

The Revolutionary Age

A Chronicle and Interpretation of Events in Europe

Vol. I, No. 14

Saturday, January 18, 1919

Price 3 Cents

The Necessity of an Emergency National Convention

EVER since the cessation of hostilities it has become increasingly clear that the Socialist movement of America must formulate an opinion upon the momentous happenings through which the world is passing. The last considered opinion of the American Socialists was issued at the St. Louis Convention and dealt almost exclusively with the war. The war, as it was then, is over, and in its place have developed new antagonisms and new problems; arising out of the war itself and out of the revolutions which the war developed. The war was merely as a preliminary struggle, in which contradictory elements were by the necessity of the moment forced to make alliances. With the signing of the armistice these elements gradually began to resume their correct relationship and out of the welter of nationalistic war began to emerge the real alignment of the conflicting forces of the world—the forces of Capitalism opposed to the forces of Socialism.

Day by day this alignment becomes more distinct. The shades of opinion are gathering together and assuming definite color. The lines of demarkation are becoming definite and distinct. The two conflicting elements—Capitalism and Socialism—are drawing to themselves all their sympathetic forces for the final struggle. . . .

Many Socialists foresaw this development, even through the smoke of battle, and endeavored to adapt their programs to the new conditions, but even the most foresighted never anticipated the incredible swiftness with which the revolution has swept onward. Socialism, from the position of a weak movement propagating an ideal, has leapt to the position of a vital force in action, dominating the trend of the world. In all the calculations of statesmen and diplomats Socialism is now the dominant factor and the chief concern of bourgeois governments is the defeat of this new force.

But with this sudden transition from theory to fact, the Socialist movement of the world has had to face new problems within its own ranks. Old values have gone by the board and men who prior to the war sat in the same councils, fought the same fights, suffered for the same ideals, are now engaged in death grips. Where the revolution has marched into action, the assault on the aristocratic remnants of feudalism has been a matter of practically no moment. The proletariat moved, and aristocracy, in the old sense, crumbled on its thrones. With the collapse of aristocracy the revolution faced its real enemy, Capitalism, dressed in the habiliments of bourgeois democracy. And led by men from the ranks of the Socialist leadership! The real struggle of the revolution, while essentially a struggle between Socialism and Capitalism, was the fight between Socialists and Socialists. Majority Socialism, first in Russia and now in Germany, became frightened by the development of its own theories and after a period of fruitless compromise found itself doing the work of its bourgeois masters.

This situation in the countries where the revolution developed is necessarily reflected in the Socialist movement of the other parts of the world. Within the Socialist movement is developing antagonisms, differing fundamentally from the antagonisms which are necessarily a part of any healthy progressive movement, and these antagonisms will inevitably rend the Socialist Party of this country into a thousand fragments if it is left without any definite plan of action or well-considered program.

Due to a variety of causes, these antagonisms have

as yet not assumed definite shape in the American movement. A vague feeling of uneasiness, a restlessness, is so far the only outward sign that they really exist, but the convocation of this "International Congress" will precipitate the crisis and finally split the movement unless the membership is given an opportunity of expressing its attitude.

The Second International is dead, dead at the hands of some of those pledged to uphold it, and it can never be revived. Many of the men who spoke loudly against war, who swore by the brotherhood of the world's workers, went over to their respective governments when war broke. They used their voices, their pens and the prestige accruing to them as members of the Socialist International to drive worker against worker. Having once started on the downward path they did not stop at glorifying international war, but when the Russian proletariat rose, overthrew the Czar and subsequently the bourgeois Socialists who would have cheated them of the fruits

Resolution adopted by the City Central Committee of Local Boston, Socialist Party of Massachusetts, on January 14, 1919.

(1) Whereas the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party has decided to send delegates to represent the party at a gathering of degenerated ex-Socialists, to be held in Lausanne, Switzerland;

(2) Whereas the organizers of said gathering and the delegates invited to it are mostly men well known as traitors to International Socialism, who, having concluded a Holy Alliance with the capitalists, monarchists and reactionaries of their respective countries have sacrificed in the world war millions and millions of proletarian lives on the altars of Capitalism, and have helped to jail and execute International Socialists, who remained true to the principles of Socialism;

(3) Whereas the purpose of their convention is to make the world safe for Capitalism—by organizing more backward elements of the working class to act as hangmen of International Proletarian Revolution—as we have seen it already in Russia, and see it now in Germany;

BE IT RESOLVED:

(1) To demand from the National Executive Committee the immediate recall of delegates appointed to a conference of traitors without the consent of the membership;

(2) That a National Convention of the Socialist Party should be called without delay, to decide on steps to be taken for laying a foundation of a conference of the Third International, where no room should be left for traitors to the working class;

(3) To call upon all true Socialists in the Socialist Party to join in our protest against this betrayal of Socialism by our National Executive Committee, and to take steps for a thorough house-cleaning in our party, as there should be no place in it for traitors to the working class;

(4) To give this resolution the widest possible publicity in party circles and the Socialist press.

of their efforts, these men joined their governments against Revolutionary Russia. And now that the revolution is in action in Germany they have joined with the Kaiser's generals to destroy the revolution and to enthrone Capitalism in the Kaiser's place.

Even at this moment the streets of the principal cities of Germany are running red with the blood of the workers who are dying to save the revolution. The "Socialists" who told the German workers that they must march to the trenches at the behest of the Kaiser and his junkers and now using "loyal" troops to mow down those workers who would banish Capitalism for ever. These "Socialists" have jailed Radek, the Bolshevik envoy to Germany, because he is a Socialist. Are the Socialists of America to meet in

council with the men who are jailing the representative of Revolutionary Russia?

These men who have betrayed every principle for which Socialism stood now call an "International Socialist Congress." By cablegram they invite the American Socialist movement to send delegates to such a Congress. Camille Huysmans, the pre-war secretary of the Second International, issues the c. l. The Socialist movement of America knows nothing of the matter except what is conveyed in a brief cablegram and what it can glean from the bourgeois press.

Socialists are fighting and dying in Europe that Socialism may triumph, mankind is trembling on the brink of world-wide Social Revolution. The action which the American movement takes now will commit it to the policy of Socialism or the policy of counter-revolution. Can such a momentous step be taken on such scanty information as we possess? Huysmans is one of those who have betrayed Socialism; newspaper dispatches report that the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviki) have already refused to participate in this Congress on the ground that it is counter-revolutionary. These facts, all the information we have so far obtained about it, would indicate that American Socialism has no place in such a gathering. Are we to act in a slipshod fashion as such a moment?

The early date set for the present Congress is another matter which may well give us pause before we decide. Why has the notice of the meeting of this Congress been so short? How is the membership of the Socialist movement of the different countries to express an opinion on the matter when they have had no time? This in itself is a suspicious circumstance. It may be that those who are calling the meeting do not want the workers to have any say in the matter. It may be that they wish to commit the various countries to a plan of action that does not represent the rank and file. It may be that the purpose of this Congress is to bolster up the forces of counter-revolution in Germany. Naturally Scheidemann would turn to those "Socialists" of the enemy countries who have taken the same attitude in their countries as he has in his, and naturally Huysmans would not turn to Liebnicht or Rosa Luxemburg when he wanted an ally in Germany.

Again on such a momentous matter it is vitally necessary that the whole American Socialist movement decides on what policy to pursue and the only effective method of so deciding is the convocation of an Emergency National Convention. Let the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party immediately call such a convention and there let the American movement decide what course it will take—whether it will stand by the Russian workers and the Spartacus Group in Germany, or whether it will line up with the Social-patriots who call themselves Socialists and who are attempting to stifle the revolution.

The National Executive Committee has already selected three delegates to attend this Congress, but in so doing it acted beyond its power. No small group of men has the right to pick out the representation of the party, no small group of men has the right to decide that the party will participate in such a Congress. The three delegates appointed should be immediately recalled and without delay an Emergency National Convention should be convoked, first to decide whether or not we will participate in what has all the earmarks of a reactionary Congress, and then to take the further steps necessary to bring about the convocation of the Third International. The International of the revolutionary proletariat of the world who are even now marching on to victory.

The Revolutionary Age

A Chronicle and Interpretation of Events in Europe.

LOUIS C. FRAINA Editor
EADMONN MACALPINE Associate Editor
Contributing Editors

SCOTT NEARING LUDWIG LORE
JOHN REED SEN KATAYAMA
N. I. HOURWICH G. WEINSTEIN

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)

Saturday, January 18, 1919

American Journalism

MR. HEARST and his papers have recently been the object of attack by other bourgeois papers. He has been denounced as disloyal, pro-German and anti-American and in turn he has denounced his accusers as the enemies of the people. All this makes good newspaper copy and is highly edifying to the American workers, besides keeping their minds occupied with unessentials, but there is another aspect of Hearst Journalism which it would be well for the common people to consider.

For some time past the Hearst papers editorially opposed the occupation of Russia by American troops, said a good word for the Bolsheviks and strongly denounced the misrepresentation of the Soviet Government by the American press. At the same time as these editorials appear in his newspapers another agency bearing Mr. Hearst's name, the Hearst news service for the moving pictures, takes quite a different attitude on the Bolsheviks. In one of this series of news pictures an animated cartoon entitled *The Menace* is shown. A scene of desolation and ruin is depicted and gradually as the film develops the giant shadow of a ferocious Russian peasant, with a villainous looking pistol in one hand and a blazing firebrand in the other, is seen gloating over the ruins. The shadow is labelled "Bolshevism."

Which is the true portrayal of the Bolsheviks? Is it the word picture of the editorials, which show the Bolsheviks as a misrepresented, maligned people who are striving to establish order out of the chaos wrought by four years of war and centuries of Czarism; or is it the film picture, which portrays the Bolsheviks as an evil force, armed with the pistol of murder and the torch of incendiarism, seeking what it may destroy. It would be well for the workers to ponder over this aspect of American journalism—if they accomplished nothing else they would at least save themselves from the ignominy of being treated as gullible fools prepared to swallow anything placed before them.

