# THE A Published Every Two Weeks by

THE SOCIALIST PROPAGANDA LEAGUE OF AMERICA

J. F. MULLEN, Secretary 61 Woodrow Avenue, Dorchester, Mass.

LOUIS C. FRAINA

S. FREIMAN. A. S. EDWARDS S. J. KUTGERS J. C. ROVITCH

Subscription One year, \$1.00; Six months, 50 cents; Three months, 25 cents. Bundle Rates 20 copies one year to one address, \$9.00; orders for bundles of a single issue, any number, 3 Cts. each, delivered free.

> BUSINESS AND EDITORIAL OFFICE 1346 Kingsbridge Avenue, New York

This paper temporarily is issued every two weeks. But really effective propaganda requires a tocckly. This paper will be issued every week as soon as your financial support makes it possible. Get subscriptions! Order a bundle! Contribute to the sustaining fund! Your Cause and Paper Need You!

#### The Russian Offensive

As a military factor, the new Russian offensive is as yet of slight importance; as a political factor, it buiks large. The American press, naturally, is interpreting its political significance in a reactionary sense. The offensive is seen as the end of "anarchy in Russia and as a victory of the pro-war Imperialistic faction. Kerensky is hailed as the savior of Russia. But while Kerensky struts through the pages of the press as a man of miraculously heroic proportions, the revolutionary forces are silently but firmly solidifying their power. An executive committee of three hundred delegates representing the Councils of Soldiers and Workmen throughout Russia, has been organized with Tscheidse at its head. The Duma refused to dissolve itself, but nobody pays any attention to it; the newly organized executive committee, dominated by Socialists, is the real government of Russia. And only a needn't fear words they remember the few weeks before the offensive started, the All-Russia Congress of Soldiers' and Workmen's Delegates adopted a resolution which characterized the present waras "the consequence of aspirations of; Imperialists, prevailing among the ruling classes of all countries," and recognizing "that the struggle for the more rapid ending of the war constitutes the most pressing problem for the revolutionary democracy-a problem imposed as much by the interests of the revolution as by the aspirations of the workers of all countries." The new offensive simply. shows that the revolutionary democracy is willing to fight for its ends. The New York Tribune recognizes that either Russia or the United States will dominate the peace conference-and by all means the dominating factor should not be the Imperialistic United States. Revolutionary Russia waging a revolutionary war will immensely strengthen its influence and purposes, and determine the terms of peace in the measure that it bulks large itself and is backed up by the revolutionary proletariat in all the belligerent nations.

# The Stockholm Conference

THE Russian Council of Soldiers and Workmen has asked the American gov-ernment to allow the delegates of the Socialist Party to participate in the Stockholm Conference. The great democracy of America now stands in the unenviable position of being the only belligerent government that prohibits its Socialists participating in the conference, It is in this way that our government is making the world safe for democracy! The attitude of President Wilson again proves that this country is a reactionary factor in the situation, and not a progressive one as many a radical romantically believes. But the pressure of world events may compel our government to lift the ban. It therefore becomes necessary that the National Office of the Socialist Party issue a call for the election of delegates to the Conference. The City Convention of the Socialist Party of Greater New York has adopted a resolution to this effect. The National Office should act immediately. The selection of Victor Berger, Algernon Lee and Morris Hillquit by the N. E. C. dominated by Hillquit and Berger, was a disregard of party democracy. If there is no time for a referenlum, then the National Committee d elect the delegates. This would de at least a measure of democracy.

Every local of the party should take immediate action to make the National Office act in this emergency.

### The Disgrace of Meyer London

A CONFERENCE of trades unions in

New York City passed a resolution calling apon Meyer London to introduce a bill in Congress for the repeal of the Conscription Law. The City Convention of Greater New York, Socialist Party, passed a similar resolution. The behavior of London is disgraceful. Imagine a Socialist having to be asked to do his duty, and still failing to perform it! Instead of it being the Socialist London to lift his voice in Congress against Conscription after it became a law, it was a bourgeois Congressman that did it. The war provided a magnificent opportunity for Meyer London in Congress, an opportunity to use a national forum for aggressive Socialist propaganda. But he egregiously muffed the opportunity. Speak privately with members of the party bureaucracy in New York, and they will admit the disgraceful attitude of London. But they do not utter one single word of public criticism, nor do they take action to discipline him. How long shall the Socialist Party, particularly in view of the adoption of the Majority Report by an overwhelming vote of the membership, tolerate the contemptible misrepresentation of its attitude in Congress?

