

The Revolutionary Age

A Chronicle and Interpretation of Events in Europe.

LOUIS C. FRAINA Editor

EADMONN MACALPINE Associate Editor

Contributing Editors

SCOTT NEARING

LUDWIG LORE

JOHN REED

SEN KATAYAMA

N. I. HOURWICH

G. WEINSTEIN

ISSUED EVERY SATURDAY

By Local Boston, Socialist Party

H. G. Steiner, Business Manager

885 Washington St., Boston, Mass.

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

Saturday, January 11, 1919

Louis C. Fraina, editor of *The Revolutionary Age*, is at present in Essex County jail, Newark, N. J. serving a thirty day sentence which was imposed for a speech made at a meeting of Conscientious Objectors in New York during the first months of the war. Fraina appealed the case and on the decision going against him he presented himself for sentence on last Tuesday. E. Ralph Cheyne, who was chairman of the meeting, was also sentenced to thirty days and is at present undergoing sentence.

They Are Still There!

SENATOR La Follette reopened the matter of the American troops at present in Russia operating against the Bolsheviks, in a speech in the Senate on January 7, which he declared was inspired by the hundreds of letters he receives daily from the people of Wisconsin asking why their sons are kept in Russia when the war is over. In the course of his speech he declared that "The great organized wealth of all the countries of the earth fears the principles that the Soviet government is trying to establish" and that "If the Soviet government, of which we know so little, is the sort of government that 140,000,000 or 150,000,000 Russians desire, that is their business and not our business."

In response to the question raised by the speech Senator Swanson, speaking for the Foreign Relations Committee, explained that it was expected that Senator Hitchcock would make a statement on the Russian situation at an early date and then proceeded to belabor the Bolshevik government for its sympathy towards Imperial Germany. All the old tales were reiterated and apparently Senator Swanson has not heard that Imperial Germany is no more. But even if what Senator Swanson intimates is true it would be interesting to know why press dispatches of the same date from London announce that Great Britain does not intend to send any more troops to Russia and is endeavoring to withdraw those she has there as quickly as possible. Surely England is interested in preventing Imperial Germany from being aided by Russia? And why did the Japanese announce the withdrawal of their troops?

As a matter of fact it is clear that none of the governments who have foreign troops in Russia are willing to make statements to their peoples as to what exactly their intentions are with regard to Russia. Now that pressure is being exerted to force an explanation they are announcing their intention of withdrawing the troops. But are these announcements being translated into action? Simultaneously with such announcements comes the news of heavy fighting between the Allies and the Bolsheviks. What is the object of this fighting? What is to be gained by killing the men of either side when the Allies are about to withdraw? Surely it is useless to send soldiers into battle to meet mutilation and death unless some definite object is to be accomplished and surely the peoples of the Allied nations are entitled to know what this object is so that they may say whether or not they want their husbands, sons and brothers to continue fighting.

From all the Allied countries protests are arising against intervention in Russia. None of the common people want to wage war against the Russians. Every

day protest meetings are being held in England, France, Italy and throughout America. The central organ of the French Socialists, *L'Humanite*, writes as follows on the threatened allied military campaign against Russia:

"All those who contribute to provoke and prolong the war are alarmed at the awakening of the masses . . . and demand that the centres of the people's revolution should be promptly suppressed. Their anxiety is no longer to conquer the enemy, but to preserve from the revolutionary peril the capitalist bourgeoisie of all countries. They know that the Russian Bolsheviks have destroyed monarchic and capitalistic privileges, have placed their hands upon the property of social parasites. Anything sooner than that. Their hatred of the enemy is giving place to the desire of coming to an understanding with him, so as to bar the advance of this scourge, which is worse, in their eyes, than war or pestilence . . . That a new war should be undertaken tomorrow—a war waged by the international counter-revolution, a crusade against the peoples who are progressing towards political and economic enfranchisement—this is possible; but surprises await the initiators of such an adventure. They will no longer be able to plead the necessities of national defense, and the necessities of capitalist defense are not of a nature to rouse the enthusiasm of the masses. On the contrary, the workers will perceive clearly that they are being thrown against one another only in order that their chains may be riveted, and the domination of their masters consolidated."

But in spite of all these protests the snows of Northern Russia are being dyed with blood. The Soviets proclaim that all they wish is for the Allies to withdraw so that they may build up their government in peace. They disclaim any wish to wage war upon the Allied countries. The Allies declare they will not send any more troops, but still the fighting continues, still the dreary spectre of war haunts the frozen Steppes.

