

THE INTERNATIONAL NEW

A JOURNAL OF REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALIST RECONSTRUCTION

Vol. I, No. 10

FEBRUARY, 1918

Price, 10 Cents

Revolutionary Unionism On Trial

THE revolutionary Socialist is intensely interested in the trial of the group of officials and members of the I. W. W. The trial is an historic event of the first importance,—not only in the magnitude of its scope, but in the magnitude of the issues involved.

This trial is the greatest of its kind in the history of the American Labor movement. Moreover, the issues are not personal, but social; not group, but class in scope. At a time when the cause of the workers has been betrayed by the "regular" unions paralyzed in the A. F. of L., the proletariat itself takes the bit in its teeth, acts and strikes aggressively. And it is this fact that has brought the I. W. W. to trial. The I. W. W. is an expression of latent revolutionary spirit of the American proletariat; and, accordingly, the capitalist government and the capitalist-dominated and corrupt bureaucracy of the A. F. of L. engage in a covert conspiracy to destroy the I. W. W., each for peculiar motives of its own, but each, equally, because the revolutionary proletariat menaces their interests.

This unholy alliance is explained by this fact: *once the American revolutionary proletariat awakens to consciousness, organizes itself and acts, it will mean the end of the domination equally of capitalist government and of the capitalist-dominated A. F. of L.*

An important immediate issue involved is the ability of the workers to strike during the war. It is the purpose of the capitalist class to curb and abolish strikes during the war, and in this way make more profits in the present and set a precedent for the future. But war intensifies the exploitation of the workers: war means a more brutal capitalism, a more intensely exploited proletariat; it means all the evils of the capitalist system raised to the highest, most malevolent point. Under these conditions, the class struggle should be waged more aggressively. The proletariat can not relinquish its strikes—that way lies more misery and subjection.

The capitalist class uses war to promote its own interests: securing new markets which can absorb its surplus capital, increasing its military prestige, making fabulous profits out of war needs, and increasing its domination over the workers.

The proletariat should use war to promote its interests: multiply its strikes for better conditions, emphasize its antagonism to and weaken the domination of the capitalist class, and develop its revolutionary spirit for action in the days to come.

The employers in the West used the war to cheat the government and the people, to make unheard-of profits. At the same time, it tried to break the spirit of the workers, crush their organizations and action. The workers marched out in revolt, through their own spontaneous mass action, and rallied around the I. W. W. as a true representative of the workers. The capitalist government thereupon

proceeded against the I. W. W. in order to strike at the workers.

This is a vital immediate issue; but there is a correlative ultimate issue of even more vital importance: *the trial of the I. W. W. means the trial of revolutionary unionism.*

feasibility of making a Social Revolution, the revolution of the proletariat which is the greatest revolution in all history, by the peurile methods described in the indictment. No, gentlemen, the Social Revolution is a much more difficult task than all that.

unorganized unskilled workers, which constitute the factor in the overthrow of Capitalism. Rally to the support of the indicted I. W. W.! Rally around the revolutionary proletariat in action!

The Constituent Assembly and the Bolsheviki

THE dissolution of the Constituent Assembly by the decree of the Bolshevik government was a necessary and a revolutionary act.

In the decree of dissolution, Nikolai Lenine, premier of the revolutionary proletarian government, declared that the Constituent Assembly was elected from the old election lists, hence necessarily became the organ of the bourgeois republic; that the Constituent Assembly had set itself against the revolution of November 6, which decreed all power to the Councils; that the revolution had proven to the masses the deceptive character of the parliamentary regime, and that there is only one government capable of maintaining the struggle against the exploiting class,—the revolutionary government of the Councils of Workers and Soldiers.

The parliamentary regime is the expression of bourgeois democracy,—an instrument for the promotion of bourgeois class interests and the deception of the masses. The proletarian revolution annihilates this parliamentary regime. The division of functions in a parliamentary government is a necessary instrument against opposition,—the legislature talks and represents "democracy," while the executive acts autocratically. The revolutionary government of Russia unites both functions democratically in the Councils of Workers and Soldiers.

All democracy is relative, is class democracy. No other class but the proletariat and proletarian peasantry. Its democracy is also class democracy, with this vital difference: that while bourgeois "democracy" perpetuates class tyranny, proletarian democracy annihilates tyranny.

The problem of parliamentary government is a crucial one in the proletarian revolution: Socialism cannot seize the ready-made machinery of the State and use it for its purposes. A new form of government must be organized by the revolutionary proletariat,—as in Russia.

Years ago, Karl Marx indicated the function of a "dictatorship of the proletariat" in the Social Revolution. It is precisely this dictatorship that is now making history in revolutionary Russia. The dictatorship of the proletariat refuses to recognize any "rights" of the non-proletarian class; it breaks completely with the institutions, ideology and superstitions of the bourgeois regime; it uses dictatorial measures, the dictatorship of a class, to promote and establish the revolution and the new society, in which dictatorship will be incompatible with the actuality of full and free democracy.

Armistice and Peace

Resolutions adopted at a mass meeting held in Arlington Hall, December 20, under auspices of Local Greater New York, Socialist Propaganda League

The workers of the world demand an immediate general peace, a peace that shall alter the imperialistic *status quo ante* in accord with the international aspirations of the revolutionary proletariat of Russia.

The governments of the imperialistic belligerents are determined upon a continuation of the war in the interest of their particular imperialism; the proletariat alone as a class is interested in and can hasten an immediate peace that shall promote civilization and progress.

The class interests of the American proletariat make necessary the adoption of an immediate program of action:

1. We demand that the government accept the proposal of the *de facto* government of Russia for the immediate conclusion of a general armistice on all belligerent fronts.

2. We demand that the government insist that Great Britain, France and Italy shall equally accept the armistice.

3. We demand that the negotiations for an armistice shall not include the discussion of peace terms, the discussion and formulation of those terms being left to the peoples of each belligerent nation.

4. We call upon the class conscious workers to prepare the organization of a proletarian peace congress, which shall discuss our action in co-operation with the international proletariat and in accord with the peace principles of revolutionary Socialism.

The proletariat must organize as an independent factor in the process of securing peace, separate and distinct from all other social groups. The proletariat alone is international in its interests, and it alone can determine the conclusion of an international peace upon the formula of revolutionary Russia.

We affirm our solidarity with the proletariat of Russia, and express our fraternal appreciation of its intrepid class conscious activity.

The first count in the government's indictment charges that the I. W. W. is a revolutionary organization that seeks to secure for the working class "complete control and ownership of all property, and of the means of producing and distributing property through the abolition of all other classes of society (by the members of said organization designated as 'capitalist,' 'the capitalist class,' 'the master class,' 'the ruling class,' 'exploiters of the workers,' 'bourgeois,' and 'parasites'); such abolition to be accomplished not by political action or with any regard for right or wrong but by the continued and persistent use and employment of unlawful, tortuous and forcible means and methods, involving threats, assaults, injuries, intimidations and murders upon the persons and the injury and destruction (known in said organization as 'sabotage,' 'direct action,' 'working on the job') of the property of such other classes, the forcible resistance to the execution of all laws and finally the forcible revolutionary overthrow of all existing governmental authority, in the United States."

This count in the indictment is as stupid as it is illuminating of the motives of the prosecution in making the indictment.

The individual who framed this indictment is certainly an original sociologist, a genius in assinity: just imagine the

But the wording of the indictment is mere camouflage, a cloaking of the real purpose. Of course the prosecution could not charge the I. W. W. with having a revolutionary objective alone, since the Declaration of Independence provides and sets a precedent for revolution. It had to be done "by tortuous means without any regard for right or wrong."

The purpose is plain. It is to strike at revolutionary unionism. This could not very well be done in the days of peace, so the opportunity of war (that patriotic pretext for all sorts of capitalist infamy) had to be used instead.

Now there can be no Socialism without revolutionary unionism and its correlated general mass action of the proletariat. Revolutionary unionism and mass action are the great forces for surmounting the capitalist mode of production; moreover, revolutionary industrial unionism will constitute the structure of the new Socialist society. It is upon the basis of unionism and mass action that revolutionary Socialism builds. And in the trial of the I. W. W. is involved precisely the action of the proletariat as expressed in revolutionary unionism and mass action.

The task of the revolutionary Socialist is clear. The I. W. W., with all its imperfection, is a revolutionary organization, an expression of the vast mass of

Peasants and Workers

By NIKOLAI LENINE

IN No. 88 of the *Isvestya* of the Pan-Russian Council of Peasants' Delegates there are printed a number of proposed laws, which are of interest in connection with the agrarian question in Russia. The first division of these laws deals with the general political premises, the requirements of political democracy, while the second division is concerned with the land question.

The land demands of the peasantry in these proposed laws, consist, first of all, in an abolition of all private ownership of land down to the peasant holdings, without compensation; in handing over to the state or the communes all parcels which are under intensive cultivation; in likewise confiscating all live stock and immovables (excluding those of peasants with small holdings), and handing them over to the state or to the communes; in the prohibition of hired labor; in equalizing the distribution of land among the toilers, with periodic redistributions, etc. Among the measures proposed for the transition period before the convocation of the Constituent Assembly, the peasants demanded the immediate passing of laws requiring the cessation of all buying and selling of land, the abolition of laws permitting sales of land to the commune, by persons intending to liquidate, or permitting the cutting down of forests, etc., for the conservation of forests, fisheries, and other preserves, etc., for the abrogation of all long-term leases and the revision of those made for shorter periods.

A short reflection on these demands will show the absolute impossibility of securing the aid of capitalists in their realization—in fact, the impossibility of avoiding a break with the capitalists, a determined and merciless struggle with the capitalist class, in short, a complete overthrow of their rule.

In fact, the confiscation of all private ownership in land means the confiscation of hundreds of millions of bank capital, with which these lands, for the most part, are mortgaged. Is such a measure conceivable unless the revolutionary plan, by the aid of revolutionary methods, shall break down the opposition of the capitalists? Besides, we are here touching the most centralized form of capital, which is bank capital, and which is bound by a million threads with all the important centers of the capitalist system of this great nation, which can be defeated only by the equally well-organized power of the proletariat of the cities.

Moreover, there is the matter of handing over the highly cultivated estates to the state. Is it not clear that the only "state" which is capable of taking them over and actually administering them in the interest of the toilers, and not for the good of the *chinovniks* (officials) and of the capitalists themselves, must necessarily be a proletarian revolutionary state?

