

**WORKERS OF THE WORLD,
UNITE!**

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL



№2

**MOSCOW
KREML.**



**PETROGRAD
SMOLNY.**

**JUNE
1
1919.**

WORKERS OF THE WORLD, UNITE!

THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL



ORGAN OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL

APPEARS SIMULTANEOUSLY IN RUSSIAN, ENGLISH, FRENCH AND GERMAN



№ 2
JUNE 1 1919

PUBLISHING OFFICE
PETROGRAD, SMOLNY, 32, Tel. 169-20.

EDITORIAL OFFICE:
PETROGRAD, SMOLNY G. ZINOVIEV'S Office.



Down with the Treaty of Versailles!

Long Live the Communist Revolution!

To the Workers of the World.

From the Communist International.

The governments that five years ago, began this war of robbery, now try to end it by a peace of robbery. The English, French and American bourgeoisie in Versailles has handed the representatives of the German bourgeoisie what they are pleased to style the terms of peace. Versailles is soon to be a second Brest-Litovsk. Every article of the Versailles treaty is a noose for the neck of one or another nation.

The spite and vindictiveness of the victorious Allied bourgeoisie knows no bounds. The Anglo-French and American bourgeoisie, that proclaims the League of Nations, is in fact deliberately outraging the wishes of all European nations. The Allied bourgeois countries are attempting to cripple Germany. Germany is to lose large areas of territory, she is to be deprived of bread and coal, she is to give up her merchant fleet, and to pay an indemnity that staggers the wildest imagination. The Allied bourgeoisie, while claiming to fight against the annexations of foreign territories, is now in reality annexing such in the grossest and most cynical manner. The colonies formerly belonging to Germany are bought and sold like cattle. The Allied imperialists have armed themselves with a large carving-knife and are cutting Germany up alive.

But the piratical peace terms dictated to Germany, from Versailles, are only a link in the long chain of violence committed by the imperialists of the Entente. At the same moment, when these imperialists attempt to maim and smother Germany, they are leading a murderous campaign against the soviet republic of Hungary.

It is the English and French bourgeoisie, that are the chief instigators of the Roumanian boyars' white-guard attack on our brothers, the Hungarian working-men.

It is the representatives of the enlightened French and English «democracy», who throw their brutal forces against red Budapest.

It is they who inspire the Russian «Black Hundreds» of Kolchak, Denikin, Krasnov, in their bloody war against the Russian working-men and peasants. It is they again, the Anglo-French bourgeoisie, by whose will the German white-guards, led by Ebert, Scheidemann and Noske, crushed the Bavarian soviet republic. The Allied imperialists expressly stipulated, that the Scheidemann government was to put down soviet power in Munich.

The same Anglo-French bankers and generals are at present disarming the revolutionary troops of Hungary. They again smother the revolutionary movement of the popular masses in Serbia and Slavonia.

These Anglo-French and American imperialists, who pretend to represent world democracy are nothing but international gendarmes.

Illusions are dispelled. The mask is off. Those who learnt no lesson from the endless, horrible imperialist war, will learn it from that imperialist peace, with which mankind is to be blessed from Versailles.

The governments, that during over four years of war, lied to the peoples they governed that they were making war for the «self-determination of nations», for the independence of small nations, for «liberty and culture», for «democracy»—those same governments are now revealed as butchers, as hardened, merciless slave-drivers.

The fable of the League of Nations sheds its blossoms before they could unfold. After Versailles, very few working-men will swallow that bait. The League of Nations, whose cradle is watched by the butcher Clemenceau, has

been exposed to the whole world as a League of Robbers, who crucify the toiling masses of Europe.

The weight of the Versailles peace will fall heaviest on, the shoulders of the working men of Germany. Should the Versailles peace prove to be to any extent durable, it would mean, that the labouring class of Germany would be forced to bear the double yoke of its own bourgeoisie and of the foreign slave-drivers; It is a matter of course that all the sympathies of the communist International, the sympathies of the honest workers of the whole world, are with the German labouring class. The worker-communists of all countries will regard the Versailles peace terms as a blow to the international proletariat, as an attack that can be beaten back only by the united efforts of the workers of all countries.

The present German government, while loudly protesting against the Versailles peace, is in reality helping the imperialists of the Allies to carry out their infernal plot against the German labouring class. The butcher Clémenceau has no more faithful servants than Scheidemann and Ebert in Germany. Their party, from the very first moment of the revolution has been obediently dancing to the bagpipes of the Allied imperialists. At the instigation of Clémenceau, Scheidemann and Ebert sent and still send their white-guard troops against Soviet Russia. To make themselves agreeable to the imperialists of the Entente, the social democrats, led by Ebert and Scheidemann, killed Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, and suppress the mighty movement of the German working class for the realization of soviet power with fire and sword. The government of Scheidemann, agent of the London and Paris stock-exchange, has exterminated many thousand of worker-communists in Germany. Every time the waves of the labour movement in Germany rose particularly high, threatening to wash away the government of the traitor social-democrats, Scheidemann and Ebert tried to intimidate the starving working-men by the threat of certain stoppage of food supplies by the Allies, should soviet power be established in Germany.

The central committee of the Scheidemann party, in a proclamation dealing with the Versailles treaty, affirms that the lesson of Versailles «was the best proof of the soundness of German social-democrat tactics in the question of home defence».

«Socialists of all countries, have you at last understood our course of action during the war»—says Scheidemann in his appeal.

Hypocrites and cynics!

In 1914, two thieves set out in quest of the same booty. One of them proved more successful than the other. He not only secured the booty his rival equally pretended to, but even contrived to pick his pocket. The latter, making a virtue of necessity and assuming an air of injured innocence, now turns to all honest people and cries:—See, the conduct of my opponent finally proves the correctness of my tactics; can't

you at last understand, that we Scheidemannists are as white as highland snow....

The Versailles terms have shown all honest workers something entirely different. The classconscious workers of the world recognize perfectly well, that if military victory had been gained by the German jingoes, they would have shown as little mercy to the defeated, as their triumphant foe now shows to them. And then Henderson and Renaudel would no doubt have used the same hollow phrases, that are used to-day by Scheidemann and Noske.

The Versailles peace terms prove, that while imperialism exists, be it but in a single country, violence and international robbery will exist as well. The Versailles terms show, that the imperialism of both coalitions was equally bloodthirsty. Whatever «democratic» fig-leaves it may use to cover its nakedness, it still is and remains the incarnation of sanguinary barbarism.

The Versailles peace terms show, that the social-patriots of all countries have finally and for ever turned into flunkies of capitalism. The Versailles terms show, how pitiful are the day-dreams of the Borne yellow «International» (Kautski's and his friends' in particular) about «disarmament» while capitalism is still maintained and about a virtuous and benign «League of the Nations» under President Wilson's protecting wing. The Versailles peace terms show, that the bourgeoisie itself leaves the workers of all countries but one way out—the road of world revolution, the road across the carcass of capitalism.

Workers of France! Workers of England! Workers of America! Workers of Italy! It is to you that the Communist International appeals. It is upon you that the fate of tens of millions of German and Austrian workers now hangs. You must wrench from the bloody hands of your governments the murderous knife they lift over the head of the German and Austrian working class. You must show that the lesson of the five years' war has not been in vain. You must not for a single moment forget that the victory of the Allied imperialists over the German and Austrian labouring class means their victory over—you, victory over the workers of all countries, victory over socialism. The fate of international socialism is in your hands. The workers of the world look to you for their salvation. We are sure that you will do your duty in spite of the advice of your Scheidemanns.

Workers of Germany! Workers of Austria! Now you see that you have no choice but to overthrow the government of traitors, who call themselves social-democrats, but who in reality are the basest agents of the bourgeoisie. You see now where the policy of Scheidemann and Noske has led you to. You can see that your only hope is in the universal proletarian revolution.

But Scheidemann, Noske and the rest are endeavouring to prevent this proletarian revolution with all their might. When Scheidemann and Noske appeal to the

international proletariat in your name, they meet with nothing but contempt.

The men who have no word of protest against the smothering of Soviet Hungary, the men who at Libau fight on the side of the German barons against the Lettish working men and rural labourers, these men cannot count upon the support of the international proletariat. It is not Count Brockdorff von Rantzen, it is not the traitor Landsberg, not the butchers Noske and Scheidemann who ought to be your spokesmen now. As long as the present German government retains power, the quarrel between Berlin and Paris will remain but a dispute between the bourgeoisie of both coalitions. All power in your country ought speedily to pass into the hands of workers' councils, and workmen-communists must speak in your name.

Then and only then can you save your country, can you count on the fullest support of the proletarians of all countries.

The time for hesitation is past. It is clear to every one of you that things cannot be worse than they are now,—the government of traitors has brought you to the brink of ruin.

Workers of Germany and Austria! Know that the proletarians of other countries will not trust the German official social-democracy, that same social-democracy that found not a word of protest when the government of William Hohensollern forced the Brest peace upon Soviet Russia.

Workers of Germany and Austria! Know that if the peace of Brest, forced upon Russia in 1918, was so short-lived, it was because the Russian working men and peasants overthrew their government of social-traitors and took power into their own hands. Only thus could the Russian workers win the sympathy and confidence of the proletarians of the world. Only thanks to this could they slip off the Brest noose in comparatively so short a time.

Universal proletarian revolution is the only salvation of the oppressed classes throughout the world.

Dictatorship of the proletariat and establishment of soviet power,—that is the only possible conclusion for the proletarians of the world after the Versailles lesson.

While capitalism exists there can be no lasting peace. Lasting peace will be built up on the ruins of bourgeois order.

Long live the revolt of the workers against their oppressors! Down with the Versailles peace, down with the new Brest! Down with the government of social-traitors!

Long live soviet power throughout the world!

The Executive Committee of the Communist International

G. Zinoviev,
Chairman.

May 18th 1919.

A Greeting to the Hungarian Working-men.

Comrades! The news we receive from the Hungarian soviet statesmen fill us with joy and triumph. Soviet power in Hungary is hardly two months old, and yet it seems that in the matter of organization, the Hungarian proletariat has overtaken us already. This is comprehensible, seeing that the general level of culture is much higher in Hungary, and besides, the proportion of industrial workers to the total population is incalculably greater (compare the three-million population of Budapest with the population of eight millions for the whole of Hungary) and lastly because the transition to the soviet system, to the dictatorship of the proletariat, was incomparably easier and more peaceful in Hungary.

This last circumstance is particularly important. The majority of European socialist leaders, social-chauvinists and Kautskians alike, had been tainted with petty-bourgeois prejudices, acquired during decades of comparatively «peaceful» capitalistic and bourgeois-parliamentary evolution, to such a degree, that they are no longer capable of comprehending soviet power and the dictatorship of the proletariat. The proletariat cannot fulfill its

historical mission of world-wide emancipation without removing these leaders, without putting them out of the way. These men quite or half believed the bourgeois lies about soviet power in Russia and could not distinguish the new proletarian democracy, a democracy for the workers, a socialist democracy, incarnated in soviet power, from bourgeois democracy which they worship slavishly, calling it «pure democracy» or «democracy in general».

These men, blinded by bourgeois prejudices, did not understand the world-historic reversal from bourgeois to proletarian democracy, from bourgeois to proletarian dictatorship. They mistook some particular features of Russian Soviet power, of the history of its evolution in Russia, for Soviet power in its international significance.

The Hungarian proletarian revolution makes even the blind to see. The outer form of the transition to proletarian dictatorship in Hungary does not in the least resemble that of Russia: the voluntary surrender of the bourgeois government, the immediate reconstitution of the unity of the proletariat, socialistic unity based on the communist programme. The essence of soviet power

comes out all the more distinctly: no power but Soviet power, none but the dictatorship of the proletariat supported by the toilers headed by the proletariat, is possible any longer in any part of the world.

This dictatorship entails the application of stern, swift and decisive violence for the suppression of any resistance the capitalists, landowners and their retainers might make. Who does not understand this, is no revolutionary and must be removed from the office of leader or counsel or to the proletariat.

But the essence of proletarian dictatorship is not in violence only, not even chiefly in violence. Its chief essence is in the organization and discipline of the vanguard and only guide of the toilers the proletariat. Its aim the building up of socialism, abolition of the class division of society, the converting of all members of society into workers, and the destruction of any possibility of the exploitation of men by their fellows. This aim cannot be realized all at once, it demands a fairly lengthy period of transition from capitalism to socialism,—and this because the transformation and reorganization of production is a difficult thing and because fundamental changes in all branches of life need time, and lastly because the tremendous force of habit in bourgeois and petty-bourgeois production can be overcome only after a long and obstinate struggle. This is why Marx speaks of an entire period of proletarian dictatorship, as of a period of transition from capitalism to socialism.

In the course of this transition period resistance to the change will consciously be made by the capitalists as well as by their numerous retainers among the middle-class «intelligentsia», and in the main unconsciously by large masses of toilers including peasants too far buried in petty-bourgeois customs and traditions. In these strata wavering is inevitable. The peasant as worker is drawn to socialism, prefers the dictatorship of the proletariat to the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie. The peasant as a seller of grain is drawn to the bourgeoisie, to free trade, that is, backward to what is «customary», old, well-known to him, to capitalism.

The dictatorship of the proletariat is necessary. The power of a single class, the force of its organization and discipline, of its centralized might, based on all the gains of capitalistic culture, science, technique; its proletarian proximity to the psychology of the worker, its authority before the less developed, less politically-hardened toilers of village and small trade—all this is needed in order to enable the proletariat to draw after it the peasantry and the whole petty-bourgeois stratum in general. Phrase-mongering about «democracy» in general, about «unity», or «the unity of labour democracy»; about the «equality» of all «toilers», and so on and so forth—all this phrasemongering, say we, so dear to shop-keeper-souled social-chauvinists and Kautskians, will not help things along in the least. Phrases only throw dust in the eyes, blind the conscience, strengthen the old dullness,

passivity, inertia and routine of capitalism, parliamentarism and bourgeois democracy.

The annihilation of classes is a matter of long, hard, determined class war, that will not disappear (as the dullards of superannuated socialism and social democracy imagine) after the downfall of the power of capital, after the destruction of the bourgeois state, after the setting-up of proletarian dictatorship, but only changes form, in many respects growing more desperate than ever.

The workers must defend its rule by the means of class war against the resistance of the bourgeoisie, against the routine, inertia, indecision and hesitation of the petty bourgeoisie. It must reinforce its organizing influence, achieve the «neutralization» of those strata that are afraid of breaking with the bourgeoisie and who do not follow after the proletariat steadfastly enough. It must enforce a new discipline, the brotherly discipline of workers, and their firm unity with the proletariat. This new discipline, is the new foundation of social cooperation, that is to take the place of the old serf discipline of the middle ages, and of the discipline of hunger, of «free» wage-slavery under capitalism.

To abolish class differences a period of dictatorship of a single class is needed, more specifically a dictatorship of that oppressed class which is capable not only of overthrowing the exploiters, not only of mercilessly conquering their resistance, but of finally getting rid of all bourgeois-democratic ideology, of all shop-keeperish phrasemongering about freedom and equality in general (these phrases in fact mean, as Marx proved long ago «liberty and equality» of employer and workman).

But this is not enough. Class can be abolished only by the dictatorship of that oppressed class, that has been trained, united, schooled and welded into one by decades of political and economic warfare against capital. Only the class that has assimilated all urban industrial capitalistic culture possesses the necessary determination and capability of defending it, of preserving and developing all its achievements, of making them accessible to the people as a whole, to all workers; only the class that is capable of enduring all the hardships, trials, rebuffs all the great sacrifices inevitably laid by history on all who break with tradition and hew their way to a new future; only the class the best of which are full of hate and contempt towards all narrow-mindedness and philistinism, towards these qualities par excellence, flourishing among the middle class small officials and employees and the «intelligentsia»; only the class that has passed through «the temporing school of labour» can impress respect for its ability upon all workers, upon all honest men.

Workers of Hungary! Comrades! You have set the world an even better example than Soviet Russia, by immediately uniting all socialists on a platform of genuine proletarian dictatorship. It is your most worthy and difficult task to defend it against the Allies in a war

full of hardships and suffering. Be staunch. If you notice hesitation in the ranks of the socialists uniting with you yesterday for the dictatorship of the proletariat or in the ranks of the petty-bourgeoisie, suppress such wavering mercilessly. A bullet is the lawful dole of cowards in time of war.

You wage the only lawful, just, truly revolutionary war, the war of the oppressed against their oppressors,

the war of the toilers against their exploiters, the war for the victory of socialism. All that is honourable among the working class of the world is on your side. Each month brings the world revolution of the proletariat nearer.

Be staunch. Victory will be yours.

N. Lenin.

27-th of May 1919.

The New World

I.

Four years of war have wrought a decisive change in the nature of the world. A new world is surrounding us; though but few of us have as yet realised what it is that has changed.

The proletarian world revolution has begun. Everybody is aware of it. The bourgeoisie sees it or guesses at it, — panic-stricken, it tries to save what can be saved and endeavours with all its might to keep its old power or to build it up anew. The vanguard of the revolution forthwith accepts the challenge, and large masses of working men get ready for the fight, though not as yet clearly seeing, only instinctively feeling that the hour is coming. The working men's revolution has begun and goes steadily on. But the conditions under which it takes place are new and altogether different from those before the war. That is where the former social democrats are mistaken, who believe they live in the old world and thus do not perceive to what extent the conditions of struggle have altered. They firmly keep to their old tenets and programme; they pride themselves upon having remained what they were. Thus they lead the workmen who follow them astray. It is therefore imperative to inspect the new world, the scene of the proletarian revolution more closely.

The war has made the world international — that is its first great result. Capitalism had created national states, great political units of the bourgeoisie, to all appearance sharply isolated from one another, yet steadily ever more and more tending to abolish the contrasts and divergencies of national character, customs, ideas and laws within their own borders. Each state was sovereign independent, in relation to the others; none admitted intervention of the others into its internal affairs; each concluded treaties and alliances at its own discretion. As armed class organisations of the bourgeoisie they stood side by side or opposite one another, settling their conflicting interests by war. In consequence of this, all further human relations were kept within the boundaries of the state. Legislation

was an internal affair of the state. Class-war was waged on a national basis, as a struggle between the bourgeoisie of a given country and its proletariat. There were, of course, subsidiary influences flooding in from beyond the frontiers; at international congresses counsel was taken and resolutions were adopted. But that was only one aspect of the actual case. Each party was sovereign in its own country; each working class—such was the general opinion—had to get the better of its own bourgeoisie.

Imperialism at length led to the formation of state groupings that finally crystallised into two great hostile coalitions. One of these has been smashed by the war. The victorious coalition has no more opponents. The defeated have partly dissolved into smaller nations that in their distress implore the conquerors to put an end to their sufferings; the neutrals had willy-nilly to do the same. The coalition grew into the League of Nations. For the Wilsonian League is after all but an extension of the Entente, brought about by the annihilation of the remnants of the neutral and defeated states.

Little is left in the «League» of the former sovereignty and independence of the old states. Even the leading countries, Britain and America, are no longer their own masters with regard to home politics. Loans and war contracting, the political measures taken by the supreme war council have left deep traces. France and Italy have become vassals to the «League» to a still higher degree. These states can no longer direct their internal politics according to their desire. Most of all, however, does this hold true of the weaker, and of the defeated countries. Britain, America, Japan can still keep their strong autonomic position, for they are the conquerors, the rulers of the world. They are even at liberty to start a new quarrel among themselves. But all the rest are independent states only outwardly. As soon as the League of Nations will lay down theoretically what is already the case in practice, they will be deprived of their right to make treaties with one another, to keep permanent armies. The leading powers will not fail to see to it that the internal life of these states be carried on along the lines prescribed by them.

The sharp isolation of the states no longer exists, but the chasm between workmen and exploiters yawns none the less wider for that. As an international unit the bourgeoisie of all countries is pitted against the proletariat of all countries. Not only theoretically, out of class-sympathy, but in practice—in 1871 Bismarck still kept aloof from the struggle between the Commune and Versailles and was content to support the latter merely indirectly and morally. In the year 1918, however, the armies of the Allied powers invaded Russia in order to restore the rule of the bourgeoisie, the generals and the nobility, in order to deliver over the people to the nagaika. It is not a war of Britain or France against Russia; it is a war of the bourgeoisie against the revolutionary proletariat, of capital against socialism.

