

"We have seen a good many singular things happen recently. We have been told that it is unpatriotic to criticize public actions. Well, if it is, then there is a deep disgrace resting upon the origin of this nation. This nation originated in the sharpest sort of criticism of public policy. We originated, to put it in vernacular, in a kick; and if it be unpatriotic to kick, why then the grown man is unlike the child. We have forgotten the very principle of our origin if we have forgotten how to object, how to resist, how to agitate, how to pull down and build up, even to the extent of revolutionary practices if it be necessary to readjust matters. I have forgotten my history if that be not true history."—President Woodrow Wilson.

**NOW UP TO YOU!**

Does the working class of Astoria and the Lower Columbia want the Toveri to continue its English section?

If you do, let us hear from you to the tune of about 800 more subscriptions. We can not afford to continue this section on less than 1000 subscribers, greatly as we should like to.

The Toveri has been issuing an English section now for about three weeks. If its policy has commended itself to the working class public, the best way to make it known is by subscriptions. If not, then the English section of the Toveri must suspend and leave the local field to the mercy of the capitalist press of Astoria.

The value of fearless publicity ought to be apparent to every workman by this time. Daylight is what the robbing rats of capitalism fear most. Public opinion is greatly influenced by the press, and without a newspaper in which to voice their aspirations, the working class is sadly handicapped.

No better evidence of this can be cited than the garbled and falsified accounts of the Shipyard Workers' strike here in Astoria by the capitalist-minded press. Out of an immediate and urgent necessity for a correct account of this strike news, the Toveri started its English section. If it has now outlived its usefulness to the working class of this vicinity it will quietly withdraw from the field.

And if the workers want to see it continue, there is but one way to do it, and that is to boost the English subscriptions to the 1000 mark. On that number we can continue. Otherwise we shall be obliged to bow ourselves out.

Let us hear from the workers at once. We must receive the 1000 subscriptions within the next two weeks or discontinue. We should like to publish a working class paper on mere principle, but everything costs money—even principles.

What is your answer, workers of the world? Do you want the working class news of this district to go out to the public through the mouths of your enemies or in the understanding voice of your comrades?

**NO WORDS WASTED BY G. B. S.**

George Bernard Shaw, though he writes lengthy prefaces, can be brief when occasion requires. The New Age, a well-known London sociological publication, has sent a questionnaire around to the ablest men in the kingdom, asking their opinion of "Industrial Reconstruction" after the war. The answers—60 of them—already have appeared in book form. The questions were as follows:

1. What in your opinion will be

the industrial situation after the war as regards (a) labor; (b) capital; (c) the nation as a single commercial entity?

2. What in your view is the best policy to be pursued by (a) labor; (b) capital; (c) the state?

This is what Shaw answered: "1. (a) (b) (c) Chaos, as usual. "2. (a) (b) (c) SOCIALISM. G. Bernard Shaw."

And if Shaw had been asked his opinion about the "only" policy possible, as well as the "best" one, he would have made the same reply. We are practically certain.

Chaos, first; the death flurry of capitalism. Then Socialism, to bring order out of chaos. Shaw is a prophet who speaks short and to the point. But, then, he knows. — The Call.

**"THE MENACE"**

Commenting on the political situation in New York City, where the Socialists are likely to elect the city mayor at the coming election, The Call, Socialist daily, says:

While we Socialists are eagerly anticipating the results of the election, and at the very least expecting an enormous increase in the Socialist vote, let us not forget that there are other cities where the outlook is perhaps even more encouraging. Dayton, Ohio, is one of them, and judging from the alarmed clucking that issues from old-party editorial henroosts there, the local outlook for Socialism is exceedingly bright.

The Dayton Daily News, in a double-column editorial, frankly urges all good men to come to the aid of the party—as the typewriter practice line has it, or, rather, to the aid of the two old parties, which have had to combine into the usual "Citizens' party" in order to hold off the Socialist political menace. Some of this clucking is so pleasant to Socialist ears that we reproduce a few sample cackles:

"There can be no mistake concerning the meaning of the resolutions adopted last night by the Democratic city committee. In terms that were direct and definite, the people of Dayton were warned of the menace of Socialism that confronts them at this time. . . .