The confiscation of stud-farms, etc., and then of all cattle and immovables, these measures are not only increasingly crushing blows against private ownership of the means of production. They are steps toward Socialism, for the passing over of this property "into its exclusive utilization by the state or the communes," makes absolutely necessary a huge Socialistic system of agriculture, or, at least, a Socialistic regulation of its functioning.

But, how about "the prohibition of hired labor?" This is an empty phrase, the helpless, unconsciously naive hope of the downtrodden petty farmers who do not see how impossible it is "not to permit" hired labor in the country, if it is to continue to be permitted in the cities,—in short, that the "prohibition" of hired labor can never be nothing else than a step toward Socialism.

This brings us to the fundamental ques-

tion of the relations of the laborers to the peasants. The social-democratic mass movement in Russia has been going on for twenty years (if we count from the great strikes of 1896). Throughout this interval, passing through the two great revolutions, there runs, a veritable red thread of Russian political history, this great question: shall the working class lead the peasantry forward to socialism, or shall the liberal bourgeoisie drag them back, into a conciliation with capitalism?

The revolutionary Social-Democratic Party has all this time been fighting to remove the peasants from the influence of the cadets and has offered them, in place of the utopian middle class view of Socialism, but a revolutionary-proletarian path to Socialism.

"Conciliate yourselves with the rule of capital, for 'we' are not yet ready for Socialism," that is what the Mensheviks say to the peasants. In other words, they misrepresent the abstract question of "Socialism" as being the concrete question of whether the wounds inflicted by the war may be healed without taking resolute steps toward Socialism.

The Monarchy has been abolished. The bourgeois revolution was crowned with success, inasmuch as Russia became a democratic republic with a government consisting of Cadets, Mensheviks and S. R.'s. But, in the course of three years, the war has driven us thirty years ahead, has made compulsory military service universal in Europe, has led to a forced monopolization of industry and brought the most developed nations to suffer hunger and unparalleled destruction, forcing them to take definite steps toward Socialism.

Only the proletariat and the peasantry can overthrow the Monarchy—that has been the fundamental declaration of our class policy. And it was a correct position, as the months of February and March, 1917, have once more confirmed.

Only the proletariat, leading on the poorest peasants (the semi-proletariat, as they are called in our program) may terminate the war with a democratic peace, may heal its wounds, and may undertake the steps toward Socialism that have become absolutely unavoidable and non-postponable. That is the clear demand of our class policy at present.

The course of history, accelerated by the war, has made such huge strides forward, that the ancient slogans have been filled with a new content. For instance: "The prohibition of hired labor" was merely an empty phrase of the *petit bourgeois* intellectual. Millions of impoverished peasants, in 242 instructions, declare that they want to attack the problem of abolishing hired labor, but do not know how to go about it. But we know how. We know it can only be done by cooperation with the workers, under their lead, and not "in agreement" with the capitalists.

Only the revolutionary proletariat can actually carry out the above plan of the impoverished peasants, which they present in the 242 instructions. For the revolutionary proletariat is actually going about the task of abolishing hired labor, and by the only real approach, namely, by overthrowing capitalism, and not by forbidding the hiring of labor. The revolutionary proletariat is actually going to confiscate the lands, the property on them, the agricultural corporations—which is exactly what the peasants want.

Here is the change to be made in the outline of the workers' appeal to the peasant: We, the workers, want to give you, and do give you, that which the impoverished peasantry wants and seeks, without always knowing where to find it. We, the workers, are defending our interests

against the capitalists, and these interests are those of the vast majority of the peasantry.

* * *

Let me remind the reader of what Engels said, not long before his death, concerning the agrarian question. Engels emphasized the point that nothing was further removed from the minds of socialists than the intention of expropriating the smaller peasants, and that the latter should be made to see the advantage of machine-process, socialist agriculture, by the force of example alone.

The war has now placed before Russia, in a practical form, this very question. Of farm property there is little. Simply confiscate it, and "do not divide" the highly cultivated estates.

The peasants have begun to see this. Need made them see it. The war made them see it; for the farm accessories are not worth taking. They must be husbanded. But management on a large scale means the conservation, both of labor on these accessories, and of many other things.

The July Uprising

By LEON TROTSKY

From Petrograd "Vperiod", July 25, 1917

BLOOD has flowed in the streets of Petrograd. A tragic chapter has been added to the Russian Revolution. Who is to blame? "The Bolsheviks," says the man in the street, repeating what his newspapers tell him. The sum total of these tragic happenings is exhausted, as far as the bourgeoisie and the time-serving politicians are concerned, in the words: Arrest the ringleaders and disarm the masses. And the object of this action is to establish "revolutionary order." The Social Revolutionists and the Mensheviks, in arresting and disarming the Bolsheviks, are preparing to establish "order." There is only one question: What kind of order, and for whom?

The Revolution aroused great hopes in the masses. Among the masses of Petrograd, who played a leading role in the Revolution, these hopes and expectations were cherished with exceptional earnestness. It was the task of the Social-Democratic Party to transform these hopes and expectations into clearly-defined political programs, to direct the revolutionary impatience of the masses in the channel of a planful political action. The Revolution was brought face to face with the question of state power. We, as well as the Bolshevik organization, stood for a handing over of all powers to the Central Committee of the Councils of Soldiers, Workers' and Peasants' Delegates. The upper classes, and among them we must include the Social-Revolutionists and the Mensheviks, exhorted the masses to support the Milyukov-Guchkov government. Up to the last moment, that is, up to the time when these more distinctly imperialistic figures of the first Provisional Government resigned, both the above mentioned parties were firmly united with the government all along the line. Only after the reconstruction of the government did the masses learn from their own newspapers that they had not been told the whole truth, that they had been deceived. They were then told that they must trust the new "coalition" government. The revolutionary Social-Democracy predicted that the new government would not differ essentially from the old, that it would not make any concessions to the Revolution and would again betray the hopes of the masses. And so it came to pass. After two months of a policy of weakness, of demands for confidence, of verbose exhortations, the government's posi-

The peasants want to retain their small holdings and to arrive at some place of equal distribution. So be it. No sensible socialist will quarrel with a pauper peasant on this ground. If the lands are confiscated, so long as the proletarians rule in the great centers and all political power is handed over to the proletariat, the rest will take care of itself, will be a natural outcome of the "power of example;" practice itself will do the teaching here.

The passing of political power to the proletariat, that is the whole thing. Then all the essential, fundamental, real points in the program of the 242 instructions become realities. And life will point out with what modifications this realization is to proceed. *We should worry*: we are not doctrinaires.

We do not pretend that Marx or the Marxians know every detail of the road which leads to Socialism. That would be folly. We know the direction of the road, we know what class forces will lead to it, but the concrete, practical details will appear in the experience of the millions when they tackle the job.

tion of beclouding the issues could no longer be concealed. It became clear that the masses had once more—and this time more cruelly than ever before—been divided. The impatience and the mistrust of the great body of workers and soldiers in Petrograd was increasing, not day by day, but hour by hour. These feelings, fed by the prolonged war, so hopeless for all participating in it, by economic disorganization, by an invisible setting-in of a general cessation of the most important branches of production, found their immediate political expression in the slogan: "All power to the Soviets!" The retirement of the Cadets and the definite proof of the internal bankruptcy of the Provisional Government convinced the masses still more thoroughly that they were in the right as opposed to the official leaders of the Soviets. The vacillations of the Social-Revolutionists and the Mensheviks simply added oil to the flames. *The demands, almost persecutions, addressed to the Petrograd garrison, requiring them to inaugurate an offensive, had a similar effect.* An explosion became inevitable. All parties, including the Bolsheviks, took every step to prevent the masses from making the demonstration of July 3rd (N. S. 16): but the masses did demonstrate, and with weapons in their hands, moreover. All the agitators, all the district representatives, declared on the evening of July 3rd (N. S. 16), that the July 4th (N. S. 17) demonstration, since the question of power remained unsettled, was bound to take place, and that no measures could hold back the people. That is the only reason why the Bolshevik Party, and with it our organization, decided not to stand aloof and wash its hands of the consequences, but to do everything in its power to change the July 4th (N. S. 17) affair into a peaceful mass demonstration. No other was the meaning of the July 4th appeal. It was of course clear, in view of the certain intervention of counter-revolutionary gangs, that bloody conflicts would arise. It would have been possible, it is true, to deprive the masses of any political guidance, to decapitate them politically, as it were, and to leave them, by refusing to direct them, to their own fate. But we, being the Workers' Party, neither could nor would follow Pilate's tactics: we decided to join in with the masses and to stick to them, in order to introduce into their elemental turmoil the greatest measure of or-

ganization attainable under the circumstances, and thus to reduce to a minimum the number of probable victims. The facts are well known. Blood has been spilled. And now the "influential" press of the bourgeoisie, and the other newspapers serving the bourgeoisie, are attempting to put on our shoulders the entire burden of responsibility for the consequences—for the poverty, the exhaustion, the disaffection and the rebelliousness of the masses. To accomplish this end, to complete this

labor of counter-revolutionary mobilization against the party of the proletariat, there issue forth rascals of anonymous, semi-anonymous, or publicly branded varieties, who circulate accusations of bribery: blood has flowed because of the Bolsheviks, and the Bolsheviks were acting under the orders of Wilhelm.

We are at present passing through days of trial. The steadfastness of the masses, their self-control, the fidelity of their "friends," all these things are being put

to the acid-test. We also are being subjected to this test, and we shall emerge from it more strengthened, more united, than from any previous trial. Life is with us and fighting for us. The new reconstruction of power, dictated by an ineluctable situation, and by the miserable half-heartedness of the ruling parties, will change nothing and will solve nothing. We must have a radical change of the whole system. We need revolutionary power.

The Tseretelli-Kerensky Policy is directly intended to disarm and weaken the left wing of the Revolution. If, with the aid of these methods, they succeed in establishing "order," they will be the first—after us, of course—to fall as victims of this "order." But they will not succeed. The contradiction is too profound, the problems are too enormous, to be disposed of by mere police measures.

After the days of trial will come the days of progress and victory.