He who observes the events in his own country only fails to see the most important points. The German proletariat must keep it in mind that it is the fate of German socialism that is being decided in the far-away steppes of the Ukraina; just as the Soviet Republic of Russia depends for its existence on the issue of the street fights in Berlin and Hamburg. The revolutionary proletariat of all countries forms a united mass, a united army; unless it realizes this and takes active part in the struggle, it will be smashed to pieces and dispersed. The German proletariat has absolutely nothing to win by isolating itself out of fear lest the help rendered them by the Russian revolutionaries call down the wrath of the Entente bourgeoisie upon them. For if it should try to free itself by its own force, it will have to stand the brunt of the attack as an isolated unit. It has to remember that there is only one battlefield in the whole world—that of capital against the proletariat. Whether it wishes to or not, it stands in the same line of battle with the Russian people and by its efforts supports its comrades everywhere—in Russia where they have already liberated themselves, in Great Britain, America and France where they are only just beginning to.

The International of Capital, the Wilsonian League of Nations is confronted by the International of Labour; communism rallies its forces and gains strength.

II.

The war has devastated the world and thrown it into utter destitution, into Chaos—that is its second great achievement.

For four whole years all productive forces were enlisted in the service of War. All raw materials, machinery, means of communication, all hands were wasted, unproductively. They were turned into instruments of destruction; they were not used for productive purposes, but for overthrowing the enemy. This had to result in a total lack of everything that society requires for its further existence. Such a state of things could continue for a period of four years only by screwing down the requirements of the masses to a minimum.

The articles produced for the purposes of warfare were so much deficit in the primary necessities of the population. But the waste of war did not stop at that; all means of production and transport were completely neglected, and, instead of being kept up and renewed, were merely used up. Thus at the end of the war we had to face a total disorganisation of economic life; there was a scarcity of means of production, raw materials, as well as of labour; for mankind was bodily exhausted with long privation. To this one could, of course, raise the objection that capital had increased and become concentrated to an enormous extent. But this capital consists mainly of paper bonds, not of productive capital. It is but a right of ownership in manufacturing concerns that have no possibility of immediately renewing production. It is made up in the first instance of war loans, as such demanding exorbitant interest to be paid to the capitalists in the shape of taxes by the proletariat, the petty bourgeoisie and the peasants. The increase of capital determines the distribution of commodities; the result is that the articles of production are distributed as unfairly as possible, but no increase of production is attained by it. The great enrichment of the few leads merely to the still greater impoverishment of the many, for the blood-suckers with their increased incomes seize the greater part of all stored-up commodities for their own needs. From a purely economic point of view, the world is on the eve of an unheard-of bankruptcy, standing before an empty desert, faced by economic chaos.

This applies more or less to all countries, least of all to states like Japan and America, most of all to those of Central Europe, just as it was formerly true of Russia. Germany has expended her last resources for the war to a greater extent than England has. Matters would have been different, had the working classes already begun their revolution in February of last year. Now that Germany has been defeated, she is being deprived of the last remnants of her possessions. Her adversaries want by all means to prevent her rising once more to the position of a great capitalistic Power. After the speeches made by British statesmen there can be no doubt whatever about it, that Germany is to be robbed to the last, stripped of everything she possesses. The gold required to regenerate production by purchases abroad, has been seized by the conquerors; Germany is cut off from foreign raw materials; foreign markets are closed to her; her most valuable iron and coal districts, Lorraine, the Saar-district, Silesia, are to be taken from her; of the available means of transport and engines a considerable part is to be given up—thus there is a complete absence of everything that could revive capitalistic production. Capital can no longer provide a livelihood for its former slaves of toil; terrible unemployment stares the proletariat in the face,—for capital as such no longer exists. The mighty industrial development undergone by Germany within the last half-century has been suddenly cut short. This

war just as three hundred years ago the 30 years' war, has thrown Germany back to a lower stage of economic development. Like the whole of Central Europe she is forced once more to start at the primitive stage of agricultural life, and it may take decades before she can rise again to a higher level of development. Such are the prospects if bourgeois production were to go on, that is to say, if the bourgeoisie were to retain the control of the state.

Still worse is the outlook for the immediate future. Food supplies and means of communication are available in such limited quantities that only strictest execution of the most punctilious regulations made by a strong government may keep body and soul of the population together. As long as the Ebert government that tries to be on good terms with both parties, remains in power, no such measures will be taken, and the approaching disaster will merely be the graver. A government can only be strong if it is a class government; it must be either a frankly bourgeois one, possessing sufficient power to be able, by means of minimum wages, to lead the proletariat to the brink of starvation and keep it there (as the former governments did before the war); or a genuinely proletarian one, relentlessly taking all resources and privileges from the bourgeoisie and honestly distributing among the masses everything that is or can be obtained.

Capitalism has nothing more to offer to the proletariat. Necessity drives the proletarians to socialism.

Prior to the war capital was still able to make some sort of provision for the workmen, to ensure them, as if not a stable, still a fairly quiet, if indigent existence. Revolution spelt chaos for the workman disturbing and paralysing the highly developed process of production. That is why the proletarian masses shrank from a revolution; they were content and nursed the illusion that everything would for ever remain as it was. Socialism to them meant a leap into darkness, into chaos.

It is that chaos and empty darkness that are now facing the world. Capitalism can no longer continue its quiet existence, its peaceful work. The people has to choose between leaving world rule in incapable hands that have brought forth this chaos, — in the hands of the bourgeoisie and the bureaucracy, and then perishing in order to enable them to rescue their system of exploitation; or taking power into their own hands and setting production going. In the former case production will hardly be able to recover,

for it is hampered by want of capital as well as by the interests of gain, and, in its last results it will merely be instrumental to a renaissance of capital. In the latter case production can be energetically taken up again as a means of self-provision for the whole working population. Necessity forces the workmen to make their choice. Not clear insight, nor theoretic calculation of the advantages to be derived, but pressing need made the workmen stand up for socialism.

Ebert — or was it someone else? — had said that this time of pressing need was not propitious to the realisation of theories. For them socialism as such has always been but an abstract theory, while for the workmen it is a practical necessity. They dreamt, as many do, of an ideal capitalism with a judicious socialdemocratic majority in parliament that thanks to abundance of production and general prosperity could bring about a peaceful change. But reality has proved somewhat different; socialism had to come as a deliverer from dire distress, as the only possibility for the masses to save themselves from utter ruin. And it did come and did do the work of rescue. But for socialism the people in bankrupt Russia would irrevocably have fallen a prey to starvation and ruin. The first steps of socialism have saved the masses of the population in the hardest time, have strengthened them, in spite of all attacks from within and without, attacks that most of all threatened the supply of food. In the same way can socialism rescue the masses in this acute crisis in Germany and in the other Central European states, by means of systematic and strict organisation of production and distribution of food-supplies, simultaneously laying the foundations for a new form of production, the germ of a new freedom.

In 1847 Marx said to the proletarians: „You have nothing but your chains to lose“. Ten years ago the spokesmen of the workers, in opposition to Marxism, said: „The workmen have something to lose now, therefore — no revolution“. And, indeed, as long as times were prosperous and the workmen thought they had something to lose, they paid no heed to Marx, they passed his sayings by in silence. Now his words have come true once more. All that capitalism could or seemed to be able to offer is irretrievably gone. The workmen have nothing more to lose. Robbed of everything, they stand naked in a wilderness before the gates of the future. They have a world to win.

Anton Pannekoek.

The New War.

Wake up! wake up! oh, sleepy British people! The new war is in full blast, and you are called to fight in it; you cannot escape; you must take part.

Out of the old inter-capitalist war between the Allies and the Central Empires, the war, the actual crude, cruel fighting between the workers and the capitalists has emerged.

Soldiers who enlisted, or were conscripted, for the old war have been quietly kept on to fight in the new war which began without any formal declaration. They have not been asked: «Do you approve this war; do you understand it?» They have merely been detained and will now fight against their comrades.

Officially the British Government is not at war with Socialism in Europe though in actual fact British and other Allied soldiers have been fighting it for a long time, and British money and munitions are keeping the soldiers of other governments in the field against it.

There has been no official declaration of war, but the House of Commons, on April 9-th, expressed its opinion in support of the war on Socialism in general, and on Russian Socialism in particular. This expression of opinion the Home Secretary claims to have been unanimous, and certainly when he challenged Members to express a contrary opinion no voice of dissent was audible enough to reach the columns of Hansard or the press. No Member of Parliament has written to the newspapers to make his protest.

Some Socialists tell us that the floor of the House of Commons is a splendid platform for propaganda; but the trouble is that when they get into the House, their courage seems to evaporate like a child's soap bubble. We have heard of Labour Members of Parliament being ready to do and say all sorts of heroic things, and to get themselves put out of the House, to arrest the world's attention on some appropriate occasion. That is not much of course, as compared with running the risk of death in the horrible trenches or with being incarcerated for years in prison; but here was an opportunity, if ever there was one, for Members of Parliament to display all their pluck. Clem Edwards, the notorious anti-socialist, moved the adjournment of the House, «to draw attention to a definite matter of urgent public importance namely, the alleged overtures from the Bolshevik régime in Russia to the Peace Conference in Paris».

In the debate Brigadier-General Page Croft and Lieut. Col. Guinness suggested that some Members of Parliament supported the Bolsheviks. Did any man cry out: «Yes, we are proud to stand by our fellow-workers in their fight for Socialism?» No, on the contrary, the Labour Members broke out in to cries of protest against the suggestion that they had any such sympathies. Bottomley rewarded them by an assurance of «the profoundest and most affectionate respect». The Home Secretary hammered in the point, saying the debate had called forth «from every quarter of the House an indignant repudiation that the House contained a single Bolshevik sympathiser». He described the Soviet Government as «a mere gang of bloodthirsty ruffians», and said it would strengthen the hands of the Government to

know there is «no quarter» for any Soviet supporters, «at any rate in the British House of Commons».

Even then there was no protest! Where was the lead to the country, and especially to the lads who may mistakenly enlist in the counter-revolutionary armies, which our «leaders» in Parliament might have given? Of what were the opponents of the resolution afraid? Either they are cravens or their opposition to the new war is of a very lukewarm character. The real work for the Socialist revolution must be done outside Parliament.

On April 10-th, the day after the House of Commons had thus expressed itself, the first contingent of volunteers, set sail for Russia.

Remember what happened in the old war: first the voluntary system: then compulsion, growing till millions of men were drawn into the net. Kitchener's first call in the late war was for 500,000 men, but the Army estimate of the other day was for 2,500,000. Conscription remains, and presently we expect to see class after class of men called up. Will they go to the war against their fellow workers who have set up a worker's government?

The child, hearing of other peoples misfortunes, says, with a way half-regret that his own life will always be tame and jog-trot, and yet with a very comfortable sense of security: «Things like that do not happen in our family.» Death comes and suddenly strikes down his brother; but after the first stunning shock which reveals to him life's instability, he assures himself that his misfortune is an isolated event, that nothing like it will again trouble him. So he returns to his old belief till his father is killed, the household plunged into ruin, and he himself is thrust out into swiftly-changing and precarious currents. So many people remain always like that: clinging, untaught by life's experiences, to the belief that there is no change; that evolution having created this our time, will carry humanity no further. They do not believe that great wars will come, never to their country, never to their households. They do not believe in the possibility of revolutions, and if such things happen, they try to dismiss them as mere temporary upheavals, certain to be crushed by the forces of established order, which never will change, at least never in their country. A revolution in their country is unthinkable; they know it is impossible: the majority of the people are too sluggish, too ignorant, would not even vote as they did at the Parliamentary election, would not even put them on the Board of Guardians or the Town Council.

And yet we in this country are actually in the revolution, although the eyes of most of us are still shut to the fact. We are in the revolution, as we were in the war with Germany. The revolutionary war is no a fight between country and country; it cuts across national boundaries and British people are already fighting on both sides.

The British men who are in the army of government are fighting against the Worker's Socialist Revolution, just as are the men, who are fighting in the armies of the capitalist Governments of Germany, France, Italy, America, Poland, Czecho-Slovakia, and any other govern-

ments which are joining in the strife. In all these armies the truth that they are fighting Socialism has dawned on some of the soldiers, and many of these have deserted and joined the Red Armies of working-class Socialism.

Many who are not actually in the fighting ranks have nevertheless ranged themselves against the capitalist governments and on the side of the Soviets. Phillips Price, who is editing a Bolshevik newspaper in Russia, and many other British people, are aiding the Soviets over there. In this country we can also help by working with might and main to establish the British Soviets, by telling the soldiers, sailors, and workers the issues that are at stake in the International Civil War.

That war has now spread far beyond the boundaries of Russia. General Smuts has left Hungary abruptly, finding that Soviet Hungary stood firm for Communism. Shall we presently see the armies of capitalism marching on Hungary? The «Evening News» reported that the Serbs had refused to obey the order of the Big Four to send their troops to attack Hungary, because the Allies had not yet recognised the kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. But the Allies will presently secure a capitalist army from somewhere to carry on the fight. Paderewski is reported to have refused to send Polish troops to fight Communism, unless Dantzig and other territory is conceded to Poland. The Allies will bargain with Paderewski till they have bought his support or substituted a Polish ruler who is more amenable.

Churchill has revealed the fact that Germany is ordered as one of the peace conditions, to fight Communism; and that the Germans may buy their way into the League of Nations by doing this efficiently. Indeed, the entire policy of the Paris Conference is dominated by the policy its members are pursuing in the war between the capitalists and the workers. Both false and foolish are the stories, so industriously circulated, that the British and American politicians at the Peace Conference are the pacifying influences and that they are working against a peace of annexation and oppression; whilst the French and Italian politicians are the greedy Jingoese, who, by demanding all sorts of advantages for themselves, are preventing the peace. The plain fact is that British and American capitalists have got what they set out to gain by the war with the Central Empires and the French and Italians have not.

The Secret Treaties represent the basis upon which the Allies entered the war; the prizes which induced them to support each other are there set forth.

British capitalists have got all, and more than all, the Treaties promised to them. They have secured control of the German Colonies, Palestine, Mesopotamia, Persia, all that was promised them in the East. They have seized Spitzbergen, with its rich stores of coal and iron, which was not mentioned in the Treaties; they have crushed their trade rival, Germany and their Government is apparently to retain for the present the dominion of the seas.

The secret arrangements which brought America into the war were not disclosed when the Bolsheviks seized the Czar's archives, because they were not made until after that date. Therefore we can only surmise what they were from the passing of events and the disclosures of politicians. American capitalists have gained by the war substantial advantages in China. They have done some very remunerative trading with the Allies, and have lent them much money on exceedingly profitable terms. More important still, as will presently be seen, American capitalists have induced British capitalists not

to make a Juss when they presently annex Mexico and its wonderful oil fields, which the Mexican Government is endeavouring to nationalise. But America is not yet satisfied. President Wilson has ordered his ship. It is said that he is dissatisfied with the slow progress made at the Paris Conference. Perhaps he is; but it is also said that American capitalists desired to sell to France and Italy motor tractors and other goods and that France and Italy refused the offer. Since then it is said the Americans have obstructed the Peace Conference. Time will show how much there is in the rumour. It will also throw light on the rumour that America is bringing pressure to bear on the Allies by threatening to sell the rejected goods to Soviet Russia—a step which would greatly assist her—instead of waiting to trade with Russia till the Soviets are defeated and capitalism re-established. Was not Bottomley referring to this rumour in the House of Commons on April 9th, when he spoke of «some wild, airy, idealistic element, which, under the guise of great ideals and altruism, is keeping a keen eye all the time upon material benefit which will come to those which are farthest away from Europe».

British capitalists have gained all that the Secret Treaties promised, but French and Italian capitalists have not. French capitalism wants more of Germany's territory than perhaps the German Government dare give, lest the German people retaliate by setting up the Soviets. French capitalism was promised the Saar basin, with its coal, and the other Allies have been hesitating whether it is safe to force Germany to surrender it. French capitalists were promised Syria by the Secret Treaties, but British capitalists are loth to let them have it.

Moreover, it seems that if France is to take part of the indemnity which Germany is to pay to her in the form of the Saar basin and its coal, Britain may decide to take the whole of the German mercantile fleet as part of her pound of flesh; and France and Italy would both like to have a share of that.

Italy's territorial claims come into conflict with the claims of the Southern Slavs and the Big Four cannot offend the Slavs because they need them to fight Bolshevism. Italian capitalism has threatened to send soldiers to fight her late Allies to defend the territories the soldiers have occupied on the Adriatic. Italian capitalists are not concerned that those territories are not inhabited by Italians; they point out that Mesopotamia and Palestine are not inhabited by British populations.

British and American capitalism has got all it can out of the war with the Kaiser; it is preparing for the war against Socialism, in which, beside crushing a menace very dangerous to capitalism itself, they may gain still further extensive profits. Great Britain, as The «Times» puts it, «has made herself responsible for the railway communications in Poland, the Baltic States, the Caucasus, and the Don country, Czechoslovakia and Yugo-Slavia have been allotted to the United States». Who controls the railways controls the nation. As The «Morning Post» has it: «The cant cry of the selfdetermination of peoples is, we believe, a German invention». Everything is said to come from Germany now which is embarrassing to Allied capitalism.

France and Italy are again unfortunate. The «Times» explains: «Greece, Turkey in Europe, the Ukraine and the Don basin have been undertaken by France, though with the evacuation of Odessa, her efforts in the last two regions can hardly be effective for the present». (The italics are ours).

The French left Odessa, by the way, for lack of food—the peasants of the Ukraine would not serve them; they appealed to have it sent to them from Roumania, but the request was not granted; Canada, by the way, seems to have something to do with the Roumanian railways. French capitalism thinks its Allies have not treated it very well. «Italy is looking after Austria-Hungary». Poor Italian capitalism: it has a set of very vigorous Bolsheviks too in Hungary; Vienna may set up the Soviets any day; and Italy itself gives cause for very serious anxiety.

It is stated now that Germany is to pay the Allies between ten and twelve thousand million pounds and that the payments will be spread over fifty years, during which the Allies will occupy Germany, we suppose. Evi-

dently it is thought that fifty years will not be too much for the crushing out of Bolshevism. Moreover, after such a period of occupation history teaches us to anticipate that the occupying Powers will consider it inexpedient to withdraw. Ireland, Egypt and India all stand as landmarks calling us to this conclusion.

To this pass has capitalism brought us. Europe, neutral and belligerent alike, is starving: not a household in our country, or any other but mourns some of its members who lost their lives in the last war; and the world, in order to maintain the capitalist system, stands on the threshold of a time of still more extensive war.

British workers, which side are you on in the International Civil War?

E. Sylvia Pankhurst.

Two Civilizations.

History always and everywhere trained rural and urban man as two psychologically entirely different types; and this difference waxed ever deeper, for the city rushes onward with the speed of Achilles, and the village is no faster than the tortoise.

The dweller of the village is a creature preeminently zoological, a being gaining bread by toiling like a galley-slave from the first days of spring till late autumn, in order to sell the greater part of that bread and to eat up the smaller in the cold, accursed days of winter.

No doubt «the living gold of glorious fields» is lovely in summer, — but in autumn, the naked earth, stripped of its living gold, again exacts galley-slave labour, again fruitlessly claims the strength of man.

This man is enslaved to the last, inwardly and outwardly, by the forces of nature, — he does not struggle against them, but merely fits himself to them. The short-lived results of his labour do not and cannot inspire him with self-respect, with respect towards his own creative force. Of all the work of his hands, earth knows only a heap of straw, and a dark, close, thatch-covered hut.

The peasant's work is hard beyond measure, and this hardness together with the futility of its results, particularly — and perfectly naturally — deepens the dark instinct of property in the peasant's soul and makes it nearly unassailable. This instinct is nearly unapproachable to the influence of that teaching, which counts property, and not the jest of the Devil and Eve at the expense of drollish Adam to be the original sin of man.