#### Patriots and Profiteers

President Wilson has read a lecture to the business interests of the country. It is a really magnificent lecture. With his usual trenchancy, he tears to shred the patriotic claims of our profiteers who are using patriotic endeavors to increase their profits. The President tells them they are entitled to "just prices," but that they shouldn't ask for them on "patriotic" grounds. Profits and patriotism have nothing to do with ea-1 other." The President says in so many words that the business interests are astempting to hold up the country, and cites the shipping interests as a particularly revolting example. Which is all very excellent. But the business interests old adage about sticks and stones may break one's bones, but names will never burt them. Business will keep on piling profits upon profits, although here and there particular business interests may suffer so that business as a whole may profit. The President having made a magnificent gesture to arouse the idealism of public opinion, business may now proceed to spoliate suffering humanity without any qualms of conscience.

# The Berkman-Goldman Case

THE inevitable always happens. It A was inevitable that Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman should receive the limit of the law, and they did receive the limit in the most outrageque way-two years each in the Federal penitentiary, \$10,000 fine each and a threat of deportation upon their release.

Their conviction was inevitable because the government wanted to make an example of them. Proceeding on the foolish assumption that if these agitators were imprisoned, the movement as which they played a magnificent part would collapse, the government acted accordingly. It took the jury thirty-six minutes to render a verdict.

The actions of the prosecution in this case have been peculiarly malignant and repulsive: A monstrously excessive bail of \$25,000 each was imposed upon the defendants, as a punitive measure and to make them suffer in jail. After their conviction, Judge Mayer denied them a few days during which to arrange their affairs-again as a punitive measure. But the most vicious act of all was seizing \$20,000 of the bail money to pay the defendants' fines in case it was found that their money was included in the money provided for bail! The Judge and the Federal attorney knew very well that the idea is preposterous. What is their purpose, then? It is to secure the names of the persons that provided the money for bail, so as to terrorize thent and others from putting up money to bail out agitators in the future. Con-

The activity of Emma Goldman and Alexander Berkman during the past three months has been the finest of their twenty years' participation in the radical movement, They knew what was coming, but they did not quail. They would be the first to spurn our sympathy, and we shall offer none. The revolutionist needs no sympathy. But they do have our admiration, and they have deserved it in

It is futile to denounce the action of the government. It is worse than futile to indulge in lampoon and lamentation. Courageous action against the reaction is the only fitting answer wee can make.

The ruling class is much mistaken it. they imagine they can terrorize the opposition. We are in the fight to stay. The issues at stake are too great, our action is too important for the future of fundamental democracy, for us to quail or to cease our activity.

The fight goes on. It may have ceased temporarily in New York, but the organizing and preparations go on. In the meanwhile, the fight breaks out in the West and Northwest.

Do your worst, gentlemen of the reaction. Fill the jails, and when they are full, build new ones. Crushed in one form, the revolutionary movement simply assumes a new form, and its activity goes on in spite of all. Our tight is not the fight of a day, but of ages. Yours is a victory out of which arises ultimate defeat.

### Conscientious Objectors

THE test of the Conscientions Ob-▲ jector is coming. The Conscription Law provides exemption only for conscientious Objectors affiliated with a recognized religious creed which does not believe in the taking of human life. fait thousands upon thousands of registrants claimed exemption as Conscientions Objectors who are not affiliated with any creed. The government has not announced its policy toward this class.

It is an absurdity to consider conscience as simply an attribute of the religious. Surely the world has progressed sufficiently to recognize the obvious fact that religion and conscience do not necessarily depend each upon the other Many a sning religious devotee is an unmitigated scamp possessed of neither conscience nor principles. Conscience is a human instinct, and is no more an integral part of religion than are morals.

But the absurdity is still greater. Quakers are automatically exempt under the law. A particular Quaker may have been born into his religion, possess really no conscientious scruples against war, and still be exempt. But here is a Socialist who has been fighting militarism and war even before the great catastrophe, whose whole life is devoted to social service: is he to be refused exemption simply because he is not affiliated with any religious creed?

This attitude would penalize social service and ideals and promote the barren religion of a creed. The Quakers are essentially selfish; they are not a proselyting sect, they do not burn with the fire of the reformer. Their's is a passive creed: let the heathen perish, we have the truth and shall live in the truth. The Socialist and the non-Socialist Conscientious Objector, on the contrary, is an eminently social being, whose opposition to war is not based simply on the dictates of his conscience but on the broad general interests of humanity. These are the real Conscientious Objectors because their objections are acquired, not inherited; because their principles are universal principles with which they seek to emancipate the world.