They Are Still There!

PERHAPS the best proof of the real character of bourgeois democracy is furnished by France's action regarding representation for the Soviet Government at the Peace Conference. France! Republican France! Who suffered during her revolution in exactly the same way as Russia is suffering today. The Great Powers of Europe united against her cry of "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity," fearing that behind that cry stalked the "terrible menace" of the awakening of the common people. The best proof of their success in crushing the spirit of the revolution is France's answer to Great Britain's proposals regarding the Soviets.

"The French Government, so far as it is concerned, will make no contract with crime," says M. Pichon, the French Foreign Minister. "By agreeing to recognize the Bolshevik Government we should give the lie to the policy—which the Allies have not ceased to sustain in agreement—of furnishing at all accessible points of Russia all the aid and succor possible to give to the healthy, honest, faithful elements of Russia in order to help them to escape from the

bloody and disorderly tyranny of the Bolsheviks and to reconstitute a regular government by themselves."

Indeed the French Government need make no contract with crime for it is already contracted to the crime of Capitalism. A contract which made possible the loans which the Czar utilized to crush in blood the aspirations of the Russian people in 1905-6 and which necessitated the invasion of Russian territory in 1918 to terrorize the Russian people into paying the money loaned to crush them.

But it would be folly to suppose that because France is the mouthpiece for the refusal to allow the Soviet Government to participate in the Peace Conference—a conference which Russia more than any other single agency brought about—the other capitalist governments are willing to recognize Russia. France is merely the foolish spokesman for the more astute forces of the Great Powers. England makes a plea for a policy of conciliation in Russia, and France refuses...

Since when did England become the conciliator of disputes? Can capitalist England afford to have Bolshevism triumph any more than capitalist France? Even our own bourgeois press shrieks loudly that the United States, removed from Europe by three thousand miles of sea, can not tolerate the growth of Bolshevism in the old hemisphere. And if capitalist America opposes Bolshevism five thousand miles off, how can capitalist England tolerate it when only removed by a few hundred miles? Great Britain's proposal was a straw proposal, made to be refused.

England has a strong working class, a working class becoming increasingly impatient with war against the Bolsheviks, and so she proposes conciliation in Russia. *And very much to her surprise France refuses to be conciliatory!* What a fine talking point for Lloyd-George when he faces the British working class!

America has given Russia many fine words and now England also spins fine phrases about conciliation. But actions speak louder than words. Alien troops are still in Archangel and Vladivostok. . . .

Spargo and the Labor Party

WITH the formation of an Independent Labor Party in New York, Chicago and several other large cities well under way *The New York World* publishes in last Sunday's issue an interview with John Spargo. For some reasons or another *The World* seems to think that Mr. Spargo is an authority on such matters—though *The Tribune* found out some time ago, when it sent him to Europe, that his information regarding the labor movement was very scanty to say the least—and it accordingly gives his views quite a prominent position.

After explaining that Mr. Spargo, although one of those Socialists who were forced to leave the Socialist Party on account of its attitude on the war, has not spent his time "abusing his former comrades—he thinks they were wrong on some fundamental points, but he doesn't think they are either fools or traitors—" *The World* allows him to plunge into the depths of Socialist philosophy. After wallowing around, with the help of the interviewer, finally a leading question is sprung and then "Mr. Spargo smiled."

The interviewer asks would the new Labor Party be "a strictly American party or would it be (here his voice dropped to whisper) *international* in its aims and attitude?" Pausing to smile, Spargo rushes into explanations. After explaining that the Socialist Party is nationalist, although calling itself internationalist, and that all the rest of America is violently internationalist, though believing itself nationalist, and that nationalism and internationalism are one and the same thing except in fundamental differences, he delivers himself: "It is quite possible then that the new Labor Party will not think of itself as international; but if it is a genuine Labor Party it will not only be a Socialist Party in fact, whatever its name, but inevitably must participate in the international Socialist movement."

But despite the confusion of terms that Mr. Spargo sees ahead of the new Labor Party he is very much in favor of it and down at the end of the interview he gives his reasons for his attitude. Labor it appears is beginning to wake up and if things don't go as it wants them to, there is a danger that it may be very

nasty, so Mr. Spargo wants a "sane" unionism, nothing like Russia, that will step by step "realize the full measure of the democracy we have been fighting for." In other words he wants a safety valve, something that will keep the workers quiet without really changing the present system of society. . . . And Mr. Spargo is a Socialist!

The movement to create a Labor Party in America is a healthy sign, a sign of the awakening of the workers to the realization of their real position in society. But it is only a sign, so far. At this stage of the world's development the creation of a Labor Party with a platform of reform, even though it is very liberal reform, is not a thing to be hailed with enthusiastic delight. The day of reform is fast passing away, and a new party that will aim to placate the workers and lull them into a sense of false security may well prove a step backward. On the other hand a small beginning may lead to a great end. It is certain, however, that any movement of labor which does not recognize the existence of the class struggle, aim at the abolition of the wage system and the establishment of industrial democracy, is out of touch with the march of the times and is destined to hold labor back, at least for a time.

We wish the new Labor Party well, that it will develop the class consciousness which its creation indicates is beginning to make itself felt in the ranks of the workers. The surest way to such development lies in having nothing whatever to do with Mr. Spargo or his brand of "Socialism."

Bolshevikjabs

The Peace Conference opens its sessions and all is well with the world except in Russia, Germany, Poland, Ireland, Montenegro, Argentina, Hungary, Italy, Greece, Jugo-Slavia, China and a few other unimportant places.

In fact if the Conference had delayed its sittings for a few more weeks it would have had a much easier task because by that time there would be no peace to discuss.

As Russia, China, Ireland and a few other countries are to be excluded from the peace table it would seem to be alright to call it a Selective Peace Conference.

Perhaps in view of the way things are going in Italy and elsewhere it will be best to call it a Piece Conference.

The life of a Bolshevik leader is at least an eventful one whatever else may be said about. Liebknecht has been killed, jailed, wounded, and exiled within the last week according to press dispatches, while within almost the same period of time Trotzky has fled from Russia, jailed Lenin, executed a thousand bourgeois officers, sent another wife away with several million dollars in gold and been confined to bed with a bad cold. Lenin has not been so fortunate of late having been merely shot while leading Bolshevik troops, thrown into jail in Moscow by Trotzky, closeted with von Ludendorff and overthrown by the Russian Government at Stockholm.

The New York Tribune in a headline tells us that the British Empire is a miniature World League which seems to us one of the strongest arguments against the League of Nations we have yet heard.

It would appear from the press reports that unless a little food is given to the starving workers of Europe they may take all they need.

General von Ludendorff is reported to be busy writing a book which will be in the nature of a defense of his part in the war. It would be a good idea for an enterprising publisher to issue all these books, now being written by former rulers, generals, admirals and diplomats, in a series under the title "A defense of failure."

It looks as if one of the first little countries to be visited with self-determination is Luxemburg. And it serves her right for not resisting the Germans!

Why is Italy like Oliver Twist?

Nothing Doing!

By George Bernard Shaw

The following article from the London "Herald," a left wing Socialist organ, is an interesting analysis of the forces in England. George Bernard Shaw has maintained an attitude all his own during the last five years and although he has supported the prosecution of the war has never surrendered his right to continually criticise the government.

IN finishing itself suddenly and unexpectedly as it did, the war has shown no consideration for the politicians. They calculated that the history of the South African War would repeat itself: that is, that they would secure a khaki election before the end of the war, and that this would enable them to do as they pleased until the inevitable repetition of the 1906 reaction, during which interval they would have time to guide our half-socialized industries safely back into the hands of private Capitalism. That is the Capitalist notion of successful demobilisation. But the war, instead of volplaning to a gentle landing in the spring of 1919, suddenly crashed; and the possibility of a khaki election crashed with it. There was nothing for it then but to rush the election at once, so as to catch what was left, if not of the war peril, which was hopelessly over, at least of the terror that peril had inspired, and to eke out that remnant with the gratitude of the people to the Prime Minister in his character of "the pilot who weathered the storm."

And now the exciting question is, how fast is that terror and that gratitude evaporating? Is the election going to be a khaki one or is it going to repeat 1906, as far as our own limited preparation admits, with a staggering reaction against the tyranny that was a necessary condition of war? We shall not be able to guess until we know; but what we can say confidently is that, though neither Labour nor Liberalism, nor even the two combined, can now oust the Coalition, yet the chances of spoiling the complete walk-over demanded by Mr. Lloyd-George are so good that no sincere Labour politician in his senses would dream of giving the Prime Minister any other answer than that which heads this article.

The Coalition is disconcerted not only by the collapse of the war, but by the equally unexpected and far less welcome thoroughness with which it has achieved the aim which all the Allied Governments had to profess: the overthrow of Autocracy and Oligarchy in Central Europe. Our oligarchs blazed away at Oligarchy with their tongues, just as they might have blazed away at De Brialmont fortifications with field artillery, feeling quite sure that the fortifications would stand. Well, they have not stood. The Oligarchs and Dynasts had been living in a fools' paradise, serenely unconscious of the fact that Socialism had been undermining those fortifications for fifty years and gradually bringing them to a condition in which the explosion of a champagne cork would be dangerous to them. Even those of us who have spent our lives at the undermining had come to feel so hopeless before the apparent strength and depth of the foundations, that we were as much taken aback as anyone when the walls came thundering down in Russia, and, more amazing still, when, before we could discern anything clearly, through the dust cloud that followed, a still more appalling crash was heard in Germany, and Potsdam went down to Potsdamnation in the twinkling of an eye, at what some of us hope may prove to have been the last war trumpet.