When I hear of «bourgeois» civilization, I have to think of the civilization of the village, — if one can unite the two notions village and civilization, nearly incompatible in their spiritual essence. Civilization is the process of the creation of ideas their incarnation in the shape of books, machines, scientific instruments, pictures, buildings, monuments, — in the shape of various objects

that, crystallizations of ideas, serve to wake to life others and increasing in quantity, spread in concentric circles, embracing an ever wider sphere, endeavouring to seize and discover the secret causes of all its phenomena. Such civilization is not brought forth by the village, the village sets itself monuments only in the shape of words — in the shape of tales and songs, and sayings. Yes, the sorrowful songs of the village are very touching, their wistful lyricism would, one should think, move a stone — and yet, stones are not moved by songs, neither are men. Doubtlessly there is much sad poetry in the village that often draws us into sentimental mistakes — but the prose, the still animalic-epic prose of the village is in its being as well as in its dimensions immeasurably, more significant. The village idyll recedes out of notice before the drama of every-day peasant life.

Compared to the passive, half-dead psychology of the old village the city bourgeoisie in a certain stage appears as a most precious creative principle, as that strong acid fully capable of dissolving the apparently yielding, in reality iron soul of the muzhik. The ignorance and backwardness of the village can be conquered only by science and large scale socialistic husbandry. A wondrous number of agricultural machines must be manufactured, — only these can convince the muzhik, that property is a chain that binds him like a beast; that it is harmful in the spirit, that unreasonable labour is unproductive and that only reason, disciplined by science and blessed by art, can be an honoured guide on the road to liberty and happiness.

The townsman's work is wonderfully varied, monumental, everlasting. Out of clumps of soil, burnt into bricks, the townsman builds palaces and churches, out of shapeless lumps of iron ore he creates machines

astoundingly intricate. He has already subjected the forces of nature to his high aims, they serve him, as the jinns of Eastern fairy tales serve the wizard who enthralled them by the force of his mind. The town-dweller has created an atmosphere of reason around himself, he constantly sees his own will incarnated in a variety of divine things, in thousands of books and pictures, where by pen and brush the great torments of his soul his dreams and hopes, his love and hate are fixed for ever,—his limitless soul unquenchably burning with the thirst of new ideas, new doings, new forms.

Even when politically a slave, the townsman is still inwardly free—and it is by the force of this inner freedom that he destroys and builds up afresh the forms of social life.

Man of action, he created for himself a life harrowing highwrought, full of vice—but of beauty as well. He is the fountain of all social disease and corruption, the creator of cruelty, hypocrisy and deceit, but—he thereby creates the microscope that allows him to see with such clearness the least movement of his everlasting unsatisfied spirit. He has educated in his circle the wizards of science, art, and technics,—wizards and sages who untiringly strengthen and develop these foundations of civilization.

A great sinner before his neighbour and maybe, still a greater one before his own self, he is the martyr of his own aspirations, that, killing their begetter, bear ever new joys and torments of being.

His spirit is like to accursed Ahasuerus,—he wanders ever on into limitless future, somewhere to the heart of the

Cosmos, into the deserts of the universe that he is called, maybe, to replete with the emanations of his energy, creating what is unattainable to the conceptions of to-day's reason.

For the intelligence the development of civilization is important in itself, without respect to its results, for intelligence in itself is before all an apparition of civilization, the most intricate and mysterious phenomenon of nature, the organ of its self-recognition.

For the instincts only the utilitarian results of civilization are of import—only what augments external well-being, even if it be a humiliating lie.

For this reason now, when the reposed instincts of the village must infallibly enter into a struggle with the intellectual forces of the city, when town-civilization—the fruit of centuries-old activity of the intellectual principle (that comprises the factory worker too) is in danger of being destroyed or hindered in its process of development,—now, these intellectual elements must revise their customary attitude towards the village.

A «people» does not exist—only classes exist. The working class until now was the creator of material values—it now wants to take active part in spiritual, intellectual work. The majority of the rural masses strive at all costs to strengthen their position of owners on the land—they reveal no other aspirations.

One and the same task looms before the intellectuals of all countries, of the whole world: to give their energy to that class, that ensures the further development of the process of civilization by its psychical qualities, and that is fully capable of speeding up the time of that process.

Maxim Gorki.

The Herces of the Berne „International“

In my article „The Third International, its Place in History“ (vide „The Communist International“, № 1, of May 1-st 1919) I have drawn attention to one of the most prominent phenomena of the failure of the old, rotten Berne „International“. This bankruptcy of the theorists of reactionary socialism who are incapable of grasping the idea of proletarian dictatorship found expression in the proposal of the German „Independent“ Social Democrats to combine, unite, reconcile bourgeois parliamentarism with soviet power.

The most prominent theorists of the old International, Kautsky, Hilferding, Otto Bauer etc. did not realize that they were proposing to combine dictatorship of the bourgeoisie with dictatorship of the proletariat.

These men who had made a name and won the sympathies of the workers by preaching class war, by expounding its absolute necessity, did not,—in

the crucial moment of the struggle for socialism—understand that they were giving up the entire doctrine of class war root and branch, and were in fact going over to the bourgeois camp when attempting to combine bourgeois dictatorship with proletarian dictatorship.

This sounds improbable, yet it is a fact.

Having by good fortune received a fair quantity of foreign papers, though not consecutive numbers—we are now in a position to reconstruct, if incompletely, the history of the vacillations of the „Independents“ with regard to the principal theoretic and practical questions of the present day. The question we speak of is that of the relationship between dictatorship (of the proletariat) and democracy (of the bourgeoisie), i. e. between soviet power and bourgeois parliamentarism.

In his pamphlet on the „Dictatorship of the Proletariat“ (Vienna, 1918) Mr. Kautsky states that:

— the soviet organisation is one of the most important phenomena of our time. It promises to play a prominent rôle in the great decisive battle between capital and labour that we are about to witness" (vide p. 35 of Kautsky's pamphlet). He goes on to say that the bolsheviks have made a mistake in transforming the soviets from a "fighting organisation" of one "class" into a "state organisation", for they thus have "destroyed democracy" (ibid).

In my booklet "Proletarian Revolution and Renegade Kautsky" (Petrograd and Moscow 1919) I have examined this argument of Kautsky's in detail and have shown that it exhibits a complete disregard of the very principles of Marxist doctrine on the State. For the state (any state, democratic republics not excepted) is nothing but a mechanism for the oppression of one class by another. To define the soviets as fighting organisations of one class and to deny them the right to become a "state organisation" means, in fact, to disavow the very A. B. C. of socialism, to proclaim or defend the inviolability of the bourgeois mechanism for oppressing the proletariat (i. e. the bourgeois-democratic republic, the bourgeois government); it means, in fact, to go over to the camp of the bourgeoisie.

The absurdity of Kautsky's position is so evident, and the working masses' insistent demand for soviet power so strong, that Kautsky and his followers could but retreat shamefacedly, for they proved incapable of honestly avowing their mistake.

On the 9-th of February, 1919 the "Freiheit", the organ of the "Independent" (independent of Marxism, but wholly dependent upon petty-bourgeois democracy) social democrats of Germany published an article by Mr. Hilferding who already demands the transformation of the soviets into state organisations, but along with a bourgeois parliament, with the National Assembly. On the 11-th of February the whole "Independent Party" (in consequence, Mr. Kautsky also, who thus refutes his statement made in the autumn of 1918) in its appeal to the proletariat of Germany, adopts this scheme.

This attempt to combine dictatorship of the bourgeoisie with dictatorship of the proletariat is a complete renunciation of Marxism and of socialism as such, complete oblivion to the experience of the Russian mensheviks and "social revolutionaries" who from the 6-th of May 1917 up to the 25-th of October, 1917 (old style) tried the "experiment" of combining the soviets as "state organisation" with bourgeois statesmanship — and ignominiously failed in this experiment.

At the party congress of the "Independents" early in March 1919 the whole party took up this scheme of combining the soviets with bourgeois parliamentarism. However, on April 13-th 1919 the Freiheit (No 178, supplement) reports the "Independents" to have proposed the following resolution at the 2-nd Congress of Councils:

The Second Congress of Councils adopts the platform of the soviet system. In accordance with it the political and economic organisation of Germany has to be based on soviet power. The councils of workmen's deputies are the acknowledged organs representing the labouring population in all the spheres of political and economic life.

Moreover, the same party submitted to the congress a project of "general directives" where among other things we read:

"All political power belongs to the Congress of Councils".... "The right to elect and to be elected into the councils belongs, without difference of sex, to those who do socially necessary and useful work, without exploiting the labour of others"....

Thus we see what pitiful petty bourgeois the "independent" leaders have proved to be, wholly dependent upon the philistine prejudices of the most backward part of the population. In autumn 1918 these leaders, by the mouth of Kautsky, opposed any transformation of the soviets into state organisations. In March 1919 they surrendered this position, plodding in the rear of the working masses. In April 1919 they overthrew the decision of their own congress and unconditionally adopted the position of the communists: "all power to the soviets".

Such leaders are not worth much. No leaders are needed to voice the sentiments of the most backward part of the proletariat, leaders marching behind and not at the head of the vanguard. Leaders so lacking in principle, changing their watch-words at a moment's notice are worth very little. We cannot place confidence in them. They will always be a ballast, a negative quantity in the labour movement.

The most "radical" of them, one Mr. Däumig, argued as follows (Freiheit, 9 III) on the party congress:

... Däumig declares that nothing separates him from the demand of the communists: "All power to the councils of workmen's deputies." But he has to protest against the coup-d'état policy carried on by the communist party, against the byzantinism they exhibit with regard to the working masses, instead of educating them. The tactics of wrath and discord cannot lead to progress....

Coup-d'état policy the Germans call what 50 years ago the old revolutionaries in Russia used to call "flares", "letting up flares" that is, arranging small conspiracies, attempts at assassinations, risings and so on.

However, in accusing the communists of "riotism" Mr. Däumig only proves his "byzantinism", his subservience to the philistine prejudices of the petty bourgeoisie. The "radicalism" of those like him who only repeat a "fashionable" slogan out of cowardice before the masses, without understanding the revolutionary mass movement, is not worth a ha'penny.

A mighty wave of strikes is sweeping over Germany with elemental force. Germany is experiencing an unheard-of widening of the proletarian struggle, evidently surpassing the Russian events of 1905 when the strike movement had attained a hitherto unequalled height. To speak of "flare-popping" in the face of such a movement means to be a hopeless platitudinarian and a slave to philistine prejudices.

Messrs the Philistines with Däumig at their head probably dream of a revolution (if they have any idea about revolution in their heads at all) in which the fully organized masses would rise simultaneously.

Such revolutions do not exist, nor can they exist. Capitalism were not capitalism did it not keep millions of workers, the great majority of them, in subjection, fear, need and ignorance. Capitalism cannot be overthrown except by a revolution which in the course of the struggle rouses the hitherto untouched masses. Elemental explosions are inevitable as

revolution progresses. There never was nor will be any revolution without it.

That the communists favour disorganised upheavals is a lie of the same sort as the one we have heard so often from the mensheviks and social revolutionaries. The communists do not favour unorganised risings, do not stand up for isolated riots. The communists teach the masses to advance in good time, in thorough, one-souled ripe organisation. No philistine slander of Messrs Däumig, Kautsky and C. can change this fact.

But the philistines are unable to understand that the communists consider it their duty — and quite correctly too — to be with the struggling masses of the oppressed, and not to stand by with the cowardly onlookers, heroes of the petty bourgeoisie. When the masses fight, mistakes are unavoidable. The communists realise these mistakes, open the eyes of the masses to them, endeavour to correct them, unwaveringly uphold conscious action against elemental manifestations. And all the time they remain with the masses. It is better to be with the fighting masses gradually freeing themselves from mistakes as the struggle progresses, than to be on the side of the so-called intellectuals, the philistines, Kautsky-adherents, who stand by and wait for „complete victory“. — Such is the truth Mr. Däumig is incapable of grasping.

All the worse for him and those like him. They already figure in the history of the proletarian world revolution as cowards, reactionary snivellers, yesterday Scheidemann's liegemen and to-day preachers of „social peace“; and it hardly makes a difference whether this preaching is hidden under the slogan of a combination of the National Assembly with the Soviets or under a profound condemnation of „riotism“.

Mr. Kautsky has beaten the record in replacing Marxism by reactionary bourgeois snivelling. He sounds but one cord: he mourns over what is taking place, complains, weeps, is horrified, preaches reconciliation. All his life this Knight of the Woeful Countenance wrote on class struggle and socialism, but when it came to the climax of the class struggle, to the eve of socialism, our wiseacre lost himself, burst into weeping and showed himself to be a very ordinary philistine. In № 98 of the „Arbeiterzeitung“ (April 9-th 1919, morning edition), the organ of the Vienna traitors of socialism, of the Austerlitz', Renners and Bauers, for the hundredth, if not for the thousandth time Kautsky sums up his lamentations:

... economic reasoning and economic understanding — thus he whines — is gone from the brains of all the classes. ... The long war has accustomed wide layers of the proletariat to a complete disregard of economic conditions and to firm belief in the omnipotence of violence ...

These are two „little items“ of our „very learned“ man. Worship of violence and failure of production — this is what makes him take recourse to habitual, traditional, petty-bourgeois snivelling, instead of analyzing the actual conditions of class struggle. „We expected — he writes — that revolution would come as a result of proletarian class struggle“... but revolution has come owing to the military failure of the existing system, in Russia, as well as in Germany ...

In other words, our wiseacre „expected“ a peaceful revolution! That is excellent!

But Mr. Kautsky has lost himself to such an extent as to forget what he himself wrote when he was a Marxist, i. e. that the war will to all likelihood bring about a revolution. Yet now, instead of soberly and fearlessly analyzing which forms of revolution are inevitable owing to the war, our „theoretician“ mourns over his „shattered expectations“.

... Disregard of the economic conditions by wide layers of the proletariat!

What pitiful nonsense! How well do we know this petty-bourgeois tune from the menshevik papers of the Kerensky era!

Kautsky the economist has forgotten that in a country destroyed by war and brought to the very brink of ruin, the chief, fundamental „economic condition“ is to save the workman. If the working class will be saved from death by starvation, from outright ruin, it will be possible to start on the restoration of production. But in order to rescue the working class we require dictatorship of the proletariat which is the only means to prevent the burden and consequences of the war being rolled on to the shoulders of the workmen.

Kautsky the economist has „forgotten“ that the question of who is to bear the burden of defeat is solved by class struggle; that class struggle necessarily changes its forms in the surroundings of a totally worn out, wrecked, starved and ruined country. It is a class war no longer for a fair share in production, for the management of production (since production is at a standstill, coal there is none, the railroads are out of repair, the men out of hand, the machines worn out and so on); it is a struggle for salvation from hunger. Only fools — be they ever so „learned“ — can under such conditions „censure“ the „consumers' soldiers“; communism and superciliously enlighten the workers on the importance of production.

First and foremost the workman has to be saved. The bourgeoisie wants to keep its privileges, to roll all the consequences of the war on to the shoulders of the worker and this spells starving the working class to death.

The working masses want to save themselves from starvation. That is why they first have to overthrow the bourgeoisie, to ensure consumption first, if but the very scantiest, for otherwise they will not be able to drag on their half-starved lives, to keep body and soul together till the moment when production can once more be renewed.

„Think of production!“ the well-fed bourgeois says to the famished workman, weakened by hunger, and Kautsky, repeating this refrain of the capitalists under cover of „economic science“ is but a henchman of the bourgeoisie.

The workman says: let the bourgeoisie live on half rations, in order that the workers may recover, and not perish. „Consumers' communism“ is the only means of rescuing the workman. Nor can we stop at any sacrifices in order to save him! Half a pound to the capitalist, a pound to the workman — that is how we have to get out of the famine period, out of destruction. The consumption of the famished workman is the basis and condition of the restoration of production.

Clara Zetkin quite rightly accused Kautsky of „slipping down to bourgeois political economy. Production is for man, not man for production...“.

The same dependence upon the prejudices of the small bourgeoisie does the independent Mr-Kautsky reveal when he mourns over the „worship of brute force“. When as early as 1914 the bolsheviks pointed out that the imperialistic war would change into civil war, Mr. Kautsky kept silent, sitting in the same party with David and Co who declared this prophecy (and this watch-word) to be „insanity“. Kautsky altogether failed to understand the inevitableness of the imperialistic war being superseded by civil war and now he blames both parties to the civil war for his own lack of understanding! Is this anything else but a specimen of reactionary philistine dullness of mind?

But if in 1914, failure to understand that imperialistic war had inevitably to be followed by civil war was merely dullness, now, in 1919, it is something far worse: it is treason to the working class. For civil war in Russia and Finland and Latvia and Germany and Hungary is a fact. Hundreds and hundreds of times has Kautsky in his former writings acknowledged that there are historical periods when class struggle must needs turn into civil war. This has taken place and Kautsky has been discovered in the camp of the wavering, cowardly small bourgeoisie.

„... The spirit animating Spartacus is in the essence the spirit of Ludendorff... Spartacus will achieve not only the ruin of its own work, but a strengthening of the policy of violence on the part of the socialists of the majority. Noske is the antipode of Spartacus.“

These words of Kautsky (taken from his article in the Vienna „Arbeiterzeitung“) are so indescribably dull, ignoble and infamous that it suffices to point one's finger at them. A party which suffers such leaders in its midst is a decaying party. The Berne „International“ to which Mr. Kautsky belongs has to be valued by us at what it is worth, from the point of view of these words of Kautsky's, as a yellow International.

As a curiosity I wish to quote from the argument of Mr. Haase on the „International in Amsterdam“ („Freiheit“, 4. V. 1919.) Mr. Haase prides himself

that on the question of the colonies he proposed a resolution according to which „the League of Nations, organised according to the project of the International... has for its task, until socialism be realised (mark!)... to govern the colonies in the first place in the interest of the natives and in the second place in the interest of all the nations united in the League of Nations...“

Is it not a pearl? Until the realisation of socialism, according to the resolution of that wiseacre the colonies will be governed not by the bourgeoisie, but by some kind little, just little, sweet little „League of Nations!“

Is his argument anything else but the vilest capitalistic hypocrisy nicely painted up? And these are the „radical“ members of the Berne „International“..

To enable the reader to better compare the whole dulness, lowness and vileness of the writings of Haase, Kautsky and associates with the real state of affairs in Germany, I wish to add one more short quotation.

The well-known capitalist Walter Rathenau has published a booklet on „The New State“ (Der neue Staat). The booklet is dated March 25-th 1919. Its theoretic value is nought. But as an observer Walter Rathenau has to acknowledge the following:

„... We, the nation of poets and thinkers are in our spare hours... philistines.“

„... Idealism now exists only among the extreme monarchists and the Spartacists...“

„... The unadorned truth is that we are on the road to dictatorship, proletarian or pretorian“ (pp. 29, 62, 68).

This bourgeois evidently deems himself as independent of the bourgeoisie, as Messrs. Kautsky and Haase think themselves independent of the small bourgeoisie and of philistinism.

Yet Walter Rathenau ranks two heads above Karl Kautsky, for the latter snivels, and shrinks from the „unadorned truth“ like a coward, while the former openly acknowledges it.

H. Lenin.

29. V. 1919.

Social Democracy as an Instrument of Reaction.

I.

The stronger official social democracy is in a country, the worse off is the proletariat. That can now be considered a well-established axiom. *Ceteris paribus*, it is undoubtedly the case.

Why is the proletarian revolution in Germany being born under such tremendous difficulties? Why must the proletariat there wrestle for power inch by inch, at the price of rivers of workmen's blood? Why are the communists there pressed so hard?

The answer is clear. It is chiefly because in Germany the old official social democracy, that has now completely

and entirely gone over to the side of the bourgeoisie, was particularly strong.