Decide what the government may, the non-religious Conscientions Objector is determined to refuse military service. Threats cannot terrify nor deter him. He will abide by the decision he has

And this decision is all the more unalterable because the non-religious Conscientious Objector is animated primarily by social motives. The fact that involved in his conscientious objections is a great, international social principle upon which depends the future of the world will give him greater strength and courage to resist and refuse being drafted into the army.

Nor will the real Conscientious Objector accept alternative service. The acceptance of this service would immediately brand his objections as hypocrisy. The motives of these Conscientious Objectors are social, and not simply individual; they are not against their individual participation in war, but against war in itself, because of the purposes that war promotes. Alternative service is a vital measure of war; indeed, under the conditions to-day, alternative service is in a sense much more important than actual military service at the front. The Conscientious Objector it not a coward; in making his protest against the war, he is determined to see it through. There can be

# The Negro and Unionism

THE East St. Louis outrage, in which scores of Negroes were brutally killed and their homes burned, is an inident that cannot be dismissed with the tereotyped phrases damning Capitalsm for its iniquity.

The responsibility of Capitalism is dain, the economic factors obvious. But there is a responsibility of Organized labor involved, a heavy responsibility that cannot be shirked.

The day after the outrage, the secretary of the local Federation of Labor ssued a statement condoning the acions of the murderous mob. President iompers has condoned the part played by Organized Labor in the outrage on the plea that the employers are responible because they imported Negro lafor from the south. In so many words, the justification is that the Negroes were taking the jobs of the whites, and accordingly deserved being killed. This is a dastardly plea.

White men who take the jobs of strikers are not massacred by the strikers. They may be intimidated, they may be assaulted, which under certain conditions may be justifiable action; but they are not massacred and their homes destroyed. The A. F. of L. cannot plead that the Negro is a scab, because the A. F. of L. refuses to organize the Negro. The trades unions are "job trusts" which through various methods exclude the bulk of the workers from membership. Their animating purpose is to provide the members with jobs. By excluding the mass of the workers, the unions of the A. F. of L. encourage

Instead of organizing the Negro and jointly fighting the employers, the unionists of East St. Louis expressed a ferocious spirit of race hatred and thereby made proletarian solidarity a still more remote thing of the future.

No one denies the shai of Organized abor in the outrage-the friends of the A. F. of L. simply justify it in a variety.

· And worse of all, we find the Socialist Party, which should be the moral and intellectual advance guard of the Working Class, compromising on the issue, remaining silent, or extenuating the whole affair by a discussion of its "economic causes."

At the recent City Convention of the Socialist . Party of Greater New York, a resolution was introduced on the East St. Louis outrage that indicated the responsibility of Organized Labor. The resolution was rejected, and a compromise resolution adopted:

"We express our unutterable horror the outrages committed upon the Negroes in East St. Louis on July 1 and 2, and we demand that the perpetrators of these fiendish deeds, as well as the local authorities who failed to give the Negroes sufficient protection, be prosecuted and punished."

A characteristic declaration-sound and fury, signifying nothing!

The New York Call admits that the outrage is the consequence of "a fierce and intense fight for jobs," its solution being "to remove the economic cruses."

Must the Negro wait for the Cooperative Commonwealth before he can secure at least a measure of justice? It is a stopid and reactionary attitude. It plays right into the hands of Capitalism by dividing the working class along racial lines. Moreover, it is going to keep the Negro away from Socialism by making him strive to improve his conditions as a Negro, instead of as a

The Negro constitutes a large proportion of the proletariat of America. The industrial transformation that is now convulsing this country is making the Negro migrate north and enter industrial pursuits in large contingents. These are facts that cannot be waved aside with dogmatic phrases. They must be faced and settled intelligently. Either the union movement organizes the Negro as a fellow-worker, or the capitalist is going to pit Negro against white to the

destruction of both. The unions must be free to all workers, they should seek to organize all the workers. The policy of the "job trust" inevitably produces disaster, particularly in the new era of Capitalism and its greater efficiency. And if the A. F. of L. refuses to organize the Negro, the unskilled and the unorganized generally, then it becomes a prime task of the Socialist Party-if it is Socialist and revolutionary-to drive the unions to action and use all its power to make good the deficiency of the A. F. of L.