As to that, I am not sanguine. The oligarchs and the democrats differ on that subject; and it is pretty certain that both of them will have trouble with the anarchists. And there is a sort of civil war like the late skirmish between the Electricians and the Albert Hall manager,¹ which may develop finally into a very sharp struggle between the Socialists and the Syndicalists. But we need not be in a hurry to bid the devil good morning. If we have a reactionary Government, as at present, then public sympathy will be with any insurgent force that sets itself against the State. If we have a popular Government, insurgency will have a worse time than any autocratic or oligarchic Government dare give it. Moral, for those who do not wish a tiny minority of the nation to have the power of leaving all the rest where Moses was when he put out the candle, strengthen Labour in Parliament.

I had better, perhaps, explain that I have not the

¹The Albert Hall, the largest hall in London, refused to let a meeting, demanding the withdrawal of troops from Russia, be held. The Electricians' Union threatened to plunge the city in darkness if the management persisted in its refusal. The hall was given for the meeting.

smallest objection to a Trade Union literally extinguishing a man in charge of a public hall when he attempts to extinguish a political movement which he does not happen to fancy. I admit that in the absence of any authority that really represents the whole community, social questions must be fought out between sections in this crude way. But it is obvious that when the conquest of the Government by the people is complete, the censorship of public meetings will not be exercised by the Electricians, nor the censorship of travelling by the Seamen and Firemen. It is for that reason that I have not suggested that the Electricians should plunge Lord Sandhurst and Colonel Sir Douglas Dawson into darkness until they consent to license my play, "Mrs. Warren's Professions."

For the moment, however, we are all Pacifists. We do not seem to realize it yet: for instance, none of the electors of Hitchin have yet interrupted Lord Robert Cecil's meetings with shouts of "What Price the Peace Offensive now?" But if any candidate were to raise the cry of "Get on with the War" at present he would run ten times the risk of lynching that ever any conscientious objector ran. I was very strongly in favour of getting on with the war myself; but now that we have got off with it I do not dwell on that side of my recent activities. As Mr. Lloyd George said the other day, after bragging gloriously of the great victory for fifteen minutes on end, "This is not a time for boasting." We are fed up; and we are no longer afraid that if we say so the Kaiser may win.

Yet the war is not over. Are we at war with the Russian Revolution or no? Are we going to wait until a British expedition perishes in the snow to provide a Christmas sensation for us before we pay any attention to this question? I see everywhere the most alarming signs of a hazy belief that because "the war is over," foreign policy no longer matters, even if it exists. People—actually Socialists—ask me why I have such a ridiculous prejudice against poor dear Viscount Grey. I have no personal prejudice against Viscount Grey: I think he is a very nice man for a small tea party, as they say in my native Dublin. I do not even press the point that though he asks to be called Grey of Fallodon, history will call him Grey of Denshawai. But I do press the point, and press it hard, that his foreign policy was the cultivation of that alliance with the Russian Tsardom which was the blackest disgrace, and, is proved, the worst peril of the war. In pursuit of this abominable crime against democracy Sir Edward Grey swallowed every infamy it involved; and he turned his back pointedly on the obvious democratic alternative—now proved to be the right alternative—of an alliance with the United States of America. In this Mr. Asquith was his accomplice; and they both, to avoid stampeding their Liberal non-interventionist majority, deliberately and repeatedly deceived the country as to our moral obligation to throw ourselves into the war on the side of Russia and France when "der Tag" dawned at last. It was not until Russia revolted and overthrew her villainous despotism that our Imperialists suddenly cooled in their devotion to Russia and began to feel their way towards war on the Russian Revolution. And yet people ask good-humouredly, "What's wrong with Grey? What's wrong with Asquith? Why are you so down on them?" Those who, after what has happened, can put such questions, must be simply unconscious of the existence of Europe. They use the word as a geographical expression denoting a place to spend a holiday in occasionally; but it can mean nothing to them politically. They are the same infatuated people who say that the King has no power nowadays, and that the Balance of Power is quite

obsolete. The truth is that the Balance of Power, now that it has to be struck between Democracy and Oligarchy, is a million times more important than when it was only a balance between Willy and Nicky, Charles and Peter, William and Louis, Frederick and Marie Therese and Catharine. President Wilson is the greatest power balancer that ever lived; and whoever is Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs under the first Labour Government here will have to balance heavier weights on his little finger than Viscount Grey had on his two shoulders.

One would have thought that at least we should see the importance of the nationalization of the Air Service. That the home service should be left to the speculations of private adventurers is shallow enough in all conscience; but that irresponsible private persons should be equipped to cross frontiers on such little smuggling and invading raids as might be amusing or profitable to them, without the sort of national control which is the first condition of international control, could only occur to those people, just mentioned, who really believe that all the world is England, though her Continental playgrounds may be kept by foreigners in quaint dresses, speaking queer dialects. Imagine what a couple of big firms, one controlling the aeroplane industry and the other the high explosive industry, could do with the assistance of a hundred young bloods of the Junker class as "aces," and with cunning enough to take good care that their other employees were well enough off to have neither discontents of their own nor any sympathy with the discontents of others!

And yet the opening of the air service between London and Paris by a private firm is announced without protest or misgiving. Actually with delight at the prospect of getting back the old holidays in gay Paree!

What a funny lot we are!

According to press reports England is going to use force to suppress the Sinn Feiners which is merely another instance of the delights of democracy.

However, seventy-five per cent. of the people of any country will require quite a lot of forcing and the seven per cent. of the British electorate that didn't vote for Lloyd-George may require some force also before they agree to a war on Ireland. Force is a very bad weapon when it doesn't work quite smoothly.

It is computed by statisticians that there are up to the present 40 plans for a League of Nations and writers, politicians and preachers still going strong. Why not every man his own League of Nations?

Much of the surprise and annoyance of the Liberals the sessions of the Peace Conference are going to be held behind closed doors. "Open covenants of peace, openly arrived at," has gone the way of all the fine phrases. But, after all, when we sit still for a moment or two and think of some of the things that will be "put over" at the Peace Conference we are filled with a feeling of thankfulness that at least the European diplomats have retained a sense of shame.

"The Revolutionary Age Red Week Conference"

meets every Friday evening at 8 P. M., Room 1, Dudley Street Opera House, 113 Dudley Street, Roxbury, Mass. All S. P. organizations of Boston and vicinity are invited to join the Conference by sending two delegates to the earliest meeting.

ROBERT ZELMS,
Secretary of the Conference.

A Criticism of the Finnish Revolution

By O. V. Kuusinen

Translated by O. W. Oksanen

This self criticism first appeared in a revolutionary publication published in Petrograd, Russia. Since its first appearance it has attracted much attention. For many years O. V. Kuusinen has been recognized as an intelligent and uncompromising representative of scientific social democracy. For seven years he has been the Social-Democratic party leader in the Finnish Diet; he has lectured at the Workers' College in Helsingfors. The European organized labor knows him because of his activity in the labor movement. When in the summer of 1918, the Bolsheviks established a Workers' Academy of Science in Moscow, they put Kuusinen on the faculty. Being directly connected with the Civil War in Finland, and being thoroughly acquainted with the course of action of the Russian Bolsheviks, Kuusinen has observed that revolution cannot be brought on by political action i. e. by the tactics of Social-Democracy. It is certain that American Labor has much to learn from the experience of the proletariat of Finland, and the valuable advice given by Kuusinen.—O. W. O.

forced. The Coalition government generally did nothing. It was like a lazy bull, the Socialist pulling by the horns and the bourgeoisie by the tail, thus holding him immovable. The exploitation flourished peacefully.

Soon the hungry workers entirely lost their faith in the coalition government and in the leadership of the social democrats. In Helsingfors the aggravated workers endeavored to search the butter warehouses and to distribute the butter; late in the summer a general strike broke out in the city, lasting for two days, when it was ended by organized labor. The pressure became so great that it seemed to interfere with our parliamentarism. This was democracy in reality; bringing the class struggle to a climax. But we, the representatives of the social democrats, did not see democracy in reality, but simply its hazy mirage.

This visionary mirage received its first knock from the hand of Kerensky's temporary government. Regardless of the stiff opposition by the bourgeois minority, the Diet had adopted the Russian Workingmen and Soldiers' Council methods for the procedure in the Nation's highest tribunal. From Petrograd a semi-official Menshevik delegation arrived to curb the accepting of this so-called "law of force;" but they arrived too late. Then, during the latter part of July, the Provisional Government dissolved the Diet and a new election was held. Our social democrats twice tried to continue the sessions of the dispersed Diet, but the first time Kerensky's hussars stood at the door; the second time only the seal of the Kerensky party was there; the session was held, but only the social democrats took part.

Our party did not refuse to take part in the new elections held the first of October. Because of the apparent increase in the votes, our party lost the majority place in the Diet. The greatest assistance to the bourgeoisie was the ballot-box stuffing. Immediately after the election newspapers commenced to report incidents where certain localities had more votes cast than there were voters in that district. Here and there in the possession of the chairmen of the election boards could be found ballots cast in favor of the social democrats. By mutual alliance the bourgeoisie also won a few seats in the Diet. But besides this must also be kept in mind that the discouragement of the proletariat, with the results of parliamentarism, also had effect on the election returns. The powerlessness of the Diet, the indefiniteness, delay and the weakening of the result of our work in the Diet, and also the depreciation of the political activity of the social democrats in the wake of the Coalition government, surely, lessened the enthusiasm for the election rather than increased it, as was expected in such a high state of political intensity. Our beautiful, parliamentary, democratic illusion thus received another blow, not only from a stimulus originating on the outside, but also from its inner nervousness and defectiveness.

Now the current of history flowed toward the first whirlpool. As might be well guessed the bourgeoisie, at once, used the advantage got in the election to usurp the dictatorial power and to subject the Diet under this dictatorship.

The working class again had lost all its hope for aid from the Diet and was consciously or unconsciously tending towards a revolution. The Coalition government had already broken up before the elections. Nothing could prevent the class struggle from becoming furious.