The old official social democracy has become the instrument of bourgeois reaction. This is no mere polemical phrase, no exaggeration, it is the objective, we may say, the scientific, truth.

The most farsighted circles of the bourgeoisie recognized it long ago. It has been particularly well understood by the middle classes of Germany, the bourgeoisie of that country, where class-struggle had gone furthest during the last period of modern history.

In the very first months of the war, the German bourgeoisie had already clearly, realised that the German

social democrats were and would continue to be its chief support. The ideologists of the German bourgeoisie saw perfectly well that the idea of socialism was conquering and was bound to go on conquering ever wider strata of the German proletariat. Hence the leaders of the German bourgeoisie drew the conclusion, that they could find no better agent than official German socialdemocracy which, under the flag of socialism, defends the interests of the bourgeoisie.

As far back as April 1915 there appeared in the periodical «Preussische Jahrbücher» a remarkable article on «Social Democracy and the World War». That journal is known to be edited by the famous professor Delbrueck, a pillar of bourgeois reaction. It is the organ of the «enlightened» conservative German bourgeoisie. The most far-seeing ideologists of the German middle-classes ranked and still rank among its collaborators. And that periodical, as early as April 1915, not only exalted «its own» social democracy, but went so far out of its way as to quite openly declare, that social democracy, for the more successful saddling of the workers, had at all costs to keep up a show of radicalism.

«It is not necessary for us» — thus the article runs «that official German social democracy openly show up as it is, i. e. as a party of bourgeois reformism, an anti-socialist party. On the contrary, «we» wish German socialdemocracy to keep its socialist signboard, for otherwise it will be unable to successfully sustain its part as a sour agent to the end».

— «It (i. e. German social democracy) has to keep its character of a labour party with socialist ideals. For the day it will cease to do so, a new party will arise that will take up the programme disowned by the former and will give it a still more radical colour.» Thus wrote the author of the above-mentioned article in Delbrueck's journal (see pp. 50—51).

Official social democracy has at all costs to maintain its radical appearance, otherwise a new party will be formed that will carry the working masses along. We, the Delbruecks of all the countries, need social democracy to serve as a signboard, as a bait for the working men. Our agents, our Scheidemanns must by all means drape themselves in the socialist's toga. It is only thus that they will succeed in getting the masses under the thumb of the middle-classes. Otherwise the workmen will not believe them.

Thus cynically and openly was the question put by the leaders of the German middle-classes as long ago as 1915.

Many an unweeded garden has run to seed since, plenty of blood has been spilled. The working-class movement has meanwhile entered upon a different phase of development. The proletarian revolution in Russia has conquered, the proletarian revolution in Germany is on the road to victory. One thing only has remained, and that is the reactionary rôle of official German social democracy. This «Social Democracy» has remained true

to itself, nor has the attitude of the leaders of the bourgeoisie towards it undergone an alteration.

In 1915, when the article we quote from was written, Scheidemann and his associates stood, formally at least, in the ranks of the «non-compromising» opposition in the German Reichstag. Now, in 1919, the Scheidemann party is at the helm of the German state, he himself is holding the office of Premier, and Germany is officially called a «socialistic» republic. And yet, the bourgeoisie is, now as ever, staking all its hopes even upon Scheidemann and his party.

The 24-th of April issue of the central organ of German social-democracy, the «Vorwärts» contains a remarkable article bearing the title «Vedant Condiest A letter of warning at the eleventh hour». The author of the article is no common mortal, but Freiherr Karl Schenk von Schweinsberg. It is not an ordinary article—it is a manifesto of the German bourgeoisie. In this article we read:

«If we wish to save Germany from the Russian Soviet system built up on the principle of «all the power to the Soviets», there is one thing left for us to do; we ourselves have to supply the German workmen with a rational soviet system, with a system under which the soviets would be a Second Chamber, side by side with the National Assembly, and would represent the interests of the proletariat in all questions. Thus we would succeed not only in establishing a certain balance of power, but perhaps even in obtaining a predominance of the bourgeois parties.»

The high-born author concludes his manifesto with the words:

«Summing up, I wish to say that the only way for us to conquer Communism is, firstly, to obtain food-supplies and raw materials from abroad and, secondly, to set up a purely socialistic government that will immediately introduce a soviet system working hand in hand with the present German National Assembly.»

It is impossible to be more lucid; By a «purely socialistic» government Freiherr Karl Schenk von Schweinsberg of course means a government of social democrats of the Scheidemann brand. By the mouth of this frank bourgeois the whole of the German middle-class confesses that in the Germany of to-day, aflame with civil war, they can save their power only by means and with the help of a «purely socialistic» government of social democrats.

The surroundings have changed, the conditions are different, but the German bourgeoisie puts the same stake on official German social democracy now as in the years 1914—1918. And the bourgeoisie is quite right. If anyone can rescue it from utter collapse or even merely postpone its ruin, it is the party that still enjoys the confidence of only of a small part of backward workmen. And such a party is official social-democracy.

The struggle against the old governmental social democracy under present circumstances means struggle against the bourgeoisie.

II.

What we have said above about social democracy holds true not only of the so-called majority faction. In its essence it undoubtedly applies to the leaders of the «independent» social-democrats, the so-called socialistic «centre», both German and French, as well.

Let us cast a glance at the pamphlet of one of the best-known leaders of the «centre», Kautsky. The pamphlet deals with the «Problems of the Proletarian Revolution» and contains several articles by that renowned theorist of the «independent» socialists of all countries. When perusing the booklet one clearly realises that Frohrr Schenk and his friends are quite right in setting all their hopes on the socialdemocratic party.

In the beginning of January Kautsky published an entire «Programme of Socialistic Transformation». The programme begins as follows:

A «On the 9-th of November 1918 the proletariat of Germany attained to political power».

Could anyone imagine it less monstrous than the one contained in these few words? In the beginning of January 1919 none but the blind could help seeing that political power in Germany was actually in the hands of the bourgeoisie, leaning for its support upon its agents, the official social democrats.

Again, in the end of December 1918, the same Kautsky writes in another article which he calls the «Intensification of the Revolution»:

«Military aristocracy, till now standing in the way of all progress, has been overthrown, but the old administrative and governmental machinery continues to work in state and army». (The italics are mine).

Kautsky cannot shut his eyes to the fact that all the old officials have remained in their places, that the government apparatus continues to be in the hands of the propertied classes. But not in vain is Kautsky the valet of the German bourgeoisie. He immediately proceeds to demonstrate «scientifically»—the necessity of preserving the old bourgeois and bureaucratic mechanism. He writes:

— «We had to choose between destroying that apparatus at one blow and thus rendering (I) demobilisation, administrative activity of the State and all (II) social life impossible, or keeping it and preserving along with it the foundations of that old regime (the italics are mine) that has plunged us into an abyss, and thus limiting the revolution to a temporary change of rôles. In this desperate circumstance the workmen's and soldiers' councils came to our aid. Thanks to whose control the old state machinery could continue work without provoking a counter-revolution».

The import of this long and intricate tirade is obvious:

— The officials and bureaucrats of the middle-class must on no account be removed. The whole governmental apparatus has to remain in the old hands; otherwise, you see, it will be impossible to carry through demobilisation, social life will be desorganised; why, in fact, the

crack of doom were near. That is why «the foundations of the old regime» are left untouched, and the workmen's and soldiers' councils have to serve only as a fig-leaf to the old mechanism. The working masses of Germany can be satisfied with the pretence, that the councils exercise «control» over the old state apparatus. The workmen can be fed with lying phrases about the proletariat of Germany already having seized political power on the 9-th of November 1918.

One can go no further in loyalty to the bourgeoisie!

The working masses of Germany demand the immediate socialisation of the most important branches of industry. Left to itself, the bourgeoisie could never have successfully opposed the onslaught of the German working masses. But what are the «independent» and dependent social democrats there for, if not to help the bourgeoisie in such emergencies?

The leader of the «independent» social democrats, Karl Kautsky, in his pamphlet on the «Programme of Socialist Transformation», already referred to, advocates buying out the capitalists when socialising their enterprises. «The expropriation of the socialised enterprises has to take place by means of compensation, not of confiscation. Justice demands it (I), for confiscation necessarily affects the individual capitalist and not the class as a whole; nor does it hit only the capitalists, but the small proprietors as well».

Really, we do not know what is to astonish us more, Kautsky's unsophisticatedness, or his shamelessness. As if he were a little child, not understanding that in some way or other we can single out the small proprietor and assure his existence, that is useful to the state. As if even the most commonplace workman did not see that it is exactly the capitalist class that is smitten by confiscation, and not the individual capitalists.

But listen further. Let us suppose that socialisation on the principle of «fair compensation» (remember the «fair evaluation» of the Russian constitutional democrats) has been carried through. Whom, do you think, will socialised industry be managed by? Do you believe, by the workmen?

Nothing of the kind! Kautsky, the leader of the «independent» socialists, proposes the following programme:

«The boards of the syndicates have to consist of: one fourth of representatives of the capitalists, one fourth of the workmen's councils, one fourth of the organised consumers of the branch of industry in question, i. e. of manufacturers, if that branch of industry produces the means of production, and of the cooperative societies and communities, if it produces articles of consumption. The fourth has to be formed by the representatives of the Government who would give expression to the interests of the whole».

Translating this into plain language, with the present distribution of forces in Germany, this would mean that the management of socialised industry would be, by one half at least, perhaps even by three fourths, in the hands not of the working men, but of the bourgeoisie and its

adulators. Could the German middle-class, under the present circumstances, have found a better agent than Kautsky?

And thus with regard to each problem Kautsky adopts the programme of the bourgeoisie, and not that of the proletariat at all.

Take, for instance, the annulment of the war loans. Every honest workman understands that, unless the loans contracted by the ruling class for the purpose of carrying on senseless slaughter for five years, are cancelled, he will be unable to disentangle himself from debt, from taxes; he will be unable to free himself from the sharp claws of hunger. The bourgeoisie, of course, is of a different opinion. They contend that in «decent society» one always pays one's debts. They think: what are the workmen for, if not first to perish by the millions on the battle-fields for the interests of the financiers and later, when the butchery has come to an end, to go on paying for half a century the debts incurred in order to carry on that butchery. What has Kautsky, the principal theorist of the «independent» party, to say on this sore point?

— «The same arguments that apply to compensation hold true with regard to a simple annulment of the war loans as well. Besides the demands of justice (!) we have to point out here that until its final socialisation, capitalistic production will yet have to play an important part. Furthermore, we are still surrounded by capitalistic countries, we stand in urgent need of food and raw materials, and in the immediate future these can only be obtained by means of loans. The stability of credit is therefore an indispensable condition of our economic life».

Is there anything else the bourgeoisie could require of Kautsky? He has proved the necessity of sucking the marrow out of the workmen to the last to pay the war loans with: he has demonstrated it not only «scientifically», but ethically, by the interest of «justice»! Stability of bourgeois credit within a socialistic republic — that is what Kautsky is aiming at...

Nor is that all.

The order of the day for the German bourgeoisie at the present moment is to set the masses of the population against the German communists. The latter are represented as banditti, as lawless cut-throats. There is no slander vile enough to give the bourgeoisie pause in its persecution of the German communists. Now that the imperialists of the Allies force upon the German nation so vile and outrageous a peace, it is natural that the hatred of the German popular masses is primarily directed against the governments of the Allies. To compare anyone to the governments of the Allies means to identify him with the worst enemy of the German people. And yet Kautsky goes so far in his officiousness as to compare the German communists to the governments of the allied countries.

In his article on the «Intensification of the Revolution» we have before quoted, Kautsky says.

— «The governments of the conquerors are partisans

of violence in exactly the same way as the Spartacus group (!). And the victory of the latter in Germany would mean renewal of the war with the Allied Powers. Lenin has already promised three million men and food-supplies in plenty for this purpose, but he omits to say where those armies and food-supplies are hidden in Russia».

Whoever reads these infamous words will agree with us that Kautsky has not only renounced the ideals of revolutionary socialism, but has become a true sycophant, a chained-up watch dog of the bourgeoisie. A man who talks himself into saying such base words has dropped to the level Leo Tikhomirov fell to when he forsook the revolutionaries and took service with orthodoxy and autocracy.

You will find in Kautsky's writings the usual tricks in the way of hundreds of little clauses. He will tell you that «the marxistic centre has simultaneously to convince the wavering ones and draw out the trusting ones to criticism, while keeping in check the ignorant and injudicious ones». He will unroll before your eyes an idyll of «unity» with a war of ideas carried on within a party, but a war that «does not break through the undivided proletarian front if it sums up to, the left wing stimulating the right and the right wing restraining the left from injudicious steps».

But all this is empty chatter which can satisfy only the old women of the «independent» party. In the main issues Kautsky is at one with Scheideemann. In his «Intensification of the Revolution» he frankly confesses that «in this interpretation of the intensification of revolution we agree with the socialists of the majority». We now all (is that to say the butcher Noske included?) stand on the same marxist platform».

Our congratulations to Mr. Kautsky...

* * *

The «independent» social democrats have now somewhat shifted their position. They pretend to have become more radical. However, to trust Kautsky and his friends would mean to trust Asev and Tikhomirov. And we are glad to say that our German communist friends have formed exactly the same estimate of the situation that we have. A few days ago we read in an article of one of the most influential German communists, comrade Hartmann, that the German communists are fully prepared to stand up in arms if necessary, against any possible rule of the «independent» party. That is to say, the German workmen are fully aware of their duty...

Official social democracy in all countries and in all its ramifications, including the «independent», has become the instrument of bourgeois reaction. We must wrest this its last weapon from the hands of the bourgeoisie, we must break, we must annihilate it. After that, the last assault against the strongholds of the bourgeoisie will not be so difficult after all...

G. Zineviev.

The International of Action.

The second International was struck with apoplexy and died in August 1914, when the world war began. It had long been leading a spurious life, had become weak and tottering, owing to the dis-integrating tubercular bacillus of reformism. Externally it was of imposing stature, it counted many millions of proletarians among its followers. Internally, however, heart, lungs and blood — everything that might have lent it strength and vigour was already affected and beginning to decay. Of the original revolutionary socialism nothing but a semblance was left; nothing but hollow words, resolutions, decisions fated for ever to remain on paper! And from behind this empty semblance, the whole futility of reformism and social-patriotism stared one in the face.

The unprecedented hardships brought about by the war made the second International crumble and moulder away. But very few of the social-democratic parties — the bolsheviks of Russia in the first instance — remained true to their ideals and fought with all their might against the world war and for the destruction of the sinful capitalistic system that had brought about the war. The others, the majority, betrayed everything that they had hitherto held sacred and considered binding for themselves. The right wing of the socialists of Germany and Austria sold themselves to the Kaiser, those of France to Clémenceau, those of England to Lloyd George, those of America to Wilson. It was only a small minority that in those countries pleaded the cause of the proletariat. Socialists fought against socialists, workmen against workmen, murdering one another with patriotic enthusiasm, at the command of their masters, the capitalists! The leaders of the right socialist wing proclaimed that abominable slaughter to be the sacred duty of the socialists! And when the revolutionary socialists in Zimmerwald unfurled the banner of revolt against war and capitalism, they were outlawed by the henchmen of capital and by the bourgeois governments that had commonly pledged

themselves by sacred oath to deceive and subdue the proletariat.

Thus the second International was killed by its own leaders. It died in shame and disgrace, the death of the coward and traitor. Face to face with incipient world-revolution the social-patriots, at the Berne conference hastened to amnesty one another and to try and breathe international life into their own political corpse. They feared to lose their power over the masses that now began to go their own way — the way of revolution — without consulting their treacherous leaders. But the yellow international is doomed to failure, for it is built up on the rotten and unsound basis of the past, of civic peace and of patriotism. Their call to rally once more round the old banner is answered by the verdict of history: "the Lord has judged you."

Out of the ashes of the world war, out of the ruins of the old International arises the new army of the fighting revolutionary working-class, the Third International. The communist world-congress in Moscow in the beginning of March, with the participation of 16 socialist parties, proclaimed the Communist International, which revived in its main features the Zimmerwald orientation, that had but a temporary character. Its chief tenets as well as its programme are in close harmony with the ideas and principles that are upheld by the communist parties in Russia and Germany — those admirable pioneers of revolutionary socialism.

The congress in Moscow was a historical event. It gives the starting-point for the revolutionary proletariat of the world, gathering for the great final struggle against capitalist wage-slavery and moral bondage. The class-conscious workmen all over the earth ought joyfully to welcome this event as the beginning of a new era, of the golden age of labour, right and liberty. The International of Action is to lead us there.

Z. Hoeglund^a (Sweden).

DUE TO THE POOR QUALITY OF THE ORIGINAL COPY,
PHOTOGRAPHS ON THIS PAGE COULD
NOT BE REPRODUCED.

DUE TO THE POOR QUALITY OF THE ORIGINAL COPY,
PHOTOGRAPHS ON THIS PAGE COULD
NOT BE REPRODUCED.

The Swiss Party Programme

The Swiss Party Congress of December 1918 appointed a committee that was to work out a new programme. The committee received no instructions as to the manner in which the programme was to be revised. There are now two diverging points of view on the matter. The one demands a complete revisal of the party-programme, while the other upholds the opinion that only the second part of it, the so called *working programme* has to be revised.

The latter point of view is supported chiefly by comrade Robert Grimm in his pamphlet on the "Revolution and Mass Action". He says: "Thus the laying down of a new programme, as decided by the last party congress, will be not so much a case of altering the present party programme, as of supplying it with a commentary that would point out *which demands* had to be placed foremost in propaganda and practical struggle". In the summary to his pamphlet we read "While the previous, so called historical, parties were consumed by the fire of the world-war, the labour movement of Switzerland, since August 1914, has witnessed an unprecedented development. Intellect and methods of combat have alike contributed towards its progress. *It needs no change in its orientation.* Its orientation is that of the programme of the social democratic party, is Socialism as such".

We cannot share his opinion. The world-war conflagration has devoured not only historical parties, it has also destroyed the *Second Workmen's International*. The fact of the great social democratic parties of Germany, France, Austria-Hungary and so forth having in August 1914 ignored the resolutions of the international socialist congresses, voted war credits and supported the world-war, has aroused great disappointment among wide layers of the population. The social democrats of Switzerland were a party to this collapse. Our group in the National Council not only voted for money to be granted for the mobilisation, but unanimously consented to the Federal Council being vested with discretionary powers. Such far-reaching support offered by social democracy to the bourgeoisie has never as yet been witnessed in any parliament. Moreover, in autumn 1914 the party agreed to make peace with the bourgeoisie. The tragedy of it is, that for a considerable time we were not even aware of our principles having been thus ignominiously betrayed. We perceived the mote in the eyes of our brethren abroad, but failed to notice the beam in our own.

We cannot pass this occurrence over without attention. The causes of its having come about must be investigated. They are not to be sought in the persons, who were active at that time, nor in the "peculiar circumstances" of our country, so frequently referred to. The collapse was an international one, the causes were the same everywhere. The excellence of our party-programme could not save us from a break-down. Hence it follows that there was something wrong, that the orientation was an erroneous one.

In the belligerent countries dissension arose within the organised proletariat, that led to a split from the state-socialists and called forth further splits into factions. Soviet Hungary proves that the road to unity of proletarian action sometimes lies above dissension. An investigation of the causes of the splits shows that it is not only a matter of difference of tactics. Those who keep up with literature and discussions will observe that there exist profound *diversities of aim*.

During the long period of peaceful development that lies behind us, the pure socialist teachings as set forth by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels were adulterated. Those points only of the socialist doctrine were continually being emphasized, which appeared acceptable to the bourgeoisie. Thus the revolutionary essence, the revolutionary soul of socialism was being more and more pushed to the background and forgotten. Socialist literature before the war contains chiefly a watery, bleached socialism that now makes it so very difficult for us to understand the lessons of the present day.