"Dayton is threatened by the possible election of a Socialist mayor and a Socialist majority of the city commission. (Hooray!)

"Thoughtful men who were once charmed by the academic reforms which Socialism proposed, seeing how its purposes have been diverted have renounced it."

One of those "thoughtful men" was John Spargo, but when the citizens' committee of Dayton sent him a letter asking him to come and help them against the Socialists, John turned them down cold, and informed them that he would rather speak for

the "menace" than for them; which shows how low they stand in the scale of humanity, when even a renegade Socialist disdains them and spurns their offer with contempt as an insult. Probably he had noted the warning of the Democratic city committee to the voters against Socialism, which opens as follows:

"The record made by this secret organization (not themselves, but the Socialists!) wherever it has secured control or controlling influence in city affairs shows a series of continuous failures, disclosing corruption, inefficiency, extravagance and incapacity to govern, resulting finally in riot and disorder."

But this is enough. We only intended to show that there are other places than New York where the "menace" exists. Let the Democrats of Dayton cheer up, and the worst is yet to come for them—on election day.

**CENSORS ARE GETTING BUSY**

Federal officials in Seattle today prepared to enforce the new law prohibiting foreign language newspapers from the mail, except under certain conditions. One of their first moves was against The British Columbia Federationist, a Socialist newspaper, published at Vancouver, B. C., which government agents allege is fostering propaganda against the draft in Seattle and elsewhere in the Northwest.

Assistant United States Attorney Donald A. McDonald today requested the postoffice department at Washington, D. C., to order this publication excluded from the mail in this country. The alleged editorial policy of the paper recently was called to the attention of federal officials by union labor men here, who vigorously protested against its circulation in the United States.

Postmaster Edgar Battle estimated today that there are fifty foreign language newspapers in Seattle which will be affected by the new law and obliged to comply with its provisions. He today caused to be sent to the editors and owners of these publications printed copies of the regulations under which the papers in the future will be admitted to the mail.

Under the law papers published in any foreign language which contain matter respecting the United States government or any other nation engaged in the war, must file with the postmaster an English translation of the article. This must be accompanied by an affidavit that it is a true translation. A further provision makes it obligatory to print the translation in English alongside the matter in a foreign language.

District Attorney Clay Allen said today that violations of the law will be handled with promptness and vigor.

"The fundamental principle of unionism is mutual aid. We join together, not so much because we love the other fellow, but because, with him, we are stronger. Our motto, 'An injury to one is an injury to all,' is a truth based upon the natural law of mutual aid."

Vigilance is the price of liberty and "Vigilantes" are the death of it.

**Uprising in Russia Appears Imminent**

**SOLDIERS AND WORKMEN ACQUISE KERENSKY WITH DESIRE TO DELIVER PETROGRAD INTO HANDS OF GERMANS.**

Petrograd, Oct. 27.—Minister of the Interior Nikitin, in a proclamation to all the commissioners throughout Russia, exhorts all classes of the population to "unite against the impending anarchy, which is driving the country to ruin."

The minister says that without this co-operation the government will hardly be able to keep order and prevent outrages.

The evening newspapers, which publish the program for the meeting of the Central Council of Soldiers and Workmen's Deputies on November 2, are filled with rumors of a Bolshevik demonstration and an attempt to seize the government on that date.

The program for the discussions of the council embraces five topics: The revolutionary democracy, the conditions of peace, the constituent assembly, demobilization and the fight against anarchy.

The Vechnere Vremya says: "The soldiers' and workmen's deputies frankly admit they are planning civil war."

The newspapers state that Premier Kerensky probably will relinquish the post of commander-in-chief of the Russian armies to General Bonkhovim at the end of the week.

