



THE CLASS STRUGGLE

Devoted to International Socialism

Vol. III

AUGUST, 1919

No. 3

What is Bolshevism?

By Rosa Luxemburg

**The Development of Socialism
from Science into Action**

By Karl Radek

The S. L. P.

By Max Eastman

Russia and Germany

By A. S. Sachs

Left or Right?

By Ludwig Lore

Samples of Allied and Bolshevik Propaganda

Price, 25 Cents

SOCIALIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY

15 SPRUCE STREET, NEW YORK.



THE CLASS STRUGGLE

Devoted to International Socialism

Vol. III

AUGUST, 1919

No. 3

What is Bolshevism?

By Rosa Luxemburg

**The Development of Socialism
from Science into Action**

By Karl Radek

The S. L. P.

By Max Eastman

Russia and Germany

By A. S. Sachs

Left or Right?

By Ludwig Lore

Samples of Allied and Bolshevist Propaganda

Price, 25 Cents

SOCIALIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY
15 SPRUCE STREET, NEW YORK.

THE CLASS STRUGGLE

Vol. III

AUGUST, 1919

No. 3

CONTENTS

	Pages
Left or Right?—By Ludwig Lore.....	257-264
What Is Bolshevism?—By Rosa Luxemburg...	265-268
Radicalism in California.—By Max Bedacht....	268-271
The Development of Socialism from Science into Action.—By Karl Radek.....	272-295
Greetings from Soviet Russia.—By S. J. Rutgers	295-300
Autumn Slush.—By August Strindberg.....	300-304
The S. L. P.—By Max Eastman.....	304-306
Russia and Germany.—By A. S. Sachs.....	306-318
On the Unhappy Peace.—By N. Lenin.....	348-352
Documents	319-333
The Soviet Government and Peace.—Allied Propaganda.—The Constitution of the Hun- garian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic.— The Last Appeal of the Hungarian Soviet Government to the Working Class of Hungary.	
Editorials	334-352
The Conventions.—The First Victim of the League of Nations.—The Railroad Situa- tion.—The Negro Problem—a Labor Prob- lem.—The Lusk Fishing Expedition.— Socialist Germany and Peace.	

The Co-Operative Press  15 Spruce St., New York

THE CLASS STRUGGLE

Devoted to International Socialism

PUBLISHED BY

The Socialist Publication Society, 15 Spruce St., New York City

Issued Every Month—25¢ a Copy; \$3.00 a Year

Editors: EUGENE V. DEBS, LOUIS C. FRAINA and LUDWIG LORE

VOL. III

AUGUST, 1919

No. 3

Left or Right?

By LUDWIG LORE

In discussing the situation that prevails in the Socialist Party of the United States at the present time it is hardly accurate to refer to the two parties to the controversy as Left and Right, at least in the European sense of those terms. The American Socialist movement has had, in the crisis through which it has just passed, no large and decisive group that would correspond to the European Right Wing, to the Scheidemanns and Davids and Suedekums in Germany, to the Plekhanoffs and Breshkovskayas in Russia, to the Renaudel and Thomas in France, and the Hyndmans in England. The small group of bona-fide social-patriots that our movement harbored have either left it voluntarily or have been expelled from membership in the Socialist Party. The few who remain are, so far as influence in the party is concerned, a negligible quantity.

The political sins of the American "Right Wing" have been sins of omission rather than of commission. Its great fault lay in its failure to act at a time when action meant life and growth to the party, in failing to crystallize the tremendous anti-war sentiment that existed in the country at the time of our entrance into the European war into a great mass movement for political and economic liberation. It adopted a radical platform at the St. Louis convention, and failed, miserably, to live up to its tenets. It was theoretically in opposition to the war, and yet allowed Meyer London, again and again to vote in direct opposition to the avowed stand of the party when war-measures came up in Congress—

may more, it vehemently insisted upon his re-nomination for office against the more determined element in the party, on the principle that even a rotten Socialist Congressman is better than none. It greeted the first Russian revolution with a tremendous demonstration, and remained discreetly silent when a Socialist government was established in Russia, until sentiment in Washington seemed so friendly to the Bolshevik régime that our leaders on the Executive Committee felt constrained to drop their attitude of "watchful waiting" and to adopt an open declaration of allegiance to the Soviet government.

When the Allied governments dropped their first friendly overtures and came out openly for Russian intervention the membership of the Socialist Party seethed with indignation and even the bourgeois liberal press adopted a policy of open opposition. But our Executive Committee contented itself with a few perfunctory protests.

The cessation of hostilities has in no wise changed the situation. The party has made no attempt to arouse public opinion against the fraud of the Peace Conference at Paris. There has been no concerted move to restore free speech and free press and to prevent the passage of new and even more stringent repressive legislation. The nation is on the eve of permanent compulsory military service—and as yet no definite policy has been adopted, no plan of action decided upon.

Our friends of the "Right" have called attention to the fact that hundreds of Socialist Party members are in jail, that almost the whole National Executive Committee is under indictment. Undoubtedly, there has been no lack of personal courage. Our leaders have delivered splendid speeches of protest and denunciation in the face of the Espionage Law. But these sacrifices were like slaps on the water, ineffectual because there was no organized movement behind them. The members of the N. E. C. were ready to risk their own persons in the fray; but they placed the party organization in a defensive position, fearing to sacrifice its prestige and its opportunities as a political party by radical action.

Where state organizations possessing the courage of their convictions took up the fight against American militarism openly, as, for instance, in Ohio, the attitude of the party leaders was, to say the least, frankly discouraging.

Their policy, throughout the critical period through which we are passing, has been the typical "Centrist" position. Com-

promise everywhere, condoning the outrages committed by social patriots, on one hand, making occasional concessions to the party membership which clamored for more revolutionary methods, on the other.

* * *

The conflict that is now raging within the party is not a local, or even a national, matter. The Socialist movement of the world has split asunder. There are two International Socialist organizations representing two irreconcilable extremes in Socialist philosophy. Between the International of Berne and the International of Moscow there can be no compromise and no understanding. The former represents a policy of State Socialism, of gradual growth and evolution into a Socialist commonwealth, of "democratic co-operation" with capitalism until the time shall have arrived when the actual majority of the people shall have become converted to Socialist ideals and shall place political supremacy into the hands of the Socialist Party. The latter is founded upon the dictatorship of the proletariat. It insists that to the proletariat which fights the battles of the revolution belong the fruits thereof, that the class-conscious working class must wrest the political power out of the hands of the capitalist class in order to establish an economic democracy under the actual control of those who produce.—It believes that Socialism cannot be realized by purely political methods; that the masses must be trained to appreciate and understand the necessity of decisive action at the critical moment. It openly disavows the accepted capitalist notion of "democracy" in political institutions and insists that Socialism is possible only when the rule of the capitalist and his power to influence the thoughts and actions of large masses of the people has been destroyed.

Between these two points of view there can be no compromise. Between them the Socialist must choose—and his choice must determine, once and for all, his course of action. Yet that is exactly what our party as an organization has refused to do. It was prevented from sending delegates to Berne, not by its own patriots who controlled it, but by a merciful fate in the shape of the U. S. government. It is equally ready to co-operate with the more radical wing of the international movement; rejoices in the success of the Soviets of Russia and mourns the murder of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg.

This same policy of straddling, of begging every question until circumstances force a decision has dominated the party ever since it has become a recognized force in this country. And that is particularly true in its treatment of organized labor. For decades the Socialist Party has realized that the policy of the American Federation of Labor condemns the organized working class to economic ineffectuality. It has seen that the failure—nay, the refusal—of the A. F. of L. leaders to organize the unskilled laborers must eventually cut the throat of organized labor itself. It supported, in theory, a system of industrial unionism to replace the system of craft unions that was keeping Mr. Gompers and other clever demagogues in power at the head of the American labor movement. It adopted a policy of boring from within, of educating the membership of the labor union movement without attacking its leaders. It refused to take sides in labor disputes, fearing to support radical insurgents against the domination of A. F. of L. leaders, lest by so doing it alienate the membership.

What has this policy accomplished? The element to which we have catered for years, the progressive leaders who were to become a force for Socialism in the labor movement, flocked to the support of American militarism as soon as the war broke out, and today are the mainstay of the new Labor party. After more than 20 years of "boring from within" Gompers was re-elected at the Atlantic City convention with one dissenting vote—that of a Westerner who stood in no connection with the radical or Socialist labor movement.

Undoubtedly the propaganda work of the Socialist movement has had its effect upon the working class of the country. The determined language in which organized labor speaks today, the astonishing demands that are being made of the government by the railroad workers, that most conservative of all organizations, are the fruits of the seed that were sown by our speakers and our literature in the past. But we have been so completely out of touch with the revolution that has been going on within the A. F. of L. that we are as astounded by the new turn affairs have taken as the capitalist class itself. The Socialist Party which should have led and directed a movement of such enormous promise, is condemned to impotence because it stood idly by allowing the ferment of discontent to break its own channels through the wall of conservatism that surrounded the American labor movement. With the co-operation and leadership of a determined and aggressive Socialist Party, the step that has just been taken by the

railway workers could become the beginning of a great class-conscious movement of the masses. Without its leadership it lacks driving and directing force and will peter out into a thousand channels of capitalist politics.

We have all of us heard the argument that elected Socialist officials will be no better than the others, once they are in power. It seemed an easy question to answer and yet in it lies the secret of our lack of success among the American working class. The American workingman is not interested in politics. To him it is a game of chance, in which the winner collects the spoils. Generations of political corruption have engrafted upon his mind the idea that it is useless to hope for reform from the elected law-making bodies. He meets all political parties with a skepticism that has become so much a part of his nature that it is almost impossible to overcome it. By our insistence upon the purely political character of the Socialist movement we have put ourselves in his eyes on a level with the other parties. By our refusal to become a driving and directing force in his struggle for economic betterment, the only movement whose aims and purposes he appreciates and understands, we have alienated ourselves completely from the actual class-struggle between capital and labor.

* * *

These things are not new. But the upheaval of the Socialist international, and the price the European movements have paid for their failure to grow with the times in which they live, make rigid self-examination at this time imperative. Capitalist society stands on the brink of ruin. The mad havoc that the last years have wrought, depleted the world of its resources. Capitalist methods of production are powerless to meet the situation. High prices and wanton profiteering are arousing the people in every country of the world to a blind fury. Strikes are breaking out everywhere and are being fought out with a tenacity of purpose and a degree of determination that bodes ill for the master class. The young men who have returned from the front have little patience with pleas for moderation and compromise. They have learned their lesson well, and are ready to get what they want, fearlessly, without regard to consequences.

Is the Socialist Party ready to meet the new situation? Is it prepared to satisfy the need of the dissatisfied masses for self-expression? Can it crystallize this dissatisfaction, this spirit of unrest, into a class-conscious, purposeful movement?

For decades the Socialist movement of the world has predicted the coming of a great world war. Yet when it came, five years ago, it found the international Socialist movement totally unprepared. The leaders of Socialist thought in Europe and in this country as well had always side-stepped a discussion of the problems that such a war would bring. They had sworn opposition to warfare, and yet failed to determine what form this opposition should take. They had decried nationalism and yet built up their movements on an essentially nationalistic basis. The demands of a small revolutionary minority for clearness of purpose and a definite program of action were discouraged and derided, because it was feared that the integrity and oneness of the Socialist movement might be shattered upon the rocks of such a discussion.

Just as opposition to national wars, as the culmination and expression of capitalist international competition, is one of the fundamental principles of modern Socialism, so the overthrow of the capitalist class has been its final aim. Toward this aim the Socialist movement has been working with the same delightful vagueness of purpose that characterized its opposition to war. Questions as to the methods by which capitalist society was to be overthrown were answered by evasions. We were preparing to fight out the social revolution at the ballot box. There were those who insisted upon the necessity of training the proletariat in the use of more powerful weapons, who favored the propagation of the political general strike and political mass action. But they were decried as irresponsible agitators who were bent on wrecking the party.

Then came the war. It wrecked the Socialist movement of the International more effectively than this could have been done by a thousand irresponsible agitators. In Russia, in Germany, in Austria and in Hungary the war was followed by a revolution. These revolutions were not political in character, i. e., they were not directly precipitated by political oppression. They were, essentially, a protest against unbearable economic conditions, the outgrowth of the bankruptcy of capitalism in these countries. These revolutions placed the Socialist movement, which had everywhere assumed the leadership, abruptly before the alternative it had so sedulously refused to consider. It was forced to choose between a system of socialized capitalism, under a "democratic" form of government from which is to evolve, by a gradual process, the Socialist state, or immediate expropriation of capital by a dictatorship of the proletariat. And at that moment, when the Socialist movement most needed unity and harmony,

it was torn by dissension and internal strife. Thousands of comrades in Russia, in Hungary and in Germany have been forced to pay with their lives for the refusal of the Socialist movement to determine its position before the great crisis had arrived. Meanwhile, we here in America, instead of learning from these tragedies, would go calmly on, legislating Socialism into existence, electing Congressmen and Aldermen, who barter Socialist principles for capitalist reforms, appealing for justice to capitalist courts. The protests of those who have learned from happenings in Europe were crushed under the weight of the prestige of our party leaders and the consistent opposition of the party press. They felt the need of re-orientation within the party, but found all avenues of approach to the rank and file of the organization closed. Their principles were often confused, their conceptions vague; they had no definite program to offer to the party membership in opposition to the hitherto generally accepted standards. An organization of these revolutionary elements within the party, for the sole purpose of conducting the propaganda of their principles, had become essential. There is nothing in the constitution of the Socialist Party that forbids such an organization. In Switzerland, where the revolutionary element in the party organized so-called *Communist groups* within the organization, these groups were expressly permitted by the National Party Executive Committee, so long as they did not affiliate with elements outside the party organization; and the same holds true for the parties in France, Italy, Great Britain. In the Socialist Party of America the insurgent element was suspended by a ruthless party autocracy. As soon as the first steps toward the formation of Left-Wing groups within the party were taken, the entire machinery of the party went into action. Local New York suspended whole branches for support of the Left Wing. The State Executive Committee decided to suspend, and did suspend, all Locals that supported the Left Wing. An appeal coming from Local Kings County, the largest of the suspended Locals, for a referendum was ignored for months. In the interests of party harmony it seemed necessary to the party authorities of the State of New York to prevent these Left-Wing Locals from sending their delegates to the National Convention that is to take place at the end of August. To this end the demand of an excluded Local to demand a referendum of the party membership of the state was taken up for consideration only after the elections for the National Convention were already under way. When the referendum that will settle the fate of the suspended Locals has been taken, the Convention will be a thing of the past, and the possibility of influencing its decisions by revolutionary

delegations frustrated. With the same laudable purpose in view our National Executive Committee has suspended entire Language Federations and state organizations. The leaders of the party, state, local and national, have precipitated a breach in the party that might have been avoided.

For, as a matter of fact, the rank and file of the party is completely in sympathy with the purposes and aims of the Left-Wing movement. Those who are more closely in touch with the American working-class can sense the mental revolution it has undergone. The party membership, from the start, has shown an instinctive loyalty to and sympathy with the Bolshevik revolution and the Spartacan uprisings. Even the leaders of the "Right Wing" feel this and are setting all sails to catch the wind of popular opinion. They are preparing to adopt a declaration promising open support to the movement for industrial unionism. The N. E. C. recently sent Comrade Shiplacoff to the National Convention of the W. I. I. U., promising this offspring and ward of the S. L. P. the active support of the S. P. and confessing that the Party had seen the error of its ways.

At the national convention, which has been carefully expurgated of all uncomfortably revolutionary elements by these wholesale exclusions and suspensions, a revolutionary-sounding program will be drawn up, full of promises of brotherhood and affection for our comrades in Russia, in Hungary and in Germany. But they will refuse to break with their old policy of "purely political" propaganda. They will continue to discourage everything that looks like mass action. They will refuse to support the program of revolutionary action based upon the dictatorship of the proletariat, that is the content and essence of these proletarian revolutionary movements. They will allow themselves to become enthusiastic over the achievements and the heroism of the Communist Parties in Europe without committing the Party in this country to a course that will enable us to emulate their example. And the methods which are the basis of communist activity in Europe will still be condemned by the same Socialist Party of America as anarchistic, syndicalistic and un-socialistic.

What is Bolshevism?

By ROSA LUXEMBURG

The revolution that has just begun can have but one outcome: the realization of Socialism! The working class, in order to accomplish its purpose, must, first of all, secure entire political control of the state. But to the Socialist political power is only a means to an end. It is the instrument with which labor will achieve the complete, fundamental reconstruction of our entire industrial system.

To-day all wealth, the largest and most fruitful tracts of land, the mines, the mills and the factories belong to a small group of Junkers and private capitalists. From them the great masses of the laboring class receive a scanty wage in return for long hours of arduous toil, hardly enough for a decent livelihood. The enrichment of a small class of idlers is the purpose and end of present-day society. To give to modern society and to modern production a new impulse and a new purpose—that is the foremost duty of the revolutionary working class.

To this end all social wealth, the land and all that it produces, the factories and the mills must be taken from their exploiting owners to become the common property of the entire people. It thus becomes the foremost duty of a revolutionary government of the working class to *issue a series of decrees making all important instruments of production national property* and placing them under social control.

But this is only the first step. The most difficult task, the creation of an industrial state upon an entirely new foundation, has only just begun.

To-day production in every manufacturing unit is conducted by the individual capitalist independently of all others. What and where commodities are to be produced, where, when and how the finished product is to be sold, is decided by the individual capitalist owner. Nowhere does labor have the slightest influence upon these questions. It is simply the living machine that has its work to do.

In a Socialist state of society all this will be changed. Private ownership of the means of production and subsistence must disappear. Production will be carried on not for the enrichment of the individual but solely for the creation of a supply of commodities sufficient to supply the wants and needs of the working class. Accordingly factories, mills and farms must be operated

upon an entirely new basis, from a wholly different point of view.

In the first place, now that production is to be carried on for the sole purpose of securing to all a more humane existence, of providing for all plentiful food, clothing and other cultural means of subsistence, the productivity of labor must be materially increased. Farms must be made to yield richer crops, the most advanced technical processes must be introduced into the factories, of the mines only the most productive, for the present, must be intensively exploited. It follows, therefore, that the process of socialization will begin with the most highly developed industries and farm lands. We need not, and will not deprive the small farmer or artisan of the bit of land or the little workshop from which he ekes out a meager existence by the work of his own hands. As time goes by he will realize the superiority of socialized production over private ownership and will come to us of his own accord.

In order that all members of society may enjoy prosperity, all must work. Only he who performs useful service to society, manual or mental, will be entitled to a share of products for the satisfaction of his needs and desires. Idleness must cease and in its stead will come universal compulsory labor for all who are physically capable. Obviously those who are unable to work, children, invalids and the aged, must be supported by society. But not as it is done to-day, by niggardly charity. Bountiful sustenance, socialized education for the children, comfortable care for the aged, public health service for the sick—these must form an important part of our social structure.

For the same reason, i. e., in the interest of general welfare, society will be more economical, more rational in the utilization of its commodities, its means of production and its labor power. Waste such as we find to-day on every hand, must cease. The production of munitions and other implements of warfare must pass out of existence, for a Socialist state of society needs no tools of murder. Instead the precious materials and the enormous labor power that were devoted to this purpose will be used for useful production. The manufacture of useless and costly foolishness for the edification of wealthy idlers will stop. Personal service will be prohibited, and the labor power thus released will find more useful and more worthy employment.

While we are thus creating a nation of workers where all must be productively employed for the general welfare, labor itself must be completely revolutionized. Today labor in industry, on the farm and in the office is usually a torture and a burden

to the proletariat. Men and women work because they must in order to obtain the necessities of life. In a Socialist state of society, where all work together for their own well-being, the health of the individual worker, and his joy in his work must be conscientiously fostered and sustained. Short hours of labor not in excess of the normal human capacity must be established; recreation and rest periods must be introduced into the work-day, so all may do their share, willingly and joyously.

But the success of such reforms depend upon the human beings who will carry them out. Today the capitalist with his whip stands behind the workingman, in person or in the form of a manager-or overseer. Hunger drives the worker to the factory, to the Junker or the farm-owner, into the business office. Everywhere the employer sees to it that no time is wasted, no material squandered, that good, efficient work is done.

In a Socialist state of society the capitalist with his whip disappears. Here all workingmen are free and on an equal footing, working for benefit and enjoyment, tolerating no waste of social wealth, rendering honest and punctual service. To be sure, every Socialist plant needs its technical superintendents who understand its workings, who are able to supervise production so that everything runs smoothly, to assure an output commensurate with the labor power expended by organizing the process of manufacture according to most efficient methods. To insure successful production the individual workingman must follow his instructions entirely and willingly, must maintain discipline and order, cause no friction or confusion.

In a word: the workingman in a Socialist industrial state must show that he can work decently and diligently, without capitalists and slavedrivers behind his back; that of his own volition he can maintain discipline and do his best. This demands mental discipline, moral stamina, it demands a feeling of self-respect and responsibility, a spiritual rebirth of the workingman.

Socialism cannot be realized with lazy, careless, egotistic, thoughtless and shiftless men and women. A Socialist state of society needs people everyone of whom is full of enthusiasm and fervor for the general welfare, full of a spirit of self-sacrifice and sympathy for his fellow men, full of courage and tenacity and the willingness to dare even against the greatest odds.

But we need not wait centuries or decades until such a race of human beings shall grow up. The struggle, the *Revolution* will teach the proletariat masses idealism, has given them mental ripeness, courage and perseverance, clearness of purpose and a self-sacrificing spirit, if it is to lead to victory. While we are

enlisting fighters for the revolution, we are creating Socialist workers for the future, workers who can become the basis of a new social state.

The young people of the proletariat are ordained to carry out this great work as the true foundation of the Socialist state. They must show, even now, that they are equal to the great task of bearing the future of the human race upon their shoulders. There is still an old world to be overthrown. A new world must be built!

Radicalism in California

By MAX BEDACHT

California is a comparatively young member of the family of the United States. Its development in the direction toward capitalism began only with the downfall of the Spanish colonial regime, the end of the Mexican period, and the accession of the rule of the United States. Its political life at first was dominated by the interests and the spirit of the frontiersman and the adventurer, of the men and women that pushed across the endless plains of the North American continent, conquered the snowheads of the Rockies and passed over the Sierra, challenging the forces of nature and the hostile tribes of the natives. The mixture produced by the gold fever, moreover, was hardly to the best advantage of the race. Thousands of adventurers of doubtful character followed the trail to the goldfields of California, and many a fortune of today has its foundation not in the honest toil of the men that wrested gold from the bosom of Mother Earth, but in ill-gotten gains won out of the pockets of the miners and prospectors.

During all that period there was little that resembled modern political institutions. When at length order came out of chaos, it was an order dominated and controlled by the unspeakable corruption of railroad capital. The fact that this capitalism was not a natural outgrowth of economic conditions, but was grafted upon the State, still industrially and politically unprepared for a capitalistic order, made the situation still more untenable. The rule of the sixshooter, modified by the conception of honor and morals of the frontiersman and adventurer, was replaced by the dictatorship of the Huntingtons, the Stanfords and the Hopkins. On the whole this was a transformation in name only. The sixshooter still ruled, but as a powerful instrument in the hands of an unprincipled element that was willing to do the bidding of the

railroad interests and that, therefore, was invested with the powers of the state.