# Russia, Germany, America

BY ANTON PANNEKOEK

LMOST three years the war has con-A timied, three years of immense sufferings and unbearable pressure, without practically any resistance of the masses. It would seem strange, after the world opposition against lesser pressure before the war, that now we should all of a sudden have this silent, inactive obedience and resignation of the proletariat to hunger, suffering and destruction. And yet it is not strange to those who see that the class struggle is at the bottom of Imperialism, and know that the classstruggle is decided by the power of the classes. The outbreak of the war and the refusal to fight it, the surrender of the leaders to the bourgeoisie, was all an immense defeat of the proletariat, Class relations were at once changed to the disadvantage of the workers. The possibility of a class fight was cut off; the proletarian masses stood without an ideal, without light, without hope. Socialism, upon which they had been relying, the star of their lives, proved to be either a compromise with bourgeois politicians for jobs or a phrase without meaning.

The proletariat passed through the dark night of the first years of the war, stifled by its unbearable misery and increasing sacrifices. But gradually a new uprising arose, not as a return from a temporary error to the old ideals, but as a new instinctive practice, against all traditions, against old theories, as a spontaneous act of self-preservation against destructive misery—the first beginning of a new Socialist struggle.

The Russian Revolution is the first great revolutionary movement of the people, born of the world war. That is the reason why its character is least simple. It is not a clear-cut proletarian revolution, but a movement of the people, in which different class movements and oppositions meet together, partly in cooperation, partly opposing one another. Because Russia is least advanced for a Social Revolution, it was first ripe for a revolt of the people resulting from the misery of the war. Because the government was not sufficiently capitalistic, because it could not develop all the capitalist energy nor organize all the powers of the nation in the service of Impeialism, because it was not fully the representative of the aggressive policy of the bourgeoisie, therefore it was not strong enough and had to give way first. In other countries the government has organized the hunger, declared Henriette Roland-Holst, after the Revolution in Petrograd, in Russia the gov ernment of the Czar was not capable enough to organize hunger, and unorganized hunger dethroned Crarism. People can endure living a year on hunger rations, but three days without any ration at all meant revolt.

Added to this, as a second factor, comes the ight which the Russian Social Democrats (of the group Lenin, who was most influential in Petrograd) have fought incessantly during the war against the war. This fact again shows the lower degree of development in Russia, where Socialism had not yet secured standing as a Party which had something to lose. Again and again during the last year strikes broke out in the munitions industry, the fighting spirit prevailed, and that was why a spontaneous hunger revolt could develop into an organized revolutionary movement.

As a third factor comes the opposition of the Bourgeoisie. We should not over-estimate this force, the real work being done by the workers. The Cadets and Octobrists looked out of the window, as it was expressed by an English correspondent, they watched Cossacks and police beating up the workers, and expected the government to maintain itself; but when it turned out differently and the revolt proved successful, they came upon the streets and headed the Revolution. Nevertheless, the attitude of the Bourgeoisie has had a great influence on the Revolution. It has long been known, that they were strongly opposed to the Czar, because of his inclination towards a peace with Germany; and with the support of the Governments of the Entente powers, they intended to proclaim a Grand Duke in the place of Nicolas at the first favorable pportunity. The bourgeoisie did not do anything to support the Government, and the workers therefore did not find any strong power

For this reason the situation in Russia can be compared to some extent with the one in France after the February Revolution of 1848. As was the case then, two classes, Bourgeoisie and Proletariat, stand opposed to each other, made the Revolution and reigned together. Not only in principle, but also in the most actual practical issues: the Bourgeoisie is in favor of the imperialistic war, the Proletariat wishes peace. And between both is another class, formerly in Paris the armed small bourgeois, the national guard, now in Russia the armed peasants, the soldiers-the factors that decide which side they finally will join, and determine the further developments of the Revolution. But between Russia of 1917 and France of 1848 is this great difference, that at that time the class antagonism had to he discovered, to the surprise of both classes, whereas now from the very start the Proletariat, at least the best among them, understand that the government represents another hostile class. Moreover, there is this difference, that the war situation compels the bourgeoisie to avoid by all means a civil war, although this offers at the same time the posibility of using nationalistic phrases to fool the less conscious part of the proletariat in betraying the class struggle. The defensive war is the slogan which the Russian Bourgeoisie uses in controlling large masses of workers and soldiers—a slogan sufficiently elastic to allow all kinds of interpretations. rom Imperialistic wars to truce and real

peace-and therefore fits very well in a time of transition in which the political aims of the classes have still to crystallize.

The further development of the Russian Revolution will depend in the last instance upon whether the Revolution spreads over the rest of Europe.