The chief reason advanced by the United States Government for its participation in intervention in Russia was to protect the Czecho-Slovaks. According to a dispatch from Vladivostok the Czecho-Slovaks refused on November 24 to take part in an offensive against the Soviet Republic, feeling "that the Allies had betrayed them." Imperial Germany is destroyed, destroyed by the influence of the Bolshevik ideas, the Czecho-Slovaks refuse to fight against the Soviet Republic. The two chief reasons advanced for intervention have disappeared but alien troops are still at Archangel and Vladivostok. . . .

International Socialist Delegates

IN answer to the call of Camille Huysmans for an International Socialist Congress to be convened at Lausanne, Switzerland, the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party of America announces that it has appointed Algernon Lee, James Oneal and John M. Work as delegates. The statement published in the New York Call goes on to say that on a referendum vote taken over a year ago, when the Stockholm Conference was to be held, Morris Hillquit, Victor Berger and Algernon Lee were elected to attend that body and intimates that the appointment of the three men named as the Lausanne delegates was governed by the vote cast on the former occasion, Hillquit being unable to go to Europe owing to ill health which has held him confined for some months past and Berger being at the present moment standing trial under the Espionage Act.

As a matter of fact the three men elected to attend the Stockholm Conference were Hillquit, Kirpatrick and Berger. None of the present appointees were elected, nor did any of them even run fourth, that position being taken by Scott Nearing. But even if they had all been elected to attend the Stockholm Conference it is the meanest kind of subterfuge to presume that such an election would give them any claim to attend a Congress called under altogether different circumstances and facing entirely new problems. In the lapse of time between the attempt to convene the

Stockholm Conference and the present day much that vitally affects the Socialist movement of the world has happened, and it is a preposterous supposition that because under one set of circumstances a man is elected he is the choice of the electorate for all time.

The National Executive Committee advances the argument in defense of its action that the time set for the opening of the Congress is so short that it has no time to appeal to the membership. This is merely paltering. The National Executive Committee has been approached by various branches and locals of the party to call an Emergency National Convention in order to give the membership an opportunity of expressing their will on all the matters arising out of the present crisis through which the world is passing, and particularly to deal with the convocation of an International Socialist Congress. However, the National Executive Committee has not been able to meet since the armistice was signed. They have put off meeting time and time again on various paltry excuses and when the call came for an International Socialist Convention they selected delegates by telegram.

The constitution of the Socialist Party provides for the election of delegates to International Socialist Conventions, it provides several ways in which they may be elected, but it does not provide that the National Executive Committee shall appoint delegates. The appointment of the present men is contrary to the constitution, it is arbitrary and it is illegal. It makes no difference whether the choice is a wise one or not, the action is illegal. The Socialist Party has insisted that the delegates of the United States government to the Peace Conference should be appointed by a referendum vote of the people but in the appointment of Socialist delegates the National Executive Committee ignores the membership of the party.

Algernon Lee, one of the appointees, is the leader of the Socialist group in the New York City Board of Aldermen and his actions and those of his colleagues in that body have not found favor with a considerable section of the membership of the party in New York. On one occasion 27 branches of New York Local voted to censure their actions, 2 advocated the withdrawal of the group from the Board of Aldermen and only 2 or 3 voted to uphold the actions of the Socialist Aldermen. At the present moment there is a movement to withdraw them from the Board. In view of these facts Lee's chances of election as one of the delegates to represent the Socialist Party of America in Europe are at least debatable and his appointment is directly contrary to Socialist practices.

But before electing delegates the American Socialist Party has first to decide whether or not it will participate in a conference called by Social-patriots of the type of Huysmans. According to the press the Bolsheviks have refused to participate in the congress on the grounds that it is called by reactionary Socialists and will not be representative of the revolutionary Socialism that is sweeping triumphantly over Europe. If the revolutionary sections of the Socialist movement repudiate this conference then the membership of the American Socialist Party must also refuse to participate or else align itself with the reactionaries who accepted and condoned the war.

The only way in which American Socialism can arrive at a decision that will reflect the wishes of the membership is through an Emergency National Convention. The National Executive Committee is empowered to call such a convention and the membership of the party should insist that it act without a moment's delay.

Labor and the New Era

IN periods of transition, such as the world is now passing through, old conceptions of old things are swept aside and old conceptions of new movements must be also swept away. Any change in the world's affair must necessarily affect all the peoples and all sections of society. Particularly is that section of society affected which is the instrument of the particular change in question. In succeeding eras the aristocracy, the upper middle classes and the lower