

The Revolutionary Age

A Chronicle and Interpretation of Events in Europe

Vol. I, No. 8

Saturday, December 14, 1918

Price, 3 Cents

Open the Prison Gates!

ONE of the chief subterfuges to which Capitalism frequently resorts to mask its real character is the refusal to recognize the existence of conditions which it cannot successfully defend. Thus although at the present time thousands of men and women languish in jail for political offenses as the result of an act of Congress aimed at, and almost exclusively executed against, political heretics, the existence of political prisoners is not officially recognized, even though the act providing punishment for political offenses is still in operation.

Autocracy recognizes its political offenders, "politicos", because autocracy is government from the top, and anyone who questions the sanctity of its laws is guilty of Lese Majeste. Under autocracy it is not necessary to violate a law, merely to question its righteousness is a crime, because in questioning the law of autocracy the inviolability of the autocrat is assailed. Democracy is theoretically the rule of the people, by the people, for the people. Under democracy the questioning of the laws or acts of those chosen to administer the government becomes not only a right, but a duty. Hence a democracy, theoretically and by its very nature, can not punish those who question the political wisdom of its acts or laws.

Thus when Capitalism finds it necessary to cast aside the fiction of democracy in its acts, it continues to remain democratic in theory by the simple expedient of refusing to recognize the existence of the victims of those acts, in the same manner as a society lady snubs those whom she considers socially her inferiors and rests secure in the thought that what she does not recognize does not exist.

In this country the hysteria of war was used to enforce measures for punishing those who refused to subscribe to the prevailing ideology, and as a result thousands of men and women are undergoing long terms of imprisonment for "offences" which the majority of the people do not recognize as offences in normal times. The very arguments by which these people were convicted—that whatever their rights might be under ordinary circumstances they were subservient to the general welfare of the people as a whole in the face of a great emergency—are the strongest advocates of their immediate release, from the bourgeois viewpoint, now that the emergency has passed.

But by far the vast majority of these prisoners were not convicted and sentenced because they were a danger to the welfare of the whole people in view of the national crisis, but because they were a danger to Capitalism, and the national emergency furnished a means whereby the people could be made to acquiesce in their incarceration. The I. W. W., the Socialists, the men who stood for the freedom of the individual, the liberals, were imprisoned for criticising the existing state of society, and because present day society is resting on a foundation of sand and this criticism was revealing the facts of the case to the people at large, they will remain in jail after the emergency, that superficially was the cause of their imprisonment, has disappeared.

The war is to all intents and purposes over. The military and naval power of the enemy has been broken, yet the prosecutions against those who dare to reveal Capitalism in its hideous nakedness continue. Eugene V. Debs, a man who for over half a century has borne an unblemished

reputation as a fearless fighter in the cause of the world's oppressed, whom his very prosecutors proceed against with shamefaced excuses for the nature of the work they are performing, and who is already under a sentence that almost certainly condemns him to death in a felon's cell, is reported to be again under investigation with a view to further prosecution under the so-called Espionage Act—prosecution which has long since ceased to have any title to the term prosecution, but which rather takes on the nature of the more ugly word persecution.

The trial of five members of the Socialist Party for alleged attempts to hinder the successful prosecution of the war by the government, is even now preceeding at Chicago, though the war is over. Victor L. Berger, one of the five men in question, has been again indicted since the cessa-

Political Amnesty

Resolution passed by the Central Committee of Local Boston, Socialist Party, December 10, 1918:

While the discussion rages about Germany making reparation, there is a reparation that the Socialists and the workers generally must insist upon—reparation to the men and women imprisoned for their courageous insistence upon the rights of free speech and free press, men and women punished for their efforts to make our own country safe for democracy during the war.

Thousands of men and women are languishing in prison, while the government is preparing to sentence still others, not for any ordinary crime, but for offenses recognized as political by every other country in the world, including formerly Czarist Russia.

Whether that was its purpose or not, the Espionage Act was used to crush Socialism, to strifle the free expression of ideas, to cow the American people.

But whatever its necessity during the war, even that alleged necessity exists no longer. The problems of the coming peace are vast and fundamental requiring the freest expression of ideas; but while the reactionary has full freedom of expression, the Socialist may be jailed if he fearlessly, frankly, and fundamentally discusses the problems of war and peace.

And yet this full, free and fearless discussion is absolutely necessary, otherwise, the coming peace will be a reactionary peace.

It is therefore resolved, by the Central Committee of Local Boston, Socialist Party, that the Espionage Law should no longer be in operation;

That complete amnesty is the right of every man and woman now in jail, or in danger of going to jail, for political offenses;

That the working class and all labor organizations should consider these two measures as vital to the workers' interests, and that not alone should the working class demand, but it should struggle and use its industrial might to accomplish this purpose.

tion of hostilities and must stand trial twice under indictments that, reduced to everyday language, charge him with being an enemy of the people, although the people of his residential state have declared by the suffrage that he enjoys their confidence to such an extent that they have chosen him to assist in the administration of the national government.

William D. Haywood faces what to a man of his years means life imprisonment for attempting to gain better living conditions for that section of the people who constitute a large proportion of the population of the country, the unskilled workers, and with him in Leavenworth jail are over a hundred of his associates, while all over the country others are being sentenced daily to long terms of penal servitude for the same "crime."

Thomas J. Mooney, who was tried before this country actually became involved in war but against whom the war hysteria was also subsequently used, is doomed to spend his life in jail

although it is stated by high officials in the government that this case did not receive a fair and impartial trial.

These few instances, out of the thousands which exist, are sufficient to show the real nature of these prosecutions, the fact that with the cessation of hostilities the prosecution of the cases pending have not been dropped, and the continuation of indictments under the Espionage Act clearly show that the powers that be have no intention of granting a general amnesty.

France has promised that she will grant amnesty to her political prisoners, Italy has already put such an amnesty into effect, as has Germany, Austria, Hungary and Bulgaria. England and America alone of the Western powers have remained silent on the question, but in England the prosecutions have ceased and even during the war the sentences imposed upon the most outspoken critics of the war and the government were mild compared to the 20 and 30 year sentences imposed in America.

Events move with lightning rapidity during these days of change and already many of the ideas, which those now lying in prison advocated, are being accepted by the masses as their vision clears, other of these prisoners' thoughts are projecting themselves into the discussions now engaging the world's attention. It is gradually emerging from the smoke of battle that many of the hitherto generally accepted theories of government work injury to the people, new values are being created, new standards are evolving, men are groping blindly for the solution of old problems only to find themselves faced with new ones. A new era is being born. Are the apostles of this coming era to lie in jail? A world that studies the question must answer, no. Even from a selfish viewpoint, the answer must be the same. These men are needed in the world today. Those who foresaw the coming of the new era are surely needed to help grapple with the problems it will produce.

But in this new era is contained the destruction of many things dear to the heart of those who benefit under the present system and it is precisely because these heralds of the new system of society hold the key to the solution of the problems now facing the world, that the disciples of the present system will endeavor, not only to keep those already sentenced in jail, but to put behind prison bars those who see with the same clear vision.

If these prisoners are to be released, if the bastiles of Capitalism are to be thrown open, it is the workers—those for whom the new day is dawning—who must liberate them. To this end the class conscious workers must devote themselves, the Socialist Party must bend its efforts.

There appears to be a tendency towards the formation of various leagues to effect a general political amnesty, but this road leads to failure. Only the working class can effect the desired result. There must be unity of aim and unity of effort. The vast majority of those lying in jail are there because of their fealty to the cause of the proletariat and in turn the proletariat must act in fealty to them, and to themselves.

United, the workers are invincible; divided into various sections, by no matter how kindly disposed persons, they are doomed to failure. Let the workers speak with one voice and the vibration will shatter the prison walls.

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 WEDNESDAY AND SATURDAY

By Local Boston, Socialist Party

H. G. Steiner, Business Manager

885 Washington St., Boston, Mass.

Three months, \$1.00; bundles, 2c a copy

Saturday, December 14, 1918

Annexations and Indemnities

It was said, during the war, that the Allies accepted President Wilson's "14 points" and that these repudiated annexations and indemnities. This was never a fact. Responsible ministers of the Allies accepted, in words, the "14 points" and the formula "no annexations and no indemnities." But precisely as Germany accepted this formula, and then at Brest-Litovsk interpreted it in the sense of annexations and indemnities, so now representatives of the Allies are urging annexations and indemnities. Disguised as these demands may be they are yet brutally apparent. Moreover, President Wilson's "14 points" were interpreted as a repudiation of the secret treaty agreements concluded among the Allies. But the governments of the Allies have never repudiated these secret agreements, exposed by the Bolsheviks as infamously imperialistic; in fact, some months ago, British Minister of Foreign Affairs Balfour declared publicly that "Great Britain was in honor bound to abide by the treaty agreements with her Allies." These monstrous secret agreements, accordingly, in spite of all the idealistic camouflage, are still considered as in force. Does this make for a democratic and lasting peace, for making the world safe for democracy? . . . The intervention of the Socialist proletariat is necessary.

Soviets and Allies

THE bourgeois-"Socialist" Government of Scheidemann, Ebert, Haase & Co. has sent a message to the Russian Government asking it not to send a delegation to the German National Congress of Soviets, on December 16, because of "the present situation in Germany." The invitation to the Russian Soviets was issued by the Executive Committee of the German Soviets of Workmen and Soldiers.

Simultaneously, the press prints a Copenhagen report, which says: "According to reports from Berlin, the Entente Governments intend to refuse to send foodstuffs to Germany until a demand they have made for the dissolution of the Soldiers' and Workers' Councils is carried out. The Allies, the reports add, will reserve the right to march into Germany."