The atmosphere in Finland indicated that Russia was progressing towards a new and a more profound

THE proletarian revolution is at all times self critical, says Marx. Our partakers have, indeed, a reason to intelligently aid this self criticism without attempting to withdraw from activities of our early historical responsibility.

The Finnish Revolution had its beginning in January, 1918, but its fundamental errors originated already in 1917.

In the same manner as the war surprised the majority of the Socialist parties of the great European nations keeping them from performing their historic duty, so the Russian Revolution of 1917 surprised the Social Democrats of Finland. The freedom in the spring came to us like a flash from heaven, and our party was overcome by the events in March.

The official stand of our party was the same "independent class struggle" stand as the German Social Democrats had before the war. During the period of reaction this stand was easily safeguarded; it was not then under severe test, nor could the conservative Socialist then get wind into its sails. But in March our party met temptation and failure. In fact, our social democrats became corrupted with the bourgeoisie of Finland, and in the beginning with that of Russia (among the seducers were also the Russian Mensheviks). The Coalition Senate of Finland was the hot bed for this immoral affiliation. In March, when this corruption occurred, half of the members of the council opposed the uniting and only the conservative Socialists were represented. But the front of the rest of us was so passive that it did not interfere in the least with our co-operation with those Socialists who were specially busying themselves with the Finnish and Russian lords. And it was very typical that not a delegate at our June convention—where, by the way, we joined the Zimmerwald alliance!—voted to secede from the Socialists of the Coalition government.

That which blinded us was primarily the mirage of a parliamentary democracy. If the one-housed representation, the relative election methods, and the general ballot had not existed, and if our party had not received the majority at the polls in the summer of 1916, then probably it would have been a little easier for us to prepare ourselves for the spring torture. But now the way of parliamentary democracy seemed clear, smooth and open for the labor movement. The bourgeoisie of our country had no army, not even dependable police; nor could it legally get this, for in so doing it would need the approval of the social democrats in the parliament. The social democrats seemed to have every reason to obstruct parliamentary legality for in this position they would reap one benefit after another.

The vision of a parliamentary democracy, admired in all its glory, was not shadowed by anything but the temporary tottering hand of the Russian government. The bourgeoisie of Finland grasped it as a drowning man grasps a straw. The social democrats wished to cast this parliamentary form of government aside, or at least to fence it up within the secure boundary of legality, so not to permit it to interfere with the internal affairs of the country, that is, to defend the advantages of the bourgeoisie of Finland. Thus our effort in behalf of Finnish independence, our patriotism, appeared most beautiful fundamentally; it, surely, was a direct fight for democracy; it was the organic part of our proletarian class struggle.

The treachery of our parliamentary delusion was further augmented by the results of legislation during the summer. From the eight hour workday law we succeeded in going to such an extent that no parliament has previously reached. Measures were also passed for the democratizing of the municipal government, which meant a change from the completely monopolized power of the capitalists to a general representation—a greater step than has been made anywhere through legislation at one time. It was very evident that these accomplishments were not attained solely through the action of the Diet, but an outside gale forced them out from the hidden shoals of parliamentarism. This gale appeared in the form of a mass demonstration with unusually violent spirit primarily because of the participation of the Russian soldier-comrades. This was nothing new to us, for we have frequently explained that the best results can be obtained from parliamentarism when the people of the outside begin to bring pressure to bear.

Adverse consequence of the result of parliamentary democracy was the fact that flourishing exploitation in the foodstuff market could not be checked. This indicated that the greater parliamentary achievements were achievements only on paper. We were able to draw up a bill and make it a law; but here the checking of the exploitation ceased, the law was not en-

revolution, the outbreak of which was a question of but a very short time. The Kerensky provisional government tottered like a twig in the storm. The Bolshevik strength grew like a thunder cloud.

Our social democrats, who should have used their strength in preparing for the revolution, waited peacefully for a session of the Diet. In November was introduced a provision by which the Nation's highest power would be entrusted into the hands of a three-man committee, but they did not dare pass this provision. At the same time they were negotiating an agreement with the Russian Provisional Government for an equal distribution of power, and the Kerensky Governor-General, Nekrasov, departed for Petrograd for a signature to the compromise.

He did not return to Helsingfors. Under the leadership of the Bolsheviks, the Russian proletariat overthrew the power of the bourgeoisie and their tools and took the leadership into their own hands. The goddess of revolution just then passed over our own nation. We did not step into her chariot, but bowed down and allowed her to fly over us. Then we joined in a commemoration for laying down our arms.

Could a revolution at this time lead to any victory in Finland? This is a different question from that—could the proletarian revolution then have been a victory, directly, as in Russia? The former question, to me, appears possible, the latter, impossible, now as then.

The general advantages of a revolution, surely, were not hopeless. The enthusiasm and desire for fight of the proletariat was at that time high pitched. The bourgeoisie were comparatively little prepared; it was in great need of weapons, having commenced to procure them from Germany. Truly, the proletariat lacked arms. We were able to borrow a few hundred rifles from the Russian soldiers stationed at Helsingfors—these are the only weapons worth mentioning. We would have, however, been able in a great need to have got some more rifles from the Russian comrades. What would have been more important, the Russian soldiers could have given the revolution greater support than during the winter when the break in the Russian army and navy was the greatest. It must be granted that there were some among the Russian soldiers who would not have supported the revolution.

Before these signs of the times, we, social democrats, who stood for class war, swayed from one stand to another, now supporting the revolution, now refraining. The conservative Socialists, numbering about a half of our party, divided, half favoring the revolution, half opposing it. A majority of the social democrats in the Diet opposed the revolutionary efforts in such a manner that it might be said they supported the bourgeoisie rather than the workers. The conservative Socialist leaders of the trades organizations, on the other hand, desired to carry on some sort of revolutionary strike, the chief purpose was to get the majority of seats in the government and the senate. With them our committee formed a "revolutionary central council," which, especially when there were added to it social democrats who took the stand of opposition, could talk of a revolution, but could not take active part in the revolution. This committee in the beginning decided to support the declaration of a general strike. At the trades organization convention, a general strike was declared. Did this mean revolution or simply a demonstration to emphasize the demands of the general strike? Everyone could draw his own conclusion as to this, for it was left undecided because there was disagreement as to it.

The general strike spreading, the question arose about its carrying on. We, vainly called Marxians, opposed its furtherance. Without us the trades organization—the then revolutionists—would not start out. Because we, the middle social democrats, failed to take part in this revolution, we remained in the same position we had been for years. We were social democrats and not Marxians. Our social democratic stand was first, the peaceful, gradual and not the revolutionary stand in the class struggle, but at the same time a stand independent of the bourgeoisie alliance. Both of these together determined our procedure.

First, we lacked faith in a revolution; we did not depend on it, nor did we strive for it. This usually is the common characteristic of the social democrats.

Social democracy, chiefly, is just that kind of labor movement, which organizes and develops the workers in the lines of bourgeois (parliamentary) class war. Its program, truly, has the same aim as Socialism, which, to a certain degree, determines the true or the so-called "nearest" direction of the program of the social democrats. But in the main this is there as a Utopian embellishment, for the reason that Socialism can never exist as a bourgeois state in whose borders the useful activity of the social democrats is limited. That means, which is historically inevitable, of getting from a bourgeois to a socialistic society, the relevant

revolutionary and dictatorial means of the proletariat, that means is entirely outside of the consciousness and practicability of the social democrats; that begins where the action of the social democrats ends.

Consistent relatively of the social democrats to the revolution is, at most, just as passive as the conforming of a forbearing historian to the past revolutions.

"A revolution is born and not made," is the favorite phrase of the social democrats, for nothing to advance the revolution concerns it. According to its nature, it would sooner hinder than aid a revolution (the same as a general strike and other semi-revolutionary mass actions). This is very clear if we look at the practicability of social democracy; revolutionary action disturbs this purpose and threatens to end it. As it is impossible to determine the outcome of the revolution in advance, whether it will be a success at the first attempt and not a failure, it always appears possible that the organized activity and political achievements, the organization, buildings, libraries, newspapers, reforms, democratic institutions, rights, etc., of the social democrats are threatened. Upon these is based the entire activity of the social democrats. In the life of social democracy these have developed in the line of self-interests, they are the chief basis for the continuation and the development of bourgeois legal action. It is for this reason that social democracy wishes to protect and guard them even against the revolutionary dangers.

It is true that in the teachings of social democracy references are made to Marx, explanations are also given of results of organized action with the apparent purpose of increasing and preserving it; and also expressly the necessity and success of the proletarian revolution is kept in view. And assuredly, will not occur because of the efforts of the social democrats, but regardless of them. (The bourgeois army, without doubt, will prove a great benefit to the proletarian revolution, contrary to the purpose of this army organization.) If the social democrats could direct the action of the workers according to their wishes, it is very doubtful if the labor organizations ever would venture such an undertaking as a revolution, or any such aim as Socialism; at least insofar that the bourgeoisie do not provoke revolution with weapons in their own hands. In this one incident you see the social democrat rise—but it is not certain that this is a rise—to revolt for the defense and continuation of his bourgeois class struggle. This resembles our rising the latter part of January.

In November we were about to withdraw from the revolution, partly to protect our democratic achievements from dangers; partly because we hoped, through our parliamentary plans, to turn the whole historical cycle; and partly, also, fatalistically thinking, if the revolution is to come now or later, it would come regardless of our position and thus it would prove itself really powerful.