This international phenomenon did not pass Switzerland by. With us too the principles of socialism were being "adapted" to the circumstances. Every single page of our party programme shows obvious traces of adaptation to our "democratic" institutions. The party programme as a whole breathes the spirit of opportunism; it is the outgrowth of the erroneous conception that a slow but steady and calm growth into the social state was possible. As a matter of course the programme places class-struggle to the fore. But the practical means suggested for carrying through the class-struggle prove that the author, comrade *Nico Lang*, was guided by the idea that socialism could be introduced by the proletariat *werey taking over* the old government institutions.

Section 3 of the party programme, dealing with "The road to socialism", gives drastic expression to this conception in the following passage: "It is in this direction that it (the social democratic party) tries to widen the functions of the Federation, the cantons and the boroughs". And, further: "It demands increased participation in the legislature and in all branches of administration in order to develop the corresponding institutions on democratic lines and make them subservient to the ends of progressing socialisation". By these words the author suggests the *cooperation* of the social-democrats with the bourgeoisie in the institutions created by the latter for the protection of its own class-interests. Our present party programme has for its aim to *mend* the bourgeois state, to patch it up. Yea, such a masterpiece is this patching to be, that the "majority of the people" will readily entrust the master-menders with the management of the bourgeois state machine, with governmental power. Thus is socialism to be realized.

While in Switzerland this aim of the social democrats as yet finds expression in their programme only, the German majority socialists professing the same

ideology, have suited the action to the word. They did come into power after the October revolution, they did take over the bourgeois state with the whole body of administrative institutions and officials of Wilhelm the Second's monarchy. They avail themselves of that bourgeois state mechanism and, like true benchmen of the bourgeoisie, they carry on the latter's business to the detriment of the working classes. We have understood long since, that this was a grave mistake on the part of the German majority socialists. Again, as in 1914, we see the mistakes of others, but fail to acknowledge our own wrongdoings, for, you see, we do not require any new orientation.

There is no other way but to go back to what Marx and Engels wrote on this subject. In the preface to the Communist Manifesto we read as follows: „Above all the Commune has proved, that the working class cannot simply take possession of an existing state machine and set it going for its own purpose.“ This important correction to the Manifesto in the current conception of marxian socialism has been expounded to mean that Karl Marx was herewith emphasizing the idea of gradual evolution as expressed in our programme, in opposition to the proletariat's *seizure of power*. This is merely one of the numerous adulterations of the socialist doctrine. The real interpretation that Karl Marx wished this sentence to be given appears from his letter to Kugelmann of April 13-th 1871, where he writes: „If you will look up the last chapter of my „18-th Brumaire“ you will see that I declare: the next attempt of the French revolution will consist not in a transfer of the bureaucratic mechanism from one pair of hands to another, as is hitherto did, but in *breaking up the machine* (the italics are by Marx), this being an indispensable condition for every real people's revolution.“ The words „to break up the bureaucratic and military state mechanism“ mark one of the chief stages in the development towards the socialist end. The communists of Russia and Hungary have followed the words of Marx, and they have been able to establish proletarian rule. The adherents of adulterated socialism have caused the downfall of the Second International. Germany shows the fruit such „socialism“ bears.

In the „Wiener Arbeiterzeitung“ Dr. Max Adler publishes a critical analysis of bolshevism and commu-

nism. In this critical essay he marks as the main feature of bolshevism, as contrasted to socialistic communism, *only* the idea of proletarian dictatorship, not only with an abnegation of democracy, but with „terrorism“ emphasized on principle. It seems to us that an accidental, secondary attribute of bolshevism has here been mistaken for its decisive feature. For did not the most characteristic, really momentous trait of bolshevism consist in *Lenin's* „breaking up“ the Russian bourgeois state apparatus and building up on its ruins the *proletarian soviet system*, the *hitherto unknown* new organ of state power? That is the great historical deed of the bolsheviks. A critical analysis of bolshevism that fails to mention this chief point is not only incomplete, but is bound to lead to false conclusions. That explains how comrade Dr. Adler who, by the way, by the last part of his article proves himself to be an adherent of Kautsky, a member of the central party, can say that the only thing that divides the communists (bolsheviks) from the social democrats is „but a complex of tactical problems“. That would hold true only in case if *before* the appearance of the bolsheviks in Russia the „revolutionary social democrat“ had not hidden „his communist ideal“ under the bushel. If the Independents of Germany and Austria and our comrades of the centre of kindred mind now exclaim for fear of bolshevism: „We too are communists, it is only questions of tactics that stand between us“, no one believes them any more.

We stand face to face with the ruins of the Second International. Before we can take part in the construction of the new, Third International, we have to free ourselves from the errors of the one that has collapsed. Those are errors not only tactical, but touching the very essence of the thing. Never again should we social democrats renounce our principles and support the middle-classes in their struggle against the interests of the workmen.

When working out the new programme -- which for us can only be a complete revision -- these questions have to be discussed. The social democratic party has to adopt a *new orientation*. The tenets of the Third International are to be its basis.

Eugen Muench (Switzerland).

A Soviet Republic in Bavaria.

The first question that presents itself if one sets about analyzing the chances for the development of the Soviet Republic proclaimed at Munich in the beginning of April is, how do matters stand as to the organisation of the soviets in Bavaria. For, clearly, the proclamation of Soviet government in the capital of a country is reasonable only if local organs that can and will be instrumental to the proletariat taking over the power in the whole country exist everywhere. That is to say, a Diet, its members, electoral districts and voters can be eliminated only if a capable soviet congress and a whole

mechanism of district, parish and factory councils can be put in their place. How about this in Bavaria?

A clear answer to this question is furnished by the first attempt to establish a Soviet government in Bavaria made at Munich after the assassination of Eisner at the end of February, as well as by the form in which this event took place. The revolutionary provisional Central Council, formed in the first days out of the strongly radicalized Munich councils, immediately summoned a general congress of the councils that was to invest the Central Council with a mandate, thereby constituting

itself as the supreme governmental power. But the councils' congress abstained from this act, pronouncing itself not authorized to it (let us say incapable), and re-summoned the Diet.

The chief supporters of this resolution were, of course the Kaiser-socialists represented at the congress. Their opportunist arguments brought forth in defence of their attitude, were, however, based on different motives than those of, for instance, the North-German Scheidemannists on the subject of the National Assembly. The true representatives of «democratic» ideology among the Bavarian social democrats were at that time excluded or temporarily set aside (Auer, the former minister, Hoffmann, and Timm in consequence of the dissolution of the diet, Franz Schmidt, the leader of the Munich trade-unions, owing to his very disreputable attitude at the last negotiations with the Munich workmen's council). The remaining majority members of the councils congress were on principle almost unanimously in favour of introducing the soviet system as state organisation (this being the result of the working masses slowly but surely becoming more and more radical). The only thing that prevented them voting for it was the point of view of «Realpolitik» on the peculiar economic and social structure of Bavaria, a country which, in their opinion, was ill-adapted for the setting up of a soviet government. This opinion, for a considerable period of time shared by the independents, can not be denied some actual foundation. Bavaria is paramouly an agrarian country and, as distinguished from agrarian North-East-Germany, a country of middle sized peasant holdings. Large estates with serf-labourers attached to them and cottagers doing statute labour, as is the case in Russia, are as little known there, as poverty-stricken dwarf holdings. As regards industry, Munich, for instance, the largest city, has but 6 or 7 works none of which, quantitatively, comes up to the smaller works of the North-German industrial districts. Moreover, the migration of the industrial labourers to and from the country is greater, probably, than in any other city of Germany, the formation of a permanent sedentary proletariat being thus made impossible. It is only with regard to Nuremberg, Fürth and Augsburg and several smaller country towns, that one can speak of a pronounced majority of the industrial proletariat. From the social point of view, that primarily means an externally weaker, less perceptibly marked accentuation of class-contrasts and, as a result, the absence of direct motives for a struggle. These actual peculiarities of the economic and social structure of Bavaria are not to be overlooked. They make the attitude of the Bavarian majority more dangerous than that of their North-German colleagues, for the latter's opportunist grimaaces are gainsaid by the plain fact of the existence of a suffering, poverty-stricken proletariat in the large cities and indigent day-labourers in the country.

Notwithstanding, there is a hitch in the train of thought of the Bavarian majority-supporters. If only they could

think, if only they were just a little revolutionary-minded and, above all, if only they had a gleam of the organisation principle put forth by the social revolution of our epoch, of the *soviets*, they would see it for themselves.

For, as a matter of fact, the less marked character of the class-contrasts is but seemingly nay, more, class-struggle in this veiled form is particularly dangerous to the workmen, since it makes the triumph of the bourgeoisie anchor fast among the very masses of the oppressed and gives rise to the danger of it becoming permanent.

Under these conditions is it the particular duty of the adherents of class-struggle to increase class-consciousness, by all available means of verbal and practical propaganda, to rouse the will to fight for power in the masses and to furnish to the battle-front means of political expression in the *soviets*, the latter having to be organisations of the purely proletarian strata of the population with any and all other tendencies shut out.

The hesitating majority at the council congress would have been right had they said: «We are against the immediate introduction of a soviet-republic because we have no councils that would form the necessary basis for it». For, as a matter of fact, councils conscious of their actual duty never did exist in Bavaria, — that duty being to organise the purely proletarian strata of the population with a view to preparing and achieving the taking over of the power by the proletariat into councils of corresponding composition and «purity». Single revolutionary (i. e. not «lawfully elected») workmen and soldiers' councils during the first November days having concentrated the organisation of the revolutionary mass-movement in Bavaria and thus helped the Eisner-government into power, their example everywhere called forth an as yet half-conscious impulse to form «soviets» according to the Russian pattern». Unfortunately one had not the slightest idea of what that «Russian pattern» was like and therefore soon fell back into the old grooves of democratic representation of interests. In the middle of December a decree signed by the Kaiser-socialist Auer ordered a «lawful» re-election of all councils. The electoral law he issued definitely annihilated the political and combatant character of the councils. Next to «representatives» of manufacturing concerns there sat delegates from merchant-organisations and even bourgeois professors as representing the «intellectual workers». The only revolutionary elements in the city councils were the remnants of the above-mentioned revolutionary labour councils whom it had proved impossible to shut out from cooperation. The only functions left to these «soviets» were the exercise of a sham control over the organs of communal administration as well as some trade-union functions. In spite of five months having passed there has nowhere taken place a re-election of the councils which, it is clear, consisted chiefly of old trade-union employees and, in the country, administrative officials, and the like. While class-consciousness and the will to struggle were steadily growing, thanks to the economic

oppression of the masses and the effective propaganda of the communist party in Germany making slow but sure headway,—the lack of political functions and the want of clearness as to their executive powers made the councils lose all interest in their work. They finished by becoming exactly the same shattering assemblies as parliaments were before them.

It thus becomes obvious that the representatives of such councils could by no means expect themselves to be the bearers of a soviet government, that is to say, to realise the dictatorship of the proletariat. By this we also may form an idea of what the first proclamation issued by the Bavarian Soviet Government the 7-th April is worth. For we have to bear in mind that the same persons who now voted for the introduction of the soviet-system had violently opposed it but a few weeks before. That this could come about is to be explained as follows: The February soviet congress had, out of opportunistic motives, decided to re-summon the diet. Yet the congress was revolutionary enough to adopt a motion for summoning the diet for a short session only, with the sole function of sanctioning a ministry proposed by the congress. But, as events developed the diet remonstrated against its elimination and, trusting to the impotence of and disharmony within the congress, decided to meet by its own prerogative in order to appoint a different cabinet. This step of the diet made it clear even to the adherents of the socialist congress majority that nothing but the introduction of a «soviet republic» could still save the «gains of the revolution». The diet was prevented from assembling and Bavaria was proclaimed a «Soviet Republic». From a purely formal point of view this step was of great import, the more so that the support of the councils all over the country could be counted upon,—those very councils whose official representatives had carried the resolution. In reality, however, it was null and void. The communist leaders of Munich saw it and therefore refused their assistance. But they also saw further than that. They knew that, while the

development of the soviets was at a standstill, the masses were becoming more and more radical owing to the increasing pressure of the disintegrated, disorganised capitalistic system. Thus they could venture to issue their watch-word for the introduction of a real soviet system, and the concentration of the whole power in the hands of the proletariat only. It appears that, having passed over the «councils» that had long ceased to be representative of the proletarian masses, the communist leaders of Munich have actually succeeded in getting into direct contact with the proletariat and thus acquiring real power. After what we have said before it was to be foreseen that the communists could not meet with a like success all over the country, the more so that the organisation of the communist party was not sufficiently advanced in order to—and that they might have done with impunity—set up capable soviets wherever possible. We shall witness this much-promising attempt of the «socialist» Hoffmann government being overthrown too; perhaps, even with the support of the very comrades that, April 7-th, voted for the «soviet government». We hope that the communists will, notwithstanding, be able to rescue their organisation and keep it effective, so that the experience of these days of struggle may be profited by and possibility may remain above all to continue the further building up of the soviets,—the cardinal points of future development.

To carry on untiring propaganda; to work out and put before all the proletarian and semi-proletarian strata of population the most important items of their programme; to arouse the consciousness of the masses to and enhance the class contrasts; to promote the will to struggle and, last but not least, by means of all this so to prepare the moment for the proletariat's taking over the state—rule that nothing on earth should be able to wrench the power out of the hands of the hard-ried working classes—such is the task that even in Bavaria, with its «peculiar economic and social structure» is bound to lead to victory.

Victor Roebig (Bavaria).

The Course of the Revolution in Hungary.

In the End of October the guns on the Italian front stopped firing, the troops in the garrisons refused to obey their officers. This result was the ruin of the agrarian-financial block, which reigned in Hungary, supported by bayonets and by the unconditional subordination of the soldiers.

A new social-democratic government of the small bourgeoisie was formed. Its programme was: to create a capitalistic democracy and to restore production on capitalistic principles. But the reckoning was made without the host. Since the very first revolutionary outbursts, Soviets had been formed in all branches

of industry which seized the factories, where they had acquired an exceptional influence, and began to put forth their demands on a broad scale. Although the government attempted to counteract these achievements, its attempts were fruitless, not being backed by armed force. The army was disorganized and in spite of all efforts the government did not succeed in creating new reliable cadres. The Allies achieved the weakening of the bourgeoisie by their tactics.

They occupied wide areas of the country, especially those providing raw materials to the industries. The attempts of the bourgeoisie to ruin the new system by sabotage called

forth the decided resistance of the workmen and ended in complete disaster of the bourgeoisie.

Hungary is a chiefly agricultural country—a fact that at first sight seemed propitious to the new political formation. The government began by tracing an agrarian reform, which was meant to increase and strengthen the existent small land-owners and at the same time create a new class of small land-owners, in other words—partisans of the petty bourgeois capitalistic system. But this attempt was thwarted by the opposition of the rural labourers and poorer peasants. Hungary possesses large estates, with a comparatively good supply of implements. The plan was to divide them into small parts and distribute them for moderate sum among the rural labourers, but it proved impossible to provide the whole newly arisen class of small peasantry with cattle and agricultural implements. Such scrapfarming without farm buildings, without agricultural implements and acquired at high price—called forth the protests of the workmen and poorest peasants. In many places they seized large estates for public use and continued their exploitation on the principle of copartnership. With such a politico-economical situation communistic agitation developed a severely feverish activity: during 15 weeks the party spread a larger quantity of agitation literature than the social democratic party during 15 years. The party daily and the scientific organ attained a high number of copies and were very popular among the workmen. Each economical measure the government took was criticized, the correct one was opposed to each false step. The government of the small bourgeoisie cruelly

persecuted the communists, but these measures only increased the number of their partisans. Such was the situation at the beginning of March. Preparations for the elections for the National Assembly were made: The experience of Germany and Germany Austria left no doubts, that a social democratic majority would not be formed. At the same time, the workmen were not inclined to give way to the bourgeois majority. The social democratic party openly declared that they would recognise the result of the elections only in case of an issue favourable to them. They threatened to dissolve the assembly by armed force.

This was openly taking the field against bourgeois democracy. One after another the bourgeois radical parties withdrew from the elections and in the meantime counter-revolution openly prepared to fight. To this difficult position of the government was added the aggravation of the situation in foreign politics. The pretensions of the Entente grew daily. In the first days of March she claimed the surrender of the Danube fleet and wharves to the Czecho-Slovaks and on the 19-th the notorious De Lobit note was handed over to the government. By this time it was clear that the government would not be able to keep its position—it came to this conclusion and retired.

Marx had already remarked in his youth that a capitalistic-democratic revolution was not possible even in a land where capitalism is only partly developed. And if the workmen get the power into their hands, they use it to the defence of their own interests. The events in Hungary are a classical proof of this thesis.

Julius Alpári.

Communist Hungary.

Only six weeks ago no outsider would have believed it possible that Hungary could ever become a soviet republic. The Hungarian proletariat was divided into two parts. The one, incomparably superior in numbers, belonged to the social democratic party. The other, numerically much smaller, but in politics acting much more resolutely adhered to the communist party. An acute struggle seemed to go on between the two camps. The leaders of the communist party were even put under arrest and that by order of a government counting four social democrat ministers. Shortly after the arrest had taken place, the proletariat of Hungary took over the whole power in the country. The proletariat started from the principles of a soviet system and proclaimed the dictatorship of the proletariat. And now the leaders of the former social democrat party are working in full harmony with the communists at strengthening this dictatorship. Among the people's commissaries are two former ministers who at the time had given their consent to the arrest of the leaders of the communist party. To-day complete harmony reigns within the Hungarian proletariat. When the union came about only three of the former leaders of the social democrat party dissociated themselves. They were: Garami, intellectual socialist, formerly minister of commerce; Buchinger, secretary to the party and Peidl, minister without portfolio. They were not inclined to adopt the platform of dictatorship.

This peculiar change in the relations of the two parties was possible only because the Hungarian social democratic party was incomparably more radical than the Western parties. The Hungarian social democrats had kept themselves aloof from all social patriotism (some small transgressions excepted). No «civil peace» was established in Hungary during the war, the class struggle of the proletariat continued and frequently acquired an acute form even during the war. This furnished the general possibility for passing from the social democratic basis to communist policy.

However, the chief inducement for the marxistically schooled leaders of the social democrat party and, in particular, for the writer of these lines, to change their political principles lay in their realising that production could not be built up anew on a capitalistic basis in Hungary, nor, to all intents and purposes, in any of the other countries. Militarism was so thoroughly eradicated by the first Hungarian revolution that the ruling classes were no longer able to use armed force against the proletariat. Thus disappeared one of the most indispensable props of all capitalistic production, armed power which, in cases of necessity, could force the proletariat to work. No intact military units remained that might have served as nucleus to all kinds of counter-revolutionary organizations, as was the case in Germany. Whatever new military organisations were formed after the first revolu-

tion were much more intimately connected with the proletariat, than with the bourgeoisie. It was therefore quite out of the question to use against the proletariat those new military units that had their own soldiers' councils and delegates.

Under such conditions the capitalists had no choice but to grant the economic demands of the proletariat, for otherwise the workmen would have used force against the capitalists and their officials. However, high wages making production an unremunerative business, the capitalist withdrew from it and the whole capitalistic system came to a deadlock. As a matter of course prices had to be raised in accordance with the higher economic demands of the workmen. Thus production as a whole was moving in a circle, and it was clear that the demands of the workmen, no longer to be kept down by intact militarism, could not be granted within a capitalistic system, the more that the productive mechanism of Hungary had greatly suffered through the war. Thus every reasonable marxist had to recognise that the preservation of the capitalistic system spelt absolute economic ruin to the country; that a reorganisation of production would be possible only if all capitalistic obstacles were removed from economic development at one blow and the whole economic life subjected to the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The entering of the Hungarian proletariat into political power was facilitated by the Allied imperialists dictating to Hungary conditions of peace which the coalition government, consisting of bourgeois and social democrats, would not accept, nor had the courage to refuse. The coalition cabinet chose the only way out and resigned, handing over entire government power to the proletariat. The bourgeoisie thought that they were transferring the power to the social democratic party and were certainly rather disagreeably surprised when they became aware that they had really paved the way for proletarian dictatorship. The resignation of the bourgeois government enabled the proletariat to take the whole political power of the country into their hands at once, without any bloodshed whatsoever.