Is this actually the decision of the Allies, or is it propaganda of the counter-revolution in Germany to frighten the masses? The bourgeois-"Socialist" Government is encouraging this sort of thing, by retaining Dr. Solf and Dr. Erzberger in the government, and using Erzberger as an armistice plenipotentiary. Scheidemann actually tells the masses: "behave, or the Americans will make you!" It is either the Soviets or the Allies, revolutionary co-operation with the one or mercy from the other, either a bourgeois peace or peace with Revolution. The revolutionary policy Liebknecht is the only proletarian policy.

They Are Still There!

SENATOR Hiram Johnson has introduced a resolution seeking information from the State Department as to the activity of American soldiers in Russia: "Are we fighting Russia? If we are not, why are we keeping American soldiers in Siberia and in Vladivostok? What is America's intention as to Russia?"

In the meanwhile, Senator Hitchcock, of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, is in communication with Prince Lvov and Colonel Lebedeff, representing the counter-revolution, who urge that more American troops shall be sent to Russia—to crush Socialism.

The German Barons and the bourgeoisie of Livonia, Esthonia and Courland, formerly the Bal-

tic Provinces of Russia, who represent a very small minority of the people and who united with German autocracy during the war against the masses, are urging allied intervention against the Bolsheviks—which means against the majority of the people, the workers and peasants. The British fleet is reported at Libau, upon invitation of the reactionary government.

The Ukrainian landowners and bourgeoisie, who united with the Austro-German autocracy against the workers and poorest peasants, are, now that German bayonets are withdrawn, helpless against the wrath and might of the workers and peasants that they oppressed, and are calling for the bayonets of the Allies.

At Stockholm, a new "Russian Government" is being organized, to be headed by the former Czarist Premier, A. F. Trepoff, one of the bloodiest and most implacable of the instruments of autocracy. It is declared that the Entente will support this "new government" while it temporarily rules Russia—in Stockholm, Sweden!

Is this the answer to Senator Johnson? Are American troops to restore autocracy in Russia?

The press teems with reports of starvation in Russia. But the Allies are starving Russia, by blockading her ports, by preventing Russia buying food and agricultural machinery in the markets of the world. Instead of shedding hypocritical tears over Russia's starvation and blaming the Soviets, end the blockade of Russia, let the Russian people determine their destiny in their own way.

Alien troops are still at Archangel and Vladivostok! Are more alien troops to go into Russia, provoke war, produce starvation on a larger scale, intensify the sufferings of the Russian people?

How Much Longer, O Karl?

IN the Berlin "Tageblatt," addressing Karl Liebknecht and the Spartacides, Theodor Wolff exclaims: "How much longer, O Karl, will you abuse our patience?" Until you and your class can no longer abuse the patience of the proletariat, O Theodor! Until the counter revolution is crushed, and the proletariat conquers all power. Until the Capitalist class can no longer have its "patience" abused, since it will have been completely annihilated by Socialism. Patience? The proletariat has long been patient, too long, in fact; and now that it is in action, it will consider not at all the patience of you and your class, O Theodor, and deprive you of all the privileges and power comprised in ruling over the proletariat. For four and a half years the proletariat's patience has been abused by the most bloody war in all history; and now its day has come, it is ready for the reckoning, which is the overthrow of Capitalism. Karl will abuse your patience, O Theodor, until you and your class are turned into relics of an infamous age. . . . And Philip Scheidemann, who intrigued against the Russian Revolution, and then piously washed his hands of all responsibility for the Brest-Litovsk infamy, this Pontius Pilate Scheidemann exclaims: "I will not put up with these conditions another week. I will get out." And describes Liebknecht as a "person" who lacks "every sense of responsibility." Get out, Philip; that's exactly what the German proletariat wants! Responsibility? Did you have a sense of responsibility when you supported an infamous imperialistic war, betrayed Socialism and the proletariat? . . . Keep the revolutionary fires burning, Karl! They will yet set the world afire.

Waging the Class Struggle

THE other day, a delegation of the French Socialist representatives in the Chamber of Deputies, of social-patriots and including the "centre" compromiser Jean Longuet, had an interview with Premier Clemenceau. They protested against the campaign for an imperialistic peace—Clemenceau declared he had nothing to do with it; they asked him if he cherished imperialistic aims—Clemenceau made a vigorous denial; they asked him if he would consent to an interpellation in the Chamber on peace terms—Clemenceau answered he would not allow any such thing. Then the delegation, having gloriously and successfully waged the class struggle, departed—to prepare new questions and arrange new conferences. And this is Socialism! It is the legitimate policy of the social-patriots and betrayers of Socialism; but Jean Longuet? Or is it a fact, after all, that "centre" Socialism in substance is identical with the social-patriotic policy of petty bourgeois Socialism?

Reconstruction in Germany.

THE problem of power in Germany, which is the decisive problem of the Revolution, is equally a problem of reconstruction: shall reconstruction proceed on a capitalist basis, shall it proceed on the basis of Socialism?

Germany, much more than any other nation except Russia, has suffered from the war. The "marvellous organization" of the government while averting disaster temporarily, multiplied the factors of disintegration. The financial system is verging on collapse; industry is in process of disorganization; foreign trade destroyed, of markets now in the control of rivals, Imperialism no longer an instrument; the old Capitalist twisted awry and compelled to adapt itself to new and disastrous conditions. The wounds inflicted by the war upon the German people, and all belligerent peoples, are terrific; and reconstruction is a process of healing these wounds. But the determining issue is whether the process shall be Capitalist or Socialist.

There is, moreover, the question of indemnities. As it is, and at its best, Germany's problem of reconstruction is enormous; and if indemnities are exacted, if the Allies are to demand the huge payments proposed by some of its representatives, then reconstruction becomes hopeless complicated. Without indemnities, reconstruction in Germany will mean that the proletariat will pay tribute to the German capitalist class! With indemnities, reconstruction will mean that the proletariat will have to pay tribute to the German capitalist class and the capitalist class of the Allies.

It is not a question of which is the better prospect, but of which is the more hopeless.

The problem of reconstruction which the German proletariat must tackle is the same as the problem of the proletariat of France, Belgium, Great Britain and Italy, enormously complicated by military disaster and the collapse of the power of German Capitalism for successful imperialistic competition.

Revolutionary Socialism in Germany insists that real reconstruction is possible only through Socialism, by means of conquest of power by the proletariat. The whole system of Capitalism and Imperialism comprised in the old German system must be destroyed; reconstruction must proceed without paying the tribute of profit to the capitalist class, without reconstruction being limited and stultified by the profit system. The reconstruction of a new society, the real healing of the wounds of the war, the protection of the proletariat against oppression and new wars, is not possible while Capitalism and Imperialism persist in Germany.

Revolutionary Socialism in Germany, moreover, realizes that indemnities would complicate the problem of reconstruction in Germany, and would not measurably ease the burdens and facilitate the process of real reconstruction for the proletariat of Belgium, Great Britain, France and Italy. Revolutionary Socialism, accordingly, struggles for the proletarian revolution in Germany as the climax of the proletarian revolution in Russia and equally struggles for the proletarian revolution in the rest of Europe, since only by the general overthrow of Capitalism and the general dictatorship of the proletariat can reconstruction proceed on a basis of Socialism, of healing the wounds of labor, and not of capital. Revolutionary Socialism strives for an alliance with Soviet Russia and with revolutionary Socialism in all European countries.

This is not an attempt to shift the burden—that is the policy of Capitalism in Germany, no of revolutionary Socialism—since the overthrow of Capitalism will facilitate real reconstruction and benefit equally the proletariat everywhere.

Moderate Socialism in Germany, in policy and as represented in the bourgeois-"Socialist" Government, refuses to accept the overthrow of Capitalist supremacy as the necessary preliminary to real reconstruction. "The Berlin Bourse," says a press report, "and banking and industrial circles do not expect the immediate enactment of radical measures. The impression prevails that the Ebert-Haase Government is convinced that the present political and economic situation is inauspicious."

This is confirmed by Majority Socialist Paul Hirsch, Prussian Minister of the Interior, who opposes a dictatorship of the proletariat, and warns of a tremendous deficit in the state finances; by Emil von Strauss, one of the leading directors of the Deutsche Bank, who declares his opinion that "the Ebert-Haase Government would make haste slowly in carrying out its program for economic radicalization;" and by Eduard

Bernstein, Independent Socialist member of the Ministry of Finance, who says:

"Socialization cannot come over-night. It can only be carried out gradually, but it is bound to come, for the people are now sovereign. Our important weapon is suffrage reform which is now a fact. It will completely reconstruct society and eventually lead to state control of important industries."

The issue is not whether the situation in Germany affords an opportunity of immediate Socialist measures of reconstruction. That is a false presentation of the problems. That Socialist measures of reconstruction cannot now be introduced in Germany is clear, since Capitalism still rules through the bourgeois-"Socialist" Government. The issue is whether the proletariat shall use the revolutionary situation for the conquest of power, or allow the revolutionary crisis to die away in a restoration of the "normal" conditions of bourgeois supremacy and petty bourgeois parliamentary "reconstruction."

Herr Bernstein ("majority" and "centre" Socialism generally) is right: "Socialism cannot come overnight." The introduction of Socialism is a process, truly; but not a process on the basis of the bourgeois parliamentary state, but on the basis of a new proletarian state, which alone promotes Socialism. The Bolsheviks, in Germany and in Russia, never proposed the immediate introduction of Socialism, but the introduction of proletarian dictatorship, of the political expropriation of the bourgeoisie, after which Socialist reconstruction and the gradual introduction of Socialism may really begin.

The struggle for proletarian power, by means of revolutionary action,—that is the policy of Spartacus Socialism in Germany.

Herr Bernstein says:

"Our present situation is most critical—more so than most of us realize. We are lacking in raw products, foodstuffs and other commodities, to procure which we shall require immense amounts of money. We cannot seize the wealth of the rich people, for then the whole system of production would become paralyzed."