On Monday the Council of Soldiers' and Workmen's Delegates adopted a resolution proposed by Leon Trotsky, president of its executive committee and a leading Maximalist, declaring that the salvation of the country lies in the conclusion of peace as quickly as possible.

The resolution contains declarations accusing Kerensky of a desire to deliver Petrograd into the hands of the Germans and their "imperialist allies," and also of openly favoring the German emperor.

The resolution demands that all powers pass into the hands of the Council of Soldiers and Workmen and instructs the executive committee to propose an armistice to all the nations.

As long as peace is not concluded, however, continues the resolution, the committee must defend Petrograd and restore the army to a status of combative force.

In consequence of this resolution, the Petrograd Council of Soldiers' and Workmen's Delegates has decided to form a revolutionary general staff for the defense of Petrograd.

Trotsky, at a meeting of the council, explained why the Bolsheviks bolted the first meeting of the Russian democratic congress, declaring that that body had not been representative of the people and was not trusted by the soldiers and workmen.

"With the formation of the preliminary parliament," he said, "the independence of the ruling power was confirmed officially. Russia is a republic, but its autocrat is Kerensky."

He urged the Workmen's and Soldiers' councils to be ready to fight for the powers to be handed over to them. He declared they would be able to save the country and make peace.

**Local Notes**

**MORNING ASTORIAN RIGHT.**

Under the title "Curb the Autocrat," the Morning Astorian has an editorial denouncing the postal department for its high-handed action in barring newspapers of the country from the mails.

This is the kind of spirit which it is the undoubted mission of the press to display in the face of autocracy. It resurrects one's faith in the ultimate triumph of the fundamentals of American democracy and a speedy return to a free press.

**ATTENTION!**

Members of Local 1500 of the Ship Carpenters, Joiners, Caulkers and Millmen.

Special meeting of the Local will be held at the Logan Hall Monday evening at 7:30 o'clock, for the purpose of electing a president, and vice-president to fill vacancies caused by resignation, and for transacting such other business as may be necessary.

By order of Local 1500. CHAS. H. BEARMAN, Chairman, pro tem.

Yesterday's issue of the Budget contains a reply to its mob law communication of some days back, and it should be read by the "good people" of the town. The Ship Carpenters' union, through a committee, have handled the subject as it deserves and their reply ought to make the anonymous writer of that

**RESOLUTION.**

Our faithful and beloved brother, Christ Cholberg, whose duty has called him away from our midst, leaves a vacancy that is hard to be filled—a staunch, faithful and self-sacrificing president of our Ship Carpenters and Joiners' Union, Local No. 1500. He has fought a whole battle against great odds, imposed by the venomous press, the Chamber of Commerce, and other citizens of Astoria who are capable of seeing but one side, and that the wrong side of this question of social freedom and justice.

Despite the slanders and vilification that were heaped upon him by the enemies of organized labor, and those who did not understand the real situation, he has been offered several positions with greater remuneration than he received at the McPheehy Ship Co., and now has accepted one of these at Victoria, B. C.

Our hearts and well wishes go with him and many of us will join him immediately.

He is now in a position where he can render great service to the U. S. as well as the British government in furthering aims that will help to win this great war for democracy, and in so doing we feel sure that he will be appreciated at his true worth. The representative of the Canadian government, Mr. Mr. John Day, had the ability to recognize his talents as a shipbuilder as soon as he came in contact with him.

May the power of love and justice ever guide him in his footsteps in his present field of activity, as well as it has when he was with us.

Adopted by Ship Carpenters and Joiners' Local No. 1500, of Astoria, Oregon, and also by all the affiliated trades locals in the shipbuilding industry. Astoria, Ore., Oct. 25, 1917.

**SHIPYARD LABORERS, ATTENTION!**

Special meeting of the Shipyard Laborers' Union will be held Saturday evening at 7 o'clock, at the A. O. U. W. hall, 9th street, for the purpose of transacting numerous important orders of business.