What is the outcome of this historical error? Did we prevent armed combats? No. It was only postponed to such a time when the bourgeoisie were armed to the teeth, as in November. The bourgeoisie can bring about an armed combat with the workers at any time it wishes. The only danger to the workers is the fact that the bourgeoisie can specify the time of the beginning of this class war. When the proletariat begins it, the bourgeoisie in all localities are not sufficiently prepared for the revolution and to a greater or less degree are surprised by it; especially where the conservative ruling power has made itself extensively hated, here the revolution started by the workers can sweep along the dissatisfied layers of society, or at least can scatter and weaken the opposing lines. Where such conditions exist as exist in the warring countries, where even the proletariat has weapons in hands, it is extremely important that a class war should begin; the revolutionary power, within a very brief period, could unarm large numbers, capture a great deal of supplies necessary for the revolution, suitably arrange the most dependable troops for the defensive and offensive against the "internal enemy," also to arrange all its strength into passive or active counter-revolutionary action. It is certain that the government at the beginning of a class war has attempted to arrange the outside political conditions in a way most beneficial to itself, to arrange for foreign help when in greatest need, or at least to protect itself from the external enemy. In November it would have been more difficult for the bourgeoisie in Finland to get assistance from Germany than after a large number of her troops were liberated on the eastern front. We could not have imagined this fact in November.

Secondly, we, middle Socialists, did not desire to unite with the bourgeois "democracy" in any governmental alliance, which kind of an alliance was hoped for by the conservative Socialists that supported the revolution and those that did not. Without this kind of an alliance, the aim of the conservative Socialists, who supported the revolution, could not be fulfilled, i. e., the bringing about of a democracy. This group, or at least a majority of them, advocated that the restriction in the exploitation of food materials, and the

bringing about of the various democratic reforms should be done through the Diet. The conservative Socialists thought it very necessary that in this "red senate" inspired by revolution, there should be some representative of the peasantry. With this in view, a conference was held during the week of the general strike, attended by the conservative Socialists, and social democrats, who invited the representatives of the peasants, and of other "progressives." The result of this conference was that Comrade Tokoi went to question the officials of the senate if they wished to remain in the service of the "Red Senate." Thus the revolutionary desire of the revolutionary Socialists was to bring to life the coalition senate of the spring in a more complete form, through the aid of the Socialist majority, leaving out the most conservative.

Under favorable circumstances, this might have been the direct result of the November revolution. Nothing more. The labor movement of Finland could acquire nothing more. Part of the organized workers, without doubt, would have demanded a further step to be taken, but the easily satisfied majority could have appeased this demand and silenced the revolutionary voice of the proletariat, by turning immediately after having attained their aim, against the desire of the revolutionary workers for dictatorship. By this, the majority surely could have obtained its own purpose. Looking back to it now, makes it seem more realistic than at that time. It is apparent that the bourgeoisie of Finland would have had to yield that much to the revolution in order to save their chief advantages, which were not threatened by the revolutionary movement of the conservative Socialists. According to all probability the November revolution in Finland would, in truth, have become a bourgeoisie democratic revolution. This most assuredly would have been followed by a split in the ranks of organized labor, the right side to defend the "commonwealth" would join the bourgeoisie, the left would take a stand for true revolutionary Socialism, or communism, and would have risen against the bourgeoisie state and all its forces.

This is the proximate outcome of the revolution we, the so-called "Marxian Democrats," had in mind as early as on the week of the general strike. But we had two important reasons for not supporting the outset of a revolution. First we did not desire to aid the

alliance of the Social-Democrats and the bourgeoisie. Secondly, we wished to avoid the breaking of the labor party into two bitterly opposing parties, even in this instance our trend was in the direction of the Social Democrats and not towards Marxism. Truly we hindered historical progress, which had ripened into unavoidable conditions, by avoiding this break in the ranks of labor; but this action made it possible for labor to progress in the lines of revolution. This organization was unable to proceed because it had to support two opposing principles. Its collapse was possibly injurious to the action of Social Democrats—to parliamentarism and craft unionism. The aspirations of election returns surely decreased; but for the true progress of labor and the strengthening of class war, this break was a sure benefit. By this break labor would have been freed from injurious and obstructing elements which would not have been so dangerous to a workers revolutionary class struggle while in the bourgeois ranks as in the ranks of the workers. It is true that we could not dictate the outcome of the revolution however we strove. History alone would dictate it. We should have done our part in aiding history. Even history cannot do its duty empty handed. Even though a great ice-flow in the current of Finnish class struggle history had not occurred, it would have been dammed up by the bourgeois democracy, yet this flow would have been a long stride in advance for it would have broken up the huge layer and could concentrate its force upon the small jam until it would have been crushed. The procedure at the time of the breaking of the ice a stream is the quickest and most natural. It was carried on in Russia in this manner. It is the quickest way of getting a start. A large part of the resistance in a shackled bourgeois state here becomes useless. On the contrary, the breaking up of the flow may last for weeks until the whole will suddenly give away.

We kind of checked the beginning of the drift by calling off the strike within a week and postponing the question of revolution until the party convention. Dissatisfaction and bitter anger because of these doings were very general amongst the workers. This dissatisfaction did not break out in open riot against the leadership of the party, but its effect may be very injurious to the future class struggle for it broke the confidence of the workers in the leaders of the movement. Leadership which needed fire to struggle against the enemy of labor, had only the cold coals of suspicion. The suspicion and envy thus created has been a nightmare during the whole period of revolution. In November it already predicted the disorganization of April. The party convention, assembling after some weeks, at that time felt that the surge of general feeling for the revolution had passed, because of the cross-winds this surge was gradually disappearing. The representatives of the party convention were selected already in the spring under different conditions. Half of them seemed to support the revolution, the other half was against it. We of the center, wished by all means to keep our party together, and "succeeded." The summarizing resolution did not contain a word for or against the revolution, but had considerable of the spirit of Independent class struggle: in addition it had a group of reformation demands from the bourgeoisie, encouraging the workers to make armed preparation, not for offensive purpose, but for purpose of self defense.

Self defense became the greatest momentary need of the bourgeoisie. Seeing that they were temporarily free from the dangers of revolution they commenced to prepare consciously for the offensive. Publicly they carried on a fierce anti-Socialistic chase, and in a less conscious manner developed their war plans; gathered arms, organized and drilled the slaughter guard and sent agents with rush business to foreign countries. Locally unorganized revolutionary eruptions burst forth automatically with their anarchistic side interests. One burst in Abo. Parliamentary procedure was now injurious to the affairs of the workers. It only employed unnecessarily the powers which might have been used in the preparation for the approaching revolution. It only blinded and led astray from seeing what is about to happen, what the bourgeoisie prepared for and what the proletariat should have prepared for. When the November revolution threatened, by majority action, the diet passed a resolution that in the parliament, no governmental clique, would have the greatest governmental power. This seems a real, even though, a weak step toward a real faultless "democracy." At a meeting of the Constitutional Committee we attempted to draft on paper a plan for the construction of this beautiful state, we also decided to give a prize for the grandest flag patterned for the flagpole of Finnish Democracy. . . .

Then we heard from the mouth of Sir Svinhufvud (dictator of Finland) the Constitution of Capital which has only one article: "Iron hand regime!"

This was a brutal and blood-thirsty Constitution, but it referred to the reality and violence of the history of class wars, when many social democrats were dreaming of a democratic constitution won through a victory in election.

Labor Defense Conference
will hold
**A PROTEST
MASS MEETING**
for release of political prisoners
Sunday, January 19, 1919
at 2 p. m.

Grand Opera House

cor. Washington and Dover Sts.

SPEAKERS:

Jim Larkin

H. W. Dana

Edward Morgann

Eadmonn MacAlpine

ADMISSION FREE

Auspices Boston Socialist Party

Jim Larkin

Will Speak at

Dudley Street Opera House

113 Dudley St.

On

Sunday, January 19, 1919

At 8 P. M.

Auspices James Connolly Literary Society

The Background of the German Revolution

By Louis C. Fraina

III

FUNDAMENTAL issue of the Russian Revolution had been the issue of peace. On this issue class antagonisms developed implacably—the imperialistic bourgeoisie had to continue the imperialistic war, because its interests and its world-relations were bound up with it; the revolutionary proletariat and the impoverished peasantry had to struggle for the end of the war, as war was devouring the Revolution and multiplying misery and oppression. The new proletarian Soviet Government, organized on November 7, issued an offer to all belligerents for an armistice on all fronts as a preliminary to concluding peace on the basis of no annexations and no indemnities. The Bolsheviki recognized that their program was not realizable through an appeal to the governments, but only through an appeal to the proletariat for pressure upon the governments and the revolutionary struggle against Capitalism and Imperialism—the revolutionary struggle against all Imperialism was the means of securing peace, immediate, real permanent.

The German Government accepted the armistice—for purposes of its own; the Allied Governments rejected the armistice—for purposes of their own. And on this issue of the armistice, as on the issues of the war, majority Socialism again divided on nationalistic lines—German majority Socialism favored the armistice, majority Socialism in France, Belgium and Great Britain repudiated the armistice. The governments had become the arbiters of "Socialist" policy.

The Allies refused, equally, to enter into general peace negotiations; and imperial Germany and Soviet Russia engaged in a peace conference at Brest-Litovsk in December, 1917. The Bolshevik delegates offered proposals for a general peace, all the while appealing to the Allied proletariat and Socialism to compel their governments to accept peace negotiations; but their appeal met no decisive response. The abstention of the Allies allowed Germany to force separate peace negotiations upon Russia. The Austro-German delegates accepted the formula of no annexations and no indemnities in words, but repudiated it in fact, insisting upon indemnities and the annexation of the Baltic Provinces in veiled form. Trotzky and the other Bolshevik delegates exposed the sinister imperialistic aims of the Austro-German delegation, but to no avail: German and Austrian Imperialism, with the tacit approval of majority Socialism, had determined to impose an imperialistic peace of violence upon the Soviet Republic.

The Bolshevik delegates used the forum of Brest-Litovsk to speak to the proletariat of Germany and Austria, and of the Allied nations. Their policy at Brest was supplemented by an intensive agitation among the Austrian and German Soldiers for revolutionary action against the war. This propaganda assumed gigantic proportions; and when the German delegation insisted that this propaganda should cease, Trotzky answered that the armistice terms did not forbid freedom of press and propaganda; and when the Bolshevik delegation officially crumpled, the propaganda went on.