These black conditions are another argument in favor of the proletarian conquest of power, since Capitalism aggravates these conditions and would use them in its own interests, against the proletariat. "Immense amounts of money"—are these easier to secure while paying profit-tribute to capital, or without paying profit-tribute? It is not a question of "seizing the wealth of the rich people"—that is a characteristically petty bourgeois proposal; but of expropriating the capitalist politically, expropriating the banks and the larger organizations of capital, and imposing a proletarian Socialist control over production and distribution, measures of partial expropriation and control that, by means of the new proletarian state of the organized producers, would gradually emerge into complete communist Socialism. The conquest of power and a new proletarian state—that constitutes the first requirement.

The bourgeois-"Socialist" Government, the moderate Socialism equally of the "majority" and the Haase-Bernstein Independents, is hesitant, afraid to act sternly toward the bourgeoisie and Capitalism. This miserable attitude expresses itself in the policy toward the Allies. The Bergische "Arbeiter Stimme," an Independent Socialist organ, says:

"The same people who two months ago could not find anything more proper than to represent Germany's position, especially the food situation, in its rosier light, now paint it blacker day by day. The talk is directed with the mechanical reiteration of the professional beggar in a definite direction to America, concerning whose democracy and readiness for peace scorn was for years uttered, but which country is now begged and whimpered to in the most pitiful manner by the same people. The whole bourgeois gang, inclusive of the government Socialists, has reached the standpoint that Communism and Socialism must be prevented at all costs, if not otherwise, then by summoning the enemy into the country. Solf, Erzberger, Scheidemann, Ebert and others would not oppose foreigners coming here for the purpose of abolishing the red flag."

Miserable hesitation and compromise, the abandonment of the revolutionary task, nationally and internationally, and promoting counter-revolution—that is the tendency of moderate Socialism. The problems of reconstruction in Germany, and all other problems, are soluble only by means of revolutionary action. All problems are immediately reducible to one problem—the conquest of power by the revolutionary Socialist proletariat.

Words and Deeds

From "The New Mir"

ON Dec. 2, President Wilson delivered a speech before Congress which, according to the calculations of diplomats, political statesmen and press representatives, was to play the role of an historical speech. But the "historical" feature in that speech was perhaps that part of it, which, satisfying neither the adherents nor opponents of President Wilson, has become the "heritage of history." True, people still talk about the speech, but the comment is weak and flabby. Even the criticism of President Wilson's opponents lacks pugnacity, force and aggressiveness. They are smiling up their sleeves at its emptiness and hollowness. While his partisans, if they do praise his speech at all, praise it exclusively as a good example of Presidential rhetoric.

However, the critics of President Wilson's speech are not fair. The speech contains in it some valuable elements. And one "valuable element" is that it once more has shown the complete incapacity of the modern rulers even verbally to grapple with those great problems, which the conclusion of the war has brought forward before the peoples.

While the war was going on and the keeping up of the spirit of the belligerent peoples was the immediate concern, one could resort to high sounding phrases and beautiful words about the "high ideals of democracy and humanity" for which the struggle was alleged to be waged. These words and phrases aimed to hypnotize the masses, to divert their attention from the hard and sordid reality. And President Wilson used them in abundance in his speeches on war matters. He was generous in pouring water on the wheels of the imperialist Allied mill, and the imperialists from the Allied camp hysterically applauded him. Also he was applauded by the opportunists from the labor camp who supported the war and, consciously or unconsciously, played traitor to the cause of the international proletariat.

But the war is ended and the deep wounds mankind has received are not yet healed. There is no possibility of healing them by the old means. A radical and merciless operation is needed which would do away with all the diseases of contemporary society and would once for all destroy the causes that bring them about.

But, are the present day statesmen capable of such a step? Are the hirelings of the decaying order of things capable of solving the contradictions that are tearing society apart?

No, and no! Their personal interests and the interests of their class dictate to them either the policy of patching up the worn out clothes of modern society, or the policy of repression of those forces under whose pressure these clothes are now falling apart.

But the former as well as the latter is a policy of impotence and weakness.

Precisely this weakness has been demonstrated in Wilson's "historical" speech. In it reappears every phrase uttered by the President and still more brings into relief the emptiness and hollowness of the speech. Even the usual "lyrical" outbursts of the President fail to correct the impression.

President Wilson's critics reprimand him because he has not given his motives for going to Europe. But could the President speak about them openly? Could he tell the country that the "united front" of the Allies has fallen apart, that yesterday's "friends" are ready now to throw themselves upon each other since they cannot divide among themselves the spoils, that the interests of the American bourgeoisie is being threatened with serious danger from her "dear" allies?

Critics of Wilson are "dissatisfied" that the President failed to give a plan of "reconstruction" to the country, the adaptation of the entire economic system to peace conditions. But shall we look for such a plan from a representative of a system of society based on relentless competition, on anarchy in production, on oppression and exploitation of one class by another?

The President has said everything that he could have said; he promised everything that he could promise. And in this regard the American imperialists should feel no anxiety; he will carry out his promises. Their interests at the Peace Conference, he will protect. And within the land, he will protect them. The railroads will be returned to the owners, the milliards of taxes

will be collected accurately, the navy and armaments building program will be put through.

Therefore the anxiety of the American imperialists is unfounded.

Bolshevikjabs

AN English worker we know has figured out that his share of the \$40,000,000,000 England is going to collect from Germany is about \$800, but he adds that as he is very hard up just now he is willing to realize for about two-bits.

We cull the following from an editorial in the bourgeois press:

"Mr. Gary, Mr. Schwab, Mr. Rockefeller, and men like them who have vision, are the ones who create confidence in the hearts of men and women in all walks of life. They can speak for capital and labor and be listened to with attention by both sides. Fairness to both capital and labor will result in conditions satisfactory to all, and will prevent the breaking out of disorders such as make some of the European countries hells on earth."

"Will you walk into my parlor?" said the spider to the fly,

"It's the prettiest little parlor that ever you did spy."

And then we run right into this:

"They have some forward looking people out in Flint, Michigan. The business men out there have resolved to keep their employes at work at their old jobs at their old wages. Not content with this, they are working to effect a substantial price reduction in the necessities of life. They have already reduced the price of milk by one cent a quart, the price of shoes by ten per cent., the price of coal by some three to five per cent. reduction of rental for ninety days."

Oh, yes, they've heard of the Bolsheviks in Flint.

The English delegates to the Peace Conference have been appointed: Lloyd-George, representing the petty bourgeoisie; Bonar Law, representing big business; Balfour, representing the aristocracy.

Faith, hope and charity.

Finding that The League to Enforce Peace has become somewhat of a fizzle, Mr. Taft becomes very bloodthirsty. Speaking to a group of bankers in Atlantic City, the other day, he is reported as saying: "The only thing to do in dealing with the Bolsheviks is to kill them." It's a good job for the umpires that he didn't get that baseball job.

Philip Scheidemann is quoted as advocating the establishment of a State tribunal to try all persons responsible for the war. Which seems to us to be treading on rather dangerous grounds if the records of the Reichstag are looked up.

The whole tendency in the press at the present time seems to be towards a rapprochement between Capital and Labor, a sort of lying down of the lion and the lamb. The only difference being that apparently the lamb is to do all the lying down and trust entirely to luck as to what the lion may decide to do.

Grand Duke Nicholas, former commander of the Russian Imperial army, has been reported dead quite a number of times, but it now appears that he is the commander of a troop of Cossacks in southern Russia. It is assumed in responsible quarters that the Grand Duke had often wished he was dead in the last few months and that some enterprising correspondent overhearing the wish translated it into fact.

Russian ex-nobility seem to have put the cats quite in the shade.

A new Russian "government" has been formed—at Stockholm. It is reported that at least two Russians have acknowledged allegiance to the new government by wireless and that General Semenov has repudiated it by postal card.

Some enterprising person is insisting on the establishment of a chair of international affairs at one of the universities. The chair will need to be well provided with telephonic connections if it aspires to be within at least two governments of the actual government functioning, every time it makes a pronouncement.

On the Eve of Disaster

By N. I. Hourwich

MORE and more often, more and more insistent, the alarming question of what will be tomorrow presents itself to capitalist society, the question of social reconstruction when the glamour of the war has passed. And as the final peace settlement approaches, more and more does "society" discuss this question in the pages of the bourgeois press.

This is quite natural. The war itself, coming as a logical product of the contradictions of capitalist society, the anarchy of capitalist production, has shown with striking clearness, and at the same time has extremely sharpened, those contradictions and this anarchy. Showing, in its concrete form, the whole organic inability of capitalist society to manage its "economics," the war has also extremely increased the difficulties Capitalism is passing through by presenting new, unheard of and hitherto non-existent demands.

While millions of the best workers have been torn away from the benches and machines—torn away from participation in productive life, and sent to the battlefields for work the very antithesis of productive, the work of mutual killing and destruction,—the demand for productive labor has increased to gigantic proportions. While the number of productive workers has decreased, industry has been faced with the demand to produce, not only for the consumption of humanity, but also for the destruction of humanity, to produce tenfold, at the expense of the energy and productive capacity of future generations. This knowing-no-limit production for destruction, production for war, ammunition production, became the center of all production and all productive activity.

All this has compelled Capitalism to brace up, to mend some of the holes which so glaringly have appeared in the shabby clothes that cover its uninviting nakedness.

In the very heart of industry gigantic grouping has been introduced—the re-distribution of productive forces. A number of new branches of industry have been formed. The ordinary indus-

tries have been forced to limit, and in some cases to discontinue, their usual production, and substitute production more suited to the needs of war. Industry has drawn to itself elements which in the past had taken relatively little part in its process—women, children and old people. Even the people with infirmities that would in normal times disqualify them have been in one form or another "made useful for certain tasks"!