**NOTICE!**

All the present and prospective members of the Milk Consumers' League are hereby requested to be present at the general meeting which will be held at the Finnish Socialist Club Hall, Sunday, Oct. 28th, at 2 o'clock p. m., for the purpose of considering the incorporation of the concern; examining a draft of rules, and discussion of such other matters as may be brought forth.

**TRUSTEES.**

**THREE MILLION CASES OF TUBERCULOSIS IN U. S.**

Baltimore, Oct. 27.—Dr. Charles J. Hatfield, of New York, executive secretary of the National Association for the Prevention and Study of Tuberculosis, in his address today before the convention of the North Atlantic Tuberculosis congress, said in part:

"The cases of tuberculosis are far greater than at first supposed. It has been recently discovered that, instead of 1,000,000 active cases, there are nearly 3,000,000 cases. "This does not mean that there has been any increase in the disease but more cases have been discovered by modern methods used in its detection. Therefore, the national program must comprise primary education in the prevention of the disease—not only for the general public, but to reach the army cantonments and the medical profession. All cases of men who are rejected in the national army must be followed up and cared for. To provide funds for this work the sale of Red Cross Christmas seals this year must be trebled."

**PROMISE BROKEN.**

Fifty women and girls employed in the Pittsburgh, Pa., yards of the B. & O. R. R., went out on strike last week against piece work. The women have been doing the dirtiest kind of work, as oilers, greasers and engine winers in the roundhouse. They have formed a union and last Monday held a joint meeting with the steelworkers on strike in Pittsburgh. They say they were lured into "grease on the elbows" by the promise of pay equal to the men who were drafted for the war, but that this promise was not met by the patriotic managers of the B. & O. Well, our sisters are learning some things they and a whole lot more didn't know before.

**ON SUPPRESSION.**

The denial of constitutional rights and especially the suppression of newspapers is one of the unwise steps any government can take. The suppression of Socialist papers is to be regretted, not so much from the viewpoint of the papers themselves, but rather of the government supporting them.

At present a majority of the people of the United States, if they do not openly approve of the war, at any rate are willing to suffer it rather than oppose the government. Denial of constitutional rights immediately endanger however, certain forces extremely sinister to the present order of things, forces which are able to do such effective work that the whole fabric of the state may be endangered. Suppression of free thought moreover leaves a large part of the citizenry of a country voiceless and consequently the government is very liable to gain a wrong impression of the popular feeling on vital subjects and be led into irrevocable errors.

These and various other considerations, not from the viewpoint of the suppressed, but rather from a proper estimation of the safety of a government, it would seem, would deter the administration from a step so fraught with danger to itself. That

the administration is also considering the suppression of the New York Evening Post, a paper strong in its support of capitalism but with a certain old-fashioned democratic tradition of the sacredness of a "scraps of paper" such as the constitution, shows the danger in which not Socialist and radical publications alone stand, but also any journals which may criticize the administration.

It is of course strongly repugnant to common sense that an institution which cannot stand wholesome scientific criticism should consider to export, but to the contrary must needs bolster itself up behind arrogant and unwarranted denials of the elementary primary rights of a free people. A year ago people would have scouted the idea that the government of a "free and independent" people could suppress the newspapers representing the world's largest political party and the world's greatest institution of internationalism. Such a thing would have then been deemed not only un-American, but characteristically "Prussian."

Whether such an action in New York City as the threatened suppression of the three Socialist dailies would result in the overthrow of the United States Constitution, is sincerely to be regretted, not on the standpoint of the suppressed papers, but from that of the government itself. But "fools rush in, where angels fear to tread."—Seattle Daily Call.

**THE WORKERS AND THE LAW.**

By Samuel H. Holland.

It has been said that the law is a sword, its handle is always in the hands of capital, its point is perpetually directed toward the worker's breast. Whether such is the purpose of the law or not, the outrageous conditions in which the modern worker is placed make him continuously the target and victim of the law, as it is interpreted and administered by the courts.