The union of the two parties having been accomplished and proletarian dictatorship proclaimed, nothing activity immediately began with a view to carrying through the socialisation of production in the shortest possible period. The very first day of the new government being in power all banks were proclaimed state property, the deposits, securities and safes of the bour-

geoisie were confiscated and the former owners permitted to draw not more than 2,000 crowns a month.

All the enterprises having over 20 workmen, were monopolised by the state without compensation to the owners. All real estate exceeding in size the piece of land that could be worked by a single farmer and his family was taken from the owners and assigned for cultivation to the landless agricultural labourers. The land itself is state property; the tillers are paid labourers of the state organised on a cooperative basis. Cultivation on the large estates takes place under the control and guidance of trained agricultural officials; there is no dividing into lots at all. In the same way all houses neither acquired nor built, but merely inhabited by proletarians went over to the state without compensation to the owner.

Order is rapidly returning in economic life.

A central office is now being established for all raw materials and half-manufactured goods. The whole production of the most important branches of industry, such as coal, wood, iron, sugar, machinery etc. is being concentrated in a central government office; the production of all the works is being reported to this office weekly. All the data on production flow into this central office. A superior council decides on the principles of distribution and further production. Moreover, an office for foreign trade has been formed that supervises and regulates the whole foreign trade, export as well as import. We thus see that the work of reconstruction is progressing much faster in Hungary than in Russia. The reasons for it are that for a whole month there was no counter-revolutionary movement, nor war in Hungary, that the country is small, which makes work much more easy than in a large country; and, lastly, that till now we had no sabotage of intellectuals. On the contrary, engineers, chemists, state and private officials have placed themselves unconditionally at the disposal of the soviet government.

A severe impediment to peaceful work has arisen in the attack of the Rumanian boyars. In order to offer them effective resistance regular work had to be interrupted and the whole force of the proletariat turned towards the defence of the country. We earnestly hope to be able to repel the attack and to soon successfully finish the work we have begun.

Bugene Varga.

People's Commissary of Social Production
of the Hungarian Soviet Republic.

In Defence of Rosa Luxemburg

The article written by comrade Louisa Kautsky in commemoration of Rosa Luxemburg (see the "Freiheit" of January 20th, № 36) challenges to energetic opposition all those who intimately knew the greatness of soul of our so foully assassinated comrade. It goes against my inclination to dispute about the deceased as it were before her open grave. Yet truth and friendship prompt me to refute some of the assertions made by Louisa Kautsky. I believe I owe it not only to the departed, but also to the living to prevent the caricature of Rosa Luxemburg, as drawn and sorrowed by her numerous

enemies, from being any further coarsened and distorted by ill-drawn lines from the hand of a friend.

Louisa Kautsky is right when she says of Rosa Luxemburg as a fighter that "she did not spare even her best friends, on the contrary". Yet as a friend thoroughly understanding the deceased, comrade L. Kautsky ought to have laid stress on some other points besides. The tenacious, thoughtful patience with which she fought for the soul of her oldest friends before setting out to combat them! The sincerity of her grief when she had to take arms against a former confederate, the bitterness

of her disappointment when his way of fighting and wielding arms made her recognize that he did not come up to the high ideal she had formed of him. To be sure Rosa Luxemburg did not spare even her oldest friend if she was honestly convinced that he was detrimental to and wronging the proletarian class-struggle. The cause in her eyes always stood above the person. Once she considered it her duty to combat even her dearest friend she did so with all the weapons at her disposal. With the heavy artillery of serious scholarly methods and mature theoretic training, with the weighty blows of brilliant dialectics, the dainty foil of irony, wit and derision. Yet at no time did she make use of unchivalrous methods. Here was a thoroughly noble character, incapable of retaliating upon anyone, of wielding the weapons of baseness, even if such were used against herself.

Louisa Kautsky is therefore in the wrong when she characterizes Rosa Luxemburg thus: "I am sorry to say that in such cases she acted like Lenin, much admired by her, who having once been brought up before a party-tribunal for libelling a party-comrade declared: 'A political opponent, in particular if he be of our own socialist camp, ought to be fought with poisoned weapons, by seeking to arouse the worst possible suspicion against him'. By the way, I strongly doubt whether the above-mentioned utterance ought really to be taken as characteristic of the great bolshevik leader. I know from the history of the Russian revolution as also from my own experience what a relentless and fear-inspiring opponent comrade Lenin was. Yet libel I did not find among his weapons. Before granting conclusive force to that alleged statement of his I ought to know all the details of the context and the circumstances in which it is said to have been made."

According to my knowledge and feelings Louisa Kautsky ought to have guarded against passing at the end of her commemoration essay, from the purely personal ground to the political one and there insinuating a change—incomprehensible to her—in the ideas and attitude of Rosa Luxemburg. I fully and with heartiest sympathy appreciate what Louisa Kautsky is endeavouring to do for socialism within the limits of her circle and her nature. By no means do I question her right to hold her own opinion on the events and phenomena that occur in the camp of international socialism. But all this does not alter the fact that in the struggle for socialism she only partakes of the experience of others but has no experience of her own. In consequence, notwithstanding her striving after objectivity, she lacks the true independent attitude towards those phenomena. She regards them from the point of view of her entourage, of a wife trying to understand, closely taking part in the struggle of her husband, but herself not standing in the midst of the fray. Rosa Luxemburg, on the other hand, was in the thickest of the fighting and kept a sharp lookout from the high watch-tower she had erected for herself.

Thus it is easily understood, that while the one, scrutinizing and weighing, fought for the historical appreciation of the Russian revolution, the other in lofty self-confidence sat in preconceived judgment upon the

«bolshevik heresies» which, «contrary to all reason have so dazzled and deluded the clear mind of Rosa Luxemburg that she desired to repeat in Germany the experiment that had miscarried in Russia». No need for me to further pursue this crushing verdict, for I am certain that the «experiments that miscarried in Russia» will still have a «defeative role» assigned to them in future history when what the socialist commentators have written against them will no longer be able to harm even a mouse. Rosa Luxemburg's attitude towards the Russian November revolution was consistent and clear. It has not to be judged by incidental utterances about persons and events, utterances that are pardonable with high-spirited persons of a subtly differentiated and high-strung consistency, influenced by impressions and things. Rosa Luxemburg valued bolshevism as a whole by its prominent historical importance, and she did not fail to criticize those details of the bolshevik activity that in her opinion stood in need of criticism. Her political inclinations and her tact forbade her to act as Louisa Kautsky's demand for consistency in political action obviously seems to have required. This means, to unearth old feuds and antiquated judgments not at the moment when the spies and hangmen of Eberth and Noske were dogging the footsteps of Rudek.

I do not desire to argue within the limits of these lines with Louisa Kautsky on the question as to which really are the «bolshevik methods» Rosa Luxemburg not only confessed but, unfortunately, even began to practice herself. All I wish to say is that these «methods» do not correspond to the figure that, for the benefit of the unprincipled and faint-hearted policy of the right wing of the Independent Socialist Party is being drawn on the wall,—a counterfeit that comes very close to the «bolshevik» and «Spartacus» honey of the government socialists. However, let us mention the «bolshevik methods» no more. With this catchword to explain the miscarriage of the January revolt of Berlin is just as foolish as to attribute the failure of the Paris Commune to its having anticipated the «bolshevik heresies» and «methods». Rosa Luxemburg did not take her methods of combat from the Russian conditions. She rather deduced them by means of deep research of and insight into international development. For Germany she based them on German conditions, yet not on the conditions of the past period of slack evolution, but on those of the stormy chapter of revolution that began after the rise and unfolding of imperialism.

My friend, Louisa Kautsky, will not be offended if I say what I think, i. e. that the commemoration article was begun by the grateful friend of Rosa Luxemburg and finished by the wife of Karl Kautsky. Rosa Luxemburg would have been the last person to reproach her for it. Out of her consciousness of her own freedom there grew up a leniency towards the inner constraint and dependence of others. It is not the patronage of Louisa Kautsky that will have spoken the last word on Rosa Luxemburg's «delusion» and «bolshevik methods». The final word will be uttered by history. We all who take pride in having been Rosa Luxemburg's friends and comrades in arms calmly await this verdict.

Clara Zetkin (Germany).

The Present situation in France.

(Observations and Impressions).

There are three kinds of symptoms, which must be considered when characterising the revolutionary situation of a country in a state of ferment. First, the decay of the ruling classes and their incapacity to grapple with the problems of the day; second, intense general discontent in large circles of the population; third and last, the formulation and expression of this state of ferment, by the most active and sensible part of the proletariat, personified by the revolutionary communist party. In this article, I will touch principally on the first two factors of objective character, and will begin by the question sorest and most difficult for us, the question of intervention. One can look upon the question of immediate military intervention into Russian affairs as being finally liquidated in France. The policy, which was being pursued by the ruling classes of France regarding Russia, after the conclusion of the Brest-Litovsk Peace, suffered a total defeat. Two different causes helped to bring about the failure of this policy. Not dwelling on the fact, that, after the German revolution the question of military intervention lost its former character in the eyes of a considerable part of the population, it must be acknowledged that our astounding success in the South, proved a decisive factor in the liquidation of the idea of immediate intervention. The French bourgeois press, which up to that moment had represented the Russian army as a confused collection of adventurers, bandits, plunderers cowards, and deserters, was forced to alter its tone. The Red Army obtained an open acknowledgment of its military fitness and technical ability from the fiercest enemies of the Russian workers revolution. Articles began to appear in the French press, to the effect that the Russian army was fighting with great enthusiasm; that it knows how to move in exceedingly complicated strategical surroundings; that from the technical point of view it was well armed and equipped, and, moreover, disposed as a powerful mechanism in the form of propaganda, which exercised a decisive influence on all foreign soldiers with whom it came in contact. In a secret report, prepared by one of the eminent officers of the Staff of the French troops, stationed near Tiraspol, all these qualities of the Russian Red Army receive due appreciation.

Another immediate cause, which brought discredit on the idea of intervention, was its extreme unpopularity in large circles of the population. Socialistic papers printed a series of letters from soldiers, as well as from their relatives, belonging to different groups of the population; and all these letters, beginning with the small rentier's and ending with the French soldier's and workman's, unanimously condemn a military expedition into Russia, as a useless expenditure of the forces of France. Given certain business circles, interested in the renewal of commercial transactions with Russia, opposed the policy of intervention. At the same time, among the French troops on the Eastern front, cases of open insubordination to superiors may be observed. A report from

the directing military circles of the Eastern front was presented to the Parliamentary Commission for Foreign Affairs, in which cases of open mutiny of soldiers, demanding to be sent back to their native land, were brought forward. In Odessa, for instance, the French troops were completely demoralized already before the approach of the Ukrainian army. At the same time, the report pointed out the fact, that the population, on whose support the French authorities had relied, looked on the newcomers as on foreign occupational forces, and everywhere, and particularly in Odessa, proved very hostile. Things took such a turn, that, on the flagship "La Provence" the mutinous sailors clamoured to be sent back immediately to France and exacted the cessation of further hostilities against Soviet Russia. An analogous incident took place among the soldiers who had been on leave in France, and were returning on the vessel "Austria". About five thousand soldiers clamoured to be demobilized; they disarmed and arrested their officers, declaring, that they would be set free only on the arrival of the vessel in a French port, and on the condition that the soldiers should be allowed to disperse freely to return to their homes. A French General was sent on to the vessel, to bring the soldiers to reason by threats and promises; but finally the General himself was arrested, and was obliged to dispatch a telegram to the French Government with the proposition of making concessions to the insurrectionists.

Two torpedo boats refused to go into action against the soldiers. At last the French Government agreed to make concessions, and the soldiers were allowed to disembark in France and return to their homes.

Such a state of mind undeniably proved an exceedingly favourable ground for the propaganda of the international wing of the French socialistic party, which, after the July congress of last year acquired a majority. At the head of this agitation stood Vale, the Socialist Deputy, and Marcel Cachin, who after the German Revolution forsook the right wing and attached himself to the left.

The fundamental point of this propaganda was the interpolation in Parliament, set on foot by the Socialist fraction, which in this case showed its unanimity. In the course of the following debates, Marcel Cachin, Mayeras and Lafont subjected the interventionist politics of Pichon to such merciless criticism, that the Government was obliged to state, once and for all, that it abandoned the idea of immediate military intervention. This change of mood was best of all manifested in the speeches of the Socialist deputies, which contained notes hitherto unheard by the members of the French Parliament. Marcel Cachin from the parliamentary tribune, regardless of general indignation, complimented the insurrection of the French soldiers, and Mayeras, after quoting the text of the Constitution of 1793, finished his speech with a summons to revolt.

But although the idea of direct military intervention experienced complete defeat—nevertheless the European

imperialists and, in particular, France become the rampart of European reaction, by no means gave up the idea of attacking Russia in an underhand way, by inciting the smaller nations against Soviet Russia. The dread of bolshevism penetrating from the east into the west, which daily gives rise to dozens of articles in the French press, spreading fear and trembling among the French bourgeoisie, obliged France to come forward with the project of creating a chain of small buffer-governments in the form of two lines of trenches. The first line of these trenches, whose object was the preservation of Europe from the invasion of bolshevism into the west was to be formed by: Finland, Esthonia, Latvia and Ukraina. The second line was represented by: Poland, Bohemia, Hungary, Roumania and Serbia. This plan of the French reaction had a double aim: firstly, in the event of this plan succeeding, revolutionary Russia and revolutionary Germany would be separated, and the possibility for the most revolutionary countries forming a united front against French reaction, would be avoided. Secondly the success of this scheme would offer the possibility of pursuing, with regard to Soviet Russia, the same policy with yet greater cynicism that had been pursued by German imperialism after the Brest-Litovsk peace. We are speaking of the balkanisation, not only of Eastern but of the whole of Central Europe. One of the heaviest blows which befell this scheme and which caused a violent panic amongst the European imperialists, was the Hungarian revolution. The Hungarian revolution brought Russia out of her isolated position on to the path of international politics, on the one side opening the way to the Balkans, and on the other—to the west. The unlooked-for occurrence of these events produced a stupefying effect in France. The most influential French paper «Le Temps» wrote, after the Hungarian revolution, that the policy of the Allies had received a blow from which European diplomacy would not soon recover. «The policy of Prinkipo»—writes «Le Temps» «has become obsolete. For, when we invited Lenin to Prinkipo we wanted to speak to him, as to a vanquished opponent; now after the evacuation of Odessa, and after the Hungarian revolution, we should have to speak to him as to a conqueror».

While these victories of the revolution in Central Europe dealt such heavy blows to the policy of the Allies the utter sterility of the Peace Conference showed up ever clearer and clearer. The Russian revolutionary communists justly appreciated the complete inability of contemporary imperialism to solve the problems of the day; but this estimation, in consequence of our isolation from Western Europe, bore an abstract character; in the work of the Peace Conference it daily received a brilliant confirmation. If the Allies after an exceedingly long and hard struggle, succeeded, in spite of Wilson's opposition, to concoct the Versailles treaty of peace, which regulated the relations of Germany to the countries of the Entente, on the other hand, a whole series of most urgent questions, have not, up to the present moment received any practical solution. The Conference has proved incapable of controlling the unbridled appetites of the smaller nationalities, whose struggle for territorial frontiers is taking the form of armed conflicts. If we look on the recently matured contests in the East, the first thing that attracts our notice is the conflict between Greater Poland and Germany on account of the Dantzic corridor. The Allies, wishing to pay a tribute to Poland, intended to disembark in Dantzic the two Polish volunteer divisions of General Haller, up to then fighting on

the Western Front. West Germany showed such persistent opposition, that, notwithstanding their victory, the Allies were forced to retreat and give up the idea. Another conflict is impending at the present moment, between the Czechs and the Poles on account of the mines of Upper Silesia. Matters came to an open collision and terminated by a general bloody fight between the Czech and Polish national troops. Further trouble is brewing between Roumanians and Serbians about the Banate, and the Roumanian oligarchy vainly appeals for help to the Allies in view of the mobilisation of Serbian troops on the territory adjacent to the Banate.

But the sorest question is the contest about the Adriatic coast on account of Fiume, even leading, as is known, to the departure from the Conference of the Italian delegates. All the attempts of the Peace Conference to straighten matters by mutual agreement were unsuccessful. Things even took such a turn that, in one of the contested districts, the Serbians arrested the Italian mission, and escorted it beyond the frontier. To further illustrate the impotence of the Conference, need we speak about the Lemberg incidents between Poles and Ukrainians, or bring forward examples from Belgian-Dutch territorial conflicts, in order to prove how heavy with impending storm is the atmosphere of Europe, on whose live body the European imperialists are tracing new territorial furrows. Facing this slowly ripening war, and seeing the complete inability of the Conference to prevent fresh and inevitable conflicts the French press is taking a deeply pessimistic tone with regard to the work of the Peace Conference. Discontent is universal. Especially displeased are the Americans, with Wilson at their head whose celebrated 13 points so completely fell through at Versailles. No less dissatisfied are the most reactionary military and industrial circles, as well as the average Frenchmen, the *centier*, the peasant and the workman. In this respect one can say, without exaggerating, that the Peace Conference is working in an atmosphere of absolute isolation, its sterility grows still more evident when we analyze the conflicts which are rending it on the questions regarding the Great Powers themselves. There is not a single problem that obtains an adequate solution in the work of the Peace Conference; for instance: on the question of the German navy the difference of opinion between the French and English is very great. As is well known, the losses of the English navy in this war were greater than those of any other country. But the English were able to compensate these losses by the building of new vessels and so increased their naval forces by 500 units. At the same time France, on whom fell all the weight of the land-war, was forced to suspend her naval constructions. The division of the German navy according to the proportion of losses is exceedingly profitable for England, and therefore naturally upheld by her. In order to paralyse the naval reinforcement of England, the French advocate division of the navy according to the principle of general burdens that fell to the lot of the belligerent countries. In answer to this proposition the English formed the project of completely destroying the German navy. An exceedingly hot press campaign followed, which witnessed to the fact that all was not well in the camp of the conquerors. In fact up to the present moment the question of the German navy has not been settled.

The question of Asia Minor, and in particular, of Syria, causes another conflict, in which the interests of France and England do not coincide. In order to conserve

a certain influence in Asia Minor, where the English are very firmly rooted (a whole series of states, like Armenia and Jewish Palestine stand under the protectorate of England), the French claim quite exceptional rights in Syria. Only after long and stormy debates, in the Conference itself, as well as in the press, did the Anglo-French diplomacy find a lame compromise, in handing over the Syrian problem to an international commission. Small wonder if in this general struggle of small and great nations, all Wilson's hopes of limiting armaments proved such a failure. Disarming revolutionary Germany on one hand, reducing her army to the proportion of a mercenary police force, the Allies, on the other hand are themselves strenuously developing projects of further armament. According to Balfour's statement the English army, in order to preserve peace in Europe, will have to number no less than a million men! It goes without saying that after the recent bloody catastrophe none of the French directing military circles think of turning their swords into ploughshares. The French press defending the right of France to increased armament, refers not only to the English, but also to the Americans, whose naval programme for 1920 is only a further logical development of growing militarism in Europe.

The demobilisation, to which the masses were so hopefully looking forward after the conclusion of the Peace Treaty is advancing at the pace of a tortoise and this tardiness is causing increasing irritation in large circles of the population. If out of 8 millions mobilized in France we deduct military losses to the amount of one and a half million killed, two and a half millions sick, wounded and invalid, only a million and a half of men are demobilized at the present moment. Out of the American troops, numbering two million men, only about 400,000 are demobilized. The percentage of demobilized is the same in England. The detention of soldiers at the front, regardless of peace negotiations, has given rise to sinister ferment throughout the country, of which the syndicalist revolutionary circles are very energetically taking advantage. Immediate demobilization is the general cry of the entire population, worn out by the war; and it is beyond doubt that if the Conference proves incapable of liquidating the question of demobilization in the shortest time, serious riots among the soldiers may be expected.