And, finally, to crown all this "transformation," capitalist society in its efforts to "make both ends meet" has been forced to introduce the principle of state control and accounting, which contradicts all its principles and "best traditions." Many branches of industry have come under the control of the state, or have been declared state monopolies, little by little the state guardianship has extended over the private life of the individual. The "citizen" has been told what to do and what not to do, what labors he shall pursue and what he shall leave alone; following his productive activity, his personal activity has also been placed under control—the "watchful eye" of the administration has even entered his kitchen, peeped into his soup bowl. . . .

Have all these "extra" measures lessened the difficulties from which Capitalism is trying to extricate itself? Of course not! For, all these measures, all this "control" and "accounting," naturally could not be introduced in any but the caricature form which does not violate the "sacred principle" of private property. As a result, the difficulties not only have not become less, but they have increased, complicated, changing the problem Capitalism was facing into something very much resembling the fable of the "trishkin" coat—cut off one part to mend another.

Now capitalist society nears the end of the war it produced, not voluntarily, but under pressure of iron necessity, under the pressure of new social forces, awakened to life by the very existence of Capitalism, and which are now arising to take

its place. And capitalist society faces the fatal questions: how to act, what to do? How return to peace without any risk of "upheavals," adapting itself, however, to the new conditions which have been created and provoked by the war?

Will Capitalism succeed in solving this all-absorbing question?

Even a superficial analysis forces a negative reply.

It must not be forgotten, immediately following the conclusion of peace, capitalist society will be forced to pass through a process diametrically opposed to that just described—the gradual process of "inserting itself into the war," adapting itself to the needs of the war. It will become necessary to adapt again to labor the millions of workers who will return from the battlefield, and, at the same time, come face to face with that inevitable and quite natural fact—that those who during four years have taken the places of the absent workers will refuse to return to a "primitive existence," that women, for instance, now being engaged in industry will refuse to "return to the kitchen." . . . On the other hand, a number of industries, whole industrial sections which have been busy with war production, will be thrown "out of work."

All this will create an industrial-economic crisis unparalleled in history. Unemployment, the eternal companion of Capitalism, will reach unheard of proportions. The seemingly big industrial and financial institutions will "burst in the air" as soap bubbles. . . .

War, this time, will be faithful to its task of being a "locomotive of history," as Marx phrased it. At lightning speed it drives the capitalist "train" against the barriers of class contradictions which stand threateningly ahead! There is no salvation! To move backward is impossible. The train is facing inevitable, unavoidable wreck.

Little wonder, then, that the "engineers" and "conductors" are alarmed, and that their hearts are shrinking with alarm.

The Siberian Soviets Protest Against Intervention

THE Central Executive Committee of the All-Siberian Soviets appeals to the toiling masses of the whole world and in the name of millions of the toilers of Siberia, in the name of all workers, peasants and Cossacks declares its indignation and resolute protest against the plan of seizure of Siberia which is the aim of the imperialistic governments of Japan, France, England and America. For some months there has been in those countries an agitation for intervention in the internal affairs of Siberia. The chief pretext for such intervention was the conclusion of peace between Russia and Germany, which peace was falsely proclaimed as strengthening German influence in Russia, the lying provocative reports concerning the arming of some hundred thousand of war prisoners in Siberia, and finally the seizure by the war prisoners of the government in Siberia. The reptile press shamelessly invented all sorts of lying reports about Russia in order to guarantee the success of the agitation. The counter-revolutionists banished from Russia came to the aid of the foreign imperialists. Being driven out of Russia by the mighty wave of the revolution, they abroad appealed to foreign Powers to intervene in Russia and Siberia for the purpose of crushing the Soviet Government and the establishment of their anti-people government.

Everything was done to realize intervention in a most convenient manner through the Czecho-Slovak troops that were passing through Siberia. A sufficient number of pretexts were found to set armed Czecho-Slovaks against the Soviet government. The Soviets' attempts to negotiate with the Czecho-Slovaks and satisfy their demands, and thus peacefully end the conflict at the beginning, were resolutely rejected by the army command of the Czecho-Slovaks. The Czecho-Slovaks in Vladivostok continued to remain there, and finally also arraved themselves against the Soviet government in Siberia. It has become clear to us, workers, peasants and Cossacks of Siberia, that the Czecho-Slovaks instead of following their former purpose, to move toward France, had another task—to establish the domination of foreign powers in Siberia. We are in possession of documents which show definitely that the foreign powers utilize the Czecho-Slovaks as an element most suitable for purposes of occupation. We

Resolution adopted, shortly after the landing of Allied troops in Vladivostok, by the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets of Workers, Peasants, Cossacks and Red Guard Delegates of All Siberia.

were forced to offer armed resistance against these troops. But, evidently, the Czecho-Slovak forces were too weak for the carrying out of the task they had on hand; to their aid British, French and Japanese troops have been rushed, once more under the imaginary pretext of defending the Czecho-Slovaks against the Germans.

We declare that the reptile press of the imperialists will always be able to invent sufficient lying information to justify the actions of the imperialists, and we are not inclined to prove the absurdity of all these inventions. We repeat again that all the provocative information concerning the mass arming of the war prisoners, the seizure by the latter of Siberia, were at the time given the lie by the official representatives of America and England, and that at any moment the Czecho-Slovaks would be given permission to pass through Siberia, should they desire so. But we must emphatically protest against the intentions of Japan, France, England and America to occupy Siberia with their troops, and protest against the actions of Russian counter-revolutionists who appeal to the Allies to intervene in Siberian affairs.

We declare that Allied intervention in Siberia will inevitably result in the strengthening of German influence in Russia against the will of the toilers of Russia, and thus such an action would mean in fact a division of Russia and Siberia between the Allies and Germany.

We declare that the plotting of the Russian counter-revolutionists in appealing for Allied intervention provokes the wrath and indignation of the Russian workers and peasants—any government in Siberia and Russia that might be established with the aid of foreign bayonets is more repugnant to the masses of the Russian people than the absolutism of Nicholas Romanov destroyed by the Revolution, and therefore is doomed to the same fate as the absolutism of Nicholas Romanov. Let the governments of Japan, France, England and America not forget the armed struggle of workers and peasants in the Ukraine against

the government of Ukrainian land-owners, and their hatred of Austria, which has played the role of restorer of reaction and the gendarme of the Revolution, a role now threatened to be assumed by their governments. We remind them about the disgraceful role played by the German soldiers during the Paris Commune of 1871, and we demand of them that they refuse to carry out the role of hangmen of the Revolution now, in 1918, in Siberia and Russia.

The toiling masses of Japan, France, England and America ought to make clear to their imperialistic governments that they will not tolerate shooting, gallows and prisons for the Russian workers, peasants, Cossacks; that they will not allow the Russian revolution and freedom to be crushed. They must rise against the attempt by their governments to chain the Russian proletariat.

In the name of the workers, peasants and Cossacks, the Central Executive Committee of the Soviets declares that the Russian masses will not stand for foreign domination in Siberia and will throw off the yoke which is being prepared for them by foreign imperialists in co-operation with the Russian counter-revolutionists. Russian workers, peasants and Cossacks will fight arms in hands to the last drop of their blood against armed foreign invasion in Russia and Siberia, in order to preserve their revolutionary conquests. Only over the corpses of the Russian people will foreign Imperialism march into Siberia, only by wading through the rivers of blood of Russian workers and peasants will the imperialistic counter-revolutionists be able to erect again the throne of reaction.

The story of intervention is a story that reveals the sinister character of Capitalism, reveals the fact that the class struggle develops into war and out of war develops the class struggle, on an international scale.

The story of intervention in Russia reveals the revolutionary integrity of the Soviet Republic and the shameless breaking of solemn pledges by the governments of the Allies waging a war to "make the world safe for democracy." It reveals a crime against civilization—the *new civilization* of Socialism—and the class unity of international Capitalism and Imperialism.

Ireland and the Peace Conference

By Eadmonn MacAlpine

GREAT hopes that Ireland's case will be satisfactorily settled at the Peace Conference, though the actions of President Wilson, are being manifested just now by that section of the Irish race in America who were ever loud in their advocacy of Ireland's rights when those rights were in fashion, and when the way to political preferment lay through "love" for the Emerald Isle. "Prominent" Irish-Americans are now busily engaged in bringing "influence to bear" on Washington to the end that America shall champion Ireland at the Peace table.

The more "prominent" these men, the less definite they are in stating just what would be considered a settlement by the Irish people. The vague term "self-determination" is being bandied back and forth, as if it were in itself some abracadabra that would in some inexplicable manner open the way to Irish freedom. A short time ago these very men, who are now the adherents of self-determination, were in complete accord with the late John Redmond when he announced that Asquith's Home Rule Bill, or as it was technically called the "Better Government of Ireland Bill," would be accepted by the Irish people as "a full and complete settlement of the Irish question." Since that time things have changed in Ireland. In Easter Week 1916, the little group of men, who for seven days raised the standard of revolt in the Irish capital, completely erased Home Rule from the Irish mind and in its place firmly established the idea of an Irish Republic.

It must therefore be taken for granted that a settlement of the Irish question means the establishment of a Republic acceptable to the Irish people and that this, and nothing less, is what these people expect to materialize for Ireland as a result of the Peace Conference, and is the end to which President Wilson would strive. But England insists that the question is purely one of local administration, the granting of local autonomy to an acknowledged portion of her empire. Lloyd-George, speaking for the British Government, has explicitly stated, within the past few days, that neither the Independence of Ireland nor the coercion of the north-east portion of Ulster into a Home Rule government would be for a moment considered by England. Nearly every minister of the British government has publicly stated that the question of Ireland is one affecting the purely internal affairs of the British Empire and can in no sense be considered as one of the problems arising out of the war.