The Russian Revolution

By ANTON PANNEKOEK

WITH the overthrow of Czarism, the Government naturally came into the hands of those who heretofore had constituted the opposition. In the Duma this was the bourgeois opposition of the Cadets, and, from the Left, the Social Revolutionists (peasant-delegates) with Kerensky and the Mensheviks with Tschaidse as their best known representatives. At the same time that the reactionary Duma disappeared the Provisional Government was formed from the Duma opposition.

Here the same development as in a number of previous revolutions occurred again; although the masses are instrumental in making the revolution, a committee of bourgeois politicians constitutes itself as government and assumes a popular character by assimilating a few well-known leaders of the masses. But contrary to previous experiences in Western European revolutions—in which the masses fell apart in powerless atoms immediately after the action—a higher development was reached now: the revolutionary masses constituted their own powerful organization. In accordance with the example of 1905 the delegates of factories and the revolutionary army corps organized into a "Council of Workers and Soldiers" as a kind of permanent parliament, defending the active force of the revolution and the democracy of the masses against the members of the bourgeois government. From the very start this Council acted as the organ of democratic distrust of the masses against the bourgeois government; the bourgeois press lamented the intolerable accessory government; the Council considered itself the organ of the popular revolution against Imperialism and war. In its name Lenine and other Russian revolutionaries were greeted by Tschaidse on their return from Switzerland to Petrograd through Germany after the closure of other routes by the English Government. And at the same time the Council addressed all workers and Socialists in neutral as well as in warring countries with the proud appeal to break with their imperialistic governments and to hold a Congress for peace—in defiance of the Congress of the great betrayal staged in Stockholm by Troelstra, Branting and Scheidemann.

Soon the Council of Workers and Soldiers acted against the Provisional Government, and at once the inner contradictions in the groups of the revolution became clear. Not yet the deeper and general class conflicts: workers, peasants and capitalists, but the more superficial antagonism between the imperialistic policy of the bourgeoisie demanding from the revolution a more energetic carrying on of the war and the masses craving for peace. The demonstrations in the beginning of May under the auspices of the Council forced the bourgeoisie to give in: Miljukof and Gutschkof, the imperialistic leaders, abdicated. The Provisional Government was re-organized in accordance with the new balance of power: a number of Socialist (Menshevik) leaders entered the ministry as representatives of the Council.

In the Council itself this result met with opposition; there the differences based on different classes in the Russian social order appeared more clearly. The "Social Democratic Labor Party," the "Bolsheviks" (Lenine, Zinovief, Kamenev) which as a militant party had already gained great influence among the industrial proletariat even under Czarism, became more and more the representative of the Petrograd workers. But in the Council they constituted a minority; the majority of the delegates, those of the soldiers, were peasants; their mode of thought corresponded best with the moderate Socialism of the Social Revolutionists and the Mensheviks. They believed in continuing the war as a war to defend the revolution against the Germans, who wanted to re-instate the Czar; the same slogan of a "war of defence" with which, in 1914, in Germany and France the masses were swept into the war, here again served its purpose; practically they were social-patriots. They approved of their leaders, Kerensky, Skobelev, Tchernoff, Tseretelli, constituting the government in a ministry together with representatives of the bourgeoisie.

This problem forms the main point of differences between the Leninites and the majority of the Council. The Bolsheviks demand: no participation in a bourgeois government, but the government in the hands of the Council. The Council of Workers and Soldiers, together with the peasants also organized at a congress, constitute the whole of the Russian working people. This has to decide its own affairs alone—the bourgeoisie is not required for this: we don't recognize its right to count as a class.

It may seem strange that the Bolsheviks wanted to give the power to an institution in which they formed only a minority and which could not be expected to act according to their views. This, however, was perfectly logical, a body representing exclusively peasants and workers would be compelled to take such economic measures required for those classes independent of theories, and do what we wish it to do—if only it is separated completely from a coalition with the bourgeoisie in the interests of the latter.

Why did the Menshevik leaders and the majority of the Council oppose this solution and why did they cling to the bourgeois politicians? Why did they not take full control at the outbreak of the revolution, why not May 2nd? Why did they turn the power, conquered by the workers in the streets, over to the bourgeoisie? The answer is not difficult: they shrank before the gigantic task of re-organizing society, backed only by the proletariat against all of the property interests. At the beginning of the revolution, they stated this clearly in a manifesto: Russia with its enormous population of peasants and its primitive capitalistic development is not yet ripe for Socialism and therefore it is necessary that at present the bourgeoisie must rule, a kind of would-be Marxian theory, that does not realize that Socialism only can result from a long process of struggles, in which the degree of ripeness of society depends upon the ripeness of

the proletariat for struggle and power. But in Russia their task looked still more hopeless, because of disorganization through the war and the mismanagement of the Czar; they did not see fit to reconstruct without the co-operation of the bourgeoisie; they relied upon the abilities of the bourgeois politicians to bring order in the chaos. All this tends to prove that those Mensheviks, although they call themselves Socialists and although they represent working classes, mentally are much closer to the bourgeoisie than to the revolutionary Socialists.

The further developments under the coalition government have shown how completely these timid views were in discord with actual conditions. Being a coalition government, it had to keep the middle of the road between the struggling classes; it could not support the workers against the capitalists nor the capitalists against the workers; it had to refer the peasants eager for land to the future constitutional assembly, because it dared not break with the land owners. It had to preach patience and compromises to all sides without satisfying anybody; it did not dare to tackle any problem seriously and had simply to let things drift along. And meanwhile the antagonism became stronger and difficulties greater.

There has been written much about the anarchy prevalent in Russia. The bourgeoisie did not mean by this the disorder in the production and distribution, but the fact that the workers were on their feet and forced the bourgeoisie and the government to recognize them—which actually meant the beginning and the necessary condition for a new social order. The bourgeoisie called for a strong government, as the only means to restore order and they emphasized that here as always a "Socialistic" government only could result in disorder. And indeed, the situation was untenable. They could only see salvation in a capitalistic government, which would keep the proletarians in submission by force, so as to have them work and slave obediently and without protest for the profits of the bourgeoisie. But there was another way out. The inefficiency of the government did not result from its "Socialism"—which only existed in fooling the proletariat with nice talk and fine slogans—but in the lack of Socialism. What a real Socialist government should have done under the circumstances has been stated repeatedly by the Bolsheviks. It is their credit to have formulated against the old phrases of the social patriots, a program of immediate demands based on the exigencies of the actual conditions in Russia, a program that could save the country and the proletariat from the untenable conditions and could pave the road for development towards Socialism. In this respect also the Bolsheviks have been the vanguard of revolutionary Socialism throughout the world.

In the first place there was the management of production. Where capitalists closed their factories as a weapon against the workers, or because they did not see fit to exploit with sufficient profit, the factories had to be expropriated and put into the hands of the workers and the technical

staff to continue production. Where landowners refused to cultivate their land, it had to be expropriated and put into the hands of the peasants. By giving land to the peasants without regard for the rights of the landowners, it could be expected that the peasants would put their products at the disposition of the rest of the population. Agricultural implements and machinery had to be given to the peasants at low prices. By regulation of the transport and strong measures against extra profits, it would be possible to reduce the high cost of living. And by socializing the most important industries, which so far made big war profits, especially also the large banks, as well as by strongly drawing on private capitals, it would be possible to open big resources of income. And no doubt a revolutionary government would start at once to repudiate national debts, which sucked the Russian people by their enormous interests to the benefit of West European bond holders. The Russians would be crazy if they patiently continued to pay interest on bonds issued by the Czar and by so doing to pay tribute to the helpers of their hangman for being his accomplices. In this way the yearly budget of the State would be materially relieved.

But for all these measures there was one necessary condition: a speedy end to the war that sacrificed all production to munition output, and tied millions of men at the front, exhausting all resources. For this reason, peace, the struggle for peace was in the center of agitation of the Bolsheviks. Peace not only was an economic necessity, in order to prevent bankruptcy and hunger: peace also was the most important demand of the class struggle against the bourgeoisie. The Russian bourgeoisie did not want peace, but war; even if for the present it had to suppress and conceal its own imperialistic aims, still it realized the necessity of sticking to co-operation with the Entente . . . in the great world struggle between Germany and England it could not be neutral. And more so because a Russian government could not bear the war expenses without the financial aid of England.

Therefore the party of the revolutionary proletariat stood opposed to the Provisional Government. What the government has been blamed for by the Bolsheviks was not only its impotence, as a result of its class character, to achieve improvements in economic conditions, but also that it followed a war policy, which characterized it as the servant of the Entente. The provisional Government considered the secret treaties, between the Czar and the English and French Governments, as an obligation on its part, and notwithstanding repeated demands and promises to publish these treaties, it failed to do so. This fact alone brands the Provisional Governments as a bourgeois government secretly plotting with other bourgeois governments about war and peace, considering the masses only as obedient tools. How far this so-called "revolutionary" government with "Socialist" ministers was from being a real revolutionary administration is shown also by the fact that it maintained the whole ex-

isting bureaucracy of the Czar, including the military, which they claimed to put into the service of the revolution.

The social-patriots co-operated in this policy. They were bound to assist, because otherwise they had to break the coalition, an act they did not want; here again was shown: Socialists co-operating in a bourgeois government are forced to assist in and take responsibility for a bourgeois policy. Whoever does not want Socialist policy, must accept bourgeois policy, which under present conditions always means imperialistic policy. But it was not even a forced solidarity with their colleagues only; when they persistently told the people that war against Germany was necessary as a war of defense of the revolution against the strongest, most reactionary state power, this was largely demagoguery, but in which they themselves as social-patriots also believed.

In this they did not take a stand different from the social-patriots in England and France, who also claimed to carry on the war as champions of democracy and freedom against German militarism and German autocracy. Plechanov already had given them an argument by claiming that the German workers could only be brought to revolt through a war against Germany. And this war policy included, in addition to the illusion and promise to win over the Entente Governments for the revolutionary peace terms, no annexations, etc., at the same time the reality of cooperating in an imperialistic war of conquest directed by secret diplomacy in the service of French-English capital.