I will now pass over to the internal position of France. The most menacing problem of the day is the financial question. The immediate expenses of the war in France amount to 200 milliard francs. When we have added to this sum the indispensable expenses incurred by giving necessary help to those provinces which have suffered most from the war, healing the wounds that the French have received from the German heavy artillery—the general losses of France will mount up to between 270—300 milliards. The French paper "Le Matin" even estimates them at 316 milliard francs. The financial position of France is perhaps still better shown by the increase of the budget. Before the war the French budget attained the sum of 5 milliard francs. Now it exceeds 22 milliard francs. In the present year, owing to the payment of subsidies to the demobilized men and assistance given to the population of the Northern regions, the French government needs 20 milliards more. The French bourgeoisie which enriched itself exclusively by war contracting, as yet keeps up the illusion in wide circles of the population that all the war expenses will be paid by Germany. But if, on one hand, we take into consideration, that Germany was put in the course of the war to an expense

of 150 milliard marks, and, on the other hand, that Germany's entire national wealth—by the calculation of the Dresden Bank—equals the sum of 100 milliard marks only; and if we add to this the enormous industrial ruin caused by the blockade—it will become clear that all hopes of Germany's healing the wounds inflicted on the French population by the war, are absolutely vain.

As to Austria-Hungary—as a debtor, she must be left out of calculation. On the contrary, even the independent states built up on the ruins of the Habsburg monarchy are themselves playing the role of parasites to the European financial world.

In order to prevent the inevitable financial bankruptcy of France, the French minister Klotz brought forward the project of distributing all war expenses among the members of the future League of Nations. But it is very doubtful whether the members of the League of Nations will be able, without a radical breaking up of contemporary capitalistic organization, to escape out of the abyss into which the war has thrown them. The position of Italy, whose expenses amount to 60 milliards, while her national wealth equals 80 milliards presents a clear picture of the incapacity of the present masters of the day to solve the financial crisis. The only possible palliative within the limits of the existing capitalistic organization is an income-tax, which has been realized in America and England; but the French bourgeoisie most energetically repudiates this measure. The author of the project of income-tax, Caillaux, who was Minister of Finance on the eve of the war and who attempted to tax the bourgeoisie with a certain minimum contribution, has been thrown into prison and his project lies dormant at the Senate.

The French Parliament is incapable of carrying out a single reform; and, at a moment when political passions flare up all round and Europe is a seething cauldron, at such a moment the old forgotten project of proportional representation turns up afresh. And when the most able and farseeing representatives of the bourgeoisie attempt to change the course of French politics in the sense of meeting the growing needs of the working masses—they meet with violent opposition from the present lords of the situation.

If the financial position of France makes her a victorious country without a victory, her reactionary politics make her a republic without republicans. All radical and republican elements of the French bourgeoisie are living in a state of oppression. Clericalism and nationalistic reaction are dominant. In the political sphere it is Clemenceau who is dictator; in the military sphere it is Foch and his military party who actually conduct the politics of France. The methods of German imperialism, against which the French republican and socialistic press had formerly protested,—methods which consisted in the intervention of military authority in the home and foreign politics of Germany,—are now being applied to their full extent in France. General Foch and the clerical party surrounding him, represented by Malter—these are the real masters of the day. And in their eyes not only antimilitarism but an insufficiently strong warlike spirit is a crime. Caillaux's case is very eloquent in this respect. Caillaux is accused of pacifist policy on the eve of the war; he is further accused of having, after the celebrated Agadir incident, signed the agreement with Germany and averted the war in 1911; and lastly he is accused of having, while holding the office of minister of finance, allowed the Turkish loans to be quoted on the French stock-exchange before the war.

The parliamentary paper «Action Française» with its celebrated editor Daudet, who has specialized in hunting down socialistic and republican workers, continually accusing them of high treason, plays the role of an official organ of the government.

This course of national politics is felt especially acutely in Alsace. The unfortunate population of Alsace, who went through all the horrors of the German occupation in 1870, is now, in 1919, obliged to bend under the heavy hand of French militarism. Executions have assumed a wholesale character. The population is divided into categories and full license is allowed against those whose ancestors are of German origin. Alsace-Lorraine is literally writhing under the heel of the military. On the other hand we see such ulcers revealed in the present parliamentary regime which only a Panama scandal can rival. At a time when French soldiers, who for four years have been fooled by high-sounding patriotic phrases, dream of at last returning to peaceful life, at a time when such terrible sacrifices were made by them, the wildest bacchanalia was taking place in the rear of the army—an awful picture, which is only now, little by little, being revealed.

Two law-suits, which unveil the venality, and corruption of the present French bourgeoisie, are causing the deepest indignation in the ranks of the population. I speak of the case of the Senator Charles Humbert and the affair of the Briey basin. The main point of the process of Humbert is very simple. This senator, vice-president of the military commission (whose president was Clemenceau, himself) who played an exceedingly important role in national defence, whom the parliamentary circles repeatedly destined for the most responsible posts in the republic, this senator, whose revelations regarding the insufficiency of the French navy made so much noise even before the war—this patriotic senator is now being accused of having bought the largest French paper «Le Journal», with German money and of having on two different occasions received from eminent German agents the sum of 20 millions! It is not only the figure of this patriotic senator that is interesting, no less interesting are the details brought to light by this case, which prove that a whole set of public men were mixed up in dealing with persons of doubtful reputation. This case revealed the fact that the—now executed—German agent Bolo, who belonged to the best French society, was more than once received by Poincaré himself at the same time that he was under accusation of high treason and the enquiry was being pursued. There were yet other piquant details in the affair of Charles Humbert. Among the papers of one of the accused cheques in the name of the son of Clemenceau were found. The whole defence of Charles Humbert was built by his counsel on the argument that this patriotic sena-

tor, who was bribing the French press with German money, was neither better nor worse than a whole series of other politicians, who were effecting the same doubtful operations, only with more good luck, and without the risk of landing in the dock.

The other case concerns the Metallurgical Trust, at the head of which stands the present minister of munitions, Loucheur. This affair is as follows: at the beginning of the war the basin of Briey, which possessed the richest seams necessary for metallurgical industry, were surrendered to the Germans without fighting. Afterwards, when the Germans began exploiting this basin, and insofar increased their chances of continuing the war, the French Staff, who had decided to assume the offensive in this region in order to recover the basin of Briey, met with a firm opposition from business and financial circles. The daily «Le Temps» stepped forward with a series of articles which spoke of the certain failure of this operation and the aviators who executed an air-raid over the basin and threw down bombs incurred the blame of the ruling military authorities. It now appears that the proprietors of the Briey basin, Franco-German companies, were interested in its being kept intact, and that while the French soldiers were dying by thousands in the trenches, the French business circles (like Loucheur) by mutual agreement with their German colleagues openly handed over the factories for exploitation to a German company.

Small wonder that among this decay the revolutionary state of mind of the masses increases hour by hour and seeks an outlet. This outlet for the Paris workmen can be but one:—out into the streets. The street manifestations, organized in Paris for the last months, are a phenomenon of such importance, that one must speak of them separately (See the «Letter from France» on next page). Coming out into the street the French proletariat has once more proved to all the world its hatred of the bourgeois order of things, its revolutionary spirit and internationalism.

Such is, in brief, the position in France. Need we say how great the prestige of the Russian revolution and of the Russian Soviets is in the eyes of the French proletariat? Need we say that after the conclusion of the armistice every attempt of the majority socialists to attack the Russian revolution at their meetings encountered such resistance, that they do not dare show themselves any more at the workmen's assemblies? The French revolution is not far off; it will come like the Hungarian revolution, rally in the sign of solidarity with the Russian proletariat and will sweep away the house of cards, which has been erected with so much art by the diplomats of Versailles.

D. Manouilsky.

Letter from France.

It is an unquestionable fact that the working class of France, as regards its revolutionary spirit, has by far outstripped the parties and syndicates that professed to lead it.

In this letter I only want to bring before you some important facts of the French workmen's movement, leaving a deeper study of French political life for some other time.

The bolshevik revolution has aroused the greatest possible enthusiasm in France. Unfortunately, at the time it took place, the socialist parties and syndicates did not even dare to express their sympathies with it; they had to confine themselves to refuting the monstrous calumnies of the bourgeois press. But scarcely had hostilities ceased, eight days after the proclamation of amnesty, a large number of meetings were organised in Paris and in the whole of France. At all those gatherings the slightest reference to the October revolution aroused profoundest sympathy, finding expression in shouts of "Hurrah for the Soviets! Hurrah for Lenin and Trotzky!"

It sufficed for a party leader, even the most popular one, to criticize the slightest detail of soviet government to make the working men's audience threateningly impose silence upon him. And these meetings sometimes even finished by brawls.

At the dozen or so meetings organised in Paris not one of the old majority-men could make himself heard. While the working masses, grouping themselves round the syndicalists manifested such vivid sympathy for Soviet Russia, such fraternal solidarity with the young republic, the socialist deputies, even of the extreme left wing, but rarely dared to speak favourably of it. They restricted themselves to carrying on a campaign against the intervention of the Allies into Russian affairs. To be sure, their campaign was energetic, sometimes even passionate, but it was based on arguments of an essentially formal character or of a general kind directed against interference into the internal life of another country; or it took the form of patriotic protests against French blood being shed on the icy plains of Russia.

We cannot hide the fact, however sad it be, that the brilliant campaign of meetings begun directly after amnesty had been granted was stopped by the party and the syndicates not so much because of the interference of the police, as by reason of diplomatic considerations inside the party.

The demonstration organised the day of Wilson's arrival in Paris furnishes a still more remarkable illustration of this fact.

The "majority" socialists (of the right wing) had decided to organise a demonstration in honour of Wilson in order to protest, if only in this mild form, against Clemenceau's cynical policy, his policy of conquest. The centre of the united socialist party, with Longuet, Cachin and Mistral as leaders, desired the demonstration to take place as an opportunity to proclaim what they called the "socialist" programme of peace. The proletarians

awaited it with impatience, in order to express their protest, restrained so long, and to regain their right of demonstration in the streets. But when the socialist deputies understood that the demonstration would assume a character more revolutionary than they desired it to have, they profited of Clemenceau's cynical prohibition in order to call it off altogether. The demonstration took place none the less; though unorganised, broken up into groups of 2 to 3 thousand persons each, the workmen marched along with red flags, singing the International shouting out their protests against the interference into Russian affairs. This demonstration was undoubtedly the starting point for all other manifestations of the Paris proletariat after the war.

In the provinces demonstrations took place everywhere, with red banners unfurled. Most of them came off peaceably but amidst the greatest enthusiasm.

In Paris the government had prohibited all demonstrations; the city was occupied by military forces. At the rallying point fixed by the Union of the Syndicates of the Seine, the Place de la Concorde and the adjoining streets, troops of all arms were disposed on an area of several kilometres. In the Tuileries, not far from the Place de la Concorde, a whole military and police General Staff was established. Notwithstanding this display of forces, from noon the square and the adjoining streets were flooded by demonstrators. According to the instructions of the Syndicates' Union the manifestation was to start from the Place de la Concorde and to follow all the main arteries of traffic up to the Place de la République. About 2 p. m. collisions between workmen and police began. Official reports have it that the manifestations broke all the military and police cordons and in columns counting from ten to thirty thousand persons continued along the marked-out route.

The demonstration against the acquittal of the murderer of Jaurès which, came off three months later bore a quite different character. Altogether peaceful as it was, it attained such tremendous dimensions as to produce deep emotion in syndicalist circles and seriously frighten the bourgeoisie and the government.

Over 300,000 persons—according to official estimates—marched past the statue of Jaurès in perfect order, carrying their red banners. And the cries that were heard most frequently were those of: "Hurrah for Lenin! Hurrah for Trotzky! Hurrah for Zinovieff!" The number of soldiers and sailors in uniform who took part in the demonstration created a sensation. We have to note an incident that took place there. One of the soldiers, passing the bust of Jaurès, took off his war cross and attached it to the statue. Numerous other soldiers immediately followed his example and soon the bust was covered with 82 war crosses and a number of other military decorations.

This manifestation that the government saw itself forced to permit passed in an almost entirely peaceable fashion. There were no armed forces and very few police officers and the demonstration kept very quiet. But its dimensions its grand character produced so strong an

impression on parliamentary circles that three days later the government brought an 8 hours working day bill into the Chamber, the very bill that but 8 days before the minister of industry Loucheur had declared could never be realised in France. And—an unprecedented fact in French parliamentary history—this bill of surpassing social importance in a bourgeois country passed the Chamber and the Senate and was promulgated into law in 8 days.

The 1-st of May demonstration marks an epoch in the revolutionary struggle that has begun.

Neither the leaders of the socialist party nor those of the syndicates had desired it. The committee of the C. G. T. (General Confederation of Labour) pronounced itself decisively against the very principle of such a demonstration. And when they saw it was inevitable they took all possible measures in order to give it the character of a peaceable procession claiming 'nothing but an 8 hours' working day.

And yet the events of the 1-st of May took such threatening proportions that they will no doubt be mentioned in the history of the revolutionary movement in France. On the 1-st of May the whole of Paris and the whole of France were on strike. Work had stopped every where. Theatres, restaurants, cafés, markets—everything was closed. According to official data the market «the belly of Paris», that daily devour produce coming from the whole world received nothing but two baskets of salad that day!

We learn from police reports that in some places encounters developed into real battles. Thus near the Opera House a solid mass of about 50,000 demonstrators resisted the police and dragoons for a whole hour. The same thing occurred in the Boulevard Magenta. But the most serious encounter where barricades were taken recourse to took place near the Gare de l'Est and lasted more than two hours. The demonstrators pulled down the railings of the station and the neighbouring houses, demolished the telephoni and electric posts and used them for building barricades. Over 3000 dragoons had to be sent out against them. There was a considerable

number of victims on both sides. Near the Renaissance theatre a reinforcement of a thousand dragoons was required to establish order. It was not far from there that the secretary of the C. G. T. Jouhaux—majority syndicalist of the right—was wounded in the eye. His eye-sight is in danger. Not far from there the majority deputy Poncet received four serious wounds; another majority deputy, Laval, was wounded when about to render his comrade assistance. At the Place de la République the struggle between the dragoons and the demonstrators, the latter equalling about ten thousands in number, lasted from 2 p. m. till 11 p. m., the workmen being incessantly supported by fresh reinforcements. Official reports admit to 430 wounded dragoons and police officers. The government had even to apply for assistance to the American soldiers stationed in Paris, in order to crush the movement. But the most threatening event of the day for the French bourgeoisie was the refusal of the troops to intervene against the manifestants. Out of 100,000 soldiers present in Paris that day it was only several thousand dragoons that consented to fight against the workmen. All the other troops either categorically refused or remained neutral.

The political, economic and financial position of France has become so complicated after the war that it were venturing too far to foretell the final development of the revolutionary movement in France. In this letter, written rather in a hurry I will confine myself merely to marking some principal points:

- 1) The revolutionary movement in France is developing with the inevitableness of the laws of nature.
- 2) In this revolutionary movement the leaders of the old United Socialist Party and the General Confederation of Labour are not only the most reactionary elements but, in a number of cases, its real adversaries.
- 3) The progress of the Russian revolution has had and still has a decisive influence on the development of the revolution in France or, to be more precise: the fate of the revolution in France depends altogether upon the fate and success of the Republic of Soviets.

A. Victor.

Public Education in Soviet Russia.

Aiming at the systematization of every and all state functions, the Soviet has fundamentally changed the competence and character of the government organ that under the old regime bore the name of «Ministry of Public Education».

1) This ministry formerly confined its activity chiefly to schools. A whole series of highly important cultural institutions were beyond its reach, even though they were purely state institutions. Thus the state theatres were under the management of the Court Ministry; the theatrical high-school of the Academy of Arts. The Musical Department was managed by the Imperial Musical Society that, strangely enough, was under the control of the ministry of Internal Affairs. Thus the artistic education of the growing generation and, in general, the regulation

of the relations between the state and the world of art did not come within the sphere of the ministry of Public instruction.

In Soviet Russia these tasks are part of the activity of the Commissariat of Public Education; to which is attached a special art section.

2) The steadily growing tasks of the state, as well as the difficulties that private, public and, lastly, state publishing business in Russia meets with at present, has induced the Soviet to create a special organ which would regulate the whole flood of literature, would in view of the shortness of paper choose the most necessary books among those intended for publication, superintend the very process of publishing and, finally, regulate the distribution of printed matter on a socialistic basis.

According to the plan adopted by all the state institutions concerned and laid for approval before the All-Russian Central Executive Committee, the above mentioned organ is to form an integral part of the Commissariat of Public Education.

Such an extension of the idea of public instruction to art and the publishing of literature will greatly enlarge and systematize the educational tasks of the government. But yet another great difference exists between the Commissariat of Education and the former ministry.

3) By its very spirit the Tsar's Ministry of Public Instruction was not so much concerned about the promotion of education in Russia, as to try to hamper it by all possible means, in order that this stream indispensable though it was to the then government, (much to its regret), should not overflow its banks. Yet the military and economic development of Russia sternly put forth the most imperative demand for a supply of educated men. Therefore, under the pretext of founding special schools, a number of government offices formed their own little ministries of public instruction where life was sometimes more pleasant than under the heavy fist of the Tsar's ministers. The Ministries of Finance, of Commerce and Industry and of Agriculture harboured a great number of schools of an essentially higher type than the normal ministerial ones. The war Ministry did the same. And however strange it may seem, even under the auspices of the Holy Synod some units of educational interest grew up, notwithstanding the despicableness of the whole net of so-called clerico-parochial schools; the normal type of clerical school, the parochial girl's school and other institutions for crippling children.

The necessity for such specialisation completely drops out in Soviet Russia. By decree of the Council of People's Commissaries all the little ministries of public instruction in the other commissariats have to be liquidated, and the affairs of public education in its most general and widest sense are gradually going over to the Commissariat of Public Education.

4) In the Russia of compromises, in the epoch between February and October, there was a tendency to hand over all the schools that had no exclusive state importance to the local government organs.

For even in Tsarist Russia, under the frequently unbearable supervision of the ministry, the municipalities, in particular the county councils, were burdened with a large part of the primary public education and were already proceeding to organize their own higher education. This tendency was cut short by the October revolution. The schools are, of course, under the immediate management of the local councils, i. e. the district, province and town departments of public education, but they are developing within the compass of the general regulations as drawn up by the Commissariat. The schools in Russia are not municipal, but national ones, just as the soviets in Russia are no organs of self-government as contrasted with the central governmental power, but

parts of that power which in its whole realises the self-government of the working people.

5) The abolition of all school fees has made private schools in Russia an impossibility. Not that the Commissariat of Public Education is interested in cramping private initiative and cutting down all schools to one general pattern; but diversity of school life has henceforth to be attained within the state schools, since, the fees being abolished, the government alone is able to keep up schools.

Thus, nowhere in the world has the Commissariat of Public Education so great a task and so wide a competence in questions of cultural structure as in Russia.

At the close of this chapter that is meant to give a general idea of the mechanism regulating the state function of public education, I wish to enumerate the chief departments, the sum total of which form the Commissariat.

At the head of the Commissariat stand the People's Commissary and assistant Commissar. They are both members of the board of eleven at whose sittings all questions of any importance are decided. According to a recent decision of the board the most important matters are discussed by an extended body, representatives of the Petrograd District Board participating with right of vote. This decision has been brought about as a result of recognizing the particular importance of a centre like Petrograd from the point of view of cultural development.

Lastly, questions of principle previous to being sanctioned by the highest legislative body are discussed by the so-called State Committee for public instruction with the participation of representatives from various state institutions directly or indirectly interested in the work of education.

The whole wide sphere of activity of the Commissariat is divided into several sections: education, science, art. But some departments do not come within the competence of any of these sections.

The section for education comprises in the first instance one huge department of uniform schools that consumes the greater part of the whole budget. Theoretic questions connected with one or the other school-reform are decided by the department for school reform. Further there belong to the section the departments of technical schools, of pre-school education, of out-of-school education and the department for the training of teachers.

The Science section consists of the department of science managing the scientific societies, the department of higher educational institutions and the library department.