A large section of the American press also embraces this view. The "Christian Science Monitor" on December 12, in a news article under the caption "Efforts Seen to Confuse Issues at Peace Table," states that friends of the President are somewhat disturbed by certain events, one of which is "the effort to enmesh the President in the tangle of the Irish question. . . . Their position is that the justice of the Irish cause . . . has nothing at all to do with the situation presented"

"The President has, on more than one occasion, refused to interfere in the Irish question. He is perfectly well aware that any effort on his part to interfere in a matter that is purely internal and the business alone of the United Kingdom, would be resented just as quickly in London, as would a British effort here to secure better prices for wheat for Swedish farmers in Minnesota."

This is very plain speaking, and anyone who has taken the pains to study the present situation can readily see that it is fairly near the reality of the situation. The best that may be expected for Ireland as a result of "resolutions" is the setting up of some form of Home Rule Government that will give the Irish people the fiction of freedom and deny them the reality.

It is very much open to question whether those now advocating Ireland's rights from this side of the water would find themselves in agreement with what the Irish people have in mind when they speak of an Irish Republic. The proclamation of the Provisional Government of the Irish Republic states: "We declare the right of the people of Ireland to the ownership of Ireland, and to the unfettered control of Irish destinies, to be sovereign and indefeasible." Taking into consideration the writings of James Connolly, one of the signatories to the proclamation; the fact that it was signed at Liberty Hall, the Headquarters of the Irish Transport and General Workers Union; the fact that the majority of the forces whose arms supported the proclamation were the men of the Citizen Army, the first class conscious army in the world; and the subsequent spee-

ches of such men as William O'Brien, chairman of the Irish Trade Union Congress for 1918, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the "right of the people of Ireland to the ownership of Ireland" means something more than is usually meant by bourgeois proclamations using somewhat similar terms.

The Irish Trade Union Congress at its last session declared for the establishment of a Workers' Republic, and it was by means of a general strike, demonstrating their economic power, that the Irish people resisted the imposition of conscription. The Irish working class twice in the past two years has demonstrated its power and indications, such as the reception accorded to Maxim Litvinoff, the ambassador to England of the Russian Soviet Republic, during his visit to Dublin, show that the general sweep of revolutionary ideas in Europe has not left Ireland unmoved. There is no doubt that Ireland has progressed beyond the stage where she is willing to shed the blood of her sons merely to exchange one form of tyranny for another, where she will send her sons to languish in English jails in order to change from the domination of the English government to the domination of the Martin Murphys, the Guinesses, the Barbour's, the Harland and Wolfs, and the Burnses of Irish Capitalism.

For the past 50 years Ireland has dabbled in bourgeois politics, hopeful that she might relieve her misery by ousting the foreign domination of England, but within recent years the conviction has slowly but surely taken root in the minds of the Irish people that their miseries were not so much the result of domination by England as of the domination by the capitalist system, of which England is such an able exponent. The great Dublin strike of 1912-13, and the subsequent industrial unrest that grew out of that economic battle, were merely the outward expression of this conviction, and today the workers of Ireland are on the high road to a full understanding of the cause of their miseries.

Ireland's entrance into the industrial struggle did much to bring her to a realization of the real facts in the case. She found that the evils that weighed heaviest upon her were not peculiar to her alone, but were equally shared by the workers of the world. She found that the workers of England, living under what is presumably their own government, suffered from these same evils, and she found that when she took the field against her economic masters her friends and enemies were not determined by territorial or racial lines but by the lines of economic interest.

Any settlement that might come from the Peace Conference as at present constituted must merely mean an outward change in the form of government and not in the system at present oppressing

the Irish working class, and even this change will only result from the action of the Irish people themselves. The British Trade Union Congress at its last session showed a deplorable lack of understanding of the Irish question, when it went on record as favoring Home Rule for Ireland, clearly proving that it lies with the Irish workers to effect their own salvation, and that little hope can be entertained from the present leadership of the British working class, either by the Irish or the British worker.

Irish freedom has long been a burning question, a question towards the settlement of which, some of the ablest and best of her sons have freely spent their energies and when necessary their lives. Long periods of sullen despair have resulted in glorious moments of action and hope, only to be again followed by the soul-sickening fruits of failure, but always the light of freedom flickered and always the call to the struggle was answered. Every flame of freedom, that from time to time has swept the world, lighted the fire in Ireland and the new ideal of freedom—the freedom of the proletariat, the rise of the world's disinherited,—is today spreading throughout the length and breadth of Ireland, uniting the workers of the North with their brethren of the South.

And it is freedom in the new sense that it is now the goal of the Irish working class; Ireland's demand is not Irish freedom, but freedom, and no one can be a genuine friend of the Irish cause who is not the friend of freedom everywhere. Even in the days gone by, when the struggle for liberty meant liberty in the bourgeois sense, the men and women who fought and died for Irish liberty were the advocates of freedom wherever the fight was being waged. But the idea of freedom for the workers is no recent innovation in Ireland; when most of the world was still thinking of the propertied classes, when it spoke of liberty, the advocates of liberty in Ireland saw beneath the surface, saw that Ireland meant the workers of Ireland and not a small and privileged class of the Irish people. The Fenian Brotherhood knew what they were striving for, and expressed themselves in the following definite language:

"To permit a small class, whether alien or native, to obtain a monopoly of the land is an intolerable injustice; its continued enforcement is neither more nor less than a robbery of the hard and laborious earnings of the poor."

While John Mitchell showed that he was not apart from the ideas that were then pointing the world towards the true path to liberty when he said: "Dynasties and thrones are not half so important as workshops, farms and factories. Rather, we may say, that dynasties and thrones, and even provisional governments, are good for anything exactly in proportion as they secure fair play, justice and freedom to those who labor."

Whatever be the result of the Peace Conference, whether, as it appears at the moment, Ireland will be entirely ignored or whether she is given a sop in the form of Home Rule, the real settlement of the question can only rest with the people themselves. Ireland will never have freedom until the English people are themselves emancipated, but it is not improbable that the movement for such freedom may emanate from Ireland.

The British Labor party is slowly awakening to the realities of its position, it is already a probability that the next parliament in England will be controlled by the workers and then the futility of such control will lead to an actual taking over of the country by the workers and the establishment of an industrial democracy; and with the coming of industrial democracy in England the Irish question will be settled.

In view of the part the Irish working class has already played in the few years it has been actually active on the industrial field, it is not extravagant to suggest the probability that the movement to secure economic freedom for the peoples of the British Empire will start in Ireland. Reports reaching here indicate that the Irish workers are in no mood to be trifled with, and it is certain that any concerted movement for economic and political independence arising in Ireland will not meet with the fate of Easter Week, 1916, but will have the hearty cooperation of a large, and an ever growing, section of the British working class, with the result that the Irish and British workers will walk side by side down freedom's path.

Mass Meeting

IN THE

Grand Opera House

Cor. Dover and Washington Streets, Boston

Sunday, December 15

at 2 P. M.

under the auspices of the

James Connolly Literary Society

SPEAKERS:

Jim Larkin

General Secretary of the Irish Transport Workers' Union and Labor Candidate for Dublin, in the Coming General Election

Eadmonn MacAlpine

ADMISSION FREE

Chapters from My Diary

By Leon Trotsky

VI

Letter to Jules Guesde, "Socialist" member of the French Ministry, concerning Trotsky's expulsion from France in 1916.

MR. MINISTER: Before I leave the soil of France, under the escort of a police officer, who personifies the liberties in whose defense you were appointed to the national ministry, I consider it my duty to express to you a few thoughts, not in the vain hope that they may convince you, but that they may at least be useful and of value against you. When my expulsion from France was decided upon, your colleague, Mr. Malvy, the Minister of Justice, did not have the courage to tell me the reasons for this measure. Nor did the other of your colleagues, the Minister of War, consider it proper to enumerate the causes that led to the suppression of the Russian newspaper "Nashe Slovo" (Our Word), of which I was the editor, and which had, for two long years, suffered continually the trials of censorship, under the watchful eye and special care of that same Minister of War.

Still I need not conceal from you the fact that the reasons that led to my expulsion are no secret to me. You feel the need of adopting repressive measures against an international Socialist, against one of those who refuse to accept the part of defender or voluntary slave of this imperialistic war.

Moreover, even though the reasons for this action against me have not been communicated to me, whom they above all concern, these reasons have been stated by Mr. Briand to the deputies and to the journalists.

In Marseilles last August a number of Russian mutineers killed their colonel. A court investigation is alleged to have disclosed that a number of these soldiers were in possession of several numbers of the "Nashe Slovo." At least this is the explanation given by Mr. Briand in an interview with Deputy Longuet and with the president of the Chamber Committee of Foreign Affairs, Mr. Leygues, who, in turn, transmitted this version to the journalists of the Russian bourgeois press. To be sure, Mr. Briand did not possess the audacity to claim that the "Nashe Slovo," which stood subject to his own censorship, was directly responsible for the killing of the officer.

It is likely that his thoughts were somewhat along the following lines. In view of the presence of Russian soldiers in France, it is necessary to weed out the "Nashe Slovo" and to banish its editors from the soil of the Republic. For a Socialist newspaper that refuses to spread illusions and lies may, according to the memorable doctrine of Mr. Renaudel, open the eyes of the Russian soldiers to hypocrisies and lead them into dangerous paths of reflection and meditation. Unfortunately, however, for Mr. Briand, this explanation of his is based upon a very vexatious anachronism. A year ago Gustav Herve, at that time still a member of the permanent administrative committee of your party, wrote that this forcible removal from France of Russian refugees guilty of revolutionary internationalism would be accepted by public opinion without protest or resistance. Obviously Herve received the inspiration for this prophecy from ministerial sources.