This revolutionary propaganda among the Austro-German troops had been going on for months previously. When, due to counter-revolutionary treachery, Riga was captured in September, the Army Committee of the Twelfth Russian Army, upon evacuating the city, issued a proclamation to the German soldiers: "The Russian soldiers of the Twelfth Army draw your attention to the fact that you are carrying on a war for autocracy against Revolution, freedom and justice. The victory of Wilhelm will be death to democracy and freedom. We withdraw from Riga, but we know that the forces of the Revolution will ultimately prove more powerful than the force of cannons. We know in the long run that your conscience will overcome everything, and that the German soldiers, with the Russian Revolutionary Army, will march to victory and freedom." In October, a formidable mutiny broke out in the German fleet at Kiel, and the sailors of the Russian Baltic fleet sent their greetings:

"The revolutionary sailors of the Baltic Fleet send their fraternal greetings to their heroic German comrades who have taken part in the insurrection at Kiel.

"The Russian sailors are in complete possession of their battleships. The Sailors' Committees are the High Command. The yacht of the former Czar, 'Polar Star,' is now the headquarters of the Fleet Committee, which is composed of common sailors, one man from each ship.

"Since the Revolution, the Russian Fleet is as busy as formerly, but the Russian sailors will not use the fleet to fight their brothers, but everywhere to fight under the Red Flag of the International for the freedom of the proletariat throughout all the world."

For months the soldiers had been fraternizing on the eastern front, the Russians spreading revolutionary ideas among the Germans and the Austrians,—

a fraternization objected to by the imperialists on all sides, since it was a revolutionary threat to all. At the All-Russian Soviet Congress on November 8, a peace decree was adopted, proposing an armistice and appealing to the proletariat of Germany, France and Great Britain to "decisive and energetic action," which "will help us bring to a successful conclusion the fight for peace, and at the same time the liberation of all the working classes from slavery and exploitation." Simultaneously, a proclamation was issued to the German soldiers, announcing that Socialism and the proletariat in Russia had conquered all government power:

"Our program, to the execution of which the Government has immediately proceeded, consists in the proposal of an immediate democratic peace, which has already been communicated to the belligerent nations and their Governments, in the transfer without compensation of all the land to the peasants for their use, and in the realization of Workers' Control of industry. . . .

"Soldiers, Brothers! We ask you to stand by Socialism with all your might in the struggle for immediate peace, as that is the only means to secure a just and permanent peace for the working class of all countries, and to heal the wounds which the present most criminal of all wars has inflicted on humanity."

A Bureau of International Revolutionary Propaganda was established by the Soviet Government, and 10,000,000 tracts appropriated to assist revolutionary Socialism in all belligerent nations. A series of daily papers for revolutionary propaganda, in German, Hungarian and other languages, which were circulated by the millions among the Austro-German soldiers—while the delegates were discussing at the peace conference. . . . One of the appeals to the German soldiers read as follows:

"Brothers, German soldiers! The great example of your comrade Karl Liebknecht, the most eminent leader of International Socialism, the persevering and long-continued struggle which you have conducted by publishing newspapers and pamphlets, by numerous demonstrations and strikes, the struggle for which your Government has thrown into prison hundreds and thousands of your comrades, and lastly, the heroic revolt of your sailors of the Fleet serve as a guarantee to us that the mass of the working class of your nation is ready to enter the decisive struggle for peace.

"Hasten to our assistance! In the name of the Workers' and Peasants' Government we guarantee that our soldiers shall not move one step forward if you decide to take into your hands the flag of peace, and even if the struggle for peace inside your own country takes away part of your forces from the front. . . ."

The proletarian revolution in Russia, in its struggle for peace and for its own complete success, had to struggle for the international revolution. It issued, accordingly, the clear call to class action, to the proletarian revolutionary struggle: by this sign alone could it conquer. . . .

The Brest negotiations proceeded. The aims of Austro-German Imperialism were clearly revealed, and were in turn revealed to the Austro-German soldiers by means of revolutionary proclamations, pamphlets and papers. The German revolt did not materialize; Austro-German Imperialism became even more brutal and insistent. . . . The revolutionary Socialists in Germany, in spite of all disadvantages, supplemented the Bolshevik propaganda at the front by a revolutionary propaganda of their own. Many revolutionary appeals were issued, of which this is one issued by the Spartacus Group:

"The German Government has demonstrated by means of the negotiations at Brest-Litovsk, that it wishes to throw dust in the eyes of the masses and to aggravate the death struggle of the warring peoples. Its pretended love for peace is merely a mask. Its statement that a partial peace would bring us nearer to a general peace, is a lie and imposture.

"A separate peace with Russia would increase the fury of the war and, consequently, increase the slaughter. The sufferings of the German people would not be abated.

"It becomes the duty of the German working class to battle unceasingly for a general peace.

"There is only one means of putting an end to the present butchery and misery of the workers—the overthrow of the government and the bourgeois class, in the way that this was done in Russia. It is solely by mass effort, by the revolt of the masses, by a mass strike paralyzing all economic activity and all war industries; it is solely by a revolution and the establishment of a people's republic in Germany by and for the working class, that an end may be put to the slaughter of the toilers of all lands, that a general peace can be achieved."

In January and February, 1918, all this agitation expressed itself in action. Great strikes and demonstrations against the war and for peace broke loose in Germany and Austria. This action verged on revolution. In Austria, in one district alone, 90,000 were on strike, and the total must have been over a million. It was the initial mass action of the proletariat, out of which might have emerged general revolutionary action against war, against Capitalism and Imperialism. The strikes and demonstrations in Austria broke loose against the orders of the union bureaucracy and the majority Socialism: when the news of these strikes

reached Trotzky, he badgered the Austro-German diplomats into postponing the Conference for a week, hoping that the movement would broaden and deepen. But in Austria, majority Socialism, in spite of not having acted to produce the movement, placed itself at the head and betrayed it into "legal" action. The movement spread to Germany, where hundreds of thousands of workers were involved; but again the union bureaucracy and majority Socialism acted against the movement. Majority Socialism ordered the strikers back to work, preached incessantly against a revolution, betrayed the German proletariat and the Russian proletariat, the cause of Socialism and peace. The movement was not broken by the government, but by counter-revolutionary Socialism: that is the great fact.

Isolated, abandoned equally by the proletariat and Socialism in all belligerent nations, the Bolsheviki at Brest-Litovsk were overwhelmed. But again Trotzky refused to accept the imperialistic treaty imposed by German Imperialism, and turned to the desperate expedient of a "declared peace"—that is, the Bolshevik delegation refused to sign the "robbers' peace," but declared the war at an end: a final appeal to the world, and particularly to German Socialism. But Austria and Germany insisted upon signing the peace, and sent their soldiers to invade helpless Russia. This was in February. Two currents developed in Russian Bolshevism—one favoring a revolutionary war, however desperate, the other insisting upon ratifying the peace, and waiting for the proletarian revolution in Germany. Lenin represented this latter attitude, and said:

"The Russian Revolution, reaching a culminating point in November, when the proletariat secured the reins of Government, was bound to pass through a period of civil war and internal disorder, because the propertied classes could not be expected to give up their privileges without a struggle.

"Therefore the war with reactionary organizations (the fight against the sabotage by which the *intelligentsia* tried to overthrow the Soviet Government by breaking the state machinery), must continue until the bourgeoisie sees the hopelessness of further resistance and surrenders unconditionally.

"This means the necessity for the Soviet Government to concentrate all its forces on the internal struggle."

The policy of the Russian Revolution must be based on the general international situation—namely, the probability or improbability of the outbreak of Social Revolution in the rest of Europe; but the chances of of this in the immediate future are slight. Therefore it is a mistake for the Russian Revolution to base its policy on uncertain eventualities:

"In Germany the reaction has temporarily triumphed, setting before the Russian Revolution the alternative of further war or an annexationist peace.

"To sign a peace with German Imperialism is not objectively speaking, treason to international Socialism.

"When workmen are beaten in a strike, and have to accept bad terms from employers, they do not betray their class because they cannot get all their demands at once. They only accept bad conditions in order better to prepare for another struggle later on.

"If the Russian Revolution continued the war in alliance with Anglo-French Imperialism against Austro-German Imperialism on the basis of the old secret treaties recently published and not openly repudiated by the Allies, then it would be prostituting itself to foreign imperialists.

"As long as there is no Social Revolution in England and Germany, the Russian Revolution must seek the most profitable conditions in existence, relying as little as possible on the English or German governments negotiating one against the other.

"It is not true that the Russian Revolution is deserting Socialist comrades in England and Germany by signing a separate peace. It takes them longer to do what Russia has done because their Imperial Governments are stronger than the old Russian Imperial Government. Nevertheless, the material weakness of Russia forces her to recuperate for internal reconstruction."

It would be a rash adventure to enter upon a holy war against German Imperialism, even if Russia were able to do so, on the chance of revolution in Germany breaking out in the next few months, for meanwhile defeat would mean more onerous conditions for the future developments of the Russian Revolution:

"Russia, if she has peace, can become the envy of all lands, and the centre of gravity of the Socialist world. By concluding a separate peace Russia can utilize the fact that the Anglo-German imperialists are too much engaged in a bloody struggle to attend seriously to her. She can therefore concentrate on the internal development of the Revolution.

"If Russia, under present conditions, attempts both enterprises—internally to reap the full fruits of the Revolution, and externally to carry on the conflict against foreign Im-

"After the strike movement had been killed, Dr. Drews, Prussian Minister of the Interior, said the strikes had served Germany's enemies, and accused the Social Democratic Party of encouraging the strikes. To this the Berlin *Vorwarts*, organ of majority Socialism, answered by quoting Prime Minister von Dandl of Bavaria as having thanked the Social Democratic leaders in a speech in the Bavarian Chamber of Deputies for "ensuring control of the strike movement, as thereby the strike was forced into normal channels." Could timidity and treason to Socialism reach lower depths than this?