The result has shown how perfectly right was the conception of the Bolsheviks and revolutionary Socialism in general: the class struggle is paramount. Each war, no matter for what splendid cause, waged together with the bourgeoisie against another country, is to forsake the class struggle and therefore is class treason, is a crime against the cause of the proletariat. From this clear viewpoint Lenin and his group carried on the struggle for peace and attacked the social-patriots. But although strong in theory, it was most difficult to win the masses for this conception under the existing conditions. For peace was not a matter of one or two peoples, the international war could only end by an international peace, and a revolutionary proletariat that stood for peace in one country could not end the war. Lenin knew perfectly well that a separate peace of revolutionary Russia with autocratic Germany was psychologically as well as politically an impossibility. As long as the German workers refused to revolt against their government, the policy of the Bolsheviks, therefore, was no doubt, logical and possible, but it could not expect to win the masses easily. The Russian revolutionary fire had to spread over Europe or to smother in its own insufficiency.

The participation of Socialists as representatives of the Council of Workers and Soldiers in the coalition Government, produced the same results as elsewhere. The Menshevik Socialists participated in and supported bourgeois policy, which it is true did not interfere in the direct economic struggle, but in broad lines followed a policy in the interest of Capital. They sanctioned this policy by their influence with the masses. And as they were bound to their bourgeois colleagues, so was the organization that delegated them. The Council could not denounce its delegates; to show its confidence in these leaders it had to proclaim its confidence in the Government. The Council became a governmental organ; the Council became a tool, which made it accept the deeds of the bourgeois ministers without protest.

In May and June the Council in Petrograd was the scene of a persistent struggle; by means of a powerful propa-

ganda the Bolshevik tried to convince the delegates that their ministers and through them the Council played into the hands of the bourgeoisie by these tactics. The majority of the peasant-soldiers allowed themselves, however, to be carried away by the fine phrases of Kerensky and Tseretelli, who always talked revolution and democracy, fatherland and freedom. And also the Congress of Councils from all parts of the country, which met in the latter part of June and where against 150 internationalists (Bolsheviks, Trotsky, Martov) stood a block of 600 social-patriots who supported the Government.

And this support became essentially a struggle against the Left Wing. The organs of the bourgeoisie had for a long time recognized the Bolsheviks as their most dangerous foes and they demanded strong action against these "anarchists." The struggle of the Bolsheviks, which they carried on as spokesmen for the proletariat against the government, gradually was considered as treason towards the fatherland, treason towards the revolution; and now the Council, as guardian of the Government, proceeded stronger against its minority. When on June 23rd a demonstration was contemplated to show the dissatisfaction of the workers with the Government policy, it was Tseretelli who accused the Bolsheviks in the Council of planning an armed overthrow of the Government; in order to avoid an open conflict—the Government had troops in readiness—the demonstration was not held. By its organized contact with the small bourgeois—agrarian elements the proletariat had lost its freedom of action. "Never in 1905," wrote Trotsky, "was proletariat so isolated as now. In December 1905 the workers had to try a definite struggle before the reserve forces of the agricultural classes had been mobilized: but then there was no friendship of these awakening masses against the proletariat. This has been achieved now—." This was indeed the meaning and the result of the participation of social democrats in a coalition cabinet: small bourgeois and peasants were tied to the bourgeoisie and the proletariat was isolated. The change in government on May 2nd, this "victory" of the revolution was in fact the beginning of the road downwards.

When in the end of June this became more and more evident the counter-revolutionary forces appeared. Rodzianko called the members of the Duma to Moscow to be ready when required: this reactionary crowd sensed some future possibilities. The Don Cossacks called a congress and recommended themselves in their well-known capacity as reliable tools of order. Kerensky delivered enthusiastic talks at the front to get the soldiers warmed up for a new beginning of the war and those who opposed or voiced their mistrust in the capitalist government were arrested. When at the Rumanian front four regiments refused to go to the trenches, they were surrounded at the orders of a general and forced to submit. The dream of freedom and peace had to end: the offensive was prepared.

The offensive was the way out of the untenable situation of the provisional government. To them the financial condition was worst of all, and as they were not willing to follow the line of the Bolsheviks—confiscation of banks, high taxes on capital—being a capitalist government, there was no way out than begging the Entente. Rightly the Pravda correspondence claims that by accepting the Bolshevik suggestions, and so becoming financially independent, the Government could have threatened with repudiation of national debts and forced the Entente governments by the revolt of the French small bourgeoisie to start serious peace negotiations. By its policy the provisional government became the slave of the Entente

Imperialism and England and America demanded: blood for gold. No new loan, unless the offensive was launched. In secret conferences the plan was schemed with the generals of the English and American rulers; with great energy Kerensky organized the campaign started on July 1st.

Nothing characterizes the nature of this offensive better than the fact that it was kept secret for the Russian people. If the preparations had been publicly known, the warnings of Lenin and his friends that the offensive was bound to fail, on account of the lack of fighting spirit of the soldiers, and that the power of the generals would greatly increase the reaction, might have exercised a strong influence upon the public opinion of the Council. For this reason the offensive had to be a surprise. In London and Paris the papers announced the offensive days in advance; in Petrograd it was only announced after it had started and the Germans were repulsed. And the provisional government rightly figured that this success would break the opposition that might have prevented the plan in advance. After long discussions the Council passed a motion to approve the offensive against a strong majority of 271 votes—many more than the number of Bolsheviks. The great change in character of the Council from a revolutionary into a governmental organ also was demonstrated by the fact that now, instead of planning peace with the revolutionists of all countries, they prepared for a peace conference with social-patriots. On the same day on which the offensive started, the delegates of the Council shook hands with Scheidemann in Stockholm.

The Council did not realize that by this action they committed suicide. For an offensive, not as a small trick, but in deadly earnest, and under these circumstances, demands a well-disciplined army, demands discipline in the military sense of the word, demands ending whatever control the soldiers had, demands therefore ultimately the abolishment of the Council itself. With the offensive the Government of Kerensky and Tseretelli openly and willingly entered the road of the counter-revolution. And all elements that put their hope in counter-revolution, the bourgeoisie and its politicians, applauded the offensive as the beginning of "sound" conditions. And in their way they were right. The authority of the generals over the troops was increasingly recovered, and this was the basis for the recovering of the bourgeois order. And at the same time that the proletarians and revolutionary soldiers prepared a sharper opposition against this policy, they were more strongly attacked by the social-patriots—blind pioneers and tools of the reaction—and accused of being agents of Germany and traitors to the revolution.

A clash could not be avoided. The Bolshevik leaders tried again and again to prevent and to postpone this until conditions would clearly show the government to be a failure. But the conflict could not be avoided. On July 15th the Government ordered the Petrograd machine gun regiment to the front; it refused arguing that it was not willing to fight in favor of English-French Imperialism, and would only submit if the Government published the secret treaties in accordance with its promise. It also refused to give up its arms; two other regiments joined. When at the same time a crisis broke out in the Government, the Cadets refusing to grant the moderate autonomy demanded by the Ukraine and resigning as ministers—the workers in the factories also became active; in great masses the workers and soldiers moved through the streets on the evening of July 16th. Kerensky narrowly escaped when they tried to arrest him. The Government now took its measures; although the Cossacks were defeated in some of the streets, the Governor of Petrograd ordered more and

more reliable troops to cover systematically all the important strategic points and so gradually succeeded in mastering the situation. The history of these days (July 16th-19th) is not yet known in details, because of the immediate closing of the frontiers by the Government. But the causes of the defeat of the proletariat of Petrograd are easily understood after what has been stated above. The workers alone were too weak against the peasants and bourgeoisie organized into an army. The policy of the Bolsheviks was based on creating a mutual interest between workers and peasants, but actual conditions made this difficult to attain immediately. Conditions caused the peasants-soldiers (small owners) to follow the social-patriotic leaders, who in fear of a revolutionary Socialist policy accepted a bourgeois imperialistic policy. Because in these July days the Council unreservedly took sides with the Government and strongly denounced the demand of the revolutionary workers to take power into its own hands as the representative of democracy, and because they declared the demonstrators foes of the fatherland, the soldiers did not immediately see any other way but to obey the orders of their generals and to suppress the revolutionary demonstration by force.

In a certain respect, the struggle of July 16th-19th can be compared with the events of June 1848 in Paris. The defeat of the proletariat by the coalition of middle class (peasants) and bourgeoisie gives a deciding turn towards reaction. From now on everything is gradually broken down, that which the revolution had gained in democratic achievements. As a matter of course, the victors started by taking revenge on their enemies, who had been so long attacking them and who now were disarmed. After a campaign of weeks and months in the bourgeois press denouncing the Bolsheviks as adulterers, thieves, scoundrels, paid agents of foreign powers, to prepare the right feelings, they now were arrested—Lenin himself succeeded in escaping—accused of high treason, revolt against the government, bribed by German gold. The Bolshevik newspapers were suppressed; a posse formed by the former "black hundred" who now again ventured into the open destroyed the editorial office of the Pravda—which fact the government cabled to Western Europe as a proof of the hatred of the "people" against the "anarchists." The workers in Petrograd were disarmed. Martial law and capital punishment, which were reintroduced, demonstrated the brand of Socialism of the social-patriots. And at the same time the offensive at the front collapsed, in accordance with the predictions of the Bolsheviks, because large units refused to fight, and the Russian armies were driven from Galicia. The terror of "order" reigned in Petrograd.

The most decided, the most radical force of the revolution was forced down for the time being and consequently the government tactics shifted greatly to the right. The government felt compelled to concentrate all patriotic forces to save the fatherland; a conference was called (in Moscow), where together with the Councils of Workmen and Soldiers—as a matter of course excluding the "criminal" Leninites—and delegates of the peasants, different organs of the bourgeoisie were united to work out new tactics. Even now they did not feel strong enough simply to push aside the social-patriots; the leaders of the Cadets, Nabokof, Rodischef, Milyukof, refused to participate in a ministry: to them circumstances were not yet ripe. First the Council of Soldiers and Workers, the organ of democracy, had to be removed. The Council originally the Center between right and left, now became the utmost left and its leaders discovered with alarm how uncertain its position had become. They suddenly realized what they re-

fused to see when the Leninites called it to their attention time and again: that, strengthened by the acts of the government, the counter revolution grew and threatened to destroy all the gains of the Revolution.