Slowly but surely railroad capital replaced the rule of the sixshooter by the rule of the law, devised and executed exclusively in the interest of the magnates. But in its own laboratories of profit-making the railroad interests produced the forces that were destined to break its undisputed political rule as far as this could be accomplished.

The colossal land grabs of the Southern Pacific could only bring the desired profits if the value of the land were tremendously increased by intensive colonization. Incidentally the increased population and products necessary for their sustenance furnished increase of the traffic to the roads. The settlers, thus imported, naturally became the enemies of the political system of the railroads. For the railroads the settlers and the farmers were simply another source of profit, while the settlers, on the other hand, considered the railroad rather as a public utility created for their convenience in marketing their products. This contradiction of interests fostered a political radicalism in the California farmer that expressed itself in the Johnsonian progressivism, woman suffrage, initiative, referendum and recall. As far as a defeat of its own objects is possible within the bounds of the capitalist political state, it suffered these defeats in California. The whole structure of the capitalist state, however, has only one object, that of serving capitalism in the pursuit of its object, profit-making. Therefore even these defeats of the railroad capital were not defeats of capitalism itself, but the establishment of a system favorable to a group of capitalist interests other than the railroads. The latter could well suffer this defeat with equanimity, for in the meantime its specific local interests were well taken care of by its local enemies. The bulk of interests lay in the field of national politics.

During the period of struggle between the settlers and farmers on the one hand, and the railroad interests on the other, the Socialist movement was introduced into California. It did not find an industrial proletariat, not even in the cities. Los Angeles is the city of retired petit bourgeois, while San Francisco is the city of the active petit bourgeois, though the latter is being pushed more and more into the background by the growing financial and commercial interests of this ideal outlet of American goods to the Asiatic world.

Thus from its very inception the Socialist movement in California was not a working-class movement, but a characteristic petit bourgeois movement. It represented not the exploited class in a struggle against exploitation, but an exploiting class against

the particular form of exploitation by which it, in turn, was being victimized. It represented that portion of the petit bourgeois who saw that the evil is not so much political as economic in its nature, and that political reforms, such as woman suffrage, initiative, referendum and recall, at their best, cannot bring relief, being, at best, not more than a means by which relief may be gotten. Socialism, that is the socialization of industries by means of an intelligent use of the ballot box, therefore appealed to them. But it was a kind of post-office Socialism which was to replace the individual capitalist by the state, which the petit bourgeois hopes to control with the help of the proletariat.

The petit bourgeois character of the Socialist Movement in California was evidenced by its painstaking effort to preserve its respectability. Upon the altar of that sickening petit bourgeois respectability principle after principle was sacrificed. Not Socialist principles, but consideration of public opinion and respectability determined the course of action taken by the party. Protests against this policy were met by the argument that one must consider the psychology of the American public. They could not and would not understand that what they actually meant was not American, but petit bourgeois psychology, and that a revolutionary movement cannot make concessions even to such a formidable god as psychology. Such concessions may be made in the form of propaganda but not in the substance propagated. Any victory won at the price of a concession of the substance is not a victory, but a defeat. In California we did not conquer, we have been conquered.

The largely agricultural character of the State of California forced the Socialist movement to deal with the agricultural problem. Here again the petit bourgeois character of this movement came out. For a Socialist the agricultural problem is one that concerns the people as a whole. It is the question how the agricultural production may be organized to feed all the people. Agricultural production is not only the means of livelihood for those directly employed in it, but of vital interest to the whole population. In a Socialist state of society the problem presents itself to this point of view. But under a capitalist system of society, as a part of the great class struggle between the classes, the agricultural question concerns itself chiefly with the agricultural labor, the farm hands and the migratory laborer.

The petit bourgeois Socialist movement of California never could see it from that point of view. For them the agricultural problem was always a problem of the farmers, in most cases the owners of the farms, the agricultural petit bourgeois. The most radical expression of its agricultural program may be summed up

in the program of the Non-Partisan League. Townley was their ideal of a practical Socialist.

Such policy could not be pursued without creating its natural reaction, alienation of the agricultural laborer and the migratory laborer. Instead of basing their activity upon the class struggle between exploited and exploiter, it was based on petit bourgeois reforms. The farm hand and the migratory laborer could not find in the Socialist movement the expression of their struggle but that of the struggle of their masters.

The Socialist movement in California was the first to recognize the fallacy of the ballot box as the only means of emancipation of the working-class. The migratory laborer has no political rights. He does not live in one place long enough to establish a residence, and therefore is deprived of his right to vote. The Socialist movement, if it is to be a revolutionary working-class movement, must comprise all workers regardless of their political rights, must use the political and economic power of the masses instead of relying on the voting power of the few whom the capitalist state permits to vote.

The petit bourgeois policies of the Socialist movement in California created, as a natural reaction, the anti-political-action attitude of the masses of the migratory laborers. Instead of uniting the working class it succeeded in splitting it by harnessing and hitching up that portion of the workers that possessed political rights, before the load of petit bourgeois politics, and by repudiating the many workers who are penalized by capitalist society for the crime of being compelled to travel from country to country, from state to state, in search of work, by political emasculation.

The historical events of the last two years will help to make out of the Socialist movement in California what it ought to be. Shipbuilding has been introduced as a new and ever growing industry and has created the only foundation upon which a healthy Socialist movement may be built, an industrial proletariat. These workers will gradually dominate the movement, hopelessly damaging its petit bourgeois respectability and creating in its stead the spirit of working-class solidarity. The more this spirit will crowd out petit bourgeois policies, reforms, and, last but not least, members, the more will our movement conform to the actual requirements of revolutionary activities of the working class. The movement will be built upon the organization of all workers, regardless of their political rights; it will exercise its activities in the actual class struggle for the exploited against the exploiter; and it will see its aim no more in State Socialism, but in Communism, the organization of production by all the people and for all the people.

The Development of Socialism from Science into Action

By KARL RADEK

The Development of Socialism from Utopianism into a Science

What is Communism? This question is answered by the young Friedrich Engels in a sketch of the Communist Manifesto in the year 1847: "Communism is the theory of the conditions of the victory of the working class." According to this definition which in itself contains the whole spirit of scientific Socialism, the whole work of Marx and Engels consisted in seeking in the development of capitalistic society, the development of the conditions of the final victory of the working class, in order to make of it a starting point for Communist activity. In this manner the development from Utopia into Science was accomplished.

The predecessors of Marx and Engels, the Utopian Socialists, have accomplished much in the characterizing of bourgeois society. The grim Fourier, who scourged himself and divested himself of all masks, the Faust-like gifted Saint-Simon, who illuminated whole epochs of human history in a few words; Owen, who penetrated deeply into the nature of man and exhibited his dependence on economic conditions in his writings and his speeches—all of them contributed building blocks for the mighty edifice of scientific Socialism. Without them Marx would have been impossible. But in spite of the deeply penetrating criticism of capitalist society, the predecessors of Marx did not understand how this very society could furnish those mass forces which would overthrow it. For this reason, they had to play the rôle of historic prophecy, and to work out a plan for the rescue of humanity from the claws of capitalism, a plan the only weakness of which was, that the architect was missing who could by means of it erect that temple of humanity to Heaven. Marx and Engels showed how the development of the powers of production under the rule of capitalism would result in ever increasing anarchy and enslavement of the masses, but also how by means of the concentration of industry, the formation of a strong working class and the realization by them intellectually and emotionally of the coming of a new order, and the iron will to attain it, the foundations of Socialism would also be created. Marx and

Engels showed the international proletariat the historic necessity of his victory—the victory of Socialism. At the same time they showed it also that this victory of the disinherited and the enslaved was not going to fall mechanically into their lap when a certain stage of historic development had been reached, but that they must prepare themselves for this victory in the sweat of their brows, by the uninterrupted struggles of their brains, fighting day by day against the bourgeoisie in all the spheres of social life, in order then in the direct revolutionary struggle, class against class, to win it. This final revolutionary struggle which will result in the iron dictatorship of the proletariat, this alone will guide the workers into the promised land of Socialism.

The theory of Marx and Engels as to the conditions of the victory of the proletariat remains true, it has been untouched by the tooth of time, it stands like a granite boulder. The seventy years which separate us from the day on which the magnificent young men saw the future of mankind sharply illumined and pointed it out to us in the unforgettable Communist Manifesto, have caused many changes in the capitalist structure, to comprehend which has been the not always well performed task of the successors of Marx. But the outlines of the development have not changed and only at the present time, during the first Socialist Revolution which the world has ever experienced, do we really comprehend the theory of Communism. Through the first Socialist revolution, through its stern necessities, we can see the splendid proof of the prophetic power of the intellect of our masters. Communism is a theory of revolution and therefore it can only be understood in its entire significance during a period of revolution. On this account we can see that in the long period of quiet development which preceded the era of revolution only a few keen intellects were in a position to comprehend the theory of Communism so completely and clearly as when, during the revolutionary epoch of rising capitalism, it was born in the brains of those children of the period of storm and stress, in the brains of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels.

In the epoch of quiet development the *most diverse non-communistic elements were mixed with it*, and so under the name *Social Democratic conception*, different *substitutes for Communism* were created which the international working class must discard if it wishes to be equal to its duty. It is the diluted and false Communism from which the living spirit has been purged, which makes it difficult for the work-

ers to understand and take to heart the theories of the Russian Revolution. On that account, one of the first duties in the proletarian struggle for freedom is to free the teachings of Communism from all impurities. This can be done very easily if we learn to understand historically the development of the separate forgeries of Communism, if we learn to know the conditions under which they arose.

The Falsification of Communism

The theory of Marx, the outlines of which were created in the 50's of the preceding century, was not disseminated among wide circles until the 80's. When in the 60's and 70's the German workingclass movement was started under the leadership of Ferdinand Lassalle, the workers were not acquainted with a single one of Marx's writings. The ideas of Communism became familiar to them through the small, inflammatory pamphlets of Lassalle, in which the theory of Communism, if not entirely falsified, was yet very peculiarly presented. Ferdinand Lassalle wanted to stir up the working class at a time when an epoch of capitalist prosperity had strengthened the counter-revolutionary forces in all Europe and made it possible for them to solve all the problems with which at the time they were confronted.

In Germany the Junkers, together with the grand bourgeoisie, were occupied with the at that time important problem of creating a unified capitalist state. The powers which tried in the year 1848 by revolutionary means to found a united German Republic proved themselves too weak, and what they were not in a position to accomplish—the founding of the German state as an organ of the German bourgeoisie—was accomplished by the bourgeoisie and the Junkers. They executed this task by rearing the reactionary structure of a bureaucratic-capitalistic federation of states, in which a clique of big capitalists, together with the Junkers and the Generals, with the Hohenzollerns at the head, guided the destiny of the German Empire. At such a time, Lassalle was trying to make the working class into a power, which, even though it had not the power to guide the destinies of the German people, could still be in a position to wring concessions from the governing class. The Communist propaganda was directed to this narrow object, as Lassalle disseminated it among the workers. In order to be able to get across as much of his propaganda as possible in spite of the oppression from the reactionary period of Bismarck, he attempted to give Communism as innocent a look as possible. The young lion

whose paws were not yet in a state to deal death to the enemy, was to be led upon the meadows disguised as a lamb. Lassalle tried to present Communism as a movement which could succeed by peaceful means. By means of the popular vote, the workers were to gain the influence over the state and were to use it to organize co-operative societies which gradually would change a capitalist society into a socialistic one. This propaganda developed in the workers a respect for the idea of the State regardless of whether the State was in the hands of the capitalists or of the victorious workers. This idea was indeed put to a severe test in so far as the relations with the Bismarck Government were concerned during the era of the fierce persecutions of the workers' movement in the period from 1878 to 1880, when the violent pressure from above, and the baiting of the workers' movement, created intense hatred against the capitalist state in the front ranks of the workers' movement and a hope nourished by this hatred that it would soon crumble as the result of the blows of the social revolution. This mood of the working class was increased by the long drawn-out crisis which existed in the economic life of Europe during the 80's. But this was only an interruption in the process of the reformistic falsifying of Communism which had been going on since the establishment of the capitalistic states in the 70's. As soon as the workers had somewhat recovered from the blows dealt them, as soon as they were a little stronger and the fiercest forms of capitalist persecution disappeared, the process of diluting and falsifying Communism took on the widest range. The rapid economic development, the period of prosperity of capitalism, as it everywhere in the last ten years of the preceding century gained a foothold, especially in the domain of the electric and the metal industry, contributed to this. Since the 80's, thanks to the development of American agriculture, the prices of grain fell, and now wages began to rise under the influence of the lively movement of business. The front ranks of the workers saw before them a path strewn with roses. The Governments were obliged to cease their persecutions, they began to promise social reforms. The workers everywhere won representation in the Parliaments; the aristocracy of the working class earned good wages; and so the idea became a fixed one to them: the Revolution is a superseded phase in bourgeois development. The working class will force the bourgeoisie to make more and more concessions, which will finally change the economic system of capitalism into a system which shall exist for the advantage of the workers. This

decision found expression first in opportunistic parliamentary practice, in the policy of the parliamentarian labor leaders, who hoped by flirting with the bourgeoisie, by limiting their demands, by giving up revolutionary propaganda, to be able gradually to better the condition of the workers. Then this tendency found its theoretical expression in the *doctrine of reformism* (revisionism), as coined by *Bernstein* in Germany, *Sarante* and *Jaurès* in France, *Treves* and *Turati* in Italy.

To reduce the doctrines of reformism to a formula, they consisted in the attempt to prove that the evolution of capitalism *does not render the differences between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie more acute but tends to soften them* and that therefore *not revolution but the co-operation of the proletariat with the sensible strata of the bourgeoisie is the true path to the liberation of the proletariat*. Reformism denied the *practical possibility of the Socialist revolution* and set up in its stead *evolution through social reform*. It was a *counter-revolutionary doctrine*, attempting to represent the revolution of the workers as an infant disease of the labor movement, in order to yoke the workers to the cart of the bourgeoisie. This tendency of reformism is most glaringly reflected in a series of articles by Bernstein's disciple, *Eduard David*, on the *Dictatorship of the Proletariat*, published in the year 1903 in the *Sozialistische Monatshefte*, the chief organ of international reformism. Not revolution but parliamentary action, the organization of unions and brotherhoods, this was the course which reformism preached to the working class.

The Collapse of Reformist Illusions

But the same evolution which, according to the conviction of the reformists, was to do away with the necessity of a revolution, soon showed the workers the utter absurdity of the reformist illusions. The Junkers defended themselves against the growing competition of the young agrarian nations by raising the price of food by means of agrarian tariffs. The development of capitalism led to the forming of trusts and cartels, big capitalist organizations, which pushed aside and conquered not only the crafts but also the middle bourgeoisie. For the protection of the cartels they demanded for industry also a high tariff. They united with the Junkers to rob and plunder the people; at the same time the growing trustification of industry meant an enormous extension of power for the capitalists—against the unions. The same unions which could without much trouble force the small textile baron to yield to their demands, were powerless against the iron and coal kings, who commanded more than ten thousands of workmen. If the

worker in a textile factory was dissatisfied with his wages, he could find work in some other factory. The trustified coal and iron barons did not recognize the unions, they held fast together against each demand of their workers and understood how to guard themselves against the workers by means of black-lists. The aggravation of the friction between proletariat and bourgeoisie, in the factory as well as in the consumers' market, was still further intensified by the imperialist policy, which threatened to turn the struggle of the trustified industries in the world, the struggle of wares and of capital into a war. The growing burden of taxation, caused by the growth of militarism and navalism, the growing danger of war which became ever more intense, conflicts with the unions, led the possessing classes to adopt a sharper policy against the working class. *Because exploitation grew, oppressive measures had to be intensified also*. The growing political reaction had the effect on the working class of a *storm signal* and showed them in all countries that not revolutionary Communism, but, on the contrary, the so-called "*real*" *Reformism was a Utopia*, not, to be sure, one that would give wings to the soul, that would stimulate the energies of the workers, that would make the journey of humanity seem shorter in the visions it presents, so that the sluggish ones might be encouraged to hasten their steps, but on the contrary one that would lame their stride, transforming them into creeping beasts.

Since the great strike in the Ruhr district, since the great fights of the electric workers of Berlin, and the violent agitation of the French workers for the attainment of the eight-hour day, the great faith of the workers in the peaceful evolution to Socialism has disappeared. They saw now how the forces of capitalism had been uniting against the proletariat in economic life as well as in political life, they saw how the bourgeois parties were solidifying more and more into a reactionary mass, they saw how the entire bourgeois society was moving toward the abyss of war, they saw how parliaments were becoming constantly less able to cope with the development, if for no other reason, then because they were themselves being forced in all countries to resign their powers in favor of secret cabinets in which bureaucracy in combination with the sharks of Capital settled the most vital affairs of the people.

The fires of the Russian Revolution of the year 1905 showed the masses of Europe what latent power can be summoned by the working class when it arises and when it is disposed to throw its personality into the fight for the cause. Since the year 1905 the problem of *the struggle for power, i. e., the*

problems of the Socialist revolution, which were brought up in a theoretical way in the discussion of reformism (Kautsky's pamphlet on the "*Social Revolution*," published in the year 1903), were present in the consciousness of the masses of the people.

In Search of the Way to Power

An anxious search began for the exit out of the blind alley into which capitalistic evolution had blundered. The first question before the toiling masses was, "*Where are we going?*" The question was answered by developments as clearly and precisely as one could wish. In France the attempt to better the condition of the workers through co-operation with the bourgeoisie turned out a complete failure. Millerand's entrance into the bourgeois government was of no advantage to the working class and led to the compromising of the Social Democracy in the eyes of the masses of workers. The result of the elections 1907 showed the workers that the bourgeois parties would unite into a solid wall against them as soon as it became a question of Imperialism, that is, a question of the extension of capitalist power over weaker peoples, and of the armed competitive struggle between the capitalist states. The facts of the economic crisis of the year 1900 spoke so plainly, that so well known a Reformist as Max Schippel could not end his investigation of the course of the economic crisis in any other way than by the assertion of the intensification of the class struggle in the entire world. Karl Kautsky summed up the entire development in the year 1908 in his work "*The Road to Power*," in which he proved that the whole capitalist world was moving in the direction of a frightful Socialistic world crisis, that we were on the eve of the Socialist Revolution. This conviction, which became more and more rooted in the minds of the foremost ranks of the workers, faced them with this second question: What means will the workers use to defend themselves when the new situation arises, and what means will they use when they launch the attack on the fortresses of Capital? Already in 1905 the German and Austrian proletariat had worked its way through to the idea of the mass strike. Regardless of the complete ossification of the intellectual life of the leaders of the party, whose quiet, petty-bourgeois lives reflected the mood of the working class very faintly, the workers had recognized in the mass strike a means of defense against the attacks on the fundamental rights of the working class (the German Social Democracy in Jena, 1905), or even a means of attack by the proletariat against particularly obstinate opponents (the Austrian Social

Democracy). The mass strike as general strike was exalted by the French syndicalists as a means of winning complete liberty. The working class, which, up to this time, had battled only politically in parliaments, began to reflect on their rôle in the process of production, on the words of Freiligrath: "Every wheel shall stop, at the will of your mighty arm."

For years the leaders of the left wing of the workers discussed the conditions that would make practicable the use of the general strike. Should the leaders of the workers' organizations decide upon the strike if parliamentary action should fail, if the enemy through his reckless policy should drive the masses to despair—should it be a pistol, then, held in readiness to back up the parliamentary struggle, or should it be the actual mode of the struggle itself, emerging spontaneously out of the increasingly acute class conflicts, prepared not in the conference chambers of the leaders but preparing every hour in the shops and in the factory prisons—not only through the growing agitation, the *stimulated action* of the proletariat. These were the questions to which the left wing of the international labor movement devoted itself most intensively during the years preceding the World War. And right at this point it appeared that even in this simple question the Socialist ranks, the ranks that fought under the banner of Marx, were divided, the one section under the leadership of Karl Kautsky outwardly embracing the approaching Socialist revolution, it is true, yet anxiously avoiding the intensifying of the class struggle, although the internal and external situation of the proletariat positively demanded it.

In this struggle to find the way to power the question came up here and there, "*Wherein shall the power of the victorious workers express itself?*" But nowhere was the question given a positive hearing, and for very simple reasons. First upon the order of business of history came the question of the mobilization of the battalions of workers, the question of their general objective, and not of the halting-places to be passed through on the way. In order to prove the necessity of the general strike, the radical Socialists pointed to the collapse of parliamentarism. They showed how it was more and more becoming a stronghold of the capitalistic highwaymen; they criticised very sharply the *Talmi*-republicanism and the *Talmi*-democracy of the republican countries, and frequently the question arose, "How shall capitalistic democracy and its parliamentary agencies be converted into agencies of power of the victorious proletariat?" When Anton Pannekoek, the clearest head of West European Socialism, answered the question by saying, that one must destroy the demo-

cratic forms of the capitalistic state and must create new organs of power of the working people in the fires of the proletarian revolution, he was accused by Karl Kautsky, the most authoritative Marxian theoretician, of being an anarchist. However correct the answer of Pannekoek may have been, it was only half an answer. It pointed to the fact that the organs of compulsion used by the capitalist state must be destroyed, but it did not show what organs of control the proletariat must build in order to carry on and assure its victory.

While the majority of even the revolutionary Socialists saw in democracy the means by which Socialists would gain the victory, the Syndicalists representing the revolutionary theory of those countries in which the bankruptcy of democracy had brought about the complete disillusionment of the masses of the people, pointed to the labor unions as the agency which should win the power and become the wielders of the power of the masses.

This problem, as has been said, was put only sporadically by those intellects who were able to see beyond the confines of the present time and could not be answered by them. The historic solutions are never found by the theoreticians of the working class, they can only be discovered by the revolutionary struggle of the masses; to the theoretician is left only the duty to grasp the practical measures of the proletariat, to make them common knowledge and to make them the universal object of the struggle of the proletariat, the solution of its struggle.

The Lessons of the World War

Before the working class could be confronted with the problem of its organs of power, they first were compelled to experience all the consequences of their powerlessness in the literal sense physically. They had to wade through the horrors of war, to be torn in pieces by grenades; they had to bleed to death for the interests of the capitalists, they had to heap up mountains of corpses, in order that the lesson: Capitalism leads to the bloodiest anarchy, to the destruction of the few cultural achievements which have been created, to the deepest misery of the masses, to its literal enslavement, so that this lesson might be converted out of a theoretical thesis into a crying and burning certainty, at least in the minds of the front ranks of the working class.