At the end of July this same Herve whispered, officiously, that I would be expelled from France; at about the same time—i. e., still before the killing of the colonel in Marseilles—Professor Durkeheim, the President of the Commission for Russian immigrants, established by the Government, informed a representative of these immigrants of the impending suppression of the "Nashe Slovo" and the expulsion of its editors (vide, "Nashe Slovo," July 30, 1916.) Everything had been prearranged, even the public opinion of the slaves of Mr. Herve. They waited only for a pretext to strike the final blow. And the pretext was found. The unfortunate Russian soldiers killed their colonel at a moment that was most opportune to the interests of certain people. This happy coincidence invites a suspicion that may, I fear, penetrate the invulnerable skin of even your ministerial shame. Russian journalists who made a special investigation of the case in Marseilles have established the fact that in this case, as in so many similar cases, the leading role was played by an agent provocateur. What was his aim, or rather what were the aims of the well-paid rascals who directed this agent, is not difficult to comprehend. An excess of some kind among the Russian soldiers was necessary not only to justify the rule of the knout against

them, which was still somewhat offensive to the French authorities, but in order to create a pretext for repressive measures against the Russian immigrants, accused of abusing French hospitality by demoralizing Russian soldiers during the war. To their credit we will assume that the instigators of this project did not themselves believe that the matter would assume such a fatal aspect, that they did not intentionally desire what actually occurred from the very beginning. It is probable that they hoped great gains by small sacrifices. But all undertakings of this sort involve an element of business risk. In this case the provocateur himself went unmolested, but Colonel Krause and his assassins were the victims. Even the patriotic Russian journalists, who are openly hostile to the "Nashe Slovo," expressed the suspicion that copies of our paper were given to the soldiers, at the most auspicious moment, by the agent provocateur.

May I beg of you, Mr. Minister, to institute, through the services of Mr. Malvy an investigation of this matter? You do not see that anything could be gained by such an investigation? Neither do I. Because—let us speak openly—agents provocateur are at least as valuable for "national defense" as Socialist ministers. And you, Jules Guesde, having so generously assumed responsibility for the foreign policy of the Third Republic, for the Franco-Russian alliance and its consequences, for the conquest aims of the Czar, and for all the aims and methods of this war—it remains for you to accept as well the renown for the deeds of these agents provocateur of his Majesty the autocratic ruler of Russia.

At the beginning of the war, when promises were spread with a lavish hand, your partner, Sembat, enchanted the Russian journalists with the perspective of the most beneficial influence to be exerted by the allied democracies upon the internal regime of autocratic Russia. Moreover, this argument was used persistently by the Social patriots of France and Belgium to reconcile the revolutionary Russians with the French Government, but with little success. Twenty-six months of constant military coalition between the generalissimi, between diplomats and parliamentarians, the visits of Viviani and Thomas to Tsarkoe Selo, in short, twenty-six months of incessant influence exerted by the Western democracies upon the Russian regime have only served to strengthen in our land the boldest and most impudent reaction, softened, to a small extent, by the chaos of the administration; have succeeded, moreover, in transforming the internal regime of England and France until they have become very similar to that of Russia.

The generous promises of Mr. Sembat are obviously less expensive than his "coal." The unfortunate fate of the "right of asylum" is but a conspicuous symptom of materialistic and police rule that are becoming more and more predominant on both sides of the Channel. Lloyd George, of Dublin fame, the imperialist incarnate, with the manners of a drunken clergyman, and Mr. Aristide Briand, for whose characterization I beg to refer you, Mr. Jules Guesde, to your own article of earlier days, these two figures represent, in the highest degree, the spirit of the present war, its justification, its morality based upon the appetites of classes and of individuals. Can there be a better and a more deserving partner for Messrs. Lloyd George and Briand than this Mr. Sturmer, who, like a real Russian, has made a career by pinning himself to the Cossacks of the Metropolitans and to the petticoats of bigoted court damsels? What a splendid, what an incomparable trio! Verily, history could have selected no better colleagues and chieftains for Guesde, the minister.

Is it possible for an honest Socialist not to fight against them? You have transformed the Socialist party into a submissive chorus, that servilely imitates the leaders of capitalist highway robbery, at a historical epoch when bourgeois society—whose deadly enemy you, Jules Guesde, have hitherto been—has revealed and demonstrated its true nature to the core. From the events, prepared in a period of world-wide depredation and robbery, whose awful consequences we have so often predicted, from the rivers of blood, from the awful suffering, and misfortune, from the crimes, from the bloodthirsty ferocity and hypocrisy of the Governments you, Jules Guesde, draw but one lesson for the enlightenment of the French

proletariat: that Wilhelm II and Francis Joseph are two criminals, who, contrary to Nicholas II and Mr. Poincare, refused to respect the rules and regulations of international law.

French Socialism, with its glorious past, with its proud line of thinkers, of fighters and martyrs, has at last found (—and what a disgrace to think that it has found!—) in Renaudel, a translator, during the most tragic period of the world's history, for the elevating thoughts of the yellow book into the language of yellow journalism.

The Socialism of Babeuf, of Saint-Simon, of Fourier, of Blanqui, of the Commune, of Jaures, and of Jules Guesde—yes, of the Jules Guesde of the days of yore—has found its Albert Thomas, who consults with the Russian tyrant concerning the surest and safest method of capturing Constantinople; has found its Marcel Sembat, to exercise and display dilettante nonchalance over the corpses and the ruins of French civilization; has found its Jules Guesde, to follow the triumphal chariot of the trumpeter Briand. And you believed and you hoped that the French proletariat, that has been bled to the point of exhaustion in this endless war for the crime of the ruling classes, will continue to tolerate quietly, to the end, this shameful union between official Socialism and the worst enemies of the proletariat? You are mistaken. The opposition is growing. In spite of martial law, in spite of this mania of nationalism which, whatever its form, be it royalistic, radical, or socialistic, always preserves its capitalistic quintessence—revolutionary opposition is marching forward, slowly, but surely. Daily it is gaining ground. "Nashe Slovo," the paper that you have strangled, lived and breathed in the atmosphere of awakening French international Socialism. The group of "Nashe Slovo," expelled from Russia by the counter-revolution, that is gaining in power and strength through the help and support of the French Banking Exchange, the group of "Nashe Slovo" was privileged to echo, even though it was hindered and hampered by your censor—the voice of the French side of the new International, that raises its head in the midst of the terrors of fratricidal war. In our capacity as "undesirable foreigners" we have identified our cause and our fate with that of the French opposition. We are proud to have received the first blow from the French Government, from your government, Jules Guesde!

We have the honor, together with Monatte, Merrheim, Saumoneau, Rosmer, Bourderon, Loriot, Guilbeaut, and so many others, to be accused, all of us, of being pro-German, of friendliness toward Germany.

The weekly Paris organ of your friend Plekchanoff, your partner in honor and glory as well as in your inglorious fall, has denounced us week after week to the police of Mr. Malvy, as being in the service of the German General Staff. Formerly you knew the value of such accusations, for you yourself had the honor of being subjected to similar accusations. But now you put your stamp of approval upon Mr. Malvy by collecting, for the government of "National Defense," the reports of Mr. Malvy's police spies. Moreover, my political correspondence box contains a very recent prison sentence pronounced against me, during the war, by a German court, in continuation—as I was not present—for my pamphlet, "The War and the International."

But besides this brutal fact, that can make an impression even upon the police brain-cells of Mr. Malvy, I should, I believe, emphasize that we revolutionary internationalists are more dangerous enemies of German reaction than all the Governments of the Allies taken together. Their hostility to Germany is, at the bottom, nothing but the hatred of the competitor; our revolutionary hatred of its ruling class is indestructible. Imperialist competition may again unite the rival enemy brethren of today. When the total destruction of Germany has been realized, England and France, after a decade, would again approach the Kaiserdom of the Hohenzollern in the friendliest spirit, to defend themselves against the superiority of Russia. A future Poincare will exchange telegrams of congratulations with Wilhelm or with his heirs; Lloyd George, in the peculiar language of the priest and the boxer, will curse and condemn Russia, as the defending wall of barbarism and militarism; Albert Thomas, as the French ambassador to the Kaiser, would be showered with flowers cut by the gentle hands

(Continued on Page Seven.)

The British Fleet and the Baltic Provinces

By J. Klawa

THE imperialistic press states that England has sent her fleet to the Baltic shores to "prevent Bolshevik anarchy" in the Baltic provinces and also that "the provinces are calling for help."

An examination of the facts should reveal the truth. As a former resident of the Baltic Provinces I know something about conditions there.

Only nine months ago the German imperial fleet sailed the same way "to bring help" to revolutionary Russia. The Allied diplomats protested then and stigmatized Germany as an invader and oppressor of peoples. They emphatically protested against Germany's actions in Belgium and the Balkan peninsula and led the peoples of the world to believe that none of the Allied governments would ever attempt anything along the same lines. But today it is a fact—the British fleet with troops aboard approaches the Baltic coast.

Before it is possible to understand the real meaning of the presence of the British fleet on the shores of the Baltic it is necessary to understand something about conditions in the Baltic Provinces. I do not intend to speak about all the Baltic states; two will suffice—Courland and Livonia—but what is true of these two is true of the others especially Esthonia and Lithuania.

Courland and Livonia are the home of the Lettish or Lettic people, who are today playing such a prominent role in the Russian Socialist Republic, adhering to the Soviet form of government.

All the Baltic Provinces, but especially Courland and Livonia, have been invaded by foreign armies time and time again. At one time they were under the domination of Prussia, then of Sweden and at last they passed into the hands of the Russian Czars. Everything was constantly changing in these provinces, the government, the policies, the economic life, except one thing and that was static—the political and economic privileges of the German landlords who have held sway for more than 700 years, and during this time the Lettish people have borne the yoke of the old Prussian junker regime. What held the people in this state of subjection?

There is no need to turn to the general history of Courland and Livonia. The history of the German landlords furnishes the answer and at the same time reveals the true character of those who call for aid when the existing conditions change.

Although lately the Baltic Provinces have been officially under the Russian government, the real governors were the German landlords. They are a particular type and race of junkers, speaking their own language and having little in common with their brothers in Germany. They have always affiliated with the ruling power, one third of the members of the ex-Czar's cabinet were Baltic barons. Baltic history is a tale of the trampling of the people by the Baltic junkers who possessed all the political and economic power.