The Council had, as a preliminary, first to realize its insignificance. At the Conference of August 4th the delegates of the bourgeoisie declared: conditions as they are cannot continue any longer; there has to be unity in the government; if the Council refuses full responsibility for the government, it should not continue to demand a voice and to obstruct, but should accept a dictatorship of the government. So Miljukof asked: is the Council willing to take the governmental power in its own hands? He perfectly knew that the Council feared nothing more than to have full power and to frighten them still more—you can never know—the minister of finances, Tsin-garef, declared that Russia was on the

verge of state bankruptcy and that the coming winter would bring a general famine. No, not the governmental power, Tscheidse lamented in answer to this categorical question; but neither a dictatorship. The bourgeoisie knew enough, but was clever enough not to hurry: most of the social patriots remained in the ministry, supplemented by Cadets and other elements still more to the right, and the Council promised to support this government.

At the same time General Kornilof started to organize the retreating army. And he emphatically made the following condition: a free hand to take such measures as were considered necessary to re-establish discipline, including capital punishment, and without interference from anybody. The government accepting these conditions, the army would become ever so more what it is in Europe, a spineless tool in the hands of the commanders, and then the last prop would have been

cut on which the Council rests: in such an army committees of soldiers are impossible; a simple command of the general can at once eliminate the whole Council. And when finally the Council sees the danger and wants to resist, it would be too late: it has no longer control over the soldiers.

Up to this stage the Russian revolution developed almost completely in accordance with previous bourgeois revolutions, especially with that of France in 1848, the development being the natural consequence of the attitude adopted by the different groups and parties. And herein lies mainly the important lesson of this revolution for the proletariat. It shows us how the middle classes (in 1848 the small bourgeoisie in Paris, in 1917 the Russian peasants) by allowing themselves to be used against the workers, bring the bourgeoisie into power and so dig their own grave; weakened because they themselves helped to subdue the proletariat,

the middle classes now are powerless against reaction and see all their class demands dissipate. And the supporters of this narrow suicidal policy, which in 1848 were the bourgeois democrats, now were known as social-patriots, the party of the misinformed or bourgeois-minded workers and small bourgeois classes, who keep the masses stupid by their radical sounding phrases, combined with purely bourgeois conceptions. They proved in Russia the worst enemies, not only of the proletariat, that largely ceased to listen to them, but also of those classes that listened, resulting in disaster.

But—the revolution is not ended at this stage. The inner conditions are still as untenable as before and become more untenable since. The proletariat has the power to rise again; the world war still continues and presses upon the European proletariat the necessity of revolutionary movements.

Holland, August, 1917.

Mass Action and Socialism

By S. J. RUTGERS

ROSA LUXEMBERG has called the mass strike the dynamic method of the proletarian struggle in the Revolution. She considers mass action, and its most important feature the mass strike, as the sum total of a period in the class struggle that may last for years or tens of years until victory comes to the proletariat. In permanent change, it comprises all the phases of the political and economic struggle, all phases of the Revolution. Mass action in its highest form of political strike means the unity of political and economic action, means the proletarian revolution as a historic process,

The word "mass action" like the words "class struggle," "industrial action," "Imperialism," etc., may mean nothing; in fact they are used to cover the most conflicting thoughts and deeds. Representing a general conception living in the minds and the deeds of millions of workers, a word may become a powerful symbol and active force in the struggle for emancipation. Since Capitalism is outgrown and has to maintain its grasp on the world by mental and moral fraud, a clear conception of proletarian methods is most essential. Science being the monopoly of non-proletarian classes under Capitalism, all the workers can hope for, unless they will entrust their fate into the hands and heads of middle class representatives, is to grasp some of the fundamental proletarian truths. These truths inevitably have to be coined into short slogans, this being the only form of theoretical abstraction, suitable both for the purpose of proletarian theory and fighting practice. What a "thesis" means to the scientist is expressed by the workers in general slogans and expressions, such as mass action, Imperialism, industrial unionism, class struggle, etc. Such and similar words may be said to express the proletarian philosophy, the strength of which depends upon the completeness and the unity of conception reflected by these words in the minds of the workers. The meaning of the words changes with the position of the workers in the class struggle and together with the consolidation of tactics, the corresponding conceptions get a more definite and more general shape. But at the same time the consolidation of these conceptions in the heads of the workers result in a more efficient, a more powerful struggle for emancipation.

Conservative Socialists may call any meeting of a dozen persons or over, a mass meeting, and may consider a big middle class vote the highest form of mass action—there is little doubt, however, that in large and increasing groups of American workers the idea of revolution-

ary mass action grows into a living and powerful conception. Industrial action, no doubt, forms the backbone of the conception in a country with highly developed industry. Industrial Unionism may, however, develop into a struggle for wages only; into job control without any further vision. Mass action is the broader vision, which includes all mass movements towards the Social Revolution.

It may be objected that, if industrial action is the most efficient form of mass action, why bother about minor issues? Why not concentrate all our efforts and thought in building our industrial unions so strong as to overcome the capitalist employer and the capitalist state? Such an objection overlooks the complexity of real conditions. We are not free in choosing our methods in accordance with certain general theoretical constructions, but have to build on the solid ground of actual facts in the light of historical developments. No matter what our preachings mass movements in one form or another will develop and we will have to make the best of it. And on the other hand, industrial organization has its historical limits beyond which we cannot rise at the given moment of our action. Large groups of workers will continue for a certain length of time to organize in craft unions, and although we will tell them they are wrong and fight them where injurious to their class, still they will be a factor in our revolutionary struggle either for or against. Moreover large groups of unskilled workers will continue to live in such a state of slavery and terrorism, that only occasional shocks will be able to overcome the pressure of the iron heel. We also have to bear in mind that the very process of capitalism consists in swallowing middle class groups and farmers between the grinding wheels of industry and that each generation needs again its education towards industrial action, and at any given moment millions and millions of proletarians will continue to work under conditions very remote from big industry, and though it may be true that these groups never will be the backbone of revolutionary movements, still they will have to play their part. To overcome the capitalist organization and the capitalist state is a job in which we cannot afford to neglect whatever forces may contribute to success. We are not satisfied to wait until in some problematic future all capitalist production will be in the form of big industry and all proletarians will have passed the school of industrial education. We are convinced that the technical development of the capitalist world makes conditions ripe for a Socialist commonwealth at this very mo-

ment, that only our lack of power stands in the way of the realization of our hopes. What we want above all is a unity and concentration of the forces already existing in a latent form, a combination and further development of these forces towards our revolutionary aims.

The mental expression of this unity of proletarian forces is "mass action." It is the expression of the firm belief that the workers can only count on their own power. It means a definite break with the diplomacy, corruption and betrayal of middle class leaders. It calls for a clear-cut, straight-lined class struggle theory and tactics, not only within the mental grasp of the average worker, but in such a form that the mechanism of its organized expression can be carried on by the workers without being dependent upon high-brow intellectuals. Mass action appeals to the numbers, but numbers welded into a mass, numbers bound together by a common cause, a common aim, a common thought, leading to common action and common organization. In its complexity of form, mass action mirrors the actual variety of the working class, in its unity of action it throws aside all middle class elements, that are not willing to break with their capitalist affiliations. Mass action is the very horror of the small bourgeois minds; is mere craziness to the intellectual radical. How in the world should the poor uneducated worker get along without the well meaning, costly advice and representation of intellectuals?

But is it possible to increase our power by street demonstrations, strikes of protest, general campaigns for political issues, such as freedom of speech, judicial murders, militarism, high cost of living, unemployment, etc.? Are not the masses who come together for those purposes too heterogeneous, too much liable to be dispersed or annihilated by military force, too unorganized to develop power? To answer this question, we should first realize what the purpose is of our power. We want power for the Social Revolution to overcome capitalist society. You may overcome power by strengthening your own, as well as by weakening your opponent's power. A wrestler may subdue his colleague by a supreme effort, but he will more likely succeed because his opponent tires out quicker. Mass demonstrations may not be able to force a government to give in, but there is no doubt that mass demonstrations, strikes of protest, etc., have a strong tendency to weaken the position of the capitalist state. Demonstrations can and will be suppressed by military force, but this at the same time endangers the morale of militarism

itself. Even the New York police showed signs of discontent and revolt, on account of the demonstrations in connection with the recent car strike. In a period of numerous demonstrations and protests all over the country combined with a variety of strikes, the bureaucratic apparatus will have great difficulty in maintaining its regular efficiency. At the same time the government will, through concessions in some places and brutality in others, open the eyes of large groups of workers previously caught in bourgeois ideologies of a State for the benefit of "the People," etc. And we should not forget that education through mass action is one of the most important factors to increase our power. No education without action and no greater educator for the workers than mass action. We should not overlook the fact that mass demonstrations will include the well trained industrial workers, will go hand in hand with strikes, aid to a certain extent can be organized in accordance with each special occasion, which is one of the foremost duties of a revolutionary Socialist party.

An advantage of demonstrations in connection with problems is that they put a general issue for immediate consideration, and thereby tend to concentrate and unite action, in which industrial strikes may be supplemented by other mass movements involving the capitalist state in a general fight from which it can only escape either by concessions or by brutality, in both instances opening the eyes of new groups of proletarians.

Mass action never can be antagonistic towards industrial action, because the latter is only the most efficient form of mass action, is a part, is the backbone of general mass action. No successful mass action is conceivable without being firmly rooted in the economic power of the workers, and the strongest form to organize this power is in industrial unions. But this does not mean that there is no economic power outside of this particular form of organization. In fact industrial unions at present are surprisingly weak. Is it logical, is it less than a crime to neglect all other forms of economic power of the workers so far as they can be utilized for the big fight against Capital and the capitalist state as its most formidable instrument? Will the Russian revolution with its splendid unity of industrial strikes and street demonstrations into one sweeping mass movement have no lessons for us?

Will we wait for certain forms where others act and win? Would the German workers have a chance unless they combine industrial strikes with more general forms of mass action?

The Case of the I. W. W.

By JUSTUS EBERT

A Word of Optimism!

LORIA, in his book on the economic foundations of society, names three institutions as performing the work of blinding the masses in favor of the capitalist control of such foundations, viz, the Law, Church and Public Opinion, as expressed and moulded principally by the press or newspapers. The first two, he declares, are waning in influence; the last alone, being the bulwark of oppression. But then "public opinion," as represented by the newspapers, seems to be losing power too. A case in point is the recent municipal elections in New York City, where the voters rallied successfully to the cause of the candidates opposed by the press. Throughout the world, in the convulsions attending the war, the ability of the press to guide so-called public action is completely destroyed. Organization and its dependent means of communication of the operation of compelling social forces, has destroyed "the power of the press" and made of it a thing of ridicule and contempt—a chip sent swirling in the modern whirlpool. The press may lie, but there is no dodging the stern realities that come home to us all through a thousand mediums other than that of the printed word.