The theoretical propaganda of the revolutionary Social Democrats, experience, the defeats, which capital had inflicted

upon the workers since the end of the last century, did not suffice to encourage the workers to aspire to more activity than the first timid steps forward. The opportunistic policy of the leaders of the workers' movement lulled the front ranks of the workers' aristocracy to sleep, a sleep which proved that the elite of the workers found themselves in a very favorable condition. The lower strata of the working class though were too ignorant, too helpless, to be in a position to throw themselves into a revolution without the bureaucracy of the party and the unions, or against its will. So there came the long awaited beast of war and began to teach the proletariat with its claws that lesson which it had not understood when revolutionary Socialism was preaching it.

The Russian people is the first which has understood this lesson and has drawn from it the consequences, and this it accomplished by means of the revolution. The Russian Revolution is the first response of the proletariat to the World War, it is the advocate and the forerunner of the international Revolution, it gives the answer to the riddles which the Sphinx of the Revolution has been giving Socialism to solve for the last century, to the question which the working class must answer, if it does not wish to be torn to pieces by it. The fact that the Russian proletariat through its Revolution is making the first steps on the road of the development of Socialism from science into action means that at the same time that Revolution marks a mighty stride in the development of the science of Communism. Communism is the theory of the conditions of the victory of the working class. These conditions become clearest in the process of victory, on that account the comprehension of the Russian Revolution is a preliminary condition of the development of Communism from a science into action.

THE LESSONS OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION The Ripening of Capitalism and the Socialist Revolution

The first question of the Socialist Revolution which confronts the working class is this: *When can the Social Revolution come?* As Marxism showed the workers that the victory of Socialism is dependent on the development of the forces of production, a perverted conception became rooted in the ranks of the Marxists that the Social Revolution would only then become possible when capitalism had the entire economic life of the nation in its grasp, when, so to say, it had divided it relentlessly into a small group of capitalists and an oppressed proletariat. Yes, those who were the most

consistent in their falsification of Communism, the revisionists, declared that Socialism could not come in Europe until capital had subjugated the entire world: on that fact they based—as is well known—the necessity of having the working class support the colonial policy. The whole argument of the pseudo-socialist parties of Russia, which rallied to the support of the bourgeoisie during the Revolution, and since the Workers' Revolution have fought in the ranks of the counter-revolutionists—the Mensheviks—consists of this fact: Socialism in Russia is impossible because the proletariat does not constitute a majority of the Russian nation. This argument won much approbation in Europe from those who had made out of Marxism a mechanical arithmetical problem. But to show the absurdity of this attitude to the question, it will suffice to point out that in Germany, the European state most highly developed economically, men as scientifically important as Heinrich Cunow, are of the opinion that the maintenance of such an attitude to the question is not so much due to the few more per cent more or less of proletarians in relation to non-proletarians, but rather to a *completely nebulous conception of the transition from capitalism to Socialism*. The hypothesis of a conception such as Cunow gives on the question of the stage of ripeness of capitalism, gives rise to the idea that capitalism will in fact do the work of socialization itself, and that Socialism will simply be invited to a table already set. When Cunow explains that Germany is not yet ripe for Socialism, he supports this theory by referring to the fact that the capitalist state must first take over all industry before the proletariat could receive it by seizing the reins of the government. But why should not the proletariat be in a position to take the cartelized and trustified industries directly out of the hands of the capitalized trusts and industries? Of course, if the proletariat is going to seize power only when, as Bernard Shaw says, a brainless, ape-like, degenerate, capitalist master by pressing on a button can set in motion millions of men who have become slaves, it will have a very easy task to chase away the brainless monkey-master from the keys of the central apparatus and dash in his brains. But this simplification of its task the proletariat would have to pay for with all those sufferings which a policy of watchful waiting would impose upon them, watching how capitalism strides mechanically over the bodies of millions. To the honor of mankind be it said that the idea of a mechanical transition from Capitalism to Socialism is contradicted by all hitherto existing historical conceptions, as also does every

sensible theory of the possibility of capitalist evolution. The earlier forms of economic life did not collapse only after they had prepared the way for an entirely new order, but as soon as they became an oppressive hindrance to the new order.

The transition from capitalism to Socialism begins when capitalist society causes so much suffering to the people that they are ready to break with the even tenor of life and rise up against the domination of capital, when the masses can no longer endure the conditions created by a capitalist society. *When capitalist development in a country has reached a point where the most important branches of industry, those of credit and transportation, are controlled by a concentrated, capitalistic group, then the proletariat which has rebelled not only can but must try to take over industry into its own hands, into the hands of the victorious proletariat, a proletariat organized into the governing power.* The proletariat will model the economic life of the country to a greater or lesser extent for its own benefit, according to the degree of capitalist penetration of the economic life of that country, or it will perhaps have temporarily to restrict itself to the socialization of the already concentrated branches of the administration, while it gradually may take over the others, for instance, the administration of land (thanks to its lack of dependence on the socialized centers of industry, thanks to its independence of the city), and socialize them. This is the state of things in Russia. In Russia the proletariat is certainly a minority of the population, but the Russian iron industry, the coal mines, and the naphtha production, the railroads, the telegraphs are concentrated in a few hands, they are directed by a small number of banks, and they dictate the economic laws of the entire agrarian population.

The unbearable situation, which capitalism created in the world war, brought the masses of the people into the struggle against the Czaristic capitalistic state. With the help of the peasants, who bled to death for capitalism during three years, the workers succeeded in gaining the power in the government. What should they do with this power? The advocates of the mechanical idea that Socialism is possible only after nine-tenths of the people have become proletarians, tried to make it clear to the people that it was impossible to establish Socialism. Back to capitalism, that was the solution of the Mensheviks. But the workers could not return to capitalism without throwing the country into the greatest misery. Should the capitalists return to power, they would impose the expenses of the war upon the workers, forcing them to work twelve hours

a day in order to liquidate these burdens and raise the expenses of re-armament for the next war. They would not put an end to the confusion of the economic life of the country but only shift the consequences of this confusion upon the workers. The communistic system of economy is the utilization of all the forces of production according to a distinct plan, in the interest of the masses of the people. *Just because the country has been unbelievably shattered through the war, communism is the only way by which the workers can hope to emerge from the want and misery of the shattered capitalistic society.* To forego beforehand the chance to organize this economic life in its own interest would mean to rush into capitalistic misery for fear that the inexperienced proletariat would be incapable of directing the main forces of national economic life concentrated by capitalism. This would not only be historical suicide but is furthermore *impossible practically.* What does the return to capitalism mean? It means in the first place giving back the power of the state to the capitalists, for naturally a proletarian state could not undertake to protect capitalistic profits. The purpose of showing this is to *reveal the whole utopianism of the solution "back to capitalism."* It was certainly not chance that the Russian proletariat took the power into its hands in October 1917. The proletariat won the power because the capitalistic regime had lost all confidence not only in the eyes of the proletarian but also of the bourgeois masses. The first representatives of Russian capital, the Guchkovs, Milyukovs, Tereshchenkos, and their Socialist fig-leaves, the Tseretellis, Kerenskys, and Chernovs, were so hateful to the masses of the people that the people drove them away. Had the workers not seized the reigns of power, the representatives of capitalism would not have been one whit more able to master the situation. Russia would have sailed without a rudder into the sea of anarchy, headed for a chaos, out of which the star of Socialism could not have crystallized, but also not a capitalist regime either. *Russia was simply the prey of foreign capital,* which is certainly not "riper," or more called upon to "set in order" the disrupted country in the interests of the masses of the people than is the young, but energetic Russian proletariat itself.

Austria and Italy find themselves in the same situation as Russia, and the experience of the Russian Revolution teaches that the *Socialistic Revolution by no means will begin in the place where Capitalism is at its highest stage of development.* Even the strongest capitalistic organization is not able to protect the masses from the unspeakable sufferings which capitalist anarchy creates, it is much better suited, as the government of the young capitalist countries, to hold the masses down.

The Socialist Revolution starts first in those countries in which the capitalist organization is not so strong. Those capitalist countries with the most unsettled organs for oppression are the *breaches where Socialism may break through,* there the social revolution will begin. It is difficult for it to break through within national boundaries, because after crushing its own bourgeoisie, it is threatened by the bourgeoisie of the remaining capitalist countries. The Socialistic Revolution can only be successful if it breaks out on the entire continent; but as the Socialistic Revolution cannot wait until the proletariat of the whole world rises to one single call, on the contrary, as national. Socialistic revolutions are themselves a product of international, capitalist disintegration, they furnish the accelerating element. In this way the answer is given to the first question which confronts the international proletariat: When can the Socialist Revolution begin? *It can and will begin in every country in which the conditions created by capital for the working class become unbearable.* The sufferings of the people jeer at the statistics of Cunow and Company, and the volcanoes of revolution are not waiting until the scholastic statisticians of Also-Marxism give them a signal. Whoever proves to the masses of the people by means of tables of statistics the impossibility of the Socialistic Revolution, shows that he understands Marx not at all. Friedrich Engels may have made a mistake when he thought in the 80's that the end of capitalism was at hand. But the possibility of such a mistake shows that he had nothing to do with this statistical conception of his and Marx's theory. This ossification of Marx was an offense easily explained during the peaceful evolution of capitalism; after the experience of the Russian workers' revolution it is not only a product of counter-revolutionary state of mind, but it is also, as the experience of the Russians shows, a counter-revolutionary Utopia. All the adjurations with the falsified spirit of Marx could not save the political necks of the Tseretellis and Dans. They were cast on the manure-heap of history by the same proletariat which is "still unripe for the Social Revolution," and from this place they may spit upon the revolution of the Russian working class, but cannot impede its progress. The revolution may temporarily be conquered by European capital if the European proletariat does not make use of the same weapons which the Russian proletariat made use of, within a reasonable time. But that it is a proletarian revolution, and that it is trying to overcome heroically the anarchistic-capitalistic economic

methods through Socialist organization, that it is, therefore, a Socialist revolution, which can only be put down by the Attilas of Imperialism, neither the Mensheviks nor their European parrots can deny, just as little as they can disclaim its Socialist character: for its Socialist character shines above it like its star of destiny, it was created with iron necessity out of the imperial character of the war.

The Dictatorship of the Proletariat

The Socialist Workers' Revolution in Russia shows the European proletariat the way which leads to power. The press of world capital is crying that this is bloody, is yelling about the rough, violent character of the Revolution. It has every right to do so. It was created by Capital to be an organ of the battle against the working class, and it is its duty to throw dirt upon and to spit upon the first Workers' Revolution, in order to frighten the workers of the other countries with its Medusa head. But how comes it that the Axelrods, Martoffs, and the—*risum teneatis!*—Kautskys use the violence of the Revolution as a ground of complaint against it? *They used to defend the idea of the dictatorship of the proletariat against the Reformists.*

What does dictatorship mean? *Dictatorship is the form of government, by which one class forces its will ruthlessly on the other class.* During the period of social evolution, in which one class is preparing itself for the struggle for power, it foregoes the use of force because it is too weak to use force. It is only gathering together, concentrating its powers, and on this account it is not necessary for the ruling class to use open force against it. The ruling class only holds its forces in readiness, but it gives the class which is striving upward a certain room for development, as long as it does not consider this class dangerous. From the moment when the ruling class lays burdens on the oppressed class, which are so heavy that the ruling class fears a possible uprising of the oppressed, it puts into play the machinery of force. The war laid burdens such as these on the masses of the workers, and on that account it brought with it the suspension of the few scanty rights enjoyed by the working class in the time of peace, that is, it brought the *Dictatorship of Imperialism*, which cost the workers millions of lives. In order to break the dictatorship of Imperialism the working class must employ force: force brings about the Revolution. But no hitherto existing ruling class can be conquered at one blow. Beaten once, it

attempts to rise again, and it can do so because the victory of Revolution is by no means able to alter the economic system of society in an instant, to tear out by the roots the power of the deposed class. *The Social Revolution is a lengthy process*, which begins with the dethronement of the capitalist class, but ends only with the transformation of the capitalist system into a workers' community. This process will require at least a *generation* in every country, *and this space of time is precisely the period of the proletarian dictatorship*, the period during which the proletariat must keep the capitalist in subjection with the one hand, while it can use only the other for the work of Socialist construction.

Everything that is being said, on the ground of principle, against the rule by force of the Russian working class, means nothing else than the disavowal not only of the teachings of Marx, but of the plainest facts of the past. When a Renner does not blush to assert with scientific mien that the political revolution, that is, the employment of brute force, contradicts the character of the Socialist revolution, because the Socialist revolution demands the organization of a new economic system and not force, that only means, that this former Marxist, with the Lassallean enthusiasm for the state, is not a worshipper of the state idea after the manner of Lassalle, as he has been characterized, but an ordinary *capitalistic sophist*. Just because the Social revolution must transform the entire economic system of capitalism, which gave to one class unheard-of privileges, it must necessarily arouse the strongest opposition of this class, an opposition which can only be broken by the use of guns. *And the stronger capitalism is developed in a country, just so much more ruthless, just so much wilder will the defensive struggle be, just so much bloodier the proletarian revolution, and just so much more ruthless the measures, by means of which the victorious working class will hold down the defeated capitalist class.* But the mollusks from the "Also-Marxist Camp," the opponents of the Russian workers' revolution, answer us that it is not a question of refusing to recognize the principle of proletarian dictatorship, *but that they decline to recognize the dictatorship in a country, where the proletariat is in the minority, and where the dictatorship degenerates into a rule of the minority over the majority*, as is supposed by them to be the case in Russia. This argument is a cowardly evasion.

Never, in any country, will the Revolution begin as an act of the majority of the population. Capitalism never signifies the physical control of the means of production, everywhere it signi-

fies simultaneously the intellectual control of the masses of the people, even in the most highly developed capitalist countries. Under the pressure of misery and want, under the convulsing of the masses by such means as the war, all the oppressed and the exploited do not rise at once. The most active, a minority, rises, accomplishes the Revolution, and its success depends upon whether this Revolution follows the line of historic development, that is whether it responds to the needs of the masses, who can then sever themselves from the former ruling class. The creative and dynamic force of the Revolution was necessary to arouse the masses of the people, to free them from the intellectual slavery of capitalism, to bring them into that camp which was defending their interests.

One might say: *every Revolution is begun by the minority, the majority rallies to its aid while the revolution is going on, and so determines its victory.* Were it not so, the dictatorship in a country like Russia, which possesses a proletarian minority, would not only be harmful as the Kautskys maintain, but in a country with a proletarian majority, to which the Kautskys graciously permit the dictatorship, it would be unnecessary. The capitalist class forms in these countries such a very small minority, that it would not be able to use weapons against the proletariat. *The Marxian theory of the unavailability of the proletarian dictatorship as a way to Socialism, is, therefore, either superannuated, or this dictatorship is as much justified in Russia as in another country.*

Revolution and Counter-Revolution

The Russian Revolution has shown us not only the Dictatorship of the proletariat, but also the concrete forms which the resistance of the bourgeoisie takes, in fact, it shows us in general, the typical features of a Workers' Revolution. Friedrich Engels, in his "anti-Duehring" has pointed out the process by which capitalism breeds militarism, militarizes the entire population (i. e. puts it at the mercy of the drill-master), simultaneously, however, creating those elements that destroy militarism by means of the class opposition in the army. This opposition, at a certain point in the historical process, causes the army, which is the sword of capital, to go to pieces in the latter's hand, by dividing the army into its proletarian and bourgeois components, into a Red Army and a White Army.

This the pupils of Marx and Engels forget when they continually cite the remark which Engels made in his introduction to the Class Wars in France, in which Engels draws attention

to the wide streets, etc., which will make an uprising so much more difficult. The Russian Revolution showed how the rising may occur on the field of battle, as well as in the trenches, not to speak of the streets; for the revolutionary idea may grip the hearts of the soldiers and form them into mass columns which march against the capitalistic elements of the army and of society. The Russian Revolution showed also how the attempt to organize new armies out of the capitalistic and the undecided elements, is one of the *principal methods adopted by the bourgeois counter-revolutionists.* In the more highly developed capitalistic countries, with a well-fed, strongly capitalistic peasantry, this tendency of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie will result directly in the struggle between the regiments from the peasant-capitalist localities and the proletarian regiments. *The civil war between the Revolution and the Counter-revolution will be a war in the literal sense of the word. The development of the Proletarian Revolution will change the imperialist fronts into revolutionary and counter-revolutionary fronts.* The German attack on the Ukraine and the French-English-Japanese attack on Russia is an indication of this evolution. The development of the Revolution and Counter-revolution will bring up the problem of the *strategy of the Socialist Revolution.* The Russian Revolution shows in what way this question will develop. If the Russian Revolution suffers from the fact that it has no corps of officers, that it is compelled to educate the workers to be army administratives as well as factory administrators, that is not merely a Russian problem. *De te fabula narratur*—so speak the experiences of the Russian Revolution to the European proletariat, but at the same time these experiences show that, eventually, the Revolution is unconquerable from a military standpoint also. It conquers by the fact that *the bourgeoisie, being a small minority, cannot get together a counter-revolutionary army out of purely bourgeois elements,* that it is compelled to take deluded, proletarian elements also, elements, which, while the battle with the armies of the Revolution is going on, will deteriorate, and sooner or later will rally to the side of the Revolution.

Just as it was not only power on which the rule of the bourgeoisie was based, but also on its function as the administrator of production; just so it does not try to overcome the proletariat by armed power alone, but also by the *sabotage of the bourgeoisie and the bourgeois intelligentsia.* This sabotage, which in Russia reached its highest point in the period from the November uprising to March, is not a Russian product. From it the European proletariat may take a hint. And when the eunuchs of Marxism point to the fact that

up to the present time the Russian proletariat has not been able to organize production on a Socialistic basis, they are only mocking themselves without knowing it. Everywhere the bourgeoisie and the bourgeois intelligentsia place the greatest hindrance in the way of the proletariat in its work of organization, and nowhere will the proletariat, even the most highly developed, be in a position, in a short time, to find the abilities in its own ranks, which will be necessary to accomplish the work of Socialist organization. In the much-praised land of organization, in Germany, the number of workers who would be able today to guide whole branches of production is extraordinarily small, even the number of workers who would be able, as technicians, to administer the production of a factory, is very small. Everyone knows this who has ever been active in the German workers' movement. The working class of every country will only be able to educate itself for the task of managing and administering production through thousands of mistakes, and nowhere will it be able to do without the services of bourgeois specialists. They will be forced, just as the Russian working class was forced, to adopt the measures of an iron dictatorship, in order to drive the bourgeois elements into the service of the workers.

No proletariat will be spared the struggle which has forced the Russian working class to take the sharpest measures of a dictatorship: the *struggle for bread*. Nowhere will the peasants range themselves on the side of the Revolution, less in capitalist countries than they did in Russia, where the Revolution gave them land and soil. *As the Revolution develops from a military standpoint, into a struggle between the workers' regiments and the regiments of the peasants, so also from the social standpoint, it will be fought out between the workers and peasants for bread; until the conquered peasantry learn that a Socialist society can offer them a life more worthy of a human being than a capitalist society can.*

Democracy or the Rule of the Working Class

And this in a word indicates clearly enough what a mighty obstinacy or what an enormous lack of sense one must have in order to accuse the Russian Revolution of harming poor Democracy. Concretely considered, Democracy is the rule of Capital, and it is so strong, so fixed in the minds of the masses that it can allow itself the luxury of permitting the masses the liberty of discussing the affairs of state. There is, in modern history, no Democracy which goes

any further than that, for as soon as the masses make the slightest attempt to convert their liberty of speech into a right to decide any question of government, Democracy goes flying. *Modern Democracy is the camouflage of the autocracy of capital.* As the feeble proletariat is interested in free speech, in free voting, in order to collect its forces, we have recognized Democracy as a way to Socialism; that means that it was necessary for us to enjoy, participate freely in the affairs of state, in order to mobilize the masses for Socialism. But abstractly considered, Democracy signifies the rule of the majority of the people. The idea that the proletariat will not begin the revolution until it has proofs that the majority of the people are behind it, is absurd, if only for the fact that capitalist Democracy will never remain unchanged long enough for the proletariat to assure itself that the majority of the people is behind it. Nowhere do the highly exploited young men and women workers enjoy full rights. If they did, the bourgeoisie would sooner turn out the Parliament, long before the workers reached a point where they could perform the will of the people by peaceful means. But it is really silly to imagine that one could, by peaceful means, through agitation only, without Revolution, overcome the lack of confidence which the masses have in their own powers. Only in the Revolution can the front ranks of the workers carry the masses along with them.

But a Revolution means that one class dictates its will to the other class. The conditions which Kautsky and Co. set for a Revolution, are these: *the Revolution, to be sure, has the right to dictate its will to the bourgeoisie, but it is its duty, at the same time, to give the bourgeoisie the possibility, by means of the freedom of the press, and from the vantage of the Constituent Assembly, of airing its accusations.* This intellectual demand of a professional kicker, who is not so much concerned with gaining his point as with registering his kick, could be abstractly complied with without harming the Revolution; but the Revolution is a civil war, and classes, who fight each other with cannon and machine guns, forego the Homeric battle of words. The Revolution does not argue with its enemies, it crushes them, the Counter-revolution does the same, and both of them will know how to bear the reproach of not having followed the order of business of the German Reichstag.

The Soviets—the Token By Which the International Proletariat Will Conquer

The harsh face which the Russian Revolution shows to the international proletariat, is the same face which, blackened with

powder, the international proletariat will itself proudly wear in the near future. *He who is frightened at this face or turns away from it, as from a Medusa's head, will turn away from the proletarian revolution, and away from Socialism.* But the Russian Revolution not only shows the European proletariat the battles which it must fight its way through, if it does not want to rot-away in the trenches, but also the forms, *the symbol, in which it will conquer. What form will the dictatorship of the proletariat take in Europe? The form of Soviets, that is, the representation of the workers in the factory, in the city, in the country, and in the nation.* That is the form in which the workers of Europe will establish their rule. The idea of the Soviets is as simple as one can imagine it to be. Only history creates such splendid crystallizations. In the factory, the slaves of Capital worked. The factory is bound by a thousand threads with the other factories, with the whole economic life of the locality. It is dependent on the transportation of the locality, on the factories which work up its semi-manufactured goods, or from which it receives them, it depends also on all the factories in the same branch of industry, and in the last analysis, on the economic life of the entire country. The representation of the factory is, consequently, political and economic, the cell of the state mechanism. The representatives of the proletariat of the locality, are, simultaneously, the economic administrators of the locality. But just as the representatives of the workers of the whole country have their policy prescribed for them by the workers of the different localities, but generalize it and make it into laws for the local units of government, in this way having their roots in the local Soviets, but at the same time presenting to the local Soviets the general proletarian interests, just so the general Economic Council, formed from the representatives of the workers, is a body which prevents the local Economic Councils from considering merely local interest, but to make them subsidiary to the interests of the whole country. The experiences of the Russian Revolution have shown what was strong and creative in Syndicalism and what was petty-bourgeois and sectarian.