A careful view of human history and development discloses that from the earliest days of mankind, since

**MORRIS HILLQUIT DEFENDS FREE PRESS**

(The following excerpts are from the address delivered by Morris Hillquit, Socialist mayoralty candidate in New York, before Assistant Postmaster General Dockery at Washington on October 15.—The Editor.)

I do not propose to go into a detailed defense of the charges made or implied by the reading of the various articles from The New York Call by the solicitor for the department, at this time. As we all understand it, The Call will have an opportunity to reply specifically and definitely to each and every one of such articles, of which opportunity we shall be very glad to avail ourselves.

What I propose to do now, and that very briefly, is to state our general position, and I hope I can make it so clear that there shall be no misunderstanding on the subject.

The articles read by my learned opponent are, I presume, typical of those he desires to quote in support of his contention that the second-class mailing rights should be withdrawn from The New York Call. They present a variety of subjects, some directly connected with the conduct of the war, others entirely unconnected. For instance a criticism of the administration in choosing Senator Elihu Root to represent this country in Russia; a cartoon indicating in a general way that the administration might well pay heed to the existing social needs of this country before taking care of the European situation; a criticism of the conduct of the department of justice in giving out for publication

certain charges against members of the Industrial Workers of the World while a criminal prosecution is pending against them and before any chance has been given them to present their side to the public; a criticism of Governor Burnquist of Minnesota and his refusal to permit a lawful organization to meet in the state of Minnesota; a general political criticism of the administration, claiming that it had duped and hoodwinked the people; then certain articles in opposition to the war, and criticism of the conduct of the war and articles in favor of peace. This, I believe, fairly summarizes the general tenor of the articles so far read.

I assume from Mr. Smith's tone of voice that he does not agree with the spirit of these articles. It is possible that you, governor, as a citizen of the United States, and in your capacity of such citizen, absolutely disagree with the principles raised in these articles; but what I want you to bear in mind is that we are not here on the question of the general correctness or incorrectness of our views. We are here on a charge that we have violated certain specific provisions of an Act of Congress, and the contention is made that the alleged violation of such provisions should deprive us of a certain right which we have heretofore enjoyed, and which is essential to the continuance of our existence. I respectfully submit that no proof has been adduced before you to sustain such charge and contentions.

In the first place, it must be borne in mind that The Call is the organ and spokesman of the Socialist party. The Socialist party is an opposition party, and frankly so. It is just as much opposed on political grounds to the present administration as ordinarily the Democratic party would be to a Republican administration, or the Republican party to a Democratic administration. In all the many years of the existence of this republic each political group has been conceded the right to criticize, and not merely politely and decorously, but in a pretty vehement tone of voice, the party in opposition. That is precisely what the Socialists are doing today.

I wish to call your attention to the fact that our motives, the motives of the Socialist party, and the motives of The New York Call, as its spokesman, have not been impugned in this hearing. No attempt has been made, no attempt can be successfully made, to assail our motives. It cannot be claimed that we are actuated by mercenary motives, by motives of malice or hate, or by any motives other than purely patriotic, as we understand that term. All that has been shown is that between our conception and the prevailing conception which finds expression in the present administration there is a radical difference. We admit there is, but we claim the right to entertain such divergent views, and we say more than that we have not done.

So the position of the Socialist party and The New York Call be fully understood, let me frankly state to you now, governor, that the Socialist

party is frankly, unequivocally, opposed to war, and that it has been opposed to our entering the war. There was no need of reading these special articles. Every line printed in The Call on that subject made its position absolutely clear and unambiguous, and in taking this position The Call again expresses the position of the Socialist party. We believe that war is one of the greatest of social evils. We do not believe that this war, or any war, can possibly tend to the improvement of social conditions of the masses or to the alleviation of human suffering. We absolutely reject war between nations as an instrument of social progress. We do not believe that war can be conducive to establishing a world democracy. We do not believe that a democracy can be imposed upon any people. We believe that the people of each country must evolve their own political and industrial democracy. There is another reason why we are opposed to war, and that is, because we believe, and again, honestly, sincerely believe, that its burdens fall primarily upon the masses of the poor, upon the working classes of the community, and we believe, further, that war is the fruit of evil social conditions.