The Landtag (landlords' political institution) during the rule of the ex-Czar had no legal title to exist but secretly it was the real political machine in the provinces.

A rough estimate of the ownership of these two provinces will illustrate. In Livonia there are 740 estates, of which 600 are owned by 162 junker families. These 700 estates represent 65 per cent of all the land. Count von Wolf alone owned 36 estates of about 200,000 desyatins (1 desyatina is about 2½ acres).

In Courland there are 640 estates comprising about 52 per cent of the whole province. Some of these estates such as, for instance, Dondangen and Pope are larger than the state of New Jersey or Massachusetts.

Against these 700 estates in Livonia—and this is exclusive of the Crown lands and the land held by priests—there are 30,000 farms averaging 44 desyatins each and half a million people who have no land at all. Against the 640 estates in Courland there are 32,000 farms averaging 42 desyatins each, 8,000 averaging 5 to 25 desyatins and about 1,800 soldiers' homes. Two-fifths of all the privately owned land is in the hands of 25 German junker families.

Practically the whole population is entirely dependent on the landlords. Woods, waters, the rights of hunting and fishing, even on the lands owned by the farmers, all belong to the barons. They control the establishment of industries but in addition to all this the common people bear all the expense such as repairing the roads, the building of schools, the upkeep of the schools, etc., the barons pay nothing towards the upkeep of

the provinces. In addition to the estates enumerated there are large tracts of land belonging to the priests who are usually the barons' sons-in-law.

Besides watching out for the souls of the peasants, the chief duty of the priests is to keep the people obedient to the barons. For example, in the church hymn books, approved by the Baltic Consistory—the highest church council—appears the following:

"I'll obey my masters with all my heart
And to the best of my ability
To magnify their wealth."

These lines express the program of the church in the Baltic.

In 1905 the people, under the banner of Socialism, revolted against this divine right of the barons which had existed for over 700 years, and in a few weeks drove out all the barons. Then the Russian Czar sent General Orloff, the same Orloff whose forefather secretly killed Peter the Great, to suppress the revolution. The dragon Escadrons, under the direction of the priests, raided the country, court martialled thousands of revolutionists, set fire to more than 600 peasant homes, jailed thousands and transported thousands more to Siberia. Thus the revolution was suppressed for a time.

Then came the world war. Courland and Li-

Chapters from My Diary

(Continued from Page Six.)

of the court madams of Potsdam, as occurred so recently in Tsarskoe Selo.

All the banalities of present-day speeches and articles would again be unpacked. Mr. Renaudel would have to change, in his article only the proper names, a task for which his mental faculties and abilities would doubtless suffice. But we will remain the outspoken, sworn enemies of Germany's rulers that we are today, for we hate German reaction with the same revolutionary hatred that we have sworn against Czarism and against the French moneyed aristocracy.

When you dare, you and your newspaper lackeys, to applaud a Liebknecht, a Mehring, a Luxemburg, a Zetkin, as the inflexible enemies of the Hohenzollerns, dare you deny that they are ours, our faithful comrades, our comrades in battle? We are united with them against you and against your chiefs, with the unalterable unity of revolutionary warfare.

Perhaps you console yourselves with the thought that we are few in number? We are greater in number than the police souls of every grade believe. In your official myopia you do not see the ghost of rebellion that is arising from all the places of suffering and martyrdom; you do not see it spreading through France, through Europe, in the suburbs, in the workmen's dwellings, in the country places, in the shops and in the trenches.

You imprisoned Louise Soumoneau in one of your jails; but have you thereby diminished the despair and the despondency of this land? You can arrest hundreds of Zimmerwaldists, after having ordered your press agents to besmirch them again and again with police suspicions; but can you return the husbands to their grieving wives? Can you restore the sons to their suffering mothers, the fathers to their children, strength and health to the sick and debilitated? Can you return, to a betrayed, exsanguinated people, the trust in those who have deceived them?

Jules Guesde, get out of your military automobile. Abandon the gilded cage in which the capitalist state has imprisoned you. Look about! Perhaps then fate will have pity, for the last time, upon your enfeeble tragical old age, and let you hear once more the dull noise of approaching events. We expect them, we cause them, we prepare them! The fate of France would be too terrible, if the via dolorosa of its working masses did not lead to revenge, to our revenge, where there will be no room for you, Jules Guesde, and for yours. Expelled by you, I leave France with the deep certainty of your triumph. Over and above your head I send brotherly greetings to the French proletariat, that is preparing for great actions. Long live, without you and against you, Jules Guesde, Socialist France!

Leon Trotzky.

voniam suffered terribly, like Belgium and Alsace-Lorraine. Hundreds of thousands were driven from the country by the approaching Germans, but the landlords welcomed the Kaiser's army as they were always striving for German protection. Then the revolution broke and the parts of the Baltic unoccupied by the German army rose with the rest of Russia and the power of the barons was wiped out by the Soviets. But the German army marched into the country and wherever it penetrated the rule of the barons was restored. The ideals of liberty cherished by the Baltic peoples was again destroyed and once more the yoke of the barons was placed upon their necks.

When the Allies signed the armistice with Germany they demanded the evacuation of Belgium and Alsace-Lorraine but on the contrary they demanded that the German army stay in the Baltic Provinces. What was the Baltic peoples to do? They were deserted by the great Western "democracies", not only deserted but a fleet is sent to destroy the wishes of the people—"to prevent Bolshevism spreading" as the New York "Times" says.

Many of the inhabitants of the Baltic Provinces believed the Allied diplomats when they stated they stood for the evacuation of all occupied territory and the self-determination of nations. But when the Allies demanded that the German army stay in the Baltic states then the people began to think that there was no difference between the Allies and the Baltic junkers.

Today the people are rising, again determined to wipe out for ever the domination of the Baltic barons. But the British fleet is on the Baltic shores.

The struggle waged in the Baltic today is not, as some nationalists are saying, a struggle for an independent state. The Baltic Provinces want to remain part of the Russian Socialist Republic, as resolved by the Lettish Social-Democracy in their Congress in May, 1917, asking only a cultural autonomy. The Lettish Social-Democracy is a part of the Russian Communist Party, the Bolsheviks.

Baron Uexcell, one of the murderers of the Esthonian workmen who fled from Esthonia to Stockholm, testifies that the Baltic inhabitants are all Bolsheviks, and that if the British fleet does not immediately arrive in Reval the cause of the Baltic barons is lost.

This is quite true. The inhabitants, excluding the junkers, some bourgeois and typical counter-revolutionists, are Bolsheviks not only in words but in deeds.

The enemies of the Baltic peoples, and especially of Courland and Livonia, whoever they may be and no matter what banner they may carry are faced with some of the best trained revolutionists in Russia. The Lettish Social-Democracy which has trained all the workers of both Courland and Livonia to be fighters for the revolution, has for more than 25 years played its part in spite of the terrible persecution of the old Czar. The "funny Peters", as the capitalist press says, "who in the Moscow cabinet signs the death warrants of counter-revolutionists until his hand is tired" is typical of the men from these provinces. The Lettish units, the Lettish sharpshooters (now the Red Guards) were the first to go out of Petrograd to meet Kornilov; it was they who assisted in the overthrow of Kerensky, guarded the Smolny Institute, and the Kremlin and 82 per cent of the Baltic Provinces are people of the same fibre.

The majority of the Lettish people are peasants, but they were driven out of their homes by the war and now they are the soldiers of the revolution. Their literature is filled with the revolutionary spirit, with ideals for the welfare of the peoples, not only of the Baltic Provinces but of the whole world.

The physical strength of the peasant, his high literary education, his revolutionary spirit tinged with the romanticism of the country and his belief in the cause of the workers, are the basis of his revolutionary action.

Neither anarchy nor chaos reigns now in the Baltic, but the new regime set up by the oppressed masses. The cries for aid that ring through the bourgeois press are not the people's cries but the whimper of 200 German ex-barons who owned 69 per cent of the wealth of the provinces and want to be restored to power. If the British navy is going to "prevent Bolshevik anarchy" or in other words, crush the will of the people, they are going to assist the Baltic barons to once more set the yoke of slavery on the neck of the Baltic peoples.

Withdraw from Russia!

1

The Story of Intervention

THE story of intervention in Russia is the story of an unjustifiable assault upon a nation, decided upon because the people of this nation determined to organize a new Socialist society.

The story of intervention is the story of the determination of international Capitalism to crush the Socialist Soviet Republic, by means of starvation and waging war upon its people, in order to crush international Socialism.

The war was a war between two rival groups of belligerents, determined to crush each other and secure all power. Each group plumed itself upon being superior to the other, each declared that the other was an enemy of humanity; yet both groups acted in precisely the same way against revolutionary Soviet Russia, waged war upon Soviet Russia, used the terrible suffering of the Russian people to accomplish reactionary purposes of their own. The form of expression varied, the fundamental purposes were identical: preserve Capitalism against Socialism.

Let us trace the story of intervention in Russia. In an address to Congress, January 4, 1918. President Woodrow Wilson said:

"The treatment accorded Russia by her sister nations in the months to come will be the acid test of their good will, of their comprehension of her needs as distinct from their own interests, and of their intelligent and unselfish sympathy."

Golden words, and true. The character of each nation and of its "ideals" have been tested by revolutionary Russia: Each and every bourgeois nation has acted against revolutionary Russia. The ideals of bourgeois society are miserable, lying imposters.

Imperial Germany, the Germany of Capitalism and Imperialism, revealed its predatory character at the Brest-Litovsk Peace Conference. The Bolsheviks came to Brest-Litovsk to negotiate a general democratic peace; the Austro-German imperialistic delegates accepted, in words, the formula of no annexations and no indemnities, and then in act repudiated the formula, insisted upon an indemnity and the annexation of Galicia and the Baltic Provinces. The Bolsheviks refused to accept "this peace of robbers and slave-traders," abandoned the Conference without signing the treaty. Then—the troops of imperialistic Germany and Austria marched into undefended Russia "in the name of civilization;" and certain influential personages and newspapers representing Imperialism among the Allies declared that it was a good thing for Germany to invade Russia! Revolutionary Russia, alone, was compelled to accept a peace of violence and shameless robbery. Imperialistic Germany sated its ravenous appetite.