Craft Unionism and the New Movement

By Michael T. Berry

STARTING with the proposition, that the historic mission of the working class is the overthrow of the political state, and the substitution of the Industrial Republic of Labor, the world's workers must be made to understand that they must part with the past.

"New occasions teach new duties. Time makes ancient good uncouth. We must ever up and onward who would keep abreast of truth."

Nowhere is the sense of these lines more obvious than when applied to the efforts of the working class on the industrial field.

To any one whose intellect enables them to reason intelligently from cause to effect, one thought above all others is clearly manifest; that the pure and simple craft union with its methods and spirit are in the daily warfare on the industrial field, as ineffective as the bow and arrow of the savage when pitted against the modern machine gun.

Craft unionism, whether it be the A. F. of L. or the host of independent unions organized in opposition to the rule of Gompers & Co., accepts the wage system and its accompaniment, the Political State, as finalities.

From the false premises of pure and simple, or craft terrorism all sorts of false teachings are given to the rank and file of the working class by these capitalist Job Trusts with the result that in the English speaking world, at least, the economic organization of labor reminds one of the story of the building of the tower of Babel, when one asked for one tool he was handed another with the result that the end was confusion worse confounded.

Craft unionism started with capitalism and it sings the same song today, when capitalism has grown to giant stature, that it sang in the valleys of Lancashire when the giant of today was a puling infant "A fair days wage for a fair days work" was its shibboleth then and is now, it regards that as the alpha and omega of the endeavors of the working class.

The cornerstone in the edifice of craft unionism is "Fight capital with capital" "Keep Politics out of the Union" "Capital and Labor are Brothers" "Capital is entitled to its share" "There is an aristocracy of Labor."

On this false foundation Gompers' castle rests. From these false principles have come all the false teachings which have caused the workers to wend their way from the cradle to the grave, through a valley of tears.

No analysis of these "principles" is necessary here. Suffice it to say that the proof of the pudding is to be found in the eating, and when the workers, 52% of whom according to the U. S. Industrial Commission's Report of 1916 earned \$10.00 per week or less, are asked to "fight capital with capital" it looks as though the one who proposes such a scheme was a combination of fraud and fool. Mostly fraud. It is equally fraudulent to say "Keep Politics out of the Union" because it is clear enough to the intelligence of a child that either the politics of the Boss or the politics of our class *must* be in the union all the time.

To say that "Capital and Labor are Brothers," is to assume that he who listens is a fool. The brotherhood is of the Cain and Abel kind. There is a red streak around the globe traced in the blood of one of these "Brothers" spilled by the other.

To say that "The capitalist is entitled to his share" is pure "bunk" whatever might have been said when the capitalist acted the part of a worker either as a foreman or director of industry, that cannot be said today. Today all big industries are organized on the lines of joint stock companies or trusts, and the capitalist performs no kind of useful work. He is like a flea on the back of a dog, he simply absorbs, sponge like, "his share" of the surplus value wrung from the brain and brawn of brutalized and ensnared labor.

There is no "aristocracy of labor," craft unionism notwithstanding. But in attempting the application of that theory the workers are kept divided into small crafts with their separate "sacred" scabby contracts which render defeat the necessary accompaniment of their efforts to improve their conditions.

Is it any wonder that in the face of such a suicidal and criminal program as is undeniably the program of Gompers and Company, is it any wonder that each succeeding census in this country from 1870, has revealed the fact that the conditions of the working class is absolutely and relatively declining?

Was not the late Mark A. Hanna, one of the most notorious, as well as the vilest outragers of labor in America in his day, right, when at a meeting of the Civic Federation in New York City he entered with Gompers on one arm, and John Mitchell on the other and introduced these worthies to his brother outrager and exploiter of labor, Seth Low, as "My trusted Labor Lieutenants?"

As long as the working class clings to craft unionism such leaders are a necessary consequence. It breeds them as a Jersey swamp breeds mosquitoes. It is inescapable, and the emancipation of the working class is impossible because they benumb the mind of the worker and disgrace the working class in the eyes of its enemies.

No man or set of men is ever respected until he or they first respect themselves. That respect once wrung from the foe the battle is half won.

But "the world do move," and Gompers and his troglodyte institution must go, they cannot secure a vote of confidence from labor except by fraud, and false pretence. In the place of this miserable program which has put crepe on the door knobs of the working class, the Industrial union must rise. "One great union of the working class." Industrial unionism represents the intelligent and civilized expression of the American working class and it gives its program to the world in these words:

"The working class and the employing class have nothing in common. There can be no peace so long as hunger and want are found amongst millions of working people and the few who make up the employing class have all the good things of life.

"Between these two classes a struggle must go on until the toilers come together on the political field under the banner of a distinct revolutionary political party governed by the working class interests and on the industrial field under the banner of one great industrial union to take and hold all means of production and distribution and to run them for the benefit of all.

The Background of the German Revolution

(Continued from Page 6)

perialism—she will lose both her objects; but if she concentrates on internal development now, she will secure her second victory later.

"The war will last long and Imperialism will finally be unmasked completely, on both sides. The example of the Russian Revolution will continue to inspire the peoples of the world, and its influence will be enormous. On the one side will be the bourgeois system and war for conquest waged by two imperialistic groups, on the other peace and the Socialist Republic.

"The reorganization of Russia, based on the dictatorship of the proletariat, the nationalization of banks and of big industry, the exchange of products of the cities with the co-operatives of small peasants, is economically quite feasible, provided we have a few months to devote to the job. Such an organization will make Socialism unconquerable in Russia, and will provide a permanent basis for the formation of a powerful red army of peasants and workers."

The Lenin conception conquered; and the All-Russian Soviet Congress in March, 1918, ratified the Brest-Litovsk peace.

Brest-Litovsk marked the first break in the imperialistic war, and was a great contributing factor to the coming of peace. If Soviet Russia had continued the war it would have meant the triumph of the counter-revolution and Capitalism; and the German proletariat, surrounded on all sides by capitalist nations prepared to cut the throat of their revolution, would have hesitated. But, with a Socialist Russia prepared to assist, a tremendous ideologic impulse was given to the coming of the German revolution. Moreover, while the Bolsheviks ceased the military war against Germany, they continued the class war of revolutionary propaganda, smuggling agents and literature into Germany urging a proletarian revolution. The Bolshevik Ambassador to Berlin, Joffe, was the centre of the revolutionary propaganda, using his "diplomatic couriers" to bring into Germany money and literature for the use of the revolutionary Socialists. The class war was waged by Soviet Russia, in Germany and all Europe, the struggle for the international proletarian revolution.

"The rapid gathering of wealth and the centering of the management of industry into fewer and fewer hands make the trade unions unable to cope with the ever growing power of the employing class because the trade union fosters a state of things which allows one set of workers to be pitted against another in wage wars.

"The trade unions aid the employing class to mislead the workers into the belief that the working class have interests in common with their employers."

"This sad conditions must be changed, the interests of the working class upheld, and while the capitalists rule still prevails all possible relief for the workers must be secured. That can only be done by an organization aiming steadily at the complete overthrow of the capitalist wage system and formed in such a way that all its members in any one industry or in all industries necessary cease work whenever a strike or lockout is on in any department thereof thus making an injury to one an injury to all."

This intelligent program of industrial unionism must supplant the suicidal one which Gompers and his tribe use to keep themselves in clover and the rank and file of the working class chained to the chariot wheels of Capitalism.

The A. F. of L. is the legitimate offspring of Capitalism. It came into being in 1881. It was created to put the Knights of Labor out of business, which it did. "Canny Andy" Carnegie was its midwife and at that early day in the development of American Capitalism was class conscious enough to scent danger in the K. of L. which was organized in 1869 by Uriah S. Stephens, a Philadelphia tailor, who constructed its program from the "Communist Manifesto" which he got from Geo. J. Eccarius, a London tailor, and secretary of the International Association of Workmen.

American craft unionism was born the tool of Capitalism. It has been at all times since, the tool of Capitalism. It is what the Wall Street Journal, leading organ of American Capitalism, proclaimed it to be some twenty years ago, "The strongest bulwark against Socialism in America."

At best it is but a job trust, and as such it is no part of the labor movement. It fights any attempt to organize the entire working class. It seeks to organize as many as it can find jobs for. It could not if it would, and it would not if it could do away with the cause of the workers' misery—the private ownership and operation of the means of production, distribution and exchange. It deals with effect, not with causes. It is eternally plucking some small pimple from the face of Capitalism, but never looks for the cause of the pimple or seeks to cure it. Its tactics have dug the brains out of the American workers and made them reactionary. It has forced them to walk through a slaughter house into a grave yard.

After forty years it has gathered some 2,000,000 members and has succeeded in organizing them against themselves and the working class of the world.

For these reasons it must go. It is a positive stumbling block to working class progress and its career must close by the organizing of the American proletariat for the overthrow of the wage system in one great union formed on industrial rather than on craft lines.

Otherwise Socialism, which is another way of saying the Republic of Labor, is an empty dream, a phantom to be chased by fools.

The Revolutionary Age Book Department

"RUSSIA AND THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS"

The Soviet's note to President Wilson and Russia's reply to the Neutral Countries.
Price 5c each. Wholesale price 3½c each.

"CHAPTERS FROM MY DIARY"

By Leon Trotzky

Price 10c each. Wholesale price 7½c each.

In Course of Preparation

"THE GERMAN REVOLUTION"

By Louis C. Fraina

A New Appeal

By John Reed

IT is time for American Socialists to do a little painful thinking. For my own satisfaction I should like to set down here what I think about the American Socialist Movement.