The press, just now, is doing much lying regarding the Industrial Workers of the World. Coupled with the campaign of vilification there goes much incitement to riot and a justification of lawlessness against the I. W. W. Yet, it is a question if this campaign is not at all successful; if the press hasn't, in other words, failed once more in its policy of moulding "public opinion." The indications that cause this questioning are well worth consideration. First there is the response to the I. W. W. defense appeals. Much of this is of a private, rather than of a public character. Organizations approached have almost invariably responded to the appeals. They have donated funds, taken up collections, placed address lists and directions at the disposal of the I. W. W. and otherwise helped the work. Many of their officers have condemned the newspaper attempts to prejudice the I. W. W. cases, as the evident expression of a well organized plan that must be apparent to all intelligent persons. This view, that the press, in this, as in other matters, is actuated by a policy rather than the truth, is entertained by many. Accordingly, the funds collected by the I. W. W. defense to date are unprecedented. Seven thousand dollars for October, the first month after the beginning of the persecutions, is a new record that surpasses the financial achievements of even Lawrence and Everett. In Seattle, Wash., the heart of the Northwestern I. W. W. activity, five thousand dollars were collected up to November 16. The promise of one thousand a week there is more than fifty in the near future. Other cities exhibit a similar enthusiasm, and best of all, I. W. W. membership increases.

But more indicative of the waning influence of the press is the lack of lawlessness resulting from its incitement to riot. Make no mistake, there has been much outrage against the I. W. W. The lynching of Frank Little, the Bisbee deportations and the Tulsa outrages have been numerous and revolting. But have they been proportionate to the continuous press campaign? Have they not been the works, not of infuriated and aroused populaces, but organized corporate gangs of thugs and cut-throats—the work of interested parties rather than a people envenomed and stirred to lawlessness? When we think of the words from high places

about shooting traitors at sunrise; when we recall the torrents of abuse against the I. W. W. and note that no traitors have been shot, either at sunrise or moonrise, and that the vast majority of Americans refuse to follow the example of corporate thuggery, we are inclined to question "the power of the press" and to believe that were it not for the greater power of profit, no lawlessness at all would take place against the I. W. W. It is the profiteer, not the press, that is getting results against the I. W. W. He is interested and organizes accordingly.

In all of this there is much room for encouragement. Make no mistake, the I. W. W. is terribly outraged. There is no law, no justice for it, especially in the calculations of the profiteer and his tool, the press. But make no mistake also, about the attitude of the great American working class. They are the victims also of present-day terrorism and, being such victims, many understand the I. W. W. situation well, instinctively, intuitively, if not consciously, and many more of them live in a world of grim realities that the press unsuccessfully tries to hide from them. They, too, understand instinctively and intuitively, if not consciously. The press cannot lie down social forces. It cannot stem the tide of evolution and revolution. That is as much apparent as its lies. Why, then, should the I. W. W. fear this crooked and impotent thing? Why then should it not proceed certain that, in the end, it will again triumph over it, as at Lawrence, Everett and elsewhere?

So, then, you members and friends of the I. W. W. everywhere—don't despair! Present day factors work for us even when they appear most to work against us! Lincoln Steffens, in his New York lecture on "The Russian Revolution" cited that event to prove that the seeds of activity blossom into life when least expected. And who will deny another fact, after what Russia has taught us, namely, that oppression is least secure when it is most firmly entrenched.

Socialist Party Pledges I. W. W. Support

THE National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party, at their recent session, passed the following resolutions:

"The Socialist Party repeats its declaration of support of all economic organizations of the working class and declares the lynching, deportation, prosecution and persecution of the Industrial Workers of the World is an attack upon every toiler in America, and we now call attention to the fact that the charges of incendiarism, the burning of crops and forests and of vicious destruction of property made by the public press against the I. W. W. have proven pure fabrications wherever put to legal test.

"The Socialist Party has always extended its aid, material and moral, to organized labor whenever and wherever it was attacked by the capitalistic class, and this without reference to form of organization or special policies; therefore, we pledge our support to the Industrial Workers of the World now facing trial in Chicago and elsewhere, and demand for them a fair unprejudiced trial and urge our members to use every effort to assist the Industrial Workers of the World by familiarizing the public with the real facts, to overcome the falsehoods and misinformation with which the capitalist press has poisoned and prejudiced the public mind and judgment against these workers,

who are now singled out for destruction, just as other labor organizations and leaders have been singled out for destruction by the same capitalist forces in the past."

Victorious Despite Oppression

IT is pleasing to record that, despite the severe hostility with which they are being persecuted, the Industrial Workers of the World are achieving some notable victories. In the Northwest they have won the eight-hour day, better camps, more food, wages, and rights for thousands of lumberjacks. They have also caused action that may result in national legislation beneficial to the workers in all branches of the lumber industry of the entire country.

The press of the Industrial Workers of the World has recorded for weeks the eight-hour and other victories achieved in numerous lumber camps throughout the Northwest. How the I. W. W. men gave up the old style strike of off the job, and went back to work for the purpose of striking on the job. How they refused to work more than eight hours a day, were discharged; and then got more members on the same job to repeat the same methods until victory was won. How, by the same means, they also secured better bunk houses, shower baths, more and cleaner bedding, more and better food, more wages, and the right to meet in the bunk houses, elect committees on grievances, and otherwise get a greater share in the products of their own labor and a greater voice in the control of industry.

Now, after the I. W. W. press has been printing these reports with increasing and more frequent detail, comes the press of the Northwest with a couple of important announcements. One states that the Western Pine Manufacturers' Association, with 16,000 employees and a membership in Oregon, Montana, Idaho and Washington, will establish an eight-hour day with no reduction in wages. The other states that the Loggers' Club of Spokane, Wash., an influential body of employing lumbermen, will petition Congress for "a basic eight-hour day for all branches of the lumber industry of the United States."

Thus does a twofold victory perch on the banners of the Industrial Workers of the World amid the most savage persecution—one actual and economic; the other prospective and legislative.

The Industrial Workers of the World are not placing much faith in either victory. They still rely on themselves as organized workers. In November, the lumberworkers' union secured 1,000 new members and did \$18,000 in business. They are out to do even better than this, with the aid of the aforementioned press reports.

The Industrial Workers are also winning other victories, despite unprecedented opposition. In Arizona, the courts at Tucson have acquitted E. S. Embree, who was arrested for inciting to riot at Bisbee, Arizona. This acquittal destroys the excuse of the copper barons, to the effect that the "incitements to riot" of Embree before the Bisbee deportation justified that event. In Idaho, the courts at St. Maries have also acquitted Neil McGuiney, and released scores of others, held on the "charge of criminal syndicalism." In these cases also an attempt was made to justify lawlessness against the I. W. W. Charges that the I. W. W. set fire to forests and committed violence were overthrown by forest wardens and deputy sheriff in charge of strike precincts. The former testified that the I. W. W. members were instructed by the organization

to be on the lookout for forest fires, that fire-fighting gangs were composed 90 per cent of I. W. W. men under the leadership of I. W. W. foremen, and when so composed were the most efficient gangs. The latter testified to the peaceful character of I. W. W. strikes and the absence of drunkenness during them. And so the I. W. W. won out again. In the courts of Minnesota, also, some cases have been won, in which "criminal syndicalism" was the charge.

The I. W. W. have not only advanced labor's interests in general, but protected its members in particular. They still have a hard fight ahead, in which the opposing odds appear overwhelming. Nevertheless, they fight on, cheered by these victories and confident of working class aid and the final triumph of the industrial democracy for which the Industrial Workers of the World stand.

The Bolshevik Terms of Peace

THE Russian delegates to the preliminary peace conference at Brest-Litovsk, have, under instructions of the Bolshevik government, presented the following peace terms:

(1.) The evacuation of all Russian territory occupied by Germany, and autonomy for Poland and the Lithuanian and Lettish provinces.

(2.) Autonomy for Turkish Armenia.

(3.) Settlement of the question of Alsace-Lorraine by plebiscite, with a guarantee of perfect freedom of vote.

(4.) The restoration of Belgium and indemnity for damages to be provided by an international financial fund.

(5.) The restoration of Serbia and Montenegro, with indemnity for damages to be taken out of a similar international fund. Serbia, moreover, to have access to the Adriatic; Bosnia and Herzegovina to have complete autonomy.

(6.) Other contested territory in the Balkans to enjoy temporary autonomy until a plebiscite is taken.

(7.) Rumania to recover all territory within her previous frontiers, after promising to grant autonomy to the Dobrudja, and to give effect to Article III of the Berlin Convention concerning the equality of the rights of Jews.

(8.) Autonomy for the regions of Trent and Trieste, inhabited by Italian populations, until a plebiscite is taken.

(9.) Germany to receive back her colonies.

(10.) Restoration of Persia and Greece.

(11.) Neutralization of all maritime straits leading to inland seas, including the Canals of Suez and Panama; freedom of commercial navigation, the cancellation of all charters during war time of enemy ships, and the torpedoing of commercial ships on the high seas to be forbidden by international agreement.

(12.) All belligerents to renounce war indemnities under any form or disguise whatsoever, and all contributions exacted since the beginning of the war to be refunded.

(13.) All belligerents to renounce definitely any commercial boycott after the war, or the institution of special customs agreements.

(14.) Peace conditions to be settled by a peace congress composed of delegates chosen by national, representative bodies, diplomatists to bind themselves to sign no secret treaties, which are to be declared, by their very nature, null and void.

(15.) Gradual disarmament on land and sea, and the re-establishment of militia to replace standing armies.

THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

Published by

The Socialist Propaganda League

10c A Copy - \$1.50 A Year

LOUIS C. FRAINA - - Editor

Press Committee:
S. J. Rutgers P. Klees
J. Axelrod S. Freiman

Address Communications
237 Lenox Avenue
New York City

American War Policy

IN the New York Times of January 4, "An American Jurist" says: "It is not compatible with the safety of America that there should be only one great power in Europe, and that power unfriendly to America." This expresses America's war policy in a nut-shell, the same sentiment expressed by President Wilson one year ago in the phrase, "Peace without victory"; it is the same old game of the "balance of power." To-day, "peace without victory" has become transformed into peace *with* victory, not because of different purposes but because of different conditions. The peace terms enunciated recently by the President, in a general way, are terms in accord with the balance of power, terms that subtly promote Imperialistic purposes. And these are the terms that representatives of the "People's Council," either through stupidity or poltroonery, have hailed as *its terms of peace!* Imperialism moves in a mysterious way its purpose to perform. Neither an aggrandized Germany nor an aggrandized Britain; neither a crushed Britain nor a crushed Germany: either eventuality would menace American imperialistic interests. Our Imperialism would secure world power by having its rivals neutralize each other. It is the game that Britain played for centuries in Europe—a game that cost millions of lives and immemorial agony. Also, American Imperialism is strengthening its hold, while the war lasts, on the investment and other markets of the world.

The A. F. of L. Convention

THE recent convention of the A. F. of L. at Buffalo emphasized the reactionary character of Gompers and his bureaucracy, and equally emphasized the cowardice and treachery of the "Socialist opposition." The Gompers war policy was approved, and the "Socialist" delegates dared not express the courage of their convictions. Or it may be that their convictions exist only on paper, and not for practical use. The misleaders of labor who cloak themselves in the idealistic garb of Socialism in order better to betray the workers are becoming more and more numerous, and dangerous. The N. Y. *Volkzeitung* says: "The unbelievable cowardice of the majority of the Socialist delegates at the A. F. of L. convention seems to us the most revolting and disgusting phenomenon imaginable." And to cap the climax, "the Socialist delegation at the convention of the A. F. of L." officially publishes a lengthy statement in the *Call* ending with the announcement that they will defeat the reactionary leaders "next year." Cowardice before the enemy is had enough, but to boast afterwards of future bravery is too much. The one really vital expression of revolutionary sentiments came from Delegate Fischer, of Montana, representing the Laborers' Local and a member of The Socialist Propaganda League. The appearance of Presi-

dent Wilson at the convention was evidently to strengthen Gompers; and certain passages in the President's address were construed by the Washington correspondent of the New York *Tribune* as meaning a contemplated attempt to get unorganized labor within the A. F. of L. or under its control, so as to simplify the problem of dealing with it, meaning betrayal, by dealing with it through the A. F. of L. bureaucracy. The country needs a new, a radical labor movement. The constituent elements for it are at hand: the vast mass of unorganized unskilled workers, a large group of independent, secession and opposition unions, and the unions in the A. F. of L. which consist of unskilled workers or those whose skill has been expropriated by the machine process. The need and the conditions are here: action is necessary.

The Bolshevik Policy

THE newspapers and the lackeys of Imperialism generally, which have been viciously and contemptibly slandering the Bolsheviks, are on the verge of trying a new trick. That is, of pretending friendliness for the Bolsheviks and cajole them into carrying on the war. These are the moral perverts. Others, more sincere, seem to imagine that the Bolsheviks are changing their policy because they are preparing to fight German Imperialism, if necessary! To these good souls, one's attitude is determined by the answer to the question, "Will you, or will you not fight?"

The circumstances are these: German and Austrian Imperialism tried to perpetrate a fraud on the Russian Revolution, by enunciating the formula "through gritted teeth" of no annexations, and then by means of characteristic duplicity trying to annex Poland and the Baltic provinces. The Bolsheviks, who want a general and revolutionary peace, and not a fraudulent, imperialistic peace, immediately protested. The correspondent of the London *Daily News*, describes this session of the peace negotiations at Brest-Litovsk as follows: "The Russian delegation, acting on unequivocal instructions from the Bolshevik authorities, took up an uncompromising attitude. They said self definition [of nationalities in Poland, Lithuania and Courland] was impossible until the last German soldier had left the country. Further, they jeered the Germans, asking what they proposed to do. They asked whether they intended to take Petrograd and feed 3,000,000 starving folk or to disarm a revolutionary country in which every workman had a rifle. They also asked what the Germans proposed to say to their own democracy, which protested a couple of months ago against the proposed annexation of Poland and Lithuania." The Bolsheviks demanded the evacuation of territory occupied by German and Austrian troops as the only way of ensuring a real plebiscite.

The Central Committee of the Soldiers' and Workmen's Council, after hearing Leon Trotsky repudiate "Germany's hypocritical peace proposals," and his declaration that it might be necessary to defend the Revolution, adopted a resolution denouncing "the dominant parties in Germany," which, "compelled by a popular movement to grant concessions to the principles of a democratic peace, nevertheless are trying to distort this idea in the sense of their own annexationist policy." The resolution further said:

"We now declare that the Russian Revolution remains faithful to the policy of internationalism.

"We say to the people of Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey and Bulgaria: "Under your pressure your Governments have been obliged to accept the motto of no annexations and no indemnities, but recently they have been trying to carry on their old policy of evasions. Remember that the conclusion of an immediate democratic peace will depend ac-

tually and above all on you. All the peoples of Europe look to you, exhausted and bled by such a war as there never was before, that you will not permit the Austro-German imperialists to make war against revolutionary Russia, for the subjection of Poland, Lithuania, Courland and Armenia."

In spite of all this, the infinitely vile moral perverts of the New York *Times* insist that the Bolsheviks "have from the beginning been committed to a German peace."

More important, however, is the belief that Russia will again fight. In view of these developments, it is hinted that the Allies may recognize the Bolshevik government—but only and if it is willing to fight!

Revolutionary Russia may fight. But, gentlemen, it won't be your war, *but a revolutionary war waged by a revolutionary government for revolutionary purposes.* The magnificent appeal of the sailors of the Baltic fleet, printed elsewhere in this issue, indicates the spirit and purposes of such a war.

If the newspapers and the lackeys of Imperialism were not miserably stupid, they would understand that the new developments are in perfect consonance with the purposes of Imperialism and the purposes of revolutionary Socialism.

Weeks ago, Trotsky said: "We did not overthrow Czarism in order to bend the knee to the Kaiser." Again: "It is all the same to us how the allied and enemy imperialists treat us. We shall carry on our independent class policy, whatever they do." And Lenin has again and again emphasized that he was in favor of a revolutionary war against Germany and all Europe, if necessary.

The Russian Revolution is pursuing to-day its *independent class policy*, nationally and internationally. This policy imposes the necessity of a struggle against all Imperialism, and the conclusion of a general, non-imperialistic peace.

The Imperialism of the Allies has as much to fear as the Imperialism of Germany and Austria from a war waged by revolutionary Russia.

It is precisely this policy of the class struggle that is the strength of the Bolsheviks. They represent revolutionary Socialism because of cleaving to the class struggle, and they cleave to the class struggle because of representing revolutionary Socialism.

The Bolsheviks, representing the revolutionary Socialism of the Left Wing, are proving and emphasizing the bankruptcy of moderate Socialism. They are not simply a product of the temporary situation in Russia, but Socialists who have always been revolutionary, the same Left Wing Socialism that, organized in small or large minority groups, operates throughout the world. The great achievements, the magnificent spirit of the revolutionary Bolsheviks will not contribute all that they should to the reconstruction of Socialism unless their policy is related to Socialism everywhere, equally during peace as during war, and in accord with conditions.

NEW BRANCH OF THE LEAGUE

A Harlem Branch of the Socialist Propaganda League has been organized in New York City, with more than forty new members.

The Branch has opened permanent headquarters, ordered 500 copies of each issue of THE NEW INTERNATIONAL, and is making plans for intensive propaganda.

Comrades and sympathizers are urged to call at our headquarters—

237 Lenox Avenue
New York City
(Bet. 121st and 122nd Sts.)

Baltic Fleet's Appeal to the Workers of the World

THE German fleet some months ago threatened to attack Petrograd.

The Second Congress of the Baltic Fleet, the sailors of which are an intensely revolutionary force and united with the Bolsheviks, was in session at the time, and decided to defend Petrograd as the *centre of the revolutionary forces.* An appeal was adopted, which will become a classic of revolutionary literature:

To the oppressed in all countries,

Comrades:

In the fatal hour in which the signals of war and of death ring in our ears, we repeat and emphasize our appeal to you. We send you our greetings and our last testament.

Attacked by the powerful German fleet, our warships are doomed in an unequal struggle.

Not one ship will refuse to fight, not one sailor will desert his ship.

Our much-abused fleet will do its duty—toward the great Revolution.

We consider it our duty to defend Petrograd. We will fulfill our self-imposed obligation.

Not because of the request of a pitiful Russian Bonaparte (Kerensky) who retains power simply because of the unlimited patience of the Russian Revolution.

Nor because of the treaties made by our government with the Allies, treaties intended to smother the Russian Revolution.

We follow the call of our revolutionary sentiments.

We go into death with the name of the great Revolution in our hearts and on our unflinching lips.

The Russian fleet has always stood in the front lines of the Revolution.

The names of its sailors are written in the book of the history of the struggle against the Czarism.

In the earliest days of the Revolution the sailors marched in the front ranks, our ultimate aim being deliverance from all misery.

And this life and death struggle with our own oppressors gives us the right to appeal to you, proletarians of all countries, with a strong voice, with the voice of those who look into the eyes of death in the revolt against the exploiters.

Break the chains, you who are oppressed!

Rise in revolt!

We have nothing to lose but our chains!

We believe in the victory of the Revolution, we are full of this belief.

We know that our comrades in the Revolution will fulfill their duty on the barricades to the bitter end.

We know that decisive moments are coming.

A gigantic struggle will set the world afire. On the horizon the fires of the revolt of all oppressed peoples are already glowing and taking definite shape.

At the moment that the waters of the Baltic will become red with the blood of our comrades, will close forever over their bodies, at this moment we call upon you.

Already in the clutch of death, we send our warm greetings and appeal to you:

Proletarians of the world, all, unite!
Rise in revolt, you who are oppressed.
All hail, the International Revolution!
Long live Socialism!

Argentine Strikes

STRIKES continue in Argentina and the capitalists use the same methods as their colleagues in the United States. Shooting in La Negra, near Buenos Ayres, resulted in one person killed and several injured.