I should like this point to clear up one common misunderstanding of the Socialist position. When we Socialists say that the war is of capitalist origin, the phrase is vulgarly interpreted to mean that the war was deliberately made by a number of individual capitalists for the purpose of making profits. That is not

what we want to imply. Even in the article of Professor Scott Nearing's, quoted by the learned solicitor, the author states very clearly that the capitalists did not want war, that they consider war barbarous; but conditions were stronger than they. The existing industrial order is bound to drive nations into war. In other words, the Socialists believe that under the existing conditions of competitive industry, of the struggle for markets, first at home, then, when these are exhausted, for markets abroad, a struggle in which the manufacturing and mercantile classes of all leading nations are necessarily involved, arises a new policy of imperialism, which must lead to diplomatic intrigues and militarism and eventually must create wars. It is that system, the competitive system of private industries prevailing in the world today, which the Socialists blame for the outbreak of all modern wars and this world war.

I repeat, we do not believe that a number of capitalists of their own free will deliberately came together and decided: "Let us make war." By no means. They did not want war. War is not pleasant, or even profitable, except for special classes. Now, this is not a novel theory. We have been expounding it for the last sixty years or thereabouts. It has come to be a well-recognized theory, technically known as the economic interpretation of history. It has been accepted, not merely by the Socialists, but by a number of other schools of thought. I might mention,

for instance, that in this country one of the greatest authorities on the subject, Professor Seligman of the department of economics of Columbia university, a non-socialist, has frankly accepted it. If, then, the department takes the position that the theory that this war is a capitalist war, in the sense in which I have tried to explain it, is an act hostile to the government, it will outlaw a school of historical thought, something that no government has ever heretofore attempted.

When we say, on the other hand, that we stand for peace, we are likewise very often misunderstood. In a very reputable magazine recently that statement was interpreted to mean a desire for an immediate separate peace, for the withdrawal of the United States from the war. That is not what we mean. The Socialists would be the last class of people to advise our government to withdraw from the war, now, that it is in it, and to leave all the nations of Europe to their own destinies. Socialism is an international movement, not a narrow nationalist movement. What we do say is, We want a speedy but general and negotiated peace, and we express our belief that the wisest, as well as the most effective, policy of our government at this time would be to make the first move in the direction of such a peace. Socialists, outside of being Socialists, are also citizens, and as such they claim all of the rights guaranteed to every citizen by the constitution. They claim a right to criticize our administration, to criticize its war policies, to advocate peace, to defend the economic standards of the workers during the war. They also claim the right to protest against all violations of our constitutional rights.

I want to say this in conclusion: While we maintain our right to do our own thinking and to print and circulate our thoughts on any political subject, whether it agrees or does not happen to agree with the opinions of the party in power, we do fully recognize that we are bound by law, and we recognize our duty as citizens to obey the law.

Where would our country be now, where would our democratic institutions be now, if the founders of this republic denied the full and free exercise of the right to criticize existing political and other institutions and the right to change such institutions by persuasion? How can you change institutions or laws by persuasion if you are not allowed to persuade? It will never do to say that such rights of criticism are permitted in ordinary normal times, but will not be permitted in critical times or times of war. The constitution was made for all times—times of war and times of peace. Congress at no time has undertaken to set a limit to the expression of mere political opinions or criticism, and all that we have said, and all that we have done, has been within these limits.

So, in considering the case, I ask you not to be guided by your own personal views. It may be that you are right; it may be that you are wrong; it may be that we are right; it may be that we are wrong; we have a constitutional right to be wrong, if we are wrong. It is only in the clash of opinions, in the discussion of vital issues, that progress is made and truth established. Progress can never come, truth will never be established, by the stifling of opinions, even if such opinions are unpleasant to the administration or to the government at a given time.