From my observations in different parts of the country, I should say that, roughly, the American Socialist party is composed of two main elements:

1). American petty bourgeois, (Clerks, shopkeepers, administrative officers of small business, a few farmers); and American intellectuals (journalists, mainly).

2). Foreign-born workers; foreign-born intellectuals.

The most significant facts in the American Labor Movement are the American Federation of Labor and the I. W. W. These two organizations prove that political Socialism has very little attraction for the American workingman; in fact, they prove that the American workman is *opposed* to Socialism.

Why?

Let us consider first, the American Federation of Labor. This is a purely economic organization, whose power consists in the fact that it *defends* certain workers against the assaults of the capitalist class, which by raising the cost of living and depressing relative wages, is always attempting to reduce the working-class to the condition of peonage. Above all, men who work with their hands are practical, and the American Federation of Labor offers a *practical* program.

By reason of the history of this country, its boundless lands and natural resources, the stupendous growth of its cities, the immeasurable opportunities presented to energetic individuals in the immense demand for food, manufactured goods, and means of transportation, and the fluidity of social boundaries, the American worker has always believed, consciously or unconsciously, that he can become a millionaire or an eminent statesman. This is expressed in the saying, once heard often but now less frequently that "any American boy can be President."

The American worker knows that this country is owned and controlled by "the Trusts." But he does not realize that the day of universal opportunity has passed. He believes, consciously or unconsciously, that he can still rise above the working-class, and above his fellows. And because *many thousands* believe this, their unanimous sentiment is opposed to any system, like Socialism, which wishes to destroy their imagined opportunity.

Moreover, although the American worker is profoundly disgusted with the dominant Democratic and Republican parties, and if you ask him what he thinks of such-and-such a political candidate, will say, "Oh he's just a dirty politician. They're all alike—they make promises, but they never do anything when they get elected," although the American worker knows that Congress, the State Legislatures and the City Councils are used by business interests for their own selfish purposes—still he does not know how to answer when he is told, "Well, if you don't like your officials, vote for somebody you *do* like. You are the boss. This is a free country."

The American worker still thinks *politically*, instead of *economically*. No one has ever been able to tell him, in a way which he understands, that in our state of society the vote is almost powerless. As I have said, he knows that the men he elects to political office are dominated by Big Business after they get elected; but he doesn't realize that unless he, *the worker*, takes away the *power* of Big Business before he elects his representatives, those representatives will always be bought—or if they are honest, they will always be powerless.

Why doesn't the American worker vote the Socialist ticket? In the first place, he probably doesn't like Socialism, which means to him only a system worked out in foreign countries, not born of his own particular needs and opposed to "democracy" and "fair play," which is the way he has been taught to characterize the institutions of this country. In the second place, if he has become conscious of his *class* interests, voting for the Socialist party seems to him *impractical*. "They won't win," he says. "it will just be 'throwing away my vote'."

Of course he does not see that voting for a candidate who promises and does not perform, is just as much "throwing away his vote" as voting the Socialist ticket.

Sometimes, however, the candidate *does* perform his promises; sometimes the popular discontent *does* force a legislative body to pass some needed social measures. The worker is satisfied; he does not follow the law to its most important stage—its operation. He

does not watch the Courts which interpret the law. For example, take the various Anti-Injunction bills which have passed Congress, hailed by the American Federation of Labor as "a new Magna Charta." And yet injunctions are still used as weapons against the workers in industrial disputes. . . . Consider the Child Labor Law, declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court. The list of cleverly drawn and inefficient labor laws on the statute-books is endless. . . . And if the laws, as sometimes happens, are effective, the employers simply refuse to obey them, and drag out litigation in the courts until the whole matter is quietly forgotten.

The American worker does not see to the heart of the society in which he lives. When the truth becomes too obvious, he is easily persuaded that all abuses can be corrected by agitation, by the law, by the ballot-box. He does not see that *the whole complex structure of our civilization is corrupt from top to bottom*, because the capitalist class controls the sources of wealth.

And yet there is one important truth which he has learned. He knows that the immediate problems of his daily life in industry cannot be solved by politics. For that is necessary a kind of insurrection—direct action—the strike. His craft union, however, is only vaguely interested in the problems of *other* unions, and this vague interest is manifested by the organization of the American Federation of Labor. One union will handle the scab products of a factory in which another union has called a strike. What business is it of the teamster, or the railroad man, who makes the material he transports?

And then, also, a defensive organization such as the American Federation of Labor is necessarily composed of limited and exclusive kinds of workers, because half their power lies in the fact that they are the *skilled* men, and therefore must protect their privileges, not only from the employers, but also from the great mass of the untrained workers who might lower the level of their position. Half the victories of American Organized Labor are at the expense of the unorganized and the unskilled. . . .

The machine character of modern industry, however, is itself operating a change in labor organization. The day of the skilled man is passing. Any man can run a machine. In Bridgeport, for example, all the trouble arose from the fact that the employers took untrained men and trained each man to do *part* of the work of a skilled machinist—at wages less than the machinist was doing it. Three machinists cost a good deal in wages; but three men, each trained to perform one-third of a machinist's function could do the work of three machinists, and do it for much less money; and at the same time the Machinists' Union was smashed.

In various sections of American industry there is appearing now a new tendency. Political parties are being organized; the American Labor Party is a symptom of this new movement. But why an American Labor Party? Why not the Socialist Party? The reason is that the Labor Party is a *practical* organization, designed to carry out politically the work done economically by the Unions; while all the Socialist Party has to offer is the election of candidates to office, where they are uniformly impotent, on a platform which is too broad to appeal to the craft union training of the American worker.

The I. W. W. presents another phase of the same question. Here again is an organization which is *practical*, and appeals to the man who does things with his hands. If an American worker becomes conscious of his class-interests, and sees the truth, he naturally wants to change the system of society in the most practical, the quickest way. He sees that the workers must control, first of all, the sources of wealth. He sees that the ballot does no good. Industrial action works; he knows that. He realizes the utter failure of the craft-unions as organs of a working-class bent on controlling industry. He is disgusted with politics. Why should he bother the vote at all? Revolutionary direct mass action is the only weapon he needs. . . .

If anything were needed to demonstrate the value of political action, the Russian Revolution ought to do it. No true Socialist denies that the parliament of the future Socialist State will be an Industrial parliament; but the transformation from the political to the industrial system must be expressed by political action, whose value in the class struggle lies in the fact that it *creates opportunities* for the education of the workers, and for industrial direct action, and

protects these two essential methods of the struggle of the working-class for power.

If the immediate program of the Socialist party in this country is inadequate, that is because it is not influenced by the needs and power of the American workers, who above all others, are competent to formulate the Socialist program in this country. If the Socialist party is politically impotent, however, it is because there is behind it no economic force from the American working-class.

The dominant theory of Socialists about Socialist propaganda to American workers seems to be the "Menshevik appeal;" to give an impression that Socialism is really Jeffersonian democracy, to intimate that all we want are reasonable reforms, labor legislation, the full dinner-pail. The idea seems to be, "First make a Liberal, and then convert him to Socialism." This is my interpretation of Socialist campaign literature, and Socialist speakers at election time. Fully a third of the Socialist votes in normal times, are, I think, cast by middle-class persons who think that Karl Marx wrote a good Anti-Trust Law. . . .

I have no quarrel with that kind of Propaganda—except that it does not make Socialists. My idea is to make Socialists, and there is only one way of doing that—by teaching Socialism, straight Socialism, revolutionary Socialism, international Socialism. This is what the Russian Bolsheviks did; this is what the German Spartacus group did. They approached not Socialists, but *people*: workers, peasants, soldiers, who did not know what Socialism was. First, they found out from the working people what they wanted most. Then they made those wants into an immediate program, and explained how they were related to the other demands of the complete Social Revolution. And they explained, explained, eternally explained. . . .

Revolutionary Socialism is not a refined theory adapted to cultivated minds. There is no value in inventing new Socialist tactics, merely so that intellectuals can discuss what Karl Marx would have thought about it. Revolutionary Socialism, above all other kinds, must be *practical*—it must *work*—it must make *Socialists* out of workers, and make them quick.

Comrades who call themselves "members of the Left Wing" have an immediate job to do. They must find out from the *American workers* what they want most, and they must explain this in terms of the whole Labor Movement, and they must make the workers want more—make them want the whole Revolution.

They must do this in words which can be understood immediately by the workers, in terms of their own lives. In this lies the secret of success of the Non-Partisan League. In this lies the secret of success of the baby American Labor Party—or will lie, if it is successful. We, however, have a bigger job than the organization of either of those movements; for we must include them and go beyond them, and our appeal must be first of all to those whom they do not touch—the unorganized, the unskilled, the landless, the propertyless. . . .

That all workers belong to the *working-class* and must be conscious of it; that all the sources of wealth belong to the capitalist class—who *are* conscious of it; that this wealth must become the property of the workers before they can control their own lives; that the civilization we live in, and our Government, are controlled by Force—Economic Force—and that it can only be opposed by Economic Force.

And finally, the workers must be told that *they have the force*, if they will only organize it and express it; that if together they are able to stop work, no power in the universe can prevent them from doing what they want to do—if only they know what they want to do!

And it is our business to formulate what they want to do.

Said Nicolai Lenin, at the Peasants' Congress in Petrograd, "If Socialism can only be realized when the intellectual development of all the people permits it, then we shall not see Socialism for at least five hundred years. . . . The Socialist political party—this is the vanguard of the working-class; it must not allow itself to be halted by the lack of education of the mass average, but it must lead the masses, relying upon the Labor Organizations for revolutionary initiative. . . ."

And again, at the Third Congress of Soviets, "You accuse us of using force. . . . We admit it. All Government is legalized force, controlled by one class and used against another. For the first time in history, we in this hall are creating a legalized force controlled by the working-class, the vast majority of the people, and directed against those who have exploited us and enslaved us. . . ."