The workers of a factory as masters of the factory might easily begin to work for their own particular interests, and in this way might become petty-bourgeois. The Economic Soviet of Industry represents in each factory the interests and the needs for expansion of every branch of industry. But it too, might favor the interests of a certain branch of industry as against the general interests of the working class. The general Economic Soviet, which designs the whole economic plan and carries it out,

equalizes the interests of the workers, makes the general interest the law. In this manner the sectarian tendencies of Syndicalism are done away with, and simultaneously the problem is solved which Syndicalism disowned and on which it turned its back. The Congress of the Workers' Soviets, the Executive Committee of the Workers' Soviets, that is the proletarian governing power; not the means of capitalist oppression, but the fighting arm of the proletariat. *The Soviet Government is not a democratic form of government, it is the form of government of the workers,* it shows its class character clearly, does not veil it with democratic phrases, but it is at the same time the form of government in which the will of the revolutionary working class can express itself clearly, unmistakably and ruthlessly. In this way, the problem which was insoluble in bourgeois democracy, is solved: the problem of the bureaucracy.

Syndicalism turned away from this problem with disgust, it wanted to do away with bureaucracy and its organization—but it could not do away with it; it negated it only in words. In capitalist society the proletariat is doomed to catch only the crumbs which fall from the table of capitalistic science. In capitalist society there had to be even in the workers' movement bureaucrats who alone had the time and leisure to learn the technique of the workers' movement. After capitalism is shaken off, in the process of the Socialist Revolution, which rouses the proletariat to the very depths, which brings out all its capabilities, the possibility arises for the first time, for the proletariat to manage its own affairs.

The form of the Worker-Delegate Councils, which can always be reelected, which always return to their native soil, the factory, this form will be the one with which the proletariat will conquer capitalism, and with which it will become capable of accomplishing Socialism.—And it is more than significant that all the "Marxists," who carp at the Russian Revolution, have not been able up to the present time to attack the idea of the Soviet Government. In order to do that, they would be compelled to defend the secret chambers in which the bureaucracy, together with the representatives of financial capital, manages the affairs of the state. The parliament is a debating society, a club for gossip. Parliament does not manage any factories, nor build any railroads. *The government machine, which is growing more and more from a police machine into a business office, could have become a bureaucratic, capitalist association, with Parliament as camouflage, otherwise bodies of workers had to be created, who together with professionals could set the economic life in motion and guide it.* While

this alternative was clear to everyone who had the least conception of the actual mechanism of the so-called democratic states, the opponents of the Soviet Government had to confine themselves to defending the right of the nation, that is, the bourgeoisie, to have its say, but they did not dare to defend the *very kernel of the system (the actual rule of the united clique of the bureaucracy and the sharks of finance)*, that is, they had to leave the cardinal question of the form of the Workers' Revolution completely untouched. And that is the best proof of the fact that the learned gentlemen were not only not able really to attack the Russian Revolution, but were unable even to grasp it.

The European proletariat will, without doubt, march forward so quickly in the near future that it will not have the time to learn the experiences of the Russian Revolution out of learned books, but it will learn them practically, before it is in a position to learn them out of the documents of the Revolution. We, who have the immeasurable good fortune after four years of horror, the horror of the world war, to be living, that is, to be fighting, in the midst of a newly created society, we do not flatter ourselves that we can be the teachers of the European proletariat. In as far, however, as history gives it a little spare time, in which to study the whole scheme of the Russian Revolution, before it uses this scheme practically on its own account and surpasses it, it is our duty to describe the strivings and doings of the Russian proletariat to the international proletariat. The facts will then speak to the longing heart of the proletariat, to its brain, which believes that facts are facts and need no apology. The Russian Revolution does not need to defend itself before the tribunal of the European proletariat. When Socialism has really fulfilled the longings and strivings of the best proletarians, as we are sure that it has, they will recognize that fact in the Russian Revolution, because it is the first step in the development of Socialism from a theory into action. And they have already recognized in the Russian Revolution the fulfillment of their dreams. From San Francisco to Vladivostok, whether one goes by way of the Atlantic or the Pacific, from all points of the world we are receiving proofs daily of the fact that in spite of the lies of the bourgeois press, in spite of the cowardice of the traitors to Socialism, the workers of all countries, when they are just beginning to stir, or just feeling the desire for the struggle, turn their eyes to blood-drenched Russia, to that Russia in which the working class is battling with a world of foes, and, as we hope, to conquer.

May this little book of my friend Bucharin, of which three millions of copies were scattered over the wide plains of Russia

in three months, in order to make clear to the proletariat the object of its activities, may it present to the proletariat of the world, whose blood is still being shed in streams by the capitalists, a picture of something that is worth fighting for, and to die for which is the greatest happiness for one to whom Socialism is not an empty sound.

Moscow, September, 1918.

(The week in which Lenine, the heart and brain of the World Revolution, fought with death and conquered.)

Greetings from Soviet Russia

By S. J. RUTGERS (Moscow)

For the third time Soviet Russia is passing through a period of life and death struggle in which all her physical and spiritual forces are strained to the utmost. First it was the threat of German Imperialism, which brought about a crisis that was so intense that it seemed to all observers to lead necessarily to a collapse. But the young power won out against the old force of brute weapons. Then came the period of counter-revolutionary conspiracies and uprisings, instigated by French and English money. The uprisings of the Czecho-Slovaks, of the Mensheviks, of the Left Social-Revolutionaries, all these without exception were based upon the aid of the Allies and upon the pretence of bourgeois "Democracy." But again the young power won out against the old system of lies and deception.

At present the Western Democracies are manifestly in open alliance against their mortal enemy, the Russian Soviet Republic. All the means of armed force, treachery, and deception are to be employed in one last endeavor to destroy that Republic.

In the North, the Murman-Archangel front; in the East, an increasing number of fronts; in the West, the threats of aggression from the Baltic and from Rumania; in the South, the English ships in the Black Sea as well as on the Caspian; together with a whole band of counter-revolutionary armies under conscienceless commanders, such as Krassnov, Denikin, Skoropadsky, etc., are manifestly receiving aid from the Allied "Democratic" Imperialists.

And yet, revolutionary Russia, economically exhausted, cut off from all supplies, and without the slightest assistance of any kind from the outside, even from the "socialistic" Germany of Scheidemann and Haase, which has categorically refused even a spiritual *rapprochement*—revolutionary Russia, young and hungry, looks full of confidence to the future.

There is a calm, determined, hopeful spirit prevailing in Moscow. The material and spiritual means at our disposal were used first of all for the needs of the Red Army, which was facing superhuman tasks on all the changing fronts. But confidence is placed not only in the army. Excellently prepared as it is to account for the internal enemies and counter-revolutionary bands, it nevertheless would be hopeless to attempt a modern war with the Allies, if such a war were a human possibility.

The confidence of the Russian proletariat is, in spite of all disappointments, still placed unshaken in the international solidarity of the workers. This firm conviction, which is capable of such tremendous sacrifices, is probably the most magnificent, the most affecting spectacle in this age so richly supplied with shifting emotions.

In spite of all the enemies at the frontiers, in spite of the unscrupulous counter-revolutionary propaganda, which is still being carried on here on an extensive scale and with unlimited funds, Moscow presents a completely normal appearance. There is no nervous excitement, the streets are animated and safe to walk in by day and by night, the theatres and concerts, as well as the countless meetings are always full of frequenters, and one would be inclined to think that all trouble was past, if it were not for an occasional reminder from one's stomach. Even the supply of clothing, including shoes, is satisfactory, in spite of all difficulties, the distribution being of course modified in accordance with supplies on hand and amount already received by individuals.

In spite of the material difficulties, spiritual life comes into its own. The thirst for education is general, and all lectures, courses and instructions are crowded with visitors, including the Socialist Academy; the latter has actually been already opened with 3,000 students. The celebration of the anniversary of the proletarian revolution was an overwhelming event. More than a million Russian citizen, men and women, workers, peasants, and soldiers, demonstrated in the most perfect order, marching with dozens of banners, made especially for this purpose, along the graves of the fallen, and singing the powerful Russian Funeral March. The whole city was generously decorated with red flags

and symbolic emblems, in many cases futuristic in style, and although the German Government had just broken off diplomatic relations, and although an Eastern Front had again become a possibility, there was a genuine holiday spirit abroad. In Petersburg there has been an exhibition of all the artistic landmarks of the city, among which there are monuments and statues of permanent value, and it is remarkable how many proletarian talents have in this short period developed into artists.

One interesting trait chosen from among many: In Moscow there was not enough fuel, and yet it was desired to have an illumination in the evening. Nothing simpler. The tramway service was restricted for a few days before the event, and electricity was thus saved for the brilliant illumination of the glorious festival of the glorious revolution. The great difficulty is and remains the question of bread, for bread is in Russia, more than in your country, the foodstuff par excellence.

Yet it has been found possible, within the last few days, to increase the bread ration in consequence of the conquests of the Red Army. The ration is now one pound (400 grams) for the first category (soldiers, etc.), 300 gr. for the second category (heavy labor), 200 for the third category, and 100 gr. for the fourth (bourgeoisie); in each case per diem. And when the German Revolution at last began to stir and the really revolutionary German Workers' Republic seemed likely to be able to obtain bread only from Russia, great gatherings were held in a number of places, in which Russian workers, with their serious pale faces, who had already hungered much, resolved unanimously that they would rather hunger a little more in order to save up supplies for their German comrades. And they did not permit the thing to stop at empty words. Immediately from various quarters there came reports of the quantities that would be set aside for this purpose, and a long train laden with precious grain soon reached Germany. But the old slave-drivers Scheidemann & Co. refused the proffered aid because the Entente did not want to permit them to have any contact with Russia, and because they were under the impression that their Allied hangmen would take better care of the German workers than their hungering Russian comrades.

The treason of their leaders and the blindness of the masses has probably deprived the German proletariat of any self-confidence at all. What could not have been attained if the technical skill and the organizing ability of the German workers could have been united with the incredible, as yet barely touched resources of Russia! For it is still rather the lack of proper trans-

portation, of organization, than lack of actual foodstuffs, that is the cause of the present deficiency. And industry also, with its present raw materials, could attain a much higher productivity if it should work more intensively and with better organization. The German workers have just permitted a good opportunity to pass them by, and may now have to watch Entente capital strengthen itself at their expense, which simply means that the number of victims in the impending inevitable conflict will only be all the larger.

And not only that. There is danger that the aid which Soviet Russia will then be able to give will be much lessened by gradual exhaustion. It is evidently the policy of the Entente to force the Russian Workers' Republic to expend a maximum of energy at the countless fronts where the fighting is going on, and thus to transform their limited resources into means of destruction. Likewise everything has been attempted, on a large scale, to disorganize, by the basest means and bribery, the economic life of Russia, and the effort has been made to attain a complete isolation of Russia, materially as well as spiritually.

But precisely the great number of the fronts represents a breach in this isolation, and an active propaganda by newspapers and handbills is being maintained in six different languages. The astonishment of the prisoners of war who fall into the hands of the Bolshevik "robbers and bandits" is quite amusing, and groups of Communists speaking English and French are being organized, in order to develop the best elements among them into propagandists for the Soviet Republic. It is hardly conceivable that French and English workers should permit themselves to be used in a new war for the destruction of the Socialistic Republic, which has no intention of making such a plan any too easy to carry out.

But passive resistance is not sufficient, and the delay of intervention is a dangerous proposition. Until a short time ago, time was an extremely favorable factor for the Russian Revolution. All that seemed necessary in order to establish the new régime immutably was time enough to build up and improve the organization of economic life. Gradually grain came in from the South, and it was again possible to depend on the iron industry of the Ural, and although the productivity of labor was still very unsatisfactory, a gradual improvement could nevertheless be noted very generally.

I have myself traveled around a bit in Russia in the last few months, particularly along the rivers and canals, visiting a number of cities, and all over there was obviously and unmistakably

a slow but sure improvement in the economic life. And it was just the smaller communities, in which such a comparison can more easily be made, in which the best impression was received. It seemed as if the new life should ripen here, from the bottom up, into new forms, and should furnish, from the working classes, the new talents, capable of controlling even the more complicated apparatus of the central administration and of overcoming both the old and the new forms of bureaucracy, which are still spreading their influence, so destructive to the profitable development of energy.

All that seemed necessary in order to permit Russia to develop peaceably by herself was—time. But time may become a fatal factor if exhaustion on the countless fronts is to proceed hand in hand with a systematic undermining of the organization that has been built up with so much pains and care. Already the intellectuals and the technical experts had, in the main, yielded to the inevitable. Although without much enthusiasm, and in many cases still practising passive or even active sabotage, they were again at their employments, now in the new Soviet institutions. But the agents of the Entente, who are still found in great numbers in this country, are attempting, by wild rumors and promises, to keep alive the hope for a change in the direction of reaction. And now that these questionable middle-class elements have wormed their way into all the portions of the Soviet Army, their sabotage has become all the more dangerous.

Of course they are opposed to foreign intervention, and both the Mensheviks and the Social-Revolutionists have publicly declared their opposition to it, and even declared themselves ready to aid the Communists, but with a few individual exceptions, such as that of Maxim Gorky, there is not much to be seen of their assistance. And for most of the members of the middle class, most hope seems still to be directed toward the Western "Democracies."

Not before these elements are replaced in the economic process by proletarian elements can the dictatorship of the workers be relinquished, can Socialism be realized.

But for the present much would be gained if the secret hope of intervention could be destroyed, and it is therefore the first and most urgent duty of the Western Proletariat to utter here a word that shall permit of no misinterpretation.

Before everything else let them spread the slogan: "Hands off Russia!" There shall be no troops sent, no ships; there shall be no diplomatic tricks, no dirty intrigues. If the workers in the West will speak clearly, and be ready to enforce their words

with deeds, all the fronts directed against Russia will collapse like houses of cards, and the opposition and sabotage of the middle class will break down of itself.

The Russian Revolution is and will remain the point of departure of the World Revolution, which, in turn, holds the destiny of the Russian Revolution in its hands. The Russian working class will conquer this crisis as they have conquered previous crises, but the Western proletariat must not look on idly while the "democratic" imperialistic vampires undermine the foundations of the Russian Communistic Society by a systematic process of exhaustion.

"No intervention in Russia, either secret or open!" must be the irresistible demand in all countries: a demand that will not be heeded unless it is supported by the strongest pressure of revolutionary mass-action.

Moscow, December 1918.

Autumn Slush

OR

The Reformer a Danger to Society

Costume Play by Rococo (August Strindberg)

Free Translation

COSTUMES: Mogol; Lama; Rococo, the Danger to Society; The Responsible Ministers; The Discontented.

ACT I

Mogol and Lama, sitting at a table with a double top, drinking champagne and distributing medals and decorations.

Mogol. Now this is going too far! They are attacking society

Lama. And morality and the foundations of the social body.

Mogol. Que faire?

Lama. We must keep them busy, give them something to think of, any old thing!

Mogol. One must make concessions in accordance with the spirit of the times, when one lives in the age of constitutional despotism. How would it be to permit them to reform society on condition that they begin by reforming themselves?

Lama. Well spoken, Mogol; that'll give them something to

keep them occupied! Reform themselves! Damned fine idea! But we must get someone to tell them that—preferably someone out of their own ranks; or else they will howl him down. Do you know of anyone?

Mogol. Do you think I don't know my sheep? I know Rococo. He is young in years, but old in reason. He has sense enough to affect asthma and the snuffbox, and does not scorn to walk about with the traditional bamboo cane, which has for centuries been the surest support of society, the family, and religion. He's the boy for me—or, rather, the man for me!

Takes up his key and whistles.

ACT II

Rococo. Here I am.

Mogol. Rococo, go at once and say to the Discontented that they shall have their reforms, if they will begin by reforming themselves.

Rococo. They can't do it!

Mogol. As if I didn't know that! But you might tell them so anyway.

Rococo. Of course I can say it! You can say anything if you only say it nicely.

Mogol. Well spoken! Now say it nicely, and show that you're a bright boy—man, I mean.

Rococo. To hear is to obey!

ACT III

THE MARKET-PLACE

Rococo and the Discontented

Rococo. You say you want reforms. You shall have one at once!

The Discontented. Spit it out!

Rococo. Reform yourselves!

The Discontented deliberate.

The Discontented. Good! We accept your royal offer, but we must have full authority!

Rococo. Here you have royal authorization to become moral, thrifty, sober, chaste, orderly, and honest. Is that enough?

The Discontented. That's enough. *Exeunt.*

ACT IV

MOGOL'S PALACE

Mogol. The Minister of Finances.

Finances. Oh, Great Mogol! It's a hell of a reformer you've

given us in the person of this Rococo! The foundations of society are crumbling!

Mogol. Whaddyemean?

Finances. He's gone and talked the Discontented into the idea that they must reform themselves. And they've taken him at his word and want to become sober!

Mogol. Well, and isn't that all right?

Finances. All right, you say? The State Treasury already shows a deficit of fourteen millions in liquor taxes. Where are we going to get the money now?

Mogol. You can't shake fourteen millions out of your sleeve. We must put a tax in that case on the finer wines consumed by the upper classes.

Finances. Won't do! We'll have the Right after us. Or they will emigrate, and society will lose its most reliable support.

Mogol. Then what shall we do?

Finances. I don't know, and therefore beg to place my portfolio at your disposition. *Exit.*

ACT V.

Mogol. *Minister for Luxuries.*

Mogol. What in God's name is the trouble now?

Luxuries. Oh, Great Mogol, that was a rotten reformer you sent out. He has gone and preached to them that they must reform themselves. And now they have become thrifty. Society threatens to collapse, for behold, the rascals will use neither tobacco, nor coffee, nor sugar. And the State Treasury shows a deficit of 27 millions in taxes.

Mogol. Fourteen and twenty-seven make forty-one millions; where are we going to get them? We must put a tax on wine and silk.

Luxuries. No use! The Right will emigrate and society will lose its most dependable support; I herewith present my resignation to you. *Exit.*

ACT VI

Mogol. *The Minister for Soldiers.*

Mogol. What misfortune brings you?

Soldiers. Oh, Great Mogol, what a stupid reformer you did send to the Discontented!

Mogol. What's he been doing now?

Soldiers. He has given them royal permission to reform themselves! And now they say that they will do no military serv-

ice, since it is forbidden by the Law and by the Gospel to use the sword. I am therefore forced to present my resignation to you. *Exit.*

ACT VII.

Mogol. *Later the Minister for the Dynasty.*

Mogol. This thing is beginning to get serious! Society doesn't really seem to be built up on the virtues exactly; we must find a way to disavow this reformer!

Dynasty. Oh, Great Mogol! Ruler by the Grace of God! Society is in process of disintegration. That devil of a reformer has succeeded in making the Discontented moral, and now they renounce their oath of fidelity to the Dynasty, since they consider it immoral to serve the Dynasty! What are we going to do now?

Mogol. We have the army!

Dynasty. We have *not* the army! It has become moral also. *Exit.*

Mogol. Oh, damn you, Lama, for giving me such advice! What on earth shall I do?

ACT VIII

Mogol. *Lama.*

Lama. Well, this is the limit! That damned Rococo has gone and given them permission to reform themselves, and they have left the State Church, because they consider it immoral to support a doctrine in which they do not believe.

Mogol. Where's our woe and where's our care, and where's C. O. Berg?

Lama. He has also left the State Church!

Mogol. So he has become moral too! Where shall this end?

Lama. We must emigrate! That's all there is to it! No Dynasty, no Army, no Church! No, it would be much better if they were immoral! The pillar of society really *does* seem to have been immorality.

Mogol. What are we going to do?

Lama. Let us become immoral!

Mogol. No; is there no middle path? Just think, suppose we should begin by reforming society!

Lama. That wouldn't be so bad, perhaps.

Mogol. Please note that I say *we*: for *they* must not occupy themselves with such delicate tasks.

Lama. If Rococo's going to have any share in this, I'll emigrate at once.

Mogol whistles.

ACT IX.

*The Former. Rococo.**Mogol.* Rococo, you're an ass. I disavow you.*Lama.* We disavow you.*Mogol.* But a wise monarch will not permit anyone to leave his presence discontented. Behold, Rococo!*Lama.* The Order of Seraphims!*Mogol.* As a token of my personal appreciation of your good will. For your good sense I wouldn't give a copper!*Lama.* As an expression of my personal gratitude . . .*Is about to bestow a decoration upon him, but Rococo exit.**Mogol.* There was a dangerous reformer, for society!*Lama.* And he even despises decorations!*Mogol.* Let us now begin our proselytizing work with the reformed Discontented! It may be a big job to demoralize them again, but . . .*Lama.* In the name of the Triune Godhead! Let us go to it! Society must be saved, for though heaven and earth may perish, society must be maintained!*Finis.*

The S. L. P.

By MAX EASTMAN

The Socialist Labor Party received an extraordinary boost when Robert Minor's dispatch in the New York World quoted Lenin as saying that the idea of a Soviet Government was first formulated by an American, Daniel De Leon. Daniel De Leon was no doubt the strongest and truest theoretician in the American political movement, and his idea that the function of the political party is to capture the government merely in order to adjourn it, allowing an economic organization without affiliation with any political party to take possession of the instruments of production, is perhaps nearer to a picture of what happened in Russia than anything else in Socialist literature.

It is also, if taken as applicable to a gradual process, the only possible program of political action today. The mood and purpose of the Socialist in politics should be negative. It should be obstructive. His function is not to try to improve the political government, but to try to narrow the scope and dissolve the force of its sovereignty, at the same time throwing what trifle of protection he can round the growth of the industrial organization,

so that the change from a political to an industrial government may be accomplished with the least possible disturbance.

In one respect, however, De Leon's teaching was quite opposite to that of Lenin. De Leon was very positive in his advocacy of peaceful methods, or at least of putting the responsibility for the initial use of force upon the capitalists. Lenin in "The Disarmament Cry" some time before the Russian Revolution showed that he conceived the moment of change almost dogmatically in military terms, and his articles advocating insurrection immediately before the Bolshevik revolution are among the most powerful and characteristic of his writings. The impression I receive from DeLeon's pamphlets, however, makes me believe that his mind was too realistic and practical to hold any absolute dogma of this kind throughout the events that have passed in Europe. He would realize that where there are vast armies, the action of these armies is almost inevitably the core of the revolution.

There is another point, too, in which I think DeLeon's principles might have been altered somewhat by recent developments. He conceived of the industrial power of labor as not coming into play until after a "high political temperature" had been recorded at the polls. He thought that if industrial or mass action was needed at all in the process of revolution, it would be only after a revolutionary vote had been counted out. He did not use his imagination quite enough to realize that an industrial organization capable of seizing and holding the means of production, could not, in the nature of man, *exist* in revolutionary times without *acting*. And he was not so well acquainted as we are with the power of the bourgeoisie to "count out" the working-class vote before it is cast. He did not know how many ways there are of controlling that rather abstract and impersonal opinion which the workers express at the polls, and so keeping down the political temperature even when the industrial temperature is high. Without displacing the clear outlines of his theory, he might have shifted his emphasis a little upon this point in these livelier times, and he might have become what we lack altogether—an adequate theoretical leader of American Socialism. Whatever his personal characteristics may have been, he had at least that combination of hard-headed theoretic knowledge with realism in practical thinking which distinguishes Marx and Lenin, and has won them the unbounded confidence of men.