The International Movement

The Bolsheviks

DURING the early part of November, shortly after the overthrow of the Kerensky provisional government, the Bolshevik government introduced the following measures, according to reports from Holland:

All local governments are authorized to confiscate all the occupied or unoccupied houses in order to provide for those living in over-crowded districts.

All factories belong to the workers.

A moratorium declared on the rent of small tenements.

Confiscation of all land in favor of the peasants, without compensation; all large properties, church and state domains together with all buildings, tools, live stock, etc., are put at the disposal of local committees.

Confiscation of coal fields, oil and salt mines, forests and canals, partly in the hands of the central government, partly to be organized by local authorities.

Nikolai Lenine, in an article in the *Jugend Internationale*, warns against the demand of some Left Wing Socialists for opposition to all wars and for advocacy of general disarmament. Not only, says Lenine, are Socialists in favor of waging the class war even when it leads to civil war, but we have to accept revolutionary wars under certain conditions, to defend the proletarian revolution in one or more countries against reactionary attacks. And even national wars may have our support when waged by peoples that are the objective of Imperialism. What we oppose is any form of imperialistic war, no matter under what national pretext it is prosecuted. Civil and revolutionary wars being a necessity, Lenine considers general disarmament not a revolutionary demand. The proletariat will have to take the weapons of war into its own hands for the overthrow of Capitalism.

Russian Troops in France

THE news has now been passed by the censor that a whole regiment of Russian troops was in open revolt in France from June to September and no report of this remarkable fact was allowed to reach the United States during that period.

More than 10,000 Russian soldiers refused to fight after the revolution was declared. General Tankevitch and all the officers had to leave camp. The provisional government of Kerensky denounced the troops and ordered the soldiers disarmed, if necessary by the use of armed force, whereupon only 2,500 submitted, the others refusing to obey. Reduction of rations and allowances did not have any result, since the Russians had already provided for a large reserve of food. A French officer and non-commissioned officers were kept under arrest for several hours.

An ultimatum under threat of bombardment had no effect, and actual artillery fire resulted only in a few more men submitting. On September 4, after thirty shells had been dropped into the camp, 8,300 gave in, but 140 rebels still remained and answered with a violent machine gun fire. It was only on September 6 that the remaining force of the mutineers was overpowered by "loyal" French and Russian troops.

German "Socialism"

THE national convention of German majority party, held in Wurzburg on October 14, rejected a resolution to vote "no" on war credits in the future, 250 votes against, 26 in favor, and 78 voting "present." The idea of a referendum to decide the status of Alsace-Lorraine was rejected by a vote of 262 against 14. With one dissenting vote the con-

vention decided in favor of re-uniting the party, on the basis of course of a surrender of the "Independents." In the debate on this resolution the Independent Social Democratic Party were called "Anarchists" and traitors, but at the same time it was admitted that the majority party was losing the support of the masses. At this convention, Philip Scheidemann made a speech which completely abandoned the principles of Socialism, urging a unity with the capitalist state and working within its limits. Commenting on this speech, the social-patriotic Berlin *Vorwaerts* says: "The most interesting point in Scheidemann's speech was the statement that the socialization of society cannot be brought about through the exclusive efforts of the Social Democracy." This means bourgeois reformism, the co-operation of classes, social-Imperialism and reaction. The Independent Socialists have rejected unity with the "majority" party.

Propaganda and Riots in Germany

COMRADE Bertha Thallheimer, of Stuttgart, a member of the group "Internationale" and a delegate to the Zimmerwalder Conference at Kienthal, has been sentenced to two years' imprisonment for the distribution of revolutionary leaflets.

At least a few reports about demonstrations and riots in Germany reach us, isolated expression of seething and even revolutionary discontent. Some news items tell of a number of killed and wounded.

And the censor certainly will not allow all the truth to come through. The eyes of the workers of the world are centered on Germany; but this should be no excuse for our own inactivity. On with the propaganda of Revolutionary Socialism!

The editor of the Left Wing paper, *Kampf*, published in Holland in the German language, Comrade Minster, has been arrested near the border by German spies, and has disappeared. Minster was at the Holland-German frontier in connection with revolutionary propaganda in Germany, and probably has been made a victim. No news of his fate is available.

Italy

THE Socialist Party of Italy, which has taken an intrepid stand against the war, has issued a call through its Executive Committee to maintain unflinchingly the anti-war stand, notwithstanding the fact that foreign troops are on Italian soil. The social-patriots, Turati and Treve, made an appeal for patriotic support and defense of the fatherland, whereas the Socialist group in Parliament definitely rejected an offer to participate in a bourgeois ministry, declaring that its policy was fundamentally different from that of the social-patriots. The Socialist Party is by no means swept off its feet by the frantic appeals and denunciations of the bourgeoisie, and the government has recourse to force. The offices of *Avanti*, the radical organ of the party in Rome, were raided and several arrests made, presumably on the charge of pro-German activity. A Socialist Congress that was to have been held November 1 was prohibited. Revolutionary Socialism in Italy carries on what the bourgeois call a "defeatist" campaign; it is striving with might and main to make a Social Revolution as did the proletariat of Russia. Of all the belligerent countries, Italy comes nearest to Russian conditions, and it may well become an ally soon of revolutionary Russia.

The revolutionary activity of the Italian Socialists is being maintained, including in Parliament. Recently Comrade

Morgari spoke for three hours in spite of violent protests from the bourgeois parties, demanding immediate peace on the Bolshevik terms and methods. Morgari openly declared his solidarity with the Russian revolutionary Maximalists.

France and England

ACCORDING to *The Labour Leader*, Philip Snowden declared in Parliament that France was in danger of a revolution. That was some time ago; conditions have since developed much more acutely. According to the statement, the soldiers had practical control of the army and were refusing to obey orders. The French soldiers were saying what the Russians had already said: "We will not go into the trenches for a war of imperialistic aims and aggression."

Our English comrades continue their activity against the war. Two women were arrested near Manchester for distributing leaflets of the imprisoned conscientious objectors. Of these conscientious objectors against war, 596 are already serving a second term of imprisonment, 157 a third.

Austria

THE party convention of German Socialists in Austria, on October 25, adopted a resolution winding up with an appeal to the government to continue its efforts for a peace without annexations and indemnities, and including international disarmament and international arbitration. The resolution, read by old Victor Adler, claims that the Austrian Socialists supported the Russian peace formula by endorsing the Stockholm conference. The arguments in every respect are a support of German and Austrian diplomacy, and a betrayal of the Russian comrades. The Social Revolution will have to sweep into oblivion this kind of "Socialists" together with all other reactionaries.

Swiss Conscientious Objectors

CONSCIENTIOUS objectors in Switzerland who preferred to go to jail rather than bear arms numbered three hundred in one year alone. Two hundred and fifty of these belonged to Young People's Socialist organizations, among whom is the chairman of the branch at Gallen, Comrade Ernest Diggelmann. He stated among other arguments: "Socialism has taught us not to look for the enemies of the people where our Swiss-patriotic misleaders want us to see them; these enemies are rather in our own country, here with us in the factories, banks, in the government bureaus and military camps. Militarism is the greatest enemy of the proletariat, because it is the instrument with which the most modern robbers, our Swiss capitalists, manage to keep their slaves in suppression. We Swiss Young People are Conscientious Objectors because we hope to undermine the present rule of capital by a refusal of military service on a large scale." Diggelmann was sentenced to six months in prison.

Holland

OUR sister organ in Holland, the Left Wing *Daily Tribune*, has been issuing since November, 1917, a bi-weekly paper, the *Soldiers' Tribune*, for the special purpose of propaganda among soldiers. Its program advocates: immediate and general demobilization of the army; the constitution of Councils of Soldiers; payment of a full wage to mobilized and unemployed workers; embargo on food-stuffs; confiscation and proper distribution of

food-stuffs at prices not higher than before the war; taxes only on war profits, capital and large incomes. The soldiers are invited to contribute to a special column "from and for soldiers," giving their own thoughts and complaints.

The Social Democratic Labor Party, which publishes the papers named above, has been officially invited by the Bolsheviks to undertake telegraphic correspondence with Petrograd regarding peace movements among the proletariat in Europe and America. This ignoring of the "majority" party in Holland by the Bolsheviks is a rebuke to moderate Socialism everywhere.

Portugal

THE president and prime minister of Portugal have been put in jail as the result of a revolutionary upheaval. Paris papers report a resemblance of this revolt to the first acts of the Workers' and Soldiers' Delegates in Russia. The rebel leader, Machado Santos, has been in prison since December, but on December 11 was reported in control of the situation. The overthrown government was strongly in favor of continuing the war together with the Allies.

Uprising in Spain

SINCE the defeat of the revolutionary uprisings in Spain in July, the workers are gradually recovering. Reports from Barcelona indicate that demands have been made to liberate those imprisoned in connection with the previous uprisings. The situation is again considered serious by the ruling class, and promising by the proletariat.

The Railroads and the Government

The New York Evening Call is jubilant over the government control of railroads. It sees in such control a step in the direction of Socialism. Wall Street is also jubilant, but for an entirely different and more accurate reason. It sees in government control, with its guarantees of profits, its domination of labor, its opportunities for complete railroad systemization and aid in militarism and imperialism, a more assured, expansive, intensive and remunerative capitalism. When railroad stocks go up in Wall Street it's time for Socialist error to go down—in ruin. Formerly, when Wall Street rejoiced Socialism despaired. Such a manifestation indicated the further entrenchment of the capitalist class to the greater detriment of the working class. Times have not changed in their essence, and there is no valid reason why Socialists should refuse to diagnose them according to the symptoms peculiar to them, as formerly. Fallacious, indeed, is the Socialist who sees in government control any other than the complete combination of railroad interests under governmental auspices, in defiance of all anti-trustism and labor unionism, and for the advancement of imperialist policy at home and abroad. It is the dream of Harriman of a single railroad system with its immense savings and earnings come true; with the needs of imperialism to give it still greater importance. It follows, consequently, that, if Socialism comes at all from such governmental control, it will come, not through it directly, but as a result of it indirectly. For such government control implies the introduction of far-reaching changes peculiar to the elimination of competition—such as we have witnessed heretofore, in fact, in the trustification of industry; government control being merely another form of trustification, with the difference of government aid instead of opposition and with a view of international capitalism instead of only national capitalism.