The Russian Bourgeoisie meets with still more problems. It promised to the Poles complete autonomy in the name of democracy and as a necessary measure in view of the German occu ation. But Poland is not the only foreign nationality in the Russian Empire. The Ukrainians have raised their voice and claim the whole territory from Ural to the Black Sea-and their intention to hold a national congress will perhaps force the Provisional Government to call the constitutional assembly for the whole Empire earlier than it intended. How will the Russian Bourgeoisie maintain the unity of the Empire against the tendency to split up into different nationalities? It is confronted with the opposing ideals of the bourgeois democracy of the earlier period of growing capitalism: national autonomy, and the demand of Imperialism: strong centralization and world empire. The opposition is not irreconcilable, in many countries the problem being solved by putting democracy in the service of Imperialism, accepting the form without the spiritual content.

No matter how this develops, whether into the confusion of internal struggles of the difterent nationalities, or into the form of a federation of nations, undoubtedly the Russian development will greatly influence as a disintegrating factor the unity of the monarchy of Austria-Hungary.

The general interest is now concentrated upon Germany. The last autocracy in Europe, the last remnant of the despotism of the Middle Ages in the midst of free peoplessuch are not only the words of the "idealist" Wilson in his declaration of war, but a great part of the democratic Socialist press of the neutral countries express the hope and expectation that the German workers will follow the Russian example.

Now, it certainly is true that the first example of a mass-movement, able to overthrow one of the warring governments, goes far towards taking away the feeling of powerlessness in the Proletariat; the spell which for many years obsessed their minds has been broken. But in these expectations we overlook the big difference that may be briefly expressed as follows: The Russian Revolution is a Bourgeois revolution; the German would be a Proletarian revolution. In Russia the \* Crar has been overthrown because he could not fulfill the Imperialistic requirements; in Germany, the Bourgeoisie is united behind the government and the dynasty, which during half a century has been the purest representative of the interests of Big Capital. In Gerunited power of Bourgeoisie, landed property. and government, against a unified ruling class. That is why a German Revolution when it breaks loose will have a much deeper meaning and wider results than the Russian Revolution could have. This circumstance explains its immense difficulty and its long delay. It is not a question of overthrowing the yoke of a crazy despot, as is claimed by English and American gentlemen in a naive combination of stupidity and hypocrisy; in involves the fight against all the powers of capital. Precisely for this reason we should not hope too much for a German revolution. Moreover, the German proletariat had quite a dir ferent experience during the war than the Russian Proletariat: kept from fighting by its leaders and its Party-the Scheidemanns, awell as the group Haase-Ledebour-Kautskya fighting spirit can only develop when it berates itself spiritually from the Social Democracy, (from both parties, the eld and the new). And while in Russia most of the workers were employed in the factories and the peasants at the battlefield, in Germany the mass of young and strong workers is on the firing line, and are replaced by women in the factories and cities.

And yet, in spite of all unfavorable circumstances, something is smouldering in Ger many. The terrible sufferings, the military disappointments, and especially hunger, the perpetual craving hunger of the half-satisfied which does not enrage quickly, but exhausts the children to starvation-these finally will exceed the limits of patience.

Here and there people have resisted, hardly controlled by the leaders who organized in Berlin an orderly and legal "protest strike." We may expect hunger revolts of the masses in these and the coming months almost with mathematical certainty, and under the present circumstances, now that Germany is losing constantly on the Western front, these hunger revolts may perhaps grow into a revolutionary movement of the people.

Never was the chance of a revolution in Germany so great as it is in the immediate

We may yet, accordingly, expect a Proletarian, a Socialist revolution. We have emphasized above very strongly the difference. between Russia and Germany; we now must point out that the difference should not be considered too absolute. If conditions once develop so far that the revolt is spreading more and more, that the police is powerless, that soldiers fraternize with the people (all still quite different things than in Russia) and turn their weapons upon the governmentthen just the same as in Russia-the bourgeofsie will head the Revolution. There are enough unemployed politicians with demo-cratic color, 'Fortschrittler" and Social Democrats, to lead a Revolution against Absolut ism, against the Junkers, in favor of liberalism and Socialism. They will try to limit the Revolution to a mere political democratic Re-volution, and in this way they will break the danger for Capitalism. German Capitalism the absolutistic militaristic rule of the Junkers. but Capitalism can also get along differently If it has to be, if the need is really pressing it can get slong with any kind of government.

(Contract on page 4, ast 1