It is the more to be regretted that the inheritors of his tradition, the Socialist Labor Party, are not capable of realistic and practical thinking, and have acquired apparently little or no illumination from the events of recent years. I judge them col-

lectively by some of the publications of their National Executive Committee, and particularly the rather pompous letter to Senator Overman in which this sentence occurs: "Let us make it plain, Sir, that we absolutely discard the strike, general or local, as a weapon of revolution." What an utterance to put forth in the midst of the events in Germany! The members of the committee have taken "the general strike" out of a pigeon-hole in their writing-desk and they "discard it" into their waste-basket, and that is about all the event amounts to. It is quite evident that their brains are merely "applying" the writings of DeLeon as a revealed dogma; they are not continuing the tradition of his alert intelligence.

The news now comes from Robert Minor that the *World* misquoted his despatch. What he actually wrote was that Lenin said that the Soviet Government did *not* grow up on the ideas formulated by Daniel DeLeon. The joke on the Socialist Labor Party is no more than it deserves.

Russia and Germany

(A Sociological Analysis)

By A. S. SACHS

In the various branches of human knowledge we differentiate speculative sciences from experimental. In the experimental sciences such as chemistry and physics—a problem is determined experimentally. Problems in speculative sciences, however, are solved abstractly (without proofs by facts). This explains the reason why we have such a great difference of opinion in respect to social problems. The human mind is greatly influenced by the environment. He, who has been raised in an atmosphere of wealth, who at no time lacked anything requisite for an easy and decent livelihood, who enjoys the best that is in nature, finds this world a very suitable and comfortable place to live in. It is only natural that those who desire a change in the existing system should be considered by the aforementioned individual as mere criminals. But he, who has been brought up in an atmosphere of poverty and misery, who had to toil while yet in his teens, if not younger, who had and still must endure all sorts of indescribable sufferings in some industrial dungeon, he does not consider this world a very pleasant place to live in at all. Sparks of protest are gradually developed in his heart as well as in his mind. Taking these things into consideration we see

that those who desire such a change in the existing system are not only not criminals, but are those who are actuated by the loftiest and most sublime ideals. They are not degenerates and cowards, but are the best and noblest heroes.

It is only very logical that there should be diverse ideas and theories in sociology. Some are bourgeois in character and others are proletarian in character. The mind of the intellectual, as well as that of the ordinary layman, is very much influenced by the class interest. Therefore we have always dealt with bourgeois ideas and proletarian ideas which have been as far apart as East from West. The bourgeois and proletariat have been reared in very different atmospheres, live in different worlds and speak different languages.

After the revolution had taken place in the countries of Eastern and Central Europe not only the leaders of the bourgeoisie fought against the proletarians but the latter vehemently opposed each other. We can readily perceive the reason why the bourgeoisie opposed the proletarians. How is it that the proletarians who have been reared in the same atmosphere, who have the same end in view, how is it that they cannot come to one conclusion whereby to solve the social problem? How is this to be explained? Is it not strange that the people who only yesterday fought shoulder to shoulder for the same cause are now such deadly enemies? We can best answer these questions by a brief analysis of historical events.

The labor movement of Russia and Germany was called the Social Democratic Party. They sought two ideals—Socialism and Democracy. Socialism is an economic principle, the aim of which is that all means of production and distribution shall belong not as now to private owners but shall be the property of the State. Democracy, on the other hand, is a political principle, the aim of which is that the government shall not be controlled by one class or one group but rather by the whole populace. Nowhere else do we find a better definition of democracy than in Lincoln—"A government of, by, and for the people." Socialism seeks economic equality while Democracy seeks political equality.

Now let us pause for a moment and ask ourselves the following question; we have no opportunity whatsoever to carry out both principles at the same time—Socialism and Democracy. If we desire to carry out Socialism we are compelled to sacrifice Democracy—on the other hand, if we desire to carry out Democracy we must sacrifice Socialism—which shall we better choose—economic or political equality? It is certain that various answers will be given to this question. Some will favor Socialism and

others will prefer Democracy. Here we have the cause for the great quarrels between the different factions of the proletarian movement—both among the leaders as well as the rank and file. The present government of Soviets in Russia and the Spartacan movement in Germany are more in favor of Socialism. To them the economic equality is more important. If economic equality cannot be carried out by Democracy, then they contend that the question of Democracy must be ignored. If Socialism cannot work hand in hand with Democracy then the latter must be sacrificed for the sake of the former. The Kerensky faction in Russia, the Social-Revolutionists and Mensheviki, as well as the Majority Socialists in Germany reason exactly in the opposite direction. They favor Democracy. They claim that since the Socialists have already fought against the bourgeoisie because the latter were not sufficiently democratic, therefore, when the Socialists are in control, they must act and behave themselves democratically. If Socialism and Democracy cannot work hand in hand the latter must be chosen.

Between these two factions there are the Independent Socialists in Germany under the leadership of Hugo Haase and Karl Kautsky. These Independent Socialists have a rather great following in Russia. They claim that Socialism and Democracy are inseparable. They are not two separate principles but are rather two complements of one unit; two arms of one body; two eyes of one head. Just as we have no right to make one healthy eye useless for the sake of the other (for ultimately the second will suffer for it), just so ought we not sacrifice either Socialism for Democracy, or Democracy for Socialism. A solution of the present situation must be found by their harmony and not by their contradiction.

This explains the reason why the Spartacans after the fall of the Kaiser were absolutely against a Constituent Assembly. They saw that the Constituent Assembly would be controlled by a majority who were bourgeois. This they would not permit, for it would form an obstacle to the fulfillment of Socialism. They therefore demanded the Dictatorship of the Proletariat and that the entire control of the government be given to the Soviets. In Russia, as we know, the Bolsheviki disbanded the members of the Constituent Assembly even after they had been called together. The Majority Socialists in Germany, under the leadership of Ebert, Scheidemann and Eduard David, and the Right Wing of the Mensheviki and Social-Revolutionists in Russia favored a Constituent Assembly. They desired that the foundation of the coming State should be democratic. The Independent Socialists, as we recollect, were neither in favor of

the program of the Spartacans, that is to ignore the Constituent Assembly—nor were they with the Majority Socialists that the Constituent Assembly be immediately convoked. They demanded a postponement of the elections for the Constituent Assembly. They wanted to wait until the workers should have entirely freed themselves from the bourgeois ideology—so that a conflict between Socialism and Democracy may be avoided.

The Revolutionary and Evolutionary Theories

Let us not assume that the great frictions in the proletarian movement came into being only after the revolution. They existed long before the revolution but they were not felt. Take a piece of wood with visible cracks. On the sides of this piece of wood place immense weights. Press these weights together. In a very short time you will discover that the cracks have seemingly disappeared. Remove the weights and the cracks will once more be noticeable. The same can be said of the proletarian movement. As long as the bourgeoisie and the Junker classes formed one compact reactionary force and with this pressed the workers to the ground, the differences of opinion amongst the workers were very trivial and only had a polemical and theoretical importance. But after the revolution, when the bourgeois class was overthrown and the workers became the controlling factor, the disagreements became prominent and important as well as much wider in scope.

The quarrels of today are, indeed, a continuation of the former polemics amongst the theoreticians—the polemics which dealt with revolutionary and evolutionary theories. The disciples of the evolutionary theory claimed that Socialism will not come suddenly, but will develop slowly, organically, step by step, from the present capitalistic system. They thought that the way towards Socialism is the way of reform. Reforms they knew may be won in the legislative bodies—hence, the importance of Parliamentarism.

The followers of the revolutionary theory have laid very little stress upon reform—for reforms have only a temporary importance—they serve no better purpose than patches on old clothes. The reforms are only significant in as much as they help strengthen the power of the workers, but they are not by any means a part of Socialism. Therefore Parliamentarism, the place of reform, never meant very much to the Revolutionist. Parliaments afforded the revolutionists an opportune place from which the gospel of Socialism may be disseminated, but it was never considered by them as a direct route towards Socialism. The Lenins and Trozky's, Liebknechts and Luxemburgs are the

followers of the Revolutionary Theory, while the Scheidemanns, Eberts, Kerenskys and Breshkovskayas are the followers of the Evolutionary Theory. For the latter, parliamentarism and the Constituent Assembly was and still is the one and only one way that leads to the Future Socialist State. While for the former parliamentarism and the Constituent Assembly, at present, when there are other and better means for agitation of the Socialist idea, mean nothing. Its importance is just as a zero without a circumference.

Now the question naturally arises, how is it, that the Orthodox Marxists, such as Plekhanov, Kautsky, Verasassulits, and Axelrod, who are the very founders of the modern radical movement, who always strenuously opposed the reformers and the evolutionists—how is it that they should in any way oppose the Spartacans in Germany, and the Bolsheviki in Russia? According to our previous explanation of things they should have been the sponsors of these Left Wings of the Socialist movement. In order to clearly understand this, it is necessary for us to digress for a while into the history and theory of Socialism.

Utopian Socialism

The Socialist movement is historically divided into two epochs: the Utopian Socialism and the Scientific.

Several individuals came to the conclusion long ago, that a system which demands that the vast masses continue toiling under the most unfavorable conditions; that they must work, enduring pain, hunger, and all sorts of insults in the mines, and docks, and factories, while a small handful of owners and proprietors possess not only that which is necessary for an honest and upright livelihood, but much more than they actually need and can consume—such a system not only is not beneficial but is a detriment to the progress of mankind. A hundred years ago there lived in England a great philanthropist by the name of Robert Owen. At one time he cried out: "How can we get rid of this Insane Asylum?" Indeed, does not this world resemble an Insane Asylum? People shout, push, run about here and there—for what?—only to try to secure the meagre piece of bread for themselves and their poverty-stricken families—yes, and even this they don't always succeed in acquiring. The system of competition results in "the struggle of all against all." It develops in the hearts of everybody concerned, jealousy, envy, cheap egotistical interests. Each one tries to undermine the existence of his fellow human being. There are times when a human being is turned into a ferocious beast. Would it not have been much better if the system of competition, "the struggle

of all against all," would be abolished? Again, would it not have been better that instead of each one only caring about his own interests, there should be a system where everybody should attempt to co-operate in building up one great family whose motto should be "one for all and all for one"? Yes, answers Robert Owen, it would have been much better and, what is more, such a system is not only desirable, but it is actually possible. The only thing necessary to be done is to abolish private property and establish the Co-operative Commonwealth—Socialism.

Just as soon as Robert Owen came to this conclusion he took his entire capital, which at that time amounted to a rather large fortune, and went to America.

Here he bought a tract of land in Indiana State. On this tract of land he founded the colony of New Harmony. The principle upon which this colony was founded was that every-one shall work according to his ability and enjoy the fruit of his labor according to his needs. Besides New Harmony he was the originator of many other similar communities. Robert Owen was convinced that a great and mighty Socialist tree would grow up as a result of the planting of these small Socialist seeds. He dreamed of a Socialist World where all should work together and enjoy the fruit of their labor together.

The same ideals that inspired Robert Owen in England became the religion of St. Simon and Fourier in France. St. Simon and Fourier were not rich, but this material obstacle was not strong enough to overcome their spirit and their firm belief in the fulfillment of their ideal. Like all geniuses they were very naïve. They so believed in the power and truth of their idea that they could not imagine that anyone could be against them. The reason why the people did not already establish a Socialist State, they believed, was their ignorance. They, therefore, considered it their duty to convince the people that there was an opportunity to change the present system for a Socialist State. It is, therefore, not surprising to find St. Simon writing letters to Napoleon and many other strong and powerful rulers of the time—in which letters he makes known his Socialist plans. He hoped that as soon as they would become acquainted with the facts they would be the first to attempt to see to it that a Socialist State be established. We also know how Fourier wrote letters to Rothschild with the absolute belief that some fine morning the latter would give up all of his millions so that the Socialist plan might be realized. Of course, their agitation was almost worthless. Rothschild did not at all entertain the idea of giving up his millions to Fourier for Socialist purposes, and Napoleon thought St. Simon to be a dangerous

fanatic and ordered the latter's arrest. The colonies that Robert Owen founded did not last very long. The members soon began to quarrel among themselves. The colonies, which Robert Owen thought served as a stepping stone to the Socialist State, were soon ruined. Not a trace of them is left. Thus ended Socialism in the first half of the last century, which is known as the period of Utopian Socialism.

Scientific Socialism

About a decade after the failure of the Socialist experiments of Robert Owen and his comrades, Karl Marx and his friend Frederick Engels let themselves be heard. Karl Marx and Frederick Engels agreed with their predecessors that the only way to free ourselves from the "Insane Asylum" is through Socialism. But they differed from the Utopians in the theory and in the means and ways with which to accomplish the self-same end. The Utopian Socialists were, as far as philosophy is concerned, idealists. They believed in the power of the idea. They did not know of a class-struggle. They thought that Socialism can come into being *at all times*, and can be carried out by *everybody* regardless to what group or what class they belonged. They contended that all depends upon the *will* of the people. The people only have to desire a certain system and it will take place. Marx, a materialist in philosophy, entertained a different point of view. He claimed that Socialism cannot be realized *at all times* and be carried out by *everybody*, but that it can only occur in a *certain historical epoch*, and can be carried out only by a *certain class of people*. The will of the people cannot change the economic conditions. On the contrary, the will depends upon the economic conditions. The will is not the cause, but it is rather the direct result. "The economic conditions are not influenced by the consciousness, but the consciousness is influenced by the economic conditions." People are influenced by their class-interest. A class-struggle exists. Idealistic motives will never convert a class whose interests are opposed to Socialism.

Robert Owen and his comrades desired to obtain Socialism when Capitalism was not yet sufficiently developed—when the production was still carried on by hand-worked implements. Such a desire could only have been an illusion—an Utopian dream. At such a time Socialism is a contradiction of the entire economic basis. When production is carried on by crude hand-implements, private ownership is a necessity and the only thing possible. The quintessence of hand-work is individualism. Then the division of labor does not exist. A commodity is begun and finished by the self-same worker. The qualification of the com-

modity depends entirely upon the skill of the worker. If the worker happens to be an efficient one, the product is good; if not, the quality of the product is not worth very much. The product bears in itself the individualism of the worker. In some of the small towns of Russia, and Roumania, where the hand-worker is the chief producer, a specialist will be able to determine who the producer of a given article is, for the personality of the worker is impressed upon the commodity. If we have individualism in production then we must necessarily have individualism in consumption of the product. The form of consumption must be adapted to the form of production. Private ownership (which means individualism in consumption) must be the result of individualism in production (hand-work). The failure of Socialism at such a time was a very natural thing. The failure was rooted in the economical conditions of that time.

The situation has entirely changed since the time of the hand-worker. The primitive instruments, the hatchet, and the hammer, have been replaced by gigantic machines; the small shop, where the owner and his children and near relatives were the sole workers, has been replaced by huge factories where thousands of workers are employed; the small shopkeeper has been replaced by the powerful capitalist; the stage-coach has been replaced by the great system of railways. In short—the present production is based upon the division of labor. The factory worker does not do the whole work on any article, but works on only a very small part of the product. The process of manufacturing has become simply mechanical. The present system of production does not demand mental ability, but physical energy. The qualification and personality of the worker has no significance as far as the product is concerned. The modern product is the result not of an individual undertaking, but of a collective workmanship. The present system of production is Socialistic. Since the consumption must be adapted to the production, the former must also be made Socialistic. How is it in reality?

At present the consumption is based upon the right of private ownership. The contradiction between the production which is socialistic and the consumption which is individualistic is very evident. This contradiction is the cause of the class-struggle. The workers who earn their livelihood in the collective atmosphere of the large factories become psychologically collectively inclined. They begin to demand, whether consciously or unconsciously, such a state of affairs where the consumption will be adapted to the production. They become the sponsors of Socialism. The wealthy class, the owners, who live comfortably in an atmosphere of private ownership, desire no change of

system. They defend with all their might the individualistic form of consumption which was a necessity only then when individualism existed also in the production, which was justified at a time when our present form of machinery was not yet dreamed of.

This class-struggle must and will only end with a victory for the workers, because only the demands of the workers correspond with the new technique, with the new productive forces. A system where a contradiction exists between production and consumption is not normal. The abnormal conditions of the present system are clearly seen at the time of a crisis.

Imagine such conditions as the following: thanks to the fact that the shoemakers have manufactured too many shoes people must go barefooted; due to the fact that the tailors made too many clothes people are compelled to go naked; just because the bricklayers happened to build too many houses people have no place in which to live; because the crops happened to be favorable, people have nothing to eat. Can you imagine such conditions? No, did you say? Ah, but they exist. When are the people deprived of food, clothing, and shelter? In times of a crisis. What is a crisis? Is a crisis caused by a lack of commodities? Not at all: It is caused by an *overproduction*. These crises are the symptoms of a chronic disease with which our system is afflicted. This disease is caused by the contradiction between the production which is socialistic and the consumption which is individualistic. The only remedy which we can apply to our system is the removing of the cause. The form of consumption must be adapted to the form of production; private ownership must be abolished and Socialism established.

The historical necessity for Socialism is thus made clear to every right thinking individual.

This much for the Marxian Theory of Socialism. Until Marx, Socialism was only a noble desire, but Marx had made a science of it. Marx by means of his analysis of the capitalistic system of production has shown that Socialism does not depend upon the will of anyone, but is a natural result of the productive forces in the present system.

The Soviets as Seen by Plekhanov and Lenin

The brief review of utopian and scientific Socialism makes it clear to us why the followers of the Marxian Philosophy and the Economical Interpretation of History, as Plekhanov, Kautsky and others, so vigorously oppose the Soviet Government. They

opposed such a form of government not because they thought that the Soviet Government would hasten the cause of Socialism, but just for the contrary reason. They thought it would retard the fulfillment of Socialism. At the time when the Soviets first took control of the government in Russia, the entire power of the government of Germany was still in the hands of the Junkers and their Supreme Chief, William II. The program of the Soviets was limited to Russian territory. Plekhanov and his comrades claimed that Russia was not yet ripe for Socialism; that capitalism in Russia was not yet sufficiently developed; that the industrial proletariat formed only a very small part of the population—about 8 or 9 per cent; and that the machine production had not yet come up to the standard of the western countries. And therefore they argued, that under such conditions to attempt to establish a Socialist Régime was a dangerous experiment which might do more harm than good. Modern Socialism takes its root in the Capitalistic System, and therefore Socialism must be the heir of Capitalism. Where Capitalism has nothing to leave, Socialism can inherit nothing. In conclusion, they claimed, just as the experiments of Robert Owen were a failure, just as the communards in France in the year 1871 were a failure, just so must the attempt of the Soviets be a failure.

The Plekhanovs and Kautskys erred due to the fact that they did not take into consideration the relationship of the power of the different economic classes and groups of Russia. They were right as far as the theory is concerned, but they blundered in their judgment regarding the sociological structure. They measured the power of the Russian industrial proletariat as a unit by itself, as an isolated power. What they should have done was to measure the power of the Russian industrial proletariat in relationship with the other social forces or classes.

When a general leads his army into battle he not only thinks of his own strength, but of that of the enemy. It is possible for him to win a battle with a small army provided the opponent has a still smaller one; on the other hand, he can lose a battle even though he may have a large army if the opponent has a still larger one. This fact Plekhanov and his comrades could not see, and therefore they could not comprehend the significance of the Soviets. It is true that the Proletarian force in Russia is proportionally very small, but the forces that are against them are still weaker. The Russian bourgeoisie had been oppressed by the Czar. They had no opportunity to organize themselves in order to become a strong force. Immediately after the Czar's dethronement, the Proletarian movement had already shown it-

self to be far stronger than the bourgeoisie. An actual bourgeois government existed in Russia at the time that Lvoff, Milyukoff and Gutchkoff were in power, but alas, they were in power only for a very short time. They existed only for a short time because the class upon which they depended was weaker than the Proletariat. Besides this, the peasants in Russia are very revolutionary. The hundreds of years of oppression by the Czar stored up in the hearts of the moujiks and peasants a violent anger against the wealthy and ruling classes. For this reason the peasants endorsed and helped any class which offered the most radical issues, in this case the Soviets. The psychology of the Russian peasant is not that of a small owner, for he lived in a communal atmosphere, known as the Mir, hence, the help he offers the industrial proletariat.

The sociological structure of Germany is somewhat different. The industrial proletariat in Germany is numerically very large. In the last election for the Reichstag (under the Kaiser) about $4\frac{1}{4}$ millions of votes were cast for the Socialist candidates. Industry in Germany is also very highly developed. Capitalism in Germany is much more advanced than in Russia. The trouble though is that the counter-forces of the power of the proletariat are very strong. The bourgeois revolution in Germany occurred in 1848. At that time the power of the German proletariat was almost negligible and the bourgeoisie had an opportunity to strengthen its position socially, politically, as well as culturally. The bourgeois ideology was preached and propagated in the universities and academies. Their literature and art had for its purpose only the deification of the bourgeois ideals. It is no wonder that even the proletarians were greatly influenced by this bourgeois psychology. Added to this, we must not forget that the German peasant is a small proprietor. He always supported the reactionary forces against the free movement of the Socialists. Just as they formerly supported the Junkers and the Kaiser, so they now uphold the conservative class and the bourgeoisie. It is very noteworthy to remark that immediately after the Kaiser lost his power the peasants issued a manifesto stating that they would support the new government, provided that the right of private ownership would not be interfered with. This explains why in Russia we hear of a Council of Workers and Peasants, while in Germany we merely hear of a "Council of Workers." The peasants in Germany are against the workers.

This brief analysis solves the puzzle. We know now why the proletariat in Russia, although a very small minor-

ity, is in power, and why in Germany the proletariat, though very powerful, is oppressed and not yet in control of the government. For, as was seen, it does not depend upon the power of the proletariat alone, but the power of the counter-forces must be taken into consideration. Frederick Engels would in such an instance say that we have to deal here with a parallelogram of forces (with forces and counter-forces).

If we were asked to express our opinion as to where Socialism will be first realized—in Germany or in Russia, we would without any hesitation say in Germany. We would say this in spite of the fact that in Germany the radical workers are not yet in control of the government. For we know that the realization of Socialism does not depend upon decrees and manifestos from the powers that be, but rather upon the objective industrial economic conditions. And the objective industrial economic conditions are more favorable in Germany than in Russia. The Plekhanovs would have been right in their opposition to the Soviets if the latter would only have as their purposes and aims the realization of Socialism in Russia. The fact though is that the significance of the Soviets is not their Socialist work, but rather their revolutionary accomplishments. Here is revealed the great disagreement between Plekhanov and Lenin as far as their attitude towards the government of the Soviets is concerned. Plekhanov considered the government of the Soviets as a factor, the function of which is to *socialize* Russia; whereas Lenin considered the government of the Soviets as a factor, the function of which should be the *revolutionizing of the entire world*. And here Lenin proved himself to be a better prophet than Plekhanov. Lenin better understood the power of revolutionary agitation than Plekhanov. Although the Kaiser was still in full power when the Soviets were first organized in Russia; although Russia was at that time absolutely isolated, yet Lenin was certain that sooner or later the German Proletariat would be infected with the revolutionary ideas and that the power of the Kaiser would be undermined. He did not think of the Soviets as a national Russian institution, but rather as an international factor. For this reason, and for no other, was he willing to sign the infamous Peace Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, which the Kaiser and his Junkers forced upon the Russian people, little caring whether the Russian territory would be decreased. Lenin's idea was to acquire such a position that he might be enabled to spread the gospel of revolutionary thought. To acquire this position meant to him much more than several Russian provinces. Plekhanov looked at

the Soviets through the spectacles of a Russian citizen, a pure and simple Slav. Lenin, on the other hand, looked through the telescope of an International revolutionist.