The Art-section is composed of the departments of fine arts, of the protection of monuments, the musical, theatrical, state publications and kinematographic departments.

The financial, building, stores school equipment and the management departments of the Commissariat stand outside of these sections.

The work of the Commissariat is enlivened by continual conferences. The most important ones that have taken place till now are: the All-Russian Congress of Represent-

tatives of the Public Education Departments, i. e. of the Province and District Education Boards; the chief task of the Congress was to definitely establish the principles of a uniform type of proletarian schools. The All-Russian Conference on the Training of Teachers. Two conferences of teachers-internationalists. The conference of representatives of Province Departments. The All-Russian Conference of Representatives of the Sub-departments on Out-of-school Education. The All-Russian Conference of Museum Workers (in Petrograd). Two All-Russian Conferences on the Reform of High-Schools. At the present moment an All-Russian Congress on Pre-school Education is sitting in Moscow. For the fifth of May an All-Russian Congress on Out-of-School Education has been summoned, for May 15-th an All-Russian Congress on the question of theatres for peasants and workmen. Besides these there are hundreds of provincial and district conferences, called in Moscow, Petrograd and other centres of Soviet Russia.

The Commissariat of Public education has a great many various subsidiary commissions and committees of experts. The most important of them is the State Education Council that has been entrusted by the Central Executive Committee with the reform of colleges and universities in Russia. The Council consists of 5 members appointed by the All-Russian Central Executive Committee and 5 appointed by the Commissariat of Education. The

People's Commissary of Public Education acts as chairman of the Council.

In view of the acute food crisis experienced by this country, it became an urgent necessity for the Soviet to do the utmost towards saving the children. For this purpose the Council of People's Commissaries formed a special Council for the Protection of Children composed of responsible representatives of the Commissariats of Social Insurance, of Labour, of Health and of Food-Supplies and with the People's Commissary for Education as chairman.¹⁾ One of the functions of the Council for the Protection of Children is to remove the children from famine districts to distant colonies, i. e. in the Ukraina, on the river Volga and so forth.

Such is the construction of the Commissariat of Public Education in its general outline.

In the following I wish to point out the fundamental characteristics of the reforms, or rather, revolutionary changes the Commissariat is carrying through in various spheres of its activity.

(To be continued).

Al Lunatcharsky.

Petrograd, end of April 1919.

¹⁾ A decree has now been issued and is being carried through that provides for the feeding of all children in the Russian Republic up to the age of 14 at the cost of the State.

Documents of the International Communist Movement.

Letter from Comrade Bela Khun to Comrade Lenin.

Dear Comrade Lenin,

That a single revolutionary act is worth more than a dozen programmes. I learned from Marx but, without wishing to flatter you I must say that you have taught me the real value of these words.

Enclosed I am sending you a historical document on the proletarian revolution in Hungary, a letter addressed by me to a comrade of the left socialist wing upon his requesting me to draw up a platform that could bring about conciliation between us. It is a bolshevik programme, and our actions are not less bolshevik.

In the first instance I have to point out that the proletarian revolution of the communists would have taken place even without the well known note of Commander Vix, but I believe it would have been foolish not to have taken advantage of the opportunity it offered. Commonplace bourgeois thinkers, grasping merely at the form of the marxist method, and not at its spirit, find it difficult to understand how it could have come about that the change in Hungary was seemingly so painless, after the bloody October revolution in Russia^{*)}. But the radical break with capitalism shows clearly that our revolution was really a communist one. No doubt, blood will yet be shed in the Hungarian revolution too, plenty of blood. Counter-revolution is about to raise its head, but before it can do so, we will chop off that head.

To return to what I started from, I have not sent you a programme, only a few reports on the situation, the important being most the Hungarian Soviet-Republic sent the first greeting of proletarian dictatorship in Hungary to its elder sister-republic. Nor am I sending you any programmes now. The further progress of international revolution will show the importance that attaches to our proletarian revolution. Our position is a critical one. But come what may, all our steps are guided by the interests of the world-revolution. Not for a moment does it occur to us to sacrifice the interests of the world-

revolution to the interests of merely one part of international revolution. Even should a Brest peace await us, we will conclude it, knowing that you carried your point when signing it against my own will, against the will of the left communists. I was not ashamed at the time to confess that your policy regarding the Brest peace was right and the point of view of those who asserted the contrary, was neither historical, nor marxist. But the interpretation of those who judge our revolution merely by the peculiar circumstances of its origin is not more historical. I have sent you our decrees, from time to time but I should have liked the events of the last days to pass before your eyes as on a film, so that you should see that we not only proclaim dictatorship, but actually practice it. What you say on the necessity of dictatorship in your book against Kautsky we have taken for our guidance in exercising it. I do not believe there is even a single action or enactment based on principle that you could raise objection to. The difficulties are much greater with us than they were with you in Russia. Our present situation in foreign politics is worse by far than that of Russia. Yet I believe no objections can be made to our actions even from the point of view of pure principle. The conciliation brought about on the basis of this programme is doubtless one of principle and tactics, that is to say, a real unity. The members of the extreme right have been pushed out of the party, and the old trade-union bureaucracy is gradually being sifted out. I know very well that not I, but the proletariat itself will decide its own fate, but I beg you to keep your confidence in me. I will never go to the right, but a left communism is impossible with us because we are standing so much to the left that a further move to the left is out of the question.

I am sending you some articles of my collaborators who have fought together with me and have been active in the front rank of the revolution.

With heartiest greetings from me and my dear comrades and friends

I am your sincere adherent

Bela Khun.

Budapest, April 22-nd 1919.

^{*)} It is characteristic for the Scheidemannists, that it was precisely this fact that they disliked and that made them see nationalistic bluff in our revolution.

Letter from Comrade Bela Khun to Comrade Ignatius Bogar.

Dear comrade Bogar.

When you came to see me in prison you requested me to define a platform that could unite both sections of the Hungarian workmen's movement. I should like to add that this is a question that concerns not only the Hungarian working class, but the whole international proletariat.

But I have to say beforehand that we will not negotiate while in prison. I think it superfluous to explain why.

As regards my opinion on the unity of the Labour movement, I believe that only a real, not a sham union can bring about the liberation of the proletariat. I think it requires no further explanation that a union of the Labour movement as proclaimed by the „Nepszava" in its issue of March 9-th would force the greatest part of the working masses into the camp of the Scheidemanns and would thus be merely harmful and objectionable. The only advantageous proletarian union is a harmonious organisation of the Labour movement rooted in the ground of a unity of theory and principle and proclaiming not the cooperation of the classes, but class war. Sacrifices of principle are equivalent to relinquishing one's principles—there is no doubt about that.

I only wish to remind you of Marx's opinion on the unity artificially created by the Gotha programme, which, in its turn, sprang from a compromise between the Eisenach and the Lassalle adherents. In his letter addressed to Bracke, Marx says in connection with his criticism of the Gotha programme:

„We know to what extent the mere fact of the union gratifies the workmen, but you would be greatly mistaken did you believe that the temporary result was achieved at a cheap price.

I hasten to explain to those eclectics who decry every reference to Marx as dogmatism, as bible-marxism and authority-worship (whereas they wish to put their own insignificant selves in place of Marx) that the words I quote are true not because Marx said them. Facts prove them to be so.

The history of the labour movement would, I believe, have been much poorer in glorious revolutionary events and, more particularly, in achievements, had not the Russian bolshoviks (as Lenin states) put an end to tactical operations within the party itself as early as 1907; had not Rosa Luxemburg, Karl Liebknecht and Franz Mehring and even the most harmless Independent socialists squared accounts with the sham unity of the German labour movement already during the war; had not the Italian socialists done the same during the Tripolitan war, and had they not thus gained freedom of action and by means of their independent organisation created the possibility of propaganda for themselves. Possibly fratricidal war, the war of one part of the proletariat against the other, would not have been carried on so openly, but—to say the least—it is questionable whether this open struggle has not spared the proletariat a much greater number of victims than each year of capitalist rule exacted. I further ask you:

is the collision of the workmen organised in trade-unions with the proletarians standing outside them not just as much a fratricidal war?

There are inevitable, so-called necessary evils. Such a one is my having to stake my head now and perhaps also later on. It was bad for me, but in the end good for the labour movement. Others ought to be able to place themselves on this historical, objective standpoint no less than I.

The unity on the labour movements must come about. But in order to render this union possible, they have to be separated first. This is no play on words, but the expression of a dialectic law.

Be it before or after the victory of the proletarian revolution, the labour movement will be united under any circumstances. Not that I feel more akin to the Hungarian proletariat than —let us say— to the proletariat of America, Russia or Bohemia. Yet subjectively I should still feel happy if the Hungarian Labour movement by its unity gained a victory for the proletariat and unitedly took up the work for the transition to socialism.

I cannot help looking somewhat sceptically into the future. The position of the international labour movement forces me to it. And yet I believe that the unity of the pure, i. e. the revolutionary labour movement will be realised in the not distant future.

The platform you demand of me would have to be a summary of our own crystallised opinion and that of our honest opponents, and may be drawn up as follows:

1) No support of the so called People's Government. No participation in the government of the bourgeois state. Cessation of all class cooperation. Transformation of the working class organisations into Workmen's Soldiers' and Peasants' Councils.

2) Abandonment of the polity of so-called territorial or, as it is now styled, national integrity. Energetic opposition to so-called „revolutionary home defence", an outgrowth of class cooperation. Prevention at all costs of a new war against the Tchecchs, Roumanians or Serbians, seeing that a proletarian party can consent to a revolutionary war only on condition that

a) all power has actually and definitely passed to the industrial and agricultural proletariat

b) all identity with capitalist interests has actually ceased

c) full guarantee is offered that the war will not create new national oppression.

3) It can be alleged that the revolution in Hungary is now in a transition stage from its so-called generally national phase to an epoch of purely proletarian revolution, of social revolution. The Hungarian revolution is a manifestation of the revolutionary energy of the international proletariat, turned active as a result of the general failure of capitalistic production. Hence the activity of the Hungarian proletariat has to develop on the following lines:

a) No parliamentary republic, but—as a transition stage—a centralized republic of Councils of Workmen's and Peasants' Deputies;

b) Abolition of the standing army and the special armed forces (police, gendarmerie, frontier-guard and so on) and their replacement by the class army of the proletariat; the disarmament of the bourgeoisie.

c) Complete abolition of bureaucracy, self-government of the proletarian masses: the councils of workmen's and peasants' deputies acting not only as legislative, but also as executive and judiciary organs. All offices are to be elective, the term of office is to be short, and the officials are to be dismissable. The remuneration of the officials is not to exceed that of the skilled workmen. Higher remuneration—as Russian experience teaches—can be granted only to specialists.

A political constitution of this kind would ensure the carrying through of measures for the transition to socialism and the suppression of all counter-revolutionary efforts of the bourgeoisie.

4) Even before taking immediate measures towards transition to socialism and before taking over state power, centralized control of the workmen's councils and decentralized control of the workmen's controlling councils has without delay to be realised over industrial and agricultural production and the distribution of products (partly as a substitute for the factory committees). At the same time detailed stock of all productive forces, raw materials and food supplies has to be taken by the workmen's and peasants' councils.

The transition measures leading up to socialism would roughly shape as follows:

5) Confiscation of all real estate in favour of the proletarian state, prohibition of wage labour for the benefit of private people in private establishments. All land is to be proclaimed state property and every acre of soil, in so far as it is not tilled by its owner or his family, is to be cultivated by the state through the councils of village poor. Energetic opposition to the division of land. A provisional measure for a short period of transition may in this respect be the formation of cooperative societies for agricultural production.

6) Socialisation of banks, confiscation of all investments and deposits.

7) Socialisation of industry and transport (in the first place, of course, large industry and their concentration through the proletarian state. Management of industry and transport by the workers. (The management boards to consist, for instance, of $\frac{1}{3}$ of employees of the works in question, $\frac{1}{6}$ representatives of the collective organisations of the given industrial branch $\frac{1}{6}$ representatives of consumers' organisations, $\frac{1}{3}$ representatives of the supreme Council of Public Economy).

8) Immediate monopolization of foreign and large home trade. Monopoly of all the more important food stuffs. Their distribution only to workers upon presentation of workmen's certificates through cooperative stores or corresponding departments of the Workmen's and Peasants' Councils (the purchase department of the factories may also serve as bases of distribution), with a view to actual realization of the toiler's income, to the transition to payment of wages in kind.

b) Immediate carrying through of all the demands for the protection of labour put forth in the so-called

transition programme of the Social Democrat party, and on the other hand, introduction of labour discipline.

10) State propaganda of socialism. Immediate separation of church and state. The schools are to be employed in educating the children to socialism.

Such is the platform which, in my opinion, will shortly unite the revolutionary wing and finally the whole of the labour movement.

The experiences they have made with democracy or, to be more exact, with bourgeois democracy have, I believe, sobered many people in Hungary too. Not only is the failure of the policy of land distribution a certainty to-day; but the hopes set on the so-called reformation of bureaucracy and on the National Assembly have already proved vain as well. The mendacity of the principle of equality as proclaimed by bourgeois democracy—the latter being falsely represented as general democracy—the incapacity of democracy for realizing the measures of transition to socialism become evident as soon as we try to confront the exploiter and the exploited. Can the exploiter ever be equal in all respects with the exploited?

Proletarian democracy, in other words, proletarian dictatorship, must necessarily occupy the first place in the struggle of all those who earnestly desire the abolition of exploitation. The revolutionary elements of the labour movement have to agree on this programme. The socialist parties of Italy and Switzerland, as well as the independent social democracy of Germany, and it is said, even the Serbian socialist party have accepted it.

No reference to coal shortage, to capitalism lying low, no catchword like «we cannot socialize old iron», no pointing to the international situation as a bugbear can keep even a single socialist of revolutionary mind from openly acting in this sense.

Every reference to the international position *openly serves to-day the imperialism of the Allies*. Every contention that the coal shortage hampers the development of the proletarian revolution serves so-called revolutionary home defence, or, to speak openly, the principle of territorial integrity. Those who, instead of standing up for proletarian revolution and the transmission of political power to the soviets, preach revolutionary home defence against Roumanians and Czechs so that the capitalistic enterprises might get coal, will, in order to achieve this aim readily place the proletariat of Hungary at the service of Allied imperialism.

I do not believe that the proletariat of Hungary will find salvation through American food profiteering, nor through coal bought in exchange for ammunition from Polish and Ukrainian counter-revolutionaries in the pay of the Entente—this can bring nothing but enslavement in the first place. An alliance with the Russian, German, Lettish and Ukrainian revolutionary proletariat, alone can save the Hungarian people. This is the problem of foreign policy that confronts us at the present moment and this will enable us to immediately proceed to conjoint action. I am convinced that disillusionment about the counter-revolutionary clique called the «League of Nations» has already set in everywhere. Those who proclaimed the League of Nations a salvation from all evils to-day possibly rely more on the solidarity of the Italian, French, English and Tchecho-Slovak proletariat. And these parts of the international proletariat will, I believe rather throw in their lot with a proletarian Hungary than with a Hungary standing under the leadership of Karolyi.

The international revolution is not the charlatanism that the League of Nations is. As late as December — if I remember right — the Wilsonists, — triumphantly pointed to Germany as the country where there was not the slightest prospect of a proletarian revolution. — However, to-day not only the Spartacists, but the Independent socialists, yea, even the proletarian elements of the majority socialists stand up for a proletarian revolution in Germany. Would you call what is taking place in Germany fratricidal war? Perhaps the so-called volunteer army also consists of «brothers»? But just ask, dear comrade, why the government does not permit the publication of the radio-telegrams received at Csepel a few days ago on the demands of the British workmen's and soldiers' councils and the details of the London disturbances. If you happen to come across one of the initiated government people in a moment of candour he will perhaps tell you what these radios contain. The bankruptcy of Berne had to coincide with the failure of the League of Nations, since the international policy of Berne was but the camp-follower of the Paris policy. This marks a progress towards the victory of the revolutionary International which is the sine qua non of every effort at unity.

The concrete measures for bringing about the union are, in my opinion, the following:

1) A conjoint conference of the revolutionary elements with the object of discussing the platform I propose.

2) Maximum alteration of the party programme in this sense and inclusion into it of

a) the valuation of imperialism as a particular stage of capitalism, the acknowledgment of the bankruptcy of capitalism, the opposition to state-socialism or state capitalism;

b) the relations of the proletariat to the state. We naturally demand a republic of soviets;

c) the alteration of the transition programme to make it correspond to what we have said above;

3) Union with the revolutionary International.

One further remark.

The so-called purely socialist government is no approach to the revolutionary dictatorship of the proletariat, to proletarian democracy. On the contrary, it diverts from that direction. A parliamentary form of government, the very organisation of the bourgeois state is an obstacle to the self-government of the working masses, to the transition to socialism. There is no pure socialist government that could realise proletarian demo-

cracy in a parliamentary republic. The rule of a socialist government no more signifies the rule of proletarian democracy, than state capitalism — which characteristically begins with monopolisation of the sugar industry in Hungary — signifies socialization.

I write you all this, dear comrade, and I believe you have no doubt that I will at all costs fight for this programme which, in my opinion, is the preliminary condition for the liberation of the proletariat. I am not ashamed, nay, I am rather proud of it that Lenin and — I will reveal the secret to you — the German Spartacists support us in this struggle. Nor am I ashamed of their support even if expressed in roubles and I am proud of it that Radek and I have won and earned their widest confidence. We will not fail to show ourselves worthy of it in the future as well.

By whom proletarian dictatorship will be established in Hungary — a question very often put — is a matter of indifference to me. I believe that the proletarian masses and not single persons will achieve it and that those destined for it by their conviction and, I add, their courage will stand at the head of the masses. I can calmly say, from my prison, that it is of no import to me whether or not I shall be among the first when offices are to be distributed. I merely wish to fight in the front rank of the proletariat in Hungary, as I did before in Russia. The test of a true revolutionary is his actions.

We who call ourselves communists must wait in the prison of the bourgeois state for the verdict that a jury, consisting of small shopkeepers from Theresienstadt, grocers from Leopoldstadt and busgesses from Josephstadt, will pass upon the revolutionary activity of the labour movement, for we «so-called» communists desire nothing but to act in this direction.

I know that this struggle for the liberation of the proletariat, although not decided upon by a united labour party, will yet weld together the workmen's movement of all countries. After the first stages of the struggle the labour movement will be united, just as in Russia where — I say it to prevent possible errors — it was not the bolsheviks who accepted the standpoint of the mensheviks.

With communist greetings from myself and my comrades

I remain yours

Geza Khun.

Budapest, March 11, 1919.

The Refusal of The Italian Socialist Party To Take Part In The Berne Conference.

Letter of Comrade Morgari to the „Berner Tagewacht“

Dear comrades! You have recently published a telegram from Milan, dated February 7-th, with the news, that the Italian Socialist party had decided to call back its delegates, Morgari and Casalini, from the International Congress in Berne, as the Party neither approved of the manner in which this Congress had been convoked, nor of the character of its debates. This communication is incorrect in the following points: 1) The Italian Socialist party did not, in any way delegate us to this Conference; 2) we did not take part in this Conference and 3) we received

no communication from Italy in the sense of the published Milan telegram. For the same reasons that had decided the Social-Democrat Party of Switzerland to boycott the International Conference of Berne, the Executive of our Party sent us to Berne to take part in all the meetings of the old International, summoned by the official plenipotentiaries of the International, to which our party yet belongs; we were charged to uphold the principles of Zimmerwald and Kienthal at these meetings, be they the Sessions of the Brussels International

Bureau, or of the Congress summoned by this Bureau or by its Secretary. At the same time we were instructed not to take part in the Conference, if it produced nothing more than Social-Patriotic discourses, or was but a continuation of the September Conference of Entente Socialists in London. Such directions were given to us because in Rome we did not know what awaited us in Berne. Our press gave very contradictory information; the invitation telegrams were wanting in lucidity; some of them were signed by Henderson, others — by Huysmans, and yet others by the Secretary of the French Socