessation of industry, of the government of the United States or all governments." Does not this resemble the legislative measures of the Czar? . . .

The issue is clear. Bolshevism penetrated Germany on its way to penetrate other nations. In spite of the statements of the moderate Socialists, who still believe that bourgeois society "has not yet exhausted its revolutionary mission," we are witnessing the coming end of bourgeois society and bourgeois democracy. It is moving with the speed of an express train toward, if not Czarist autocracy, then capitalist autocracy of the worst sort. And, apparently, judging by deeds, there is no difference between Czarism and the bourgeois "democracy" of Imperialism.

The Soviets on the Invitation to Prince's Island

THE Allies recently invited the Bolsheviki to a Conference at Prince's Island (now abandoned). Below we give Tchitcherin's first note on the subject, which is a radio message to Worewski, the Soviet ambassador in Sweden:

A Paris wireless informs us that the Great Powers have the intention of inviting all the governments who exercise any actual power in Russia to a conference on Prince's Island in the Sea of Marmora and specify certain conditions of a military nature as a prerequisite to such a conference. This report is so improbable that we expressly request you to give us some information on the subject.

We have not received any official notice in this matter, and as our only information so far has been through the press we must regard it as a rumor without foundation. If, which we consider improbable, this rumor should be confirmed, we will consider carefully what position we shall take towards it. For the moment, however, we request you to give us all possible information on the matter.

The selection of a solitary island, far from all the political centers of Europe, could only have been inspired by the intention of surrounding the conference with secrecy or at the most giving it only artificial and partial publicity, since the Entente Powers would completely control the avenues of public information. A conference of this kind can by no means satisfy the Russian people or the class conscious masses of the other countries. We desire nothing so much as to "express in the most open and candid manner," as the Paris message phrases it, our wishes and conceptions about the situation in Russia, but Prince's Island is the most inappropriate place for that and we do not see how in this way the true publicity, which we consider vitally necessary, can be secured.

The subject of the conference itself seems obscure

to us. A territorial agreement between various governments (here the telegram has been mutilated) could be successfully reached at a conference of their representatives, and that all the more, if third powers participate. But in Russia the situation is much more complicated. You have no doubt learned that the Social-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks have proposed an alliance with us for the purpose of jointly fighting against Kolchak. . . . The fight which the mass of the people of Siberia wage, is directed against the most extreme reactionaries and the monarchists, and as long as the latter have the upper hand, with the aid of the Entente, the fight will continue.

Where the power of the Soviets is established quiet is complete and the civil war no longer exists. Where, however, foreign bayonets support the role of the reactionary elements civil war is unavoidable. If the Entente Powers desire an adjustment, the only means whereby it can be accomplished is by their abstention from interference in this internal struggle and this is what we ourselves desire. A decision for arbitration by third powers (mutilated). To break off the fight is an impossibility, since this fight is directed against the most extreme reactionaries and monarchists. The proposal for mediation is rather peculiar coming from those governments which participate in the fight against us and whose armies are occupying parts of our country.

Just as peculiar are the military conditions, which, according to the Paris wireless, are a prerequisite to the conference. The proposal for a cessation of hostilities, which was not made when we were in a difficult position, now comes at the moment when the forces of reaction are retreating more and more rapidly.

At present the rule of the Krasnovs in on the verge

of collapse and its fate is sealed as soon as the aid, which first the Germans and later the Entente powers extended to them, is withdrawn. The capital city of Dntov has been taken. In Siberia the revolt of the workers and poor peasants increases from day to day, and the position of the reactionaries was shaken immediately a part of the Czecho-Slovaks departed.

The demand for the withdrawal of troops from the territories, whose autonomy is being planned by President Wilson's fourteen points seems not only obscure to us, but also apt to become a source of new conflicts, which would appear to be in opposition to the wishes of the Entente.

Although the Ukrainian Soviets have supported themselves by their own forces in the fight against the directorate, it is known to us that the directorate spread the false report that the troops of the Russian Soviet Republic have flooded the Ukraine. The demand in question could therefore become a new weapon against the Ukrainian Soviet Government; the same could also be the case in several other territories.

All these measures stated in the Paris message are therefore in complete opposition with the aims which the same message attributes to its originators. Therefore we beg of you to inform us what are the exact facts of the case with this supposed decision of the Entente Powers, the statement of which seems so peculiar to us.

If it is possible for you to examine the documents relating to this conference, do so carefully, then let us know whether in your opinion the Entente has annexationist designs upon Archangel, Siberia, Baku, Askaniad, Rostov on the Don, in short upon all those territories where their support has thus far made possible the maintenance of reactionary rule. Our acceptance of the military proposals of the Entente would mean the firm establishment of this reactionary rule.