And the Allies? "In the name of civilization," they refused revolutionary Russia's appeal to enter general peace negotiations, compelled the Bolsheviks to hold a separate peace conference. The Bolsheviks all the time, however, insisted upon a peace basis for general peace. While Germany was wreaking her will upon prostrate Russia in "the name of civilization," the Allies did not lift a finger to help their "ally"—equally "in the name of civilization." In fact, the imperialistic press of the Allies violently and viciously attacked Russia, at a time when Russia, alone, was waging a desperate but glorious struggle against German Imperialism. While the Bolsheviks were waging this struggle, the representatives of the Allies in Russia intrigued against the Soviet Government, worked for a restoration of reaction and the bourgeois government. When Germany marched its troops into Russia, the Allies did not offer any help whatever. Indeed, at this time, the Soviet Government asked the governments of France, Great Britain and the United States whether, if Russia carried on the war, they would assist with munitions and food. The governments of the Allies *did not* answer. Russia made peace. International Imperialism chuckled: Socialism is conquered!

Germany directly and the Allies indirectly acted against the Soviet Republic, against Socialism. Touching unanimity! . . . It is the class struggle. . . .

But Soviet Russia in abandoning the military war against German Imperialism, immediately opened a new war—a war of revolutionary propaganda within Germany to awaken the proletariat for the revolutionary overthrow of the German government. When Soviet Russia made its offer of an armistice on all fronts, it developed a powerful propaganda among the Austro-German troops, millions of leaflets, pamphlets and daily newspapers, printed in German, Hungarian and other languages, being distributed, and revolutionary fraternizing among the troops being developed. After the ratification of peace, this propaganda was continued in Germany and Austria, Bolshevik agitators placing life and liberty in jeopardy for the cause of the Revolution.

Immediately upon his arrival in Berlin, the Bolshevik ambassador, Joffe, became the centre of revolutionary propaganda against the Kaiser's government. Joffe refused to meet the Kaiser, as was the ambassadorial custom (repeatedly, after August 4, 1914, and before the United States entered the war, American Ambassador Gerard met the Kaiser), and instead gave a banquet in the Russian Embassy to German revolutionary Socialists. Rosa Luxemburg, just out of prison for agitation against the German government, was the guest of honor; Franz Mehring, Liebknecht Socialist, was toastmaster, while the Independent Socialist Haase acted as chairman. The German government was bitterly denounced, the German revolutionary Socialists speaking freely and fully, since the embassy was neutral soil and they could not be prosecuted. . . . And the next day the bourgeois press, in reporting the affair, wailed at the outrage of an ambassador associating thus with "the enemies of the Empire"! Peculiar fellows these "Bolshevik agents of the Kaiser"!

But in the meantime, the Allied press, and often government representatives, accused the Bolsheviks of being pro-German,—at a time when the Bolsheviks were waging a new war (and, as we see now, a victorious war) against German Imperialism. The Allies blockaded Russia, isolated her from the world, refused to allow Russia to purchase food and machinery in the markets of the world: the Allies consciously adopted the policy of starving the Russian people as a means of starving out the Soviet Government. Representatives of the Allies in Russia, moreover, plotted and engaged in counter-revolutionary moves against the Government. In the meantime, Bolshevik Ambassador Joffe brought, through diplomatic couriers, millions of revolutionary pamphlets into Germany, urging the people to make a revolution against Imperialism and the government. . . .

While the All-Russian Soviet Congress in March was in session at Moscow, President Wilson cabled a message of encouragement. . . . The campaign against the Soviet Republic flared up again. . . .

The Allies, it is clear, imagined that the Soviet Government could not last, that it was not representative of the Russian people, and that by starving Russia the process of the Bolshevik collapse would be accelerated. But the Russian people, in spite of counter-revolutionary plots from within and without, refused to overthrow their government. The Soviet Republic, instead of weakening, was strengthened by every single new day of its existence.

The Allies realized this fact, and the campaign for armed intervention in Russia assumed enormous proportions—intervention to rescue the Russian people from starvation and from the allies of Germany, the Bolsheviks! The ideals of Capitalism and Imperialism, in the test, are revealed as maggots. . . .

The Czecho-Slovak adventure provided the opportunity. Czecho-Slovak prisoners from Austria had, under Kerensky, been formed into independent units to fight Germany and Austria for the independence of Bohemia. Reactionary officers of the old regime were put in command. When peace was signed with Germany, arrangements were made for the Czecho-Slovaks to leave Russia for the western front by way of Vladivostok. On the march, the counter-revolutionary Russian officers and other counter-revolutionary elements instigated the Czecho-Slovaks against the Russian people, against the Soviets; and fighting developed. In order to stop this counter-revolutionary activity, which was demoralizing the railways and food transportation, Trotzky demanded that the Czecho-Slovaks yield up their arms. This met with a refusal, and the Czechs began a regular war against the Soviets and the Russian people—a brutal war, a counter-revolutionary war, upon the instigation of reactionary elements.

Then the imperialistic press of the Allies yelled in unison, "Armed Austrian and German prisoners in Russia are massacring the Czecho-Slovaks." The fact that, upon Trotzky's request, an Allied military mission had investigated the charge of "arming Austro-German prisoners" and found it false, did not daunt the imperialistic press in its lying campaign. The fact that the only massacres were massacres of the Russian people by the Czecho-Slovaks did not daunt the imperialistic press in its lying campaign.

After much diplomatic palaver, armed intervention in Russia was decided upon. British and French troops were already in Archangel, British and French and Japanese troops in Vladivostok. The American government decided to join. But in announcing the

American government's intention to send troops to Vladivostok, the American State Department on August 3 issued a statement, which said:

"Military intervention in Russia would be more likely to add to the present and confusion there than to cure it and would injure Russia rather than help her out of her distress. Such military intervention as has been most frequently proposed, even supposing it to be efficacious in its immediate object of delivering an attack upon Germany from the east, would in its [the American government's] judgment be more likely to turn out to be merely a method of making use of Russia than to be a method of serving her."

This was an excellent evaluation of the situation, and true. President Wilson is a master of words. . . .

But in the same statement it was declared that the purpose of landing American troops in Vladivostok was to assist "the westward moving Czecho-Slovaks." Westward moving Czecho-Slovaks—but this was away from Vladivostok, back into the heart of Russia! Surely this was not assisting the Czecho-Slovaks to get out of Russia—and it was interpreted by the press as a declaration of war against the Soviet government. State Department officials have privately declared that "westward" was a misprint for "eastward"; then why was a public correction never made?

The offensive against the Soviet Government was on,—to crush the revolution! At Vladivostok British and Japanese troops had dispersed the Soviet and arrested its officials, making the world safe for democracy! A new election was held, and the municipal officials elected were overwhelmingly Bolshevik—but the Allies refused to allow these officials to take power, and placed a counter-revolutionary administration in power.—the right of peoples to self-government!

Intervention, the Allies declared, was invited by the Russian people. But why did the people of Vladivostok, after seeing the beneficence of intervention in their own city, overwhelmingly elect Bolsheviks to office? The counter-revolution invited the troops of the Allies, not the Russian people.

Allied troops from Archangel and Vladivostok marched into Russia, the Czecho-Slovaks assumed the offensive. On August 6, 1918, Soviet Commissaire of Foreign Affairs Tchicherin issued the following statement, in the form of a note to the American Government through Consul-General Poole:

"We request you to inform your Government and people abroad that a completely unjustifiable attack and a pronounced act of violence is being committed against us. Our people want nothing but to live in peace and friendship with the masses and workers of all nations. Despite the existing state of peace, Anglo-French armed forces have invaded our territory, taken our towns and villages by force, dissolved our workers' organizations, imprisoned their members, and driven them from their homes without any reason possibly warranting these predatory acts. Without a declaration of war and without the existence of a state of war, hostilities are opened against us and our national property pillaged. Toward us no justice is observed and no laws acknowledged by those who sent these invading troops against us, for we are the first to establish a Government for the oppressed poor. Barefaced robbery is held permissible against us.

We, who represent the poor, are no barbarians like these invaders. Our retaliation against those who shoot the members of our Soviets does not take the shape of similar acts against the representatives of these governments. . . . We intern the nationals of invading powers in concentration camps. We apply these precautionary measures only against the members of the property classes, who are our opponents. No such measures are taken against our natural allies, the workmen of these same countries, who happen to be here. The working classes of the whole world are our friends. Precisely at this moment we say this to the countries whose armies proceed with open violence against us, and we call out to their people: "Peace be to the homes of the poor."

This impassioned and just protest met with no official answer, and was reviled by the bourgeois press. The Soviets asked the Allies to state their grievances, and negotiate, saying they would be only too glad to get the Czecho-Slovaks out of Russia, but the Allies did not answer.

Why? Solemn promises and pledges had been made not to interfere in the internal affairs of the Russian people; but the British Government stated, through Lloyd-George, that the purpose of intervention was to create "a centre for the elements opposed to Bolshevism." Solemn promises and pledges! They are the camouflage of Capitalism, means for the deception of the proletariat.

It was war upon the Russian people, it was war against Socialism, it was Capitalism against Socialism.

The Russian people did not rise in revolt against the Bolsheviks, instead they rose in revolt against the invading troops. . . .

The futility and counter-revolutionary character of intervention is now clear; it is clear that the Allies are starving the Russian people. . . . But alien troops are still at Archangel and Vladivostok! The intervention of the proletariat is necessary: Withdraw from Russia!