When an automobile is to be started, the first thing necessary to be done is to turn the crank. Thanks to this movement of the crank, the gases injected by the carburetor are ignited. As a result of this, the motion of the machine is started. Lenin thought of the Soviet Government as the crank of the great machine—the All-World Revolution. The significance of the Soviets is not in the positive Socialist constructive work, but the work to undermine the might of the Junkers and bourgeoisie of the neighboring countries, such as Germany and Austria.

Documents

Bolshevist Propaganda

(Distributed among British and American Soldiers in North Russia)

THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT AND PEACE

To British and American Soldiers.

Comrades!

Now that the war with Germany is over, you no doubt, in common with your fellow-countrymen in France and at home, are demanding to be discharged from further military service, and to be allowed to return to your dear ones. Do you know that your comrades in France and at home are practically "raising hell" because demobilization is not proceeding quickly enough? Why are you not being sent home?

You are probably being told that peace cannot be restored in Europe until peace is restored in Russia, and that you are still required for that purpose. But who stands in the way of peace in Russia? Not the Soviet Government.

The Soviet Government has made repeated offers to the Allied governments to discuss peace. In November last through the medium of neutral governments it informed the Allies of its readiness and willingness to open negotiations. On the occasion of the departure of the Swedish consul from Russia the Soviet Government requested him to convey to the Allied governments its desire to discuss peace. At the last All-Russian Convention of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies, the supreme parliament of Russia, a resolution was carried instructing the Soviet Government to offer to negotiate peace with the Allies. This resolution was telegraphed far and wide. Finally a letter was sent to President Wilson personally when he arrived in Europe, to the same effect. No reply was received to any of these offers. Towards the end of December Reuter's Agency sent out a message to the effect that the peace offers of the Soviet Government had been received, but as the Allies did not recognize the Bolsheviks, no reply would be sent.

In the meantime, however, the workers and soldiers in your home countries had discovered the real reason for the Allied armed intervention in Russia. They saw through the lies and calumny spread by the capitalist press about the Bolsheviks. They know that intervention was undertaken for the purpose of overthrowing the working class government, and restoring the reign of monarchy and capitalism. There is now a tremendous agitation which is taking on a revolutionary character in your home countries against the war on Russia. Huge protest meetings of workers are held in the big cities under the motto "Hands off Russia!" Strikes have broken out in the mines and railroads, and in some places riots have taken place in which workers and police have been injured. The strongest agitation against the continuation of the war on Russia is carried on by the soldiers. Discipline in the army at home has completely gone. Soldiers are parading the streets demanding immediate demobilization. In Aldershot, the largest military camp in England, there

were huge demonstrations of soldiers shouting: "You want to send us to Russia, but we won't go!"

In order to allay the storm of popular indignation the Allied governments sent out a statement in which they expressed their deep concern and sympathy for the sad plight in which the Russian people found themselves. They expressed their keen desire to assist Russia to get out of its difficulties. They had no wish to interfere in the internal politics of Russia, they said, nor endeavor to impose any particular kind of government on the Russian people. They definitely declared that they recognized the Russian revolution, and would under no circumstances support any counter-revolutionary attempts. They invited all the political groups which had achieved or were striving to achieve governmental power in Russia to meet Allied representatives on the Prince Islands in the Sea of Marmora in order to submit their claims. They suggested in the meantime that an armistice should be arranged between the warring sections, and demanded that the Soviet Government should withdraw its troops from those territories outside of European Russia.

If this were a sincere offer of peace it would have been communicated to the Soviet Government through the usual diplomatic channels. But it was not even addressed to the Russian Government, but sent out by wireless for anybody to read who cared to take notice of it. The Allies still refuse to recognize the Soviet Government. The other political groups referred to are the counter-revolutionaries Tchaikovsky, Admiral Koltchak, and Generals Denikin and Krasnoff. In inviting them the Allies place them on the same level as the government of Russia. The Allies have been, and are still helping the Counter-Revolution. That is what you American and British soldiers are here for. In demanding an armistice with these, and the withdrawal of the Soviet troops the Allies demand that the Red Army give up the fight just when it is beating the Tsarist counter-revolutionaries hands down. It is not a peace offer, but a demand to the Bolsheviks to surrender. These conditions were attached to the invitation, as the London "Times" frankly stated, with the expectation that the Soviet Government would refuse it. The Allied governments would then be able to say to their people: "You see, we have offered peace to the Bolsheviks, but they refuse. There is nothing else for us but to go on with the war."

But it does not say much for the cuteness of the Allied governments if it imagined that the Soviet Government would walk into a trap so clumsily laid. As a matter of fact the tables have been turned. The Soviet Government in the note published below accepts almost all the conditions attached to the Allies invitation and announces its readiness to meet the Allied representatives wherever and whenever they desire. It is now the turn of the Allied governments to show whether they desire to discuss peace with the Soviet Government or not.

Soviet's Note to Allied Governments

To the Government of Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, and the United States of North America:—

The Russian Soviet Government has learned from a press telegram of an alleged invitation from the Entente powers to all the de facto governments in Russia, calling upon them to send delegates to a conference to the Prince Islands.

Having received no invitation and learning from press radios that

the absence of a reply is being interpreted as a refusal to answer the invitation, the Russian Soviet Government wishes to remove from its line of action every possibility of misrepresentation. Taking into consideration further that its acts are being systematically presented by the foreign press in a false light, the Russian Soviet Government takes this opportunity to state its attitude quite clearly and openly.

Although the situation of Soviet Russia is becoming every day more and more favorable both from a military and interior point of view, the Russian Soviet Government places such value on the conclusion of an agreement which will put an end to the hostilities that it is ready to enter immediately into negotiations to that end, and even, as it has so often before declared, to pay the price of serious sacrifices under the express condition that the future development of the Soviet Republic will not be endangered.

Considering that its enemies derive their force of resistance solely from the help given them by the Entente powers, and that these are consequently the only real adversaries with whom it has to deal, the Russian Soviet Government states herewith to the Entente powers the points on which it would consider possible such sacrifices in order to put an end to every difference with these powers.

Seeing the special importance assigned in the press, and also in the repeated declarations made by the representatives of the Entente governments to the question of the Russian state loans, the Russian government declares itself in the first place ready to make a concession on this point to the demands of the Entente governments. It does not refuse to recognize its financial obligations towards its creditors belonging to the Entente powers whereas the details of the realization of this point must become the object of special agreements as a result of the proposed negotiations.

Further, seeing the difficult financial situation of the Russian Soviet Republic and the unsatisfactory state of its credit abroad, the Russian Soviet Government proposes to guarantee the interests with raw material which will be enumerated in the suggested agreements.

Thirdly, seeing the great interest which has always been shown by foreign capital for the exploitation of Russia's natural riches, the Russian Soviet Government is disposed to grant concessions upon mines, forests, and so on, to citizens of the Entente powers, under conditions which must be carefully determined so that the economic and social order of Soviet Russia should not suffer from the internal rule of these concessions.

The fourth point upon which the Russian Soviet Government finds it possible to negotiate with the Entente powers is the question of territorial concessions. Seeing that the Russian Soviet Government is not determined to exclude at any price from these negotiations the discussion of eventual annexations of Russian territory by the Entente powers, the Russian Soviet Government adds further that in its opinion, by annexations is understood the maintenance in some regions formerly making part of the old Russian Empire with the exclusion of Poland and Finland, of armed forces of the Entente, or maintained at the expense of the Entente, or enjoying the military, technical, financial, or any other support of these same powers.

As regard the second, third, and fourth points, the extent of the concessions that can be expected from the Russian Soviet Government will depend upon its military situation towards the Entente

powers which at the present period is ameliorating itself every day. On the Northern front the Soviet troops have just re-conquered Shenkursk, on the Eastern front having temporarily lost Perm they have re-captured Ufa, Starlitamak, Belebey, Orenburg, and Uralsk, the railway communications with Central Asia being now in their hands. On the Southern front they have recently taken the important railway stations of Povorino, Alexikovo, Uriopino, Talovaya, Kalach, Boguchar, the railways of the region thus passing into their power, whilst from the Southwest the Ukrainian Soviet troops moving from Lougansk are threatening Krasnoff's rear. In the Ukraine the Soviet troops of that republic have taken Kharkof, Ekaterinoslav, Poltava, Kremenschug, Chernigoff, Ovruch, as well as numerous other less important towns. White-Russia, Lithuania, Lettland have almost completely passed into the hands of the Soviet troops of these republics together with the large towns of Minsk, Vilna, Riga, Dvinsk, Mitau, Windau and others.

The remarkable consolidation of the internal situation of Soviet Russia is shown by the negotiations with the Russian Soviet Government begun by members of the previous constituent assembly whose representatives Rakitnikoff, chairman of their Congress, Sviatitsky, Secretary, Volsky, Khmelev, Burevoy, Tchernenkoff, Antonoff, all members of the Central Committee of the Social-Revolutionary Party, arrived yesterday, February 3rd, in Moscow, these well-known social-revolutionaries having with great force pronounced themselves against Entente intervention in Russia. The amelioration of the relations between the Soviet Government and those elements of Russian society hitherto hostile is being illustrated by the change of attitude of the Mensheviks whose conference has likewise protested against Entente intervention and whose paper "Vperiod" (Forward) appears now in Moscow. The growing internal order is seen by the suppression of the district Extraordinary Commissions.

As to the false news of the foreign press concerning alleged disorders in Petrograd and elsewhere these are, from beginning to end, only fiction. Emphasizing once more that the situation of Soviet Russia will necessarily influence the extent of the sacrifices to which it will consent, the Russian Soviet Government nevertheless maintains its proposition to negotiate upon the points enumerated above.

As to the frequent complaints of the Entente press about the **Russian revolutionary international propaganda**, the Russian Soviet Government, whilst pointing out the fact that it cannot restrain the liberty of the revolutionary press, declares its readiness in case of necessity to include in a general agreement with the Entente powers the pledge to refrain from any interference in their internal affairs.

On the indicated basis the Russian Soviet Government is disposed to begin negotiations immediately whether on Princes Island or elsewhere, with the Entente powers collectively or else with some of them separately, or else with some Russian political groups, according to the desires of the Entente powers. The Russian Soviet Government asks to name without delay the place to which its representatives are to be sent, as well as the date of the meeting and the route to be followed.

People's Commissary for Foreign Affairs,

Tchitcherin.

Moscow, February 4th, 1919.

The acceptance of the Allies' invitation has by no means been prompted by the mere desire to score a diplomatic success. Nor must it be taken as a sign of weakness. As the official note of Tchitcherin points out in detail, the military position of the Red Army is immensely favorable; and all the signs are that the counter-revolutionary forces are on the verge of utter defeat. The acceptance of the invitation is prompted by the earnest desire of the Soviet Government to avoid further bloodshed, and to bring peace to Russia, so that she may have the opportunity of proceeding with the work of constructing the new Socialist order.

In accepting the invitation the Soviet Government was under no delusions as to the nature of the people they will have to meet, or the business they will have to transact. It knows perfectly well that just as it is impossible for a tiger to master his instinct, so it is impossible for capitalist governments to be guided by any other motive than that of serving the interests of the exploiting class. It knows that the Allies' ardent avowals of friendship for the Russian people, and their profuse offers of assistance are only worthy screens behind which to conceal their eagerness to lay their hands upon the undeveloped resources of Russia.

With its rough revolutionary candor, therefore, the Soviet Government completely disregards the silk and suavity, the posing and hypocrisy of traditional diplomacy, and frankly says to the Allies: "Never mind sympathy and good wishes, you may cut that out; we make you a purely business proposition, we want peace and are prepared to pay for it. You want us to repay the Tsar's loans, you want concessions on our forests, our mines, on railway construction—very well, we are prepared to consider it; **NAME YOUR PRICE.**" What can be more fair or outspoken than this? It is for the Allies to accept or refuse. So far no reply has been received, and the war goes on.

British and American Soldiers!

You can see now who stands in the way of peace. It is the capitalist governments of your countries, who compel you to undergo the horrors of war, and who keep you away from your loved ones who are yearning for your return. It is they, and not the Bolsheviks, who are bringing ruin and anarchy into Russia. It is they who maintain the civil war in Russia, for without the support which they are giving **through you**, the counter-revolutionaries would long ago have been crushed, and normal life restored in Russia. Do not permit yourselves to be deceived by the lies of your officers. Your country-men at home, soldiers as well as civilians, are violently opposed to the attempt to crush the Russian Workers' Revolution. Their protests have so far been so strong as to compel your government to pretend to desire peace. You can help to make the desire real, by refusing any longer to do the dastardly work you have been brought here to do. Why, if you refuse to fight, then peace is made, and there is no more to it! That is sense, is it not?

Your fellow-workers at home have given up their blind obedience to the capitalist and military class; they are going to dictate the policy of the governments. Are you going to lag behind? You, too, wake up, be men, and we shall soon sweep away the reign of capitalist exploitation and plunder!

The Group of English-Speaking Communists.

press their opinion freely in speech and writing, for that power of capital which enabled it to degrade the press to an agency for disseminating the capitalistic ideologies and obscuring the self-consciousness of the proletarians, the dependency of the press upon capital, has ceased. The right to publish literature of every kind belongs to the workers, and the Soviet Republic shall see to it that the ideas of Socialism shall be propagated freely throughout the country.

Sec. 9. In the Soviet Republic freedom of assemblage of the workers shall be absolutely guaranteed. All proletarians shall have the right to meet freely or organize processions. With the overthrow of the rule of the bourgeoisie all obstacles to the free right of organization of the workers are removed, and the Soviet Republic shall not only bestow upon the workers and peasants the fullest freedom of union and organization, but shall also, in order to secure the development and permanency of their freedom of organization, extend to them every material and moral support.

Sec. 10. The Soviet Republic shall do away with the cultural privilege of the bourgeoisie and extend to the workers the opportunity for the positive appropriation of culture. It shall guarantee to the working class and the peasants free instruction, offering a high degree of education.

Sec. 11. The Soviet Republic shall preserve the true freedom of conscience of the workers by complete separation of church and state and of church and school. Everyone may exercise his own religion freely.

Sec. 12. The Soviet Republic proclaims the proposition of the unification of the proletarians of all lands and, therefore, grants to every foreign proletarian the same rights that are due to the proletarians of Hungary.

Sec. 13. In the Hungarian Soviet Republic every foreign revolutionist shall possess the right of asylum.

Sec. 14. The Hungarian Soviet Republic recognizes no differences of race or nationality. It shall not permit any form of oppression of national minorities nor any abridgement of the use of their language. Everyone shall be permitted to use his mother tongue freely, and it shall be the duty of all officials to accept any document written in any language in use in Hungary, to hear everyone in his native tongue, and to deal with him in that tongue.

The Central Organization of the Soviet Government

Sec. 15. In the Soviet Republic the supreme authority shall be vested in the National Congress of the Federated Soviets.

Sec. 16. The jurisdiction of the National Congress of Soviets shall extend over all state affairs of high importance, in particular (1) the establishment and amendment of the Constitution of the Hungarian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic; (2) the establishment and modification of the boundaries of the country; (3) the declaring of war and the negotiating of peace; (4) the closing of international agreements; (5) the raising of state loans; (6) the supreme direction of external and internal policies; (7) the division of the country into districts; (8) the definition of the jurisdiction of the local councils; (9) the general direction of the economic life of the country, in its entirety as well as in its separate branches; (10) the establishment

and modification of the monetary system and the system of weights and measures; (11) the drawing up of the budget of the Soviet Republic; (12) the determination of the public burden; (13) the determination of the system of defense; (14) the regulation of the right of state citizenship; (15) state, civil, and criminal legislation; (16) the determination of the structure of the judicial system; (17) general or partial amnesty; (18) the supreme direction of cultural affairs.

All questions relating to the affairs over which the National Congress of Federated Soviets has established its authority shall be brought up in the National Congress of Soviets. During the time that the National Congress of Federated Soviets is not in session its jurisdiction shall be exercised by the Directing Federal Central Committee.

The following, however, shall come unconditionally and solely under the jurisdiction of the National Congress of Federated Soviets:

- a) the establishment and amendment of the Constitution;
- b) the declaring of war and the negotiation of peace;
- c) the determination of the boundaries of the country.

Sec. 17. The National Congress of Soviets shall be convened by the Directing Federal Central Committee at least twice in each year.

Sec. 18. The National Congress of Soviets must be convened by the Federal Central Committee upon demand of the Councils of districts and cities whose population totals at least one-third of the population of the country.

Sec. 19. The Directing Federal Central Committee, which is to be elected by the National Congress of Federated Soviets, shall consist of not more than 150 members. All nationalities living in the country shall be represented in the Central Committee in proportion to their population.

Sec. 20. The Directing Central Committee shall, during the time that the National Congress of the Councils is not in session, assume the conduct of state affairs; it shall exercise supreme legislative and executive power. During the other time it shall always participate directly in the control of state affairs. From among its members shall be chosen, besides the People's Deputies, all committees assigned to the People's Commissariats and supplementing the work of the People's Deputies.

Sec. 21. The Directing Central Committee directs the activities of the Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Councils as well as of all representative publications of the Councils. It shall care for the practical working out of the Soviet Constitution and carry out the decisions of the National Congress of Soviets.

Sec. 22. The Directing Central Committee shall report to the National Congress of Soviets concerning its operations. It shall keep the Congress informed of the general political and economic situation, as also concerning definite questions of greater importance.

Sec. 23. The Directing Central Committee shall be responsible for its actions to the National Congress of Soviets.

Sec. 24. The Directing Central Committee shall elect the Revolutionary Soviet Government and its President.

Sec. 25. The members of the Revolutionary Soviet Government are the People's Deputies. The Revolutionary Soviet Government shall appoint the People's Deputies to the heads of the various

People's Commissariats and of the main sections of the People's Council for Political Economy.

Sec. 26. It shall be the duty of the Revolutionary Soviet Government to transact the affairs of the Soviet Republic in accordance with the injunctions of the National Congress of Soviets, as well as of the Federal Central Committee.

Sec. 27. The Revolutionary Soviet Government shall have the power to issue decrees. In general it may order all that is necessary for the speedy transaction of state business.

Sec. 28. The Revolutionary Soviet Government shall inform the Directing Central Committee forthwith of its decrees, decisions, and any measures taken in important affairs.

Sec. 29. The Directing Central Committee shall examine the decrees, decisions, and measures of the Revolutionary Soviet Government, the People's Council for Political Economy, and all other People's Commissariats, and shall have power to amend them.

Sec. 30. The Soviet Government may take steps in state matters of decisive importance without previous dispensation of the Directing Central Committee only in case of extraordinary urgency.

Sec. 31. The members of the Revolutionary Soviet Government are responsible to the National Congress of Soviets and the Directing Federal Central Committee.

Sec. 32. The various People's Commissaires shall be, as follows: (1) the People's Council for Political Economy; (2) the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs; (3) for Military Affairs; (4) for the Interior; (5) for Justice; (6) for Public Welfare and Health; (7) for Education; (8) the German; (9) the Russian People's Commissariat.

Sec. 33. The various People's Deputies may, within the jurisdiction of their respective People's Commissariats, and the People's Council for Political Economy in questions coming under its jurisdiction, issue decrees and injunctions. The Revolutionary Soviet Government shall have power to amend the decrees of the People's Council for Political Economy as well as those of the various People's Commissariats.

Sec. 34. The jurisdiction of the People's Council for Political Economy shall extend over the uniform control of production and the distribution of goods, the issuing and executing of decrees affecting the national economy, and the technical and economic control of the agencies of production and distribution.

Sec. 35. The main divisions of the People's Council for Political Economy are as follows:

a) general administration of production, husbandry of raw materials, and foreign trade; b) agriculture and cattle-raising; c) technical direction of industrial production and channels of distribution; d) finance; e) public relief; f) traffic; g) economic organization and control; h) labor.

Organization of the Local Soviets

Sections 38 to 65 concern the structure of the local system of councils, the prescriptions for suffrage, the powers and the mutual relations of the councils, which hold all political power in their hands. On account of lack of space we can reproduce only a few of the most important dispositions.

The working rural population sends one member to the village council for each 100 inhabitants, the working urban population sends only one member for each 500 inhabitants to the city council. The village and city councils of a district elect the District Workers', Peasants' and Soldiers' Council, in which the delegates of the cities may not comprise more than one half. For every 1000 inhabitants there is one member. The district councils of each county (comitat) elect the county councils, one delegate being elected for each 5000 inhabitants.

Sec. 48. The function of the village, city, district, and county councils shall be to promote in every way the economic and cultural welfare of the working people living within the borders of their respective territorial units. To this end they shall decide all matters of local significance and execute all decrees referred to them by their superior councils and People's Commissariats.

Sec. 49. The previously existing machinery of local administration herewith ceases to exist. The personnel taken over by the councils with the public offices and public works shall be at the disposal of the councils. The administration and other public buildings that have heretofore served the purposes of local government shall be transferred, together with their equipment, into the hands of the councils.

Sec. 52. The councils shall constantly observe whether the ordinances of their superior administrative bodies prove satisfactory. They shall direct the attention of the latter or of the appropriate People's Commissariat to any shortcomings and may present suggestions, if in their opinion any measure of the higher administration or of any other body seems necessary.

Sec. 53. The councils shall receive all the public works and institutions serving the dietary, hygienic, economic, cultural and similar needs of the population, may create new ones and recommend the establishment of others to their superior councils.

Sec. 54. The villages, cities, districts and counties shall conduct their financial affairs independently, within the limits ordained by the People's Council for Political Economy.

Sec. 55. The councils shall have power to choose and discharge officials and other trained workers, including the transferred personnel of the former administration. Any trust conferred upon an officer of the Hungarian Soviet Republic may be revoked at any time.

Sec. 58. In counties, cities and districts special committees of experts (sub-committees) shall be regularly formed for the following affairs: (1) economic, financial and industrial; (2) roads and public traffic; (3) public welfare and health; (4) housing; (5) public relief; (6) cultural affairs.

Sec. 62. The councils shall see to it that disputing parties receive prompt and accurate advices in regard to their cases without any formalities and in their mother-tongue; that appropriate agencies exist for receiving oral complaints and requests; that, after the hearing of the interested parties and after a complete disposition of the case—based, wherever possible, upon direct observation of the circumstances—the requests be discharged within the shortest time possible, without awaiting solicitation, and the parties be notified thereof in appropriate form.

Suffrage

Sec. 66. In the Hungarian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic

only the working people shall have the right to vote. All those are voters and eligible for election to membership in the councils, regardless of sex, who have passed their eighteenth year and as workers or employees, etc., live by work that is useful to society, or occupy themselves with household labor which makes possible the labor of the abovementioned workers or employees, etc. Further, soldiers of the Red Army are voters and eligible for election, as well as those workers and soldiers who have formerly lived by useful labor, but have entirely or partially lost their capacity for labor.

Sec. 67. Citizens of other states shall also be voters and eligible for election, provided, they fulfill the conditions contained in preceding sections.

Sec. 68. The following may not vote and are not eligible for election: a) all those who employ wage-workers for the purpose of obtaining profit; b) those who live off unearned income; c) merchants; d) clergymen and members of religious orders; e) those mentally deranged and those living under guardianship; f) those whose political rights have been suspended because of a crime committed from base motives, for the period of time stipulated in the conviction.

The Budget Privilege

Sec. 78. The Hungarian Soviet Government shall be guided in its financial policy exclusively from the point of view of the satisfaction of the needs of its workers. It shall show no consideration for unearned income.

Sec. 79. The branches of the Soviet Republic may collect receipts and defray expenditures only within the limits of an approved budget.

Sec. 80. The estimate of costs for the village, district, city and county shall be determined by the appropriate local council upon the suggestion of the directing committee, the estimate of costs for the Soviet Republic by the National Congress of Soviets upon the suggestion of the Revolutionary Soviet Government or of the Directing Central Committee.

The Rights of Nationalities in the Hungarian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic

Sec. 84. All nationalities living in the Hungarian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic may use their language freely and foster and promote their own culture. To this end any national group, even if it does not live in a continuous territory, may create a federal council for the promotion of its culture.

Sec. 85. As a result of the Soviet system the local administration will be conducted by the workers of those nationalities whose workers form the majority in their respective local unit. This sort of local administration will naturally find expression in the matter of language. The national minorities may, nevertheless, use their own speech in dealing with the agents of the Soviets. This system cannot disturb the Soviet organization based upon territorial principles.

Sec. 86. Wherever the workers of any particular nationality in a continuous territory extending over several districts find themselves in the majority, independent counties shall be created.

Where any particular national group in a continuous territory extending over several counties finds itself in the majority, the districts may unite into one national county.

The counties united in this manner are, through the national county, parts of the Hungarian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic.

Sec. 87. The Hungarian continuous counties with German majority or Russian majority are herewith recognized under the Constitution of the Federated Soviet Republic as German and Russian national counties. In matters affecting the universal interests of the Soviet Republic the decisions of the Federated Soviet Republic extend to the national counties.

Sec. 88. The Hungarian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic shall interpose no obstacle if the national groups of the increasingly independent territories, empowered by their population and their economic strength, decide to form a separate Soviet Republic allied with the Hungarian Soviet Republic.

Sec. 89. The provisions of the Constitution relating to the rights of nationalities may be amended only with the consent of the Federal Council of the workers of the participating national groups.

The Last Appeal of the Hungarian Soviet Government to the Working Class of Hungary

TO THE WORKING PEOPLE OF HUNGARY!

Comrades! Proletarians!

The *international* and the *Hungarian* counter-revolution are swooping down with grim fury upon the Hungarian Soviet Republic, the state of the poor and the workers, the destroyer of the dominion of capital, the constructor of Socialism.

The police force of the *international* counter-revolution of the capitalists, the *Entente*, has set its armed hordes upon us. The misled and terrorized mass of proletarians which has been welded to the slave-chains of the Roumanian boyars or forced to groan under the yoke of the Checho-Slovakian capitalists is stirring against us in order to drive the proletariat of Hungary back into that pool of misery, of bondage, and exploitation which the Dictatorship of the Proletariat has dried up. On command of French, English, and American *capitalists* and Chech and Roumanian *nationalists*, Checho-Slovakian, French, colored peasants and workers are attempting to force the liberated Hungarian proletariat once more under the yoke of the capitalists and oppressors. The attack which they are directing against the rule of the Hungarian proletariat PURPOSES TO RE-ESTABLISH THE PRIVATE OWNERSHIP OF THE MEANS OF PRODUCTION.

They want to return the *banks* and hence the complete dominion over the economic life of the country to the *money-kings*.

They want to return to the *stockholders* their dividends and their unearned income and to turn the hard labor of the miner and the industry of the factory worker once more into a source of prosperity and ease for the idlers.

They want to give back all the means of production, the factory, the machine, the raw material, the transportation facilities to the *exploiters* and once more set upon the workers' necks the boss, the *director*, the slave-driver.

They want to force the workers to pay the interest on the *war loans* and surrender a tithe out of the return from their labor to the *drones*, the various rent-profiteers.

They want to reinstate the *landlords* whom the country people have driven out and to thrust the poor peasants, the small landholder, the squatter, the agricultural workers back into the condition of serfdom.

They want to put the confiscated money and jewels back into the hands of the *rich* so that they may be able to continue their luxurious, indolent, frivolous life which is a bane to society.

The *house-rent usurers* and the *usurious dealers* who without any necessity or cause have raised the price of every commodity—these they want to let loose once more upon the proletarian consumer, so that the value of his money may decrease still more. They want to reduce *wages* and increase the *hours of labor*, in short, **WHATEVER THE REVOLUTION HAS BUILT UP IN THE WAY OF SOCIALIST INSTITUTIONS** they want to tear down and distort.

The international counter-revolution aims to force upon us once more with armed might the *dominion of private property*, the strength of the capitalists, and it aims to drown in the blood of the workers that mighty work of the *Dictatorship of the Proletariat*, a work which has carried us amid a thousand dangers and sufferings but with giant strides toward the world of *Socialism*.

Under the protection of the international capitalistic counter-revolution preparations are being made to organize **THE HUNGARIAN COUNTER-REVOLUTION**.

Under the protection of the Roumanian and Checho-Slovakian army of occupation the great Hungarian patriots have gathered to lay waste the Hungarian land with the force of arms. In Arad the landlords, the capitalists, and their beholden retinue of bourgeois politicians have established an opposing government. Like the *Russian leaders* of 1849, so to-day the representatives of the ruling classes are clearing the way for the present hostile invasion. They are trying to organize **A WHITE GUARD FOR THE WHITE GOVERNMENT**. The justices of the peace, the notaries, the little autocrats of the comitats, the former congressional representatives of privilege, the grafters, who have been deprived of their business, the bankrupt adventurers, all the derelicts of the worn-out and overthrown political parties, finding support in the Roumanian and French arms, are preparing to revive the *class government of tyranny and oppression*, they are organizing to *wrest the political power from the poor workers and peasants* and to entrust it again to those mercenary oppressors and politicians, to those classes whom only the storm of two revolutions was able to shake out of their political seats of power.

The Dictatorship of the Proletariat as a *transition stage* of the state to Socialism—that is the watchword of the Hungarian Soviet Republic.

The Dictatorship of the oppressors and exploiters as a *permanent form of government*—that is the emblem of the counter-revolution.

In the factories, in the fields, in the offices all power to belong to the *workers, the producers*—that is the significance of our red banner.

All authority vested in the *landlord, the manufacturer, the banker, the bishop*—that is the motto which sullies the white flag of our opponents.

The preparing and establishing of Socialism—that is the purpose and the reason for existence of the Soviet Republic.

The vain attempt to revive Capitalism—that is the economic program of the counter-revolution.

Hence it is not a *war*, whose furies are now being loosed upon us, even though it is being conducted by the force of arms, but an **ARMED CLASS STRUGGLE** which Hungarian and International Capitalism is

carrying on against the proletariat of Hungary, the *advance guard of the World Revolution*. This conflict is the struggle for the existence and development of the working class, a life and death struggle which will mean the realization or the overthrow of Socialism, and every proletarian is a *traitor* to himself, a *traitor* to his class, a *traitor* to the sacred cause of the Social World Revolution, a *traitor* to the world-redeeming idea of Socialism, who does not now with all his readiness to sacrifice, with all his energy, with all his courage, his life and limb, his work, his manhood stand by the endangered Revolution, the besieged Dictatorship of the Proletariat, the hard-pressed Cause of Socialism!

The organized workers of Budapest are at this moment at the front holding over the dominion of the proletariat a shield made of their own living bodies. The pick of the workers have taken up arms in order, even at the cost of their lives, to defend the *great idea of the rule of the workers*, to protect the **CAUSE OF THE SOCIAL WORLD REVOLUTION** from any reverse.

We believe that the great energies of Socialism poured forth in an inexhaustible stream will render this *Red Army, which is fighting the class-struggle of the workers against the hordes of the exploiters and oppressors*, invincible. But this struggle necessitates the work, the sacrifices of the *workers and poor peasantry* of the whole country! We, therefore, call all proletarians, the workers of city and village, all the adherents of *outraged Poverty demanding power*, to arms. We call upon the proletariat of the occupied districts to *prevent* with all lawful and unlawful means, with all methods of open and underground warfare the *organization of the White Counter-revolution* and to fight with every weapon of individual and mass action against all counter-revolutionary classes, groups, and individuals! We call upon every proletarian of the occupied districts to **OBSTRUCT BY MEANS OF SABOTAGE THE WAR WHICH THE INTERNATIONAL AND HUNGARIAN CAPITALISTS** are waging against the Hungarian Revolutionary Soviet Republic, against the rule of the toiling masses of the poor.

But let the capitalists and the counter-revolutionists heed the following:

The Cause of the Proletariat, of the Social Revolution cannot fall, in fact it is obviously making strides the world over. And the forces of the proletariat will advance to the points where at this moment the counter-revolutionists are hiding under cover of the arms of the imperialistic conquerors, and then *our settlement* with those who introduced armed civil war against the rule of the proletariat *will be merciless and unsparing!* But until we are able to extend the power of the proletariat to those districts which have been wrested from us, we owe it to our proletarian brothers fighting at the front, to our own principles, and the obligation which we have assumed toward the World Revolution, to work with all our might to *destroy root and branch the economic system of Capitalism and the State based upon oppression and force*, and **OUT OF THE CONSTRUCTIVE FORCES OF SOCIALISM** to rebuild and perfect it as much as possible in the triumphant, indomitable spirit of the *Dictatorship of the Proletariat!*

Long live the International Socialist World Revolution!

Long live the Dictatorship of the Proletariat!

Long live the Hungarian Soviet Republic!

With fraternal greetings,

**THE REVOLUTIONARY SOVIET GOVERNMENT,
THE HUNGARIAN SOCIALIST PARTY.**

EDITORIALS

Beginning with this number, *The Class Struggle* will appear as a monthly magazine.

The price per copy will be, as heretofore, 25 cents; annual subscriptions, \$3.00.

The next issue will appear at the end of September and will contain a critical review and all interesting data of the Socialist and Communist Conventions to be held during the last days of August and the first days of September in Chicago.

The Socialist Publication Society, the publishers of *The Class Struggle*, at its last meeting, endorsed the Program and Manifesto of the Left Wing of the Socialist Party of Greater New York, as well as the Declaration of Principles adopted by the National Left Wing Conference held in New York, and pledged its heartiest support to its organization and propaganda work.

The Lusk Fishing Expedition

We should, of course, take this opportunity to register an indignant protest against the appointment and the activity of the notorious Lusk Committee. But, try as we may, we can feel nothing more serious than a sensation of mild amusement, coupled perhaps with honest amazement at the stupidity and blindness of the gentlemen into whose hands the ruling class of our state has laid the important task of demolishing Bolshevism.

Ostensibly the Lusk Committee was created for the purpose of investigating the radical labor movement, here and abroad; as a matter of fact there remains nothing to investigate. The capitalist class, and those who look at the world through its ready-to-wear eye-glasses, has long since come to the conclusion that Bolshevism is the common name applicable to all that is vile, dastardly and horrible in human nature. They know that right here, in our little old United States, dangerous elements are bloodthirstily craving to wrest the power of the nation out of the hands of its super-perfect, sublimely idealistic, intensely democratic rulers for the purpose of killing, murdering and butchering every man, woman and child that has no red card in his pocket.

They know that the Russian Soviet Government is spending millions in this country, for propaganda, and for the manufacture of guns, bombs and other implements of destruction which have hitherto been regarded as the sole and exclusive property of the ruling class. They know that the Rand School is a hotbed of sedition; that revolt, anarchy and murder are the chief subjects on the curriculum. They know that the Socialist movement has already organized a Red Army that is only waiting for the signal to overwhelm the City of New York as a basis of operation against the rest of the nation. They know that the bombs that caused such tremendous excitement during the first week of May were sent by Bolshevik agitators. They know that the Negro riots in Chicago and Washington broke out because Bolshevik propagandists had been putting ridiculous notions into the heads of the Negro population, telling them that they were human beings, with human rights, under the Constitution of the United States. Haven't they discovered that Bolshevik agitators are responsible for the increase in prostitution and venereal diseases, that they are actually fostering sexual promiscuity in order to lower the morale of the American people?

Obviously, it is quite superfluous to summon representatives of the suspect organizations before the august committee, to wring from them a confession of their wrong-doings. Particularly since the purpose of the whole investigation is simply to create public opinion in favor of new repressive legislation. The espionage laws that served their purpose during the war are no longer available. It has been found practically impossible to secure convictions against Socialist and radical speakers and writers since talesmen have become more interested in the high cost of living than in the establishment of democracy in Europe. New laws curtailing the freedom of speech of the dissatisfied, gagging the radical press, proscribing workingmen who speak in favor of strikes and all others who dare to disturb the peaceful harmony that has settled down upon this great land of ours by disaffection and strife must be placed upon the statute books. Laws so rigorous that even the easy-going American will protest unless he is effectually scared into submission by the fear of the terrible Bolshevik.

What matters it that the raids upon centers of radical thought failed to produce material of an incriminating nature? The headline readers are convinced that they are the meeting places of desperate characters, and clamor for their extermination. What if the raid on the Soviet Bureau failed to prove that Russian money was financing revolutionary propaganda in the United States? What if the identity of the May 1st bomb plotters, in

spite of all the big talk of our secret service agents, remains a dark and horrible mystery? Doesn't it merely prove how dangerous these fellows have become?

So experts on radicalism like Hugh Frayne and Jim Holland were called upon the stand to cast slurs upon the fair record of the harmless ladies of the Woman's Trade Union League and to besmirch the spotless patriotic record of ex-Comrade Rose Schneiderman. The other witnesses were of a similar caliber. All reports on brutalities and barbarism in Russia where given from hearsay. The testimony of men who have just arrived from Siberia and Russia was pointedly ignored if they were suspected of sympathy for the Soviets. In short, the Lusk Committee has done its work thoroughly and well, with a brazenness and a bold disregard of even the outward semblance of decency that promises much for the things that are yet to come. L.

The Railroad Situation

Never before in the history of the labor movement of the United States has a strike caused such great confusion in governmental circles as the present impending Railroad strike.

President Wilson, his Cabinet, the Congress of the United States—all are seeking ways and means whereby to appease the anger of the Railroad workers, in order that a stand-still in transportation may be averted.

The complaint that life is becoming more and more unbearable—that the most essential necessities of life are rapidly reaching the class known as luxuries which a workingman or any man in ordinary circumstances cannot even hope to acquire; that the wages and salaries only afford a miserable existence at the very best—this complaint has been made a long time by people in various parts of this country and in various industries.

But the "Masters of Power" have eyes that see not and ears that hear not. So, of course, they have been ignorant of the ever increasing discontent—a discontent that is prevalent from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from Canada to Mexico. Until now if any economical trouble occurred they always blamed those scoundrels, the "Bolsheviki," the vipers who spread the germs of revolution among the innocent, obedient, hard-working people.

People who are, sociologically speaking, short-sighted, who

neither see nor understand the needs of the masses, and who can neither read nor understand the language of the time—accept an excuse as that given above at its face value.

If a strike occurred, a raid on the Bolsheviki ensued, until quiet was restored and life was once more covered with the blanket of "law and order."

But the situation at present is entirely different. The complaint is now made by rather loyal people. The discontent is now made known and felt by people concerning whom there is not the slightest suspicion that they are "Red Card Men." And it is now that the "Masters of Power" have at last begun to fear the consequences.

The Powers that Be would, of course, try to apply the same methods to the Railroad industry as they do to the other branches of industry, if it were possible. But it is neither practical nor possible to do so. The Railroad industry is the most important industry. It is the very heart of the economic life of the country. And when anything affects the heart then playing the game of the deaf and blind man is not advisable—remedies must be sought so that the disease may be stopped from spreading and the heart cured.

The textile industry, the cloak-making industry, the building industry, etc., are only individual organs in our economic life. A strike in any or in all of the above mentioned industries affects only one particular part of our industrial organism. Such a strike is in truth not very pleasant but it is not of a dangerous character. The industry of transportation is the *heart* of our economic life. Just as the heart circulates the blood in a higher developed animal just so does the transportation system circulate the finished products. A stand-still in the transportation system means more than a stand-still in the iron or wood industries. A stand-still in the transportation system means that *all the wheels stop*. The entire economic life of the country receives a death blow. A chaos with unforeseen consequences is the result. It is, therefore, natural that the warning of the President of the Railroad workers has had the effect of compelling those in control to seek methods whereby to quiet down the discontent and extinguish the sparks of protest.

But a Railroad strike of this character is unlike any other strike *in that it contains the germs of a revolution*

* * *

The Socialists and labor leaders ought to learn a great lesson from the confusion in governmental circles caused by the

threatening Railroad strike. The fact that the Powers that Be are so frightened by such a strike leads us to conclude that a strong and aggressive organization of the transportation workers is, as far as the class-struggle is concerned, a far more important factor than an organization of any other industry. In ordinary times one regiment in an army is just as important as any other. But when war is declared and the soldiers are led to the battlefield the General in command usually picks the best regiments, for then there are good regiments and better ones. The same holds true for the class-struggle.

Of course, a carpenter, a cloak-maker, an iron-worker, a surface-car conductor must be organized if they are to make an honest living. But for the class-struggle in the broad sense of the word it is much more important that the Railroad workers shall be organized than it is that the textile workers be organized, for example.

In order to realize important demands a Railroad strike is far more effective than a strike in an individual industry which may be localized.

And we know as a matter of fact that in the countries where the workers have obtained control in the last few years it was due to the fact that the transportation workers were organized and under the control of the radical parties. Every Revolution is begun by a strike on the Railroads, which takes away from the central government the power to send forces to subdue the masses and suppress the voices of protest.

* * *

It is also characteristic that the Railroad workers are not contented with the fact that their wages will be raised. They demand that the exorbitant prices of commodities be immediately reduced. It is the first time in the history of the trade-union movement in America that the workers of one industry make such a *general* demand.

The Railroad workers, it seems, have at last begun to realize that higher wages alone does not better the condition of the worker, especially here in America.

The trusts control not only the production—the factories, the shops, the coal-mines, etc.—but they also control consumption. We not only have a steel trust, an oil trust, a railroad trust, but also a meat trust, a milk trust, a fish trust, etc. The trusts are all combined and chained into a sort of combination which I would call the trust of trusts.

If the workers are successful in a strike and have gained an increase in wages the trust immediately gets on the job and

balances up its loss. It raises the price on commodities. The cost of living goes up. The result is that what the worker gained in the factory he loses in the store.

The trusts control both fronts, production and consumption. If they lose on one front they counterattack and beat the workers on the other front.

It is for this reason that the Railroad workers should be congratulated. Their double demand—to raise the wages *and* decrease the cost of living—should be heartily welcomed. It is the first time that those in control were attacked on both fronts simultaneously. Thus from an economic demand a great political issue has arisen.

S. D.

The Negro Problem—A Labor Problem

For the moment the race riots that raged in Washington and in Chicago are quelled. But they will break out again, there and in the cities where colored people have congregated in great numbers. For decades the states of the North have looked passively on while the conflict raged in the South between Black and White, with the quiet superiority of the onlooker who refuses to interfere in affairs that are none of his business.

But the last two years have radically changed the situation. The acute labor shortage brought about by the artificial stimulation of American industries during the war and the withdrawal of hundreds of thousands of young men from the labor market led to the mass importation of Negro labor from the South. And with the Negro the North has imported his problems; without attempting, however, to find a solution for the difficulties that were sure to arise.

Among the first of these was the housing problem. Even under more favorable circumstances it has always been difficult for a Negro family to find quarters in the large cities of the North. To allow a family of colored people to live in a house in a respectable neighborhood in decent houses, among decent surroundings meant an immediate exodus of the Whites living in that vicinity. Real estate values consequently decreased and houses were bought for a song by profiteering speculators, to be rented out, at enormous rentals, to the colored population. Indeed, this method has been used on more than one occasion in real estate controversies, one party to the difficulty renting out his property to Negro ten-

ants and then causing a depreciation of the value of the property of his neighbor litigant.

This chronic shortage became acute with the importation of thousands of Negroes into the larger cities of the North. Colored families paid fantastic prices for dwelling places and thus secured a foothold in neighborhoods that were closed to them before, to the consequent irritation of their white neighbors. Passive prejudice against the Negro became active resentment.

That the health and morals of the colored population must suffer under such adverse conditions is obvious. They raised the money necessary to pay the high rentals by overcrowding their cramped quarters. Immorality and disease flourish under such conditions. The "Survey" reports that in Cincinnati the death rate of the colored population is double that of the Whites, that pneumonia among the colored people is three times as deadly as among their white neighbors, that their syphilis rate is five times as high. That in proportion to the population, three times as many colored children die before birth, that three times as many colored babies, born alive, die before their first birthday; that the excess in colored deaths from preventable causes alone is so great that it accounts for more than one point in the general death rate of the city. Conditions in other large cities are very similar. Nor is this due to racial weakness on the part of the colored population, for the physical examination of the male population during the draft revealed the surprising fact that the white men of the South show a far greater percentage of physically unfit than the colored population.

The returning soldiers and the subsidence of inflated war industries to their normal level have produced a situation that is little short of a calamity. The white man finds the job that used to support him in the hands of Negroes who are willing to underbid him in the labor market in order to maintain an existence. Labor unions which excluded Negroes from membership find their existence threatened by the influx of colored labor into their industries. Everywhere the colored man has become the dangerous competitor of the white. It is this fact, above all, that lies at the root of the race trouble that is brewing everywhere.

Popular discontent will remain, and will continue to culminate in horrible excesses such as occurred in Washington and Chicago, and in East St. Louis a year ago, so long as State and National authorities maintain the passive attitude

of "neutrality" they have hitherto affected. Punishment of the offenders on both sides will do little good—and, indeed, we doubt whether there exists the slightest intention of calling to account those white hoodlums who precipitated the trouble. The remedy must be more fundamental, more far-reaching in its effects.

So long as the colored children of the South are allowed to grow up with practically no schooling, because state and county appropriations for education are barely sufficient to give a rudimentary education to the children of the Whites; so long as the Negro of the South can receive a high school and college education only in schools and universities maintained by colored people themselves; so long as in many sections of the South Negro communities must maintain their own public schools and yet pay school taxes for the upkeep of white schools in their districts; so long as no attempt is made to develop and improve the moral tone of the Negro boy or girl after school hours, to maintain institutions of correction for the wayward boy or girl, for the incipient thief or rapist outside the county jail or state prison—so long will the moral and mental standard of the Negro be beneath that of the White. The authorities of the North must meet this problem with a vigorous and efficient program of education and public hygiene.

But the most important factor in the permanent cessation of these race riots is the white workingman himself. So long as he insists upon Negro segregation, so long as he closes the doors of his industrial organization to the colored man, he will have in him a dangerous competitor on the industrial field. No protest, however emphatic, can drive him from the labor market, for, to the capitalist entrepreneur, Negro labor is cheap labor. Race feeling will persist until economic competition between the white and the black man will have ceased. But first the white man must understand that there is but one alternative—either competition to the utmost or a common fight of all workers, without regard to color, race or creed, against the common enemy, the capitalist class.

Socialist Germany and the Peace

The German Social-Democracy as a unified group no longer exists. It is divided into three parties, each of which has its own distinct character, its own ideology, its own policy in every question (although all three declare their aim to be

the same thing—the realization of Socialism). This appeared also in the peace question. The peace question afforded a new, a classic example, illustrating the divergent fundamental character of the three parties, and at the same time another touchstone to test their socialistic insight, their adherence to principle, and their vitality.

Here the Majority Socialists proved themselves as ever the faithful lackeys and representatives of the bourgeoisie. The "flaming protest" against the Entente's peace of violence which they trumpeted forth into the world in a thousand speeches and gatherings, it was the protest of the German bourgeoisie, which, enraged at the impending loss of its imperialistic strongholds, was trying once more to rouse the nationalistic passions of the people, to force concessions from the Entente by means of threats. How completely the protest of the Majority Party was saturated with this imperialistic spirit is best proved by the reservations with which they, concurring with the Centrum, were prepared to sign, when their stage-shouting subsided before the inexorability of the conquerors: the Kaiser not to be surrendered, the guilt of Germany not to be recognized, the claim to the colonies not to be given up. As though it were not the first duty of a Socialist government to brand those who were guilty in its own country and bring them to justice and to solemnly abjure forever every imperialistic policy, particularly the policy of the exploitation and domination of colonies.

Of course, there was no lack of attempts on the part of the Scheidemanns to represent their policy as truly socialistic. "The fight against this peace treaty is a part of our class struggle," cried the "Vorwärts" pathetically, only a few days before the decisive turn of affairs. Meaning the class struggle which they have been carrying on since the beginning of the war, with the concurrence and for the advantage of their own bourgeoisie, against foreign capitalism. And even this "part of their class struggle" they were prepared to forego when there remained for them only the alternative of signing or retiring from the government, thereby proving without a doubt that the only foundation of their policy was—clinging to the ministerial chairs, that is, boundless opportunism and complete lack of principle. Hence their hypocritical appeal to the International could naturally carry no weight whatever.

Quite different is the case of the Independents. They were from the first most decidedly in favor of signing the treaty. They showed the people that a refusal would mean more unnecessary bloodshed, a still greater tightening of the

oppressive conditions, still more hunger, misery, and bondage. On the other hand, they tried to make the peace conditions in their present form seem "not so unbearable" and anticipated their future revision through the "growing international solidarity of the proletariat" which alone could create a just peace. But while their recommendation to sign was correct from a Socialist point of view, still their stand was rather a humanitarian than a political one, or better, it was rather of a pacifistic than of a socialistic nature. They pointed out the harmfulness and uselessness of a renewal of the war, for the "people," instead of showing that a new campaign, even under the present circumstances, could be fought only in the interests of the bourgeoisie and could not serve the cause of the proletariat of Germany or any other country. They were so unmindful of the necessity of maintaining the class point of view (the fundamental opposition to the present state and the present government) that through their slogan "We must sign," set in scare-type at the head of their organ, "Freiheit," they created the just suspicion that they wished to assume the reins of government themselves in order to sign the treaty.

It was also in accord with the pacifistic character of the party that they made their whole policy center about the question of "acceptance or rejection," wishing to stamp it as the most important issue of the moment. "There must be no delay," wrote the "Freiheit" at the time of the crisis, "if peace is to be signed and Germany to be saved!" Peace was signed, Germany was saved, but what has been gained by it for the German and the international proletariat? The Independents today find themselves once more in the same embarrassing and at the same time ridiculous position as last fall; they are in a position to declare triumphantly that all the government parties have been converted to "their program." At that time it was "disarmament and the League of Nations, all of Wilson with his fourteen old and five new points which the German Government had swallowed whole," this time it is the actual, imperialistic peace of violence which it has been forced to accept. Neither of these things came about through the pressure of the Independents but under the threat of foreign arms, and neither the conversion to the Wilson program nor the acceptance of the peace of violence are the expression of a real proletarian policy.

The task of a really socialistic party would have been different. It must resist any attempt to drive the masses into the war anew but at the same time point out that the fight for peace in the present bankrupt Germany could no longer be a

revolutionary conflict of fundamental significance. For neither signing nor refusing to sign could lead the German and the international proletariat out of the desperate situation into which the ruling classes have forced it through the World War. It must prove that the ruling classes are altogether unqualified to really end the war, that is, to again create normal, stable conditions, that only the seizure of political power by the proletariat, the overthrow of the present rulers, and a complete revolutionizing of the entire political and economic system can bring about a real peace between the peoples. Only under these conditions will the hazy words of the Independents about the "growing international solidarity of the proletariat" gain any significance. It is the growth of the World Revolution upon which the German proletariat must set all its hopes and which it must bring about and hasten through its own revolutionary struggle.

The Communist Party of Germany has, to the extent that the state of siege has not stifled its voice, spoken and acted in this sense. Thus one of the few of its newspapers that have not yet been suppressed, the Chemnitz "Kämpfer," wrote at the time of the crisis: "The German workers take no interest in the business at Weimar; they know that the great problems of the time cannot be solved by mere phrases; they know that Versailles will not mean peace, even after the German Government has signed; they stand apart, coldly and indifferently observing this miserable haggling. With calm eye and determined will they await the moment of the other decision which is now preparing, and they will answer the empty phrase "accept or reject" with a threatening "No!" to the world. A "No!" which is not intended to prevent a peace but to hasten the historical derailment and to bring about more quickly the great catastrophe of German capitalism which is now inevitable."

The First Victim of the League of Nations

Now that the League of Nations has withstood its first task so well, international capital will be even more insistent in demanding its speedy realization. For no other power on earth could have accomplished the fall of Soviet Hungary so easily as the united perfidy of the "democratic nations"; the restoration of the Habsburg monarchy could never have been so readily carried out as was possible with the willing assistance of Roumania as "enfant terrible." No wonder Mr.

Francis, the American ambassador to Russia, who has returned to the U. S. for an extended vacation, whose inefficiency Mr. William Hart so delightfully describes in his Robins interview series in the "Metropolitan Magazine," is so emphatic in his opinion that Soviet Russia can be crushed only by a League of Nations. For this reason, he is busily engaged in creating public opinion, by speeches before Manufacturers' Associations, Chambers of Commerce and similar bodies in favor of immediate ratification of the Covenant by the Senate.

As abruptly as Hungary became a Soviet Republic, it has returned to the ranks of capitalist nations—or rather, has been driven back. We have said before that the leading components of the League of Nations constituted this driving force. The Soviet Government of Hungary again and again declared its readiness to enter upon peace negotiations. Again and again it acceded to exorbitant territorial demands upon which the Entente had decided. And in spite of an "accidental" invitation to Bela Kun, the final answer was an uncompromising No. Under no circumstances would the Supreme Council make peace with Soviet Hungary. The gentlemen in Paris, instead of carrying out their promised program of self-determination for the small nations, sent the Chechian forces into Hungary. They were sent back with bloody noses. The Roumanian army met with the same success. Whereupon propaganda, so perfidious when used by Bolsheviks for their purposes, was tried and proved a failure. Finally desperate measures were employed. Munitions and money were sent to Roumania, and a second attack upon Hungary prepared. Cut off by blockade on all sides, without food, surrounded by threatening nationalist counter-revolutionary governments, hungry for Hungarian territory, the unfortunate Soviet government had to choose between two alternatives, either to die fighting or to resign. To resist the armed forces of the Roumanians was a hopeless undertaking. The Roumanian offensive had cut them off any possibility of Russian help, and the other Socialist and revolutionary groups in Europe were neither strong enough nor determined enough to come to its assistance.

Perhaps it would have been wiser to die fighting. If Bela Kun, who showed himself in the four months of his administration as a man of rare courage and determination, finally submitted to the force of circumstances, it was surely for good and sufficient reasons. And the chief reason was the lack of unity in the Hungarian proletarian government. To

judge from the reports at hand the Socialist coalition in Hungary proved at every turn to be a hindrance to the success of the Soviets. The opportunistic elements of the old social democratic party remained opportunistic even in the communist government. They who were persuaded to join their forces with the Communists whom they had persecuted and jailed, only by the pressure of a revolutionary uprising, were still opposed to all radical measures. They still retained their old "democratic" ideals and with their hesitation robbed the Hungarian Soviet government of that elan, of that wonderful force that characterize the Russian government. After the experience of our Hungarian comrades we are more than ever convinced that the stupid opposition of the anti-bolshevist Socialist elements of Russia was the savior of the Russian Revolution, for there, too, a Socialist coalition government would have meant its dilution—and consequently its speedy, and catastrophic overthrow.

This explains the readiness of the opportunistic elements of the Hungarian Soviet Government to immediately proceed with the formation of a socialistic government and that the actual majority of the Peidl Ministry—and Peidl himself—were formerly members of the Soviet Administration. Of course, the faith of this Socialist government in the honorable intentions of the Allied rulers was shortly disillusioned. While an American officer was conducting negotiations in Vienna with the Peidl men, promising the assistance of the Allies in the establishment of a stable socialistic government in Hungary, France and Italy were already conniving with Roumania for its overthrow and the accession of a Habsburg Archduke.

In spite of countless political difficulties within the nation and in its foreign relations, in spite of the obstructionist politics of the opportunistic elements in the government, the Soviet dictatorship, in the four months of its existence established a splendid record of achievements. The September issue of "The Class Struggle" will deal in detail with its activities.

L.

The National Convention

When the holding of a national convention was first proposed, the project was received with obvious hesitation by the party authorities, coming as it did from that element of the movement which felt the need of a reorientation in party

tactics and methods with which to meet a new world. In every country of Europe the Socialist movement had been split asunder, everywhere Left Wing Communists and Right Wing opportunists had become bitter antagonists. In Italy and in Norway alone it has been possible to save the unity of the party because these parties as a whole adopted the program and methods of the Communist movement.

At that time it still seemed possible to follow the example of our Italian and Norwegian comrades in this country. The party-membership was undoubtedly in sympathy with the revolutionary movement in Europe. The enthusiastic support they gave to the Bolshevik movement in Russia, to the Spartacists in Germany and to Hungarian Communists seemed to prove that the rank and file was ready to support a radical departure from the methods that have hitherto prevailed in the American Socialist Party. Sentiment in the West was and is undoubtedly with the Communists, and in the East, too, whole States and strong local organizations are strongly in favor of new methods.

Under the circumstances the so-called "Left Wingers" were perfectly justified in organizing their forces for a campaign of intensive agitation within the party. That the party-membership was divided on the question of methods of propaganda and tactics was apparent. But the division was so obviously in favor of the Left that the only possibility of safeguarding the unity of the movement lay in the adoption of a Communist program of action, emphasizing the allegiance of the American party not only to the revolutionary groups in Europe, but to the principle of the dictatorship of the proletariat upon which these groups are fundamentally organized.

Apparently the National Executive Committee entertained the same conviction. Why, otherwise, should it expell the state organizations of Massachusetts, Ohio, Michigan and Pennsylvania for Left Wing sympathies? Why, otherwise, should it suspend entire language federations for the same reason? Why should the State Executive Committee of New York, with the same disregard of constitutional forms, suspend most of the largest locals of the State and proceed with their reorganization long before a referendum of the party membership was finally taken? Why, otherwise, was the referendum on the expulsion of these locals postponed until even their possible readmission by the handful of members that remained in the State was no longer dangerous to the convention? Why, otherwise, should the National Executive Committee allow to the reorganized locals, with but a small

fraction of the original membership, the right to elect the full quota of delegates allowed to these locals before their reorganization? (In Kings County the reorganized local branches, of about 500 members, will send a delegation of 6 to the national convention, a delegation that requires a membership of 3000). Surely our party leaders would not have used practices of such extremely questionable character had they felt confident of their power to control the convention.

Under these circumstances the outcome of the convention can hardly be doubtful. Packed as it will be by representatives from "reorganized" states and locals who will be little more than the mouthpieces of the powers that be in the Socialist party, we doubt whether even the strong revolutionary element that will come from the West and from some states in the East, will be numerically sufficiently strong to win out over their Right Wing opponents.

The parting of the ways has come. And it has come because the brutal violation of the party autocracy of all who differed with them has left no other choice. L.

On the Unhappy Peace

By N. LENIN

1. The present state of the Russian Revolution is such (since all the workers and the great majority of the peasants are in favor of putting all power into the hands of the Soviets, and in favor of the Social Revolution inaugurated by the Soviets), that the success of the Social Revolution in Russia seems to be assured.

2. Meanwhile, the civil war brought about by the desperate resistance of the possessing classes, who are well aware that this is to be the last, the determining conflict for the retention of private ownership of land and of the means of production, has not yet reached its climax. In this conflict the victory of the Soviets is certain, but for some time our intensest efforts will still be required. A period of disorganization is inevitable,—that is the case in all wars, all the more so in a civil war—before the resistance of the bourgeoisie is broken.

3. This resistance takes the form chiefly of passive manifestations, not of military force; of sabotage, bribery of vagrants,

bribery of agents of the bourgeoisie, who permeate the ranks of the Socialists in order to compromise their cause, etc.; etc. This resistance is so obstinate and assumes such varying forms, that the conflict must go on for some time, and will not terminate for some months, since the victory of socialism is not possible until all the encumbrances have been removed.

4. Finally, the task of socialist reorganization in Russia is so great and so difficult,—both because of the *petit bourgeois* elements who are taking part in the revolution, and because of the unsatisfactory level of the proletariat,—that its solution still requires some time.

5. All this means that the success of the Russian Revolution will require at least for some months, that the Russian Government shall have a free hand, in order to conquer the bourgeoisie in its own country, in order then to undertake the great task of reconstruction.

6. The international policy of the Soviets must be based chiefly on the conditions of the revolution in Russia, for the international situation in the fourth year is such that, in general, it is not possible to fix a time for the overthrow of imperialistic powers (including the German Government). There is no doubt that revolution must and shall break out in Europe. All our hope in a *decisive victory* of Socialism is based on this conviction, on this scientific hypothesis. Our propaganda in general, and that of fraternization in particular, must be deepened and extended. But it would be an error to base the tactics of the socialist government on the probability that the European Revolution, particularly the German, will take place within a few months. As prediction is here absolutely impossible, all efforts in this direction would be a mere gamble.

7. The negotiation of the Brest-Litovsk Treaty has now (January 7, 1918) shown that the military party has gained the upper hand in the German Government, and that this party has its own way with the governments of the other countries in the Quadruple Alliance. The military party already has actually sent an ultimatum to Russia, the official form of which we may expect in a few days. This ultimatum means: either the continuation of the war or the conclusion of a peace by annexation, i. e.,

the Germans will retain all the districts occupied by them, while we must give up the districts occupied by Russian troops, and an indemnity will be imposed upon us (under the guise of a compensation for the maintenance of prisoners) of nearly three milliards, to be paid in a few years.

8. The Russian Government, therefore, has this pressing problem to solve: Must this annexation-peace be accepted at once, or must the revolutionary war be waged at once? There is no middle path in this question. The solution cannot be postponed, as we have already done all in our power to gain time and draw the thing out.

9. Among the arguments made use of to show that revolutionary warfare must be waged at once, there is, in the first place, the following: an immediate, separate peace, regardless of the intentions of those who conclude it would amount to an agreement with the German imperialists, and therefore, such a peace would be a breach of the principles of international socialism.

10. In the second place, we are reproached with becoming, through the conclusion of a socialistic peace, agents of the German Government against our will, since we are giving to it the possibility of withdrawing troops from our front and are liberating millions of their prisoners of war. But this argument also proves nothing, since a revolutionary war *against* Germany would make us agents of the Anglo-French Imperialism. The English promised outright to Krylenko, the commander of our army, one hundred roubles a month for each soldier if we should continue to wage war. And even if we should not accept a penny from the Entente, we should yet, as far as the outcome is concerned, have become their agents in holding a portion of the German troops at the front.

11. It is maintained that the German socialist minority has asked us not to yield to German Imperialism. But we do not consider this a good interpretation. We have always fought our own imperialism, but the overthrow of the imperialism of one country by means of an alliance with the imperialism of another is a line of action that we reject both on reasons of principle and because we consider it inadmissible. This argument, therefore, is really only a repetition of the former one. If the inter-

national socialists of Germany should ask us to postpone the conclusion of peace for a time, and should guarantee us the outbreak of the revolution in Germany by a fixed time, we might *eventually* take the matter under consideration. But the German international socialists not only do *not* say this to us, but they actually *are* saying, formally, "Offer as much resistance as you can, but decide on this point in agreement with the interests of the *Russian* Revolution, for it is impossible at present to make any definite promises with regard to the German Revolution."

12. It is maintained that we had promised to wage revolutionary warfare and that the conclusion of a separate peace was a betrayal of our own promise. This is not true. We spoke of *the necessity of preparing and waging revolutionary warfare* in the epoch of imperialism. We said this in contradiction of the theory of abstract pacifism, the total negation of "national defense," in the epoch of imperialism; and we said this in order to resist the merely physical instincts of some of the soldiers; but we have never assumed the obligation of waging a revolutionary war without for a moment asking ourselves whether it was possible to wage it at a given moment.

13. Considering the arguments in favor of an immediate revolutionary war, as a whole, it is evident that they constitute a policy that may perhaps be in line with a fine gesture, but they have absolutely no relation with the material and class conditions of the present moment.

14. It is beyond doubt that our army can neither now, nor at any time within the next few weeks or even months, resist or push back the German offensive, in the first place because of the fatigue and exhaustion of most of our soldiers and the total disorganization of the provision supply, in the second place because of the absolute insufficiency of horses (which makes defeat for our artillery a certainty), in the third place because it is impossible to defend the Riga coast, thus assuring the enemy of the conquest of the rest of Livland, and facilitating the occupation of Petrograd.

15. Furthermore, there is no doubt that the majority of the peasants in our army would now be in favor of a peace by annexations (by the Germans) and not of revolutionary war, while the

organization of a revolutionary army and the forming of a Red Guard have hardly been begun.

16. The poorest section of the Russian peasants would be ready to support a revolution headed by the working class, but they are not ready to support a revolutionary war at present. It would be a serious error to overlook this state of things.

17. The question of revolutionary war, therefore, stands as follows:

18. Conditions being as indicated above, it is intolerable thus to jeopardize the fate of the Russian Revolution.

19. The German Revolution will absolutely not be made more difficult by the conclusion of a separate peace. It will probably be weakened for a time by chauvinism, but the condition in Germany will remain very critical. The war with America and England will last long and imperialism will finally be unmasked completely, on both sides. The example of the Russian Revolution will continue to inspire the peoples of the world, and its influence will be enormous. On the one side will be the bourgeois system and war for conquest waged by two imperialistic groups, on the other peace and the socialist republic.

20. By a separate peace we free ourselves, in so far as present conditions will permit, from the two imperialist coalitions; by taking advantage of their warfare and their mutual enmity, preventing them from uniting against us, we shall utilize the time so gained, in order to strengthen the socialist republic in Russia. The reorganization of Russia, based on the dictatorship of the proletariat, the nationalization of banks and of big industry, the exchange of the products of the cities with the co-operatives of small peasants in the country, is economically quite feasible, provided we have a few months to devote energetically to the job. Such an organization will make socialism unconquerable in Russia, and will provide a permanent basis for the formation of a powerful red army of peasants and workers.

21. A truly socialistic war could not, at this moment, have any other character than that of a war between the socialistic republic and the bourgeois countries, with the distinct object, approved by the red army, of overthrowing the bourgeoisie in the other countries.

Do You Want to Know the Truth about Russia?

Then read the New Weekly Newspaper devoted to telling
You this Truth.

"Soviet Russia"

is the Official Organ of the Russian Soviet Government
Bureau, of New York City

Its weekly issues have for three months already been spreading all the available information on the operation of the Russian Soviet Government; the plans and accomplishments of that Government for the betterment of the social, economic and educational conditions of Russia; the plots and intrigues of counter-revolutionary forces both within Russia and in the governing classes of foreign countries; the great military successes of the Soviet armies against the foreign invaders; the cruelty of the hunger blockade, and the imperative necessity of lifting it, in the interests both of Soviet Russia and of the rest of the world.

AT ALL NEWS-STANDS, TEN CENTS

Subscription Price, \$5.00 per year; \$2.50 for six months

SPECIAL OFFERS

- A. For the price of a six-months' subscription, we shall send you the 12 issues that have already appeared, and the remaining weekly issues up to January 1, 1920, 30 issues in all, instead of 26. Ask for Special Offer A.
- B. For one dollar, we shall send you the first twelve issues of "Soviet Russia" (instead of ten). Ask for Special Offer B.

Special Rates to Distributing and Retailing Agents.

Address: "SOVIET RUSSIA"

110 West 40th Street

Room 303

New York, N. Y.

Most Recent Publications

The Program of the Communist Party of Russia (Bolsheviki)

By N. BUCHARIN

120 Pages. 25c.

"Education and Art in Soviet Russia"

In the Light of Official Decrees and Documents, with a Foreword by MAX EASTMAN. Sixty-four-page pamphlet

Retail price, 15c. each

In lots of 5 or more, 10c. each

"Radek and Ransome on Russia"

A 32-page Pamphlet

Retail price, 5c. each. \$3.00 per 100

"THE CRISIS IN THE GERMAN SOCIAL DEMOCRACY." By Rosa Luxemburg. An arraignment of German capitalism and militarism. This is the second edition of this pamphlet. Retail price, 25c. each. In lots of 5 or more, 17c. each.

"THE OLD ORDER IN EUROPE AND THE NEW ORDER IN RUSSIA." By M. P. Price, Russian correspondent of the "Manchester (England) Guardian." The best story of an industrial government yet printed. Retail price, 10c. In lots of 5 or more, 6c. each.

"FROM OCTOBER TO BREST-LITOVSK." By Leon Trotsky. One hundred pages. A pamphlet of historical value; every student should have a copy. Retail price, 35c. each. In lots of 5 or more, 20c. each.

"THE SOVIET, THE TERROR, AND INTERVENTION." By the same author. The title tells the story. Retail price, 10c., in lots of 5 or more, 6c. each.

"A LETTER TO AMERICAN WORKINGMEN." By N. Lenin. A 16-page pamphlet. Retail price, 5c. each. \$2.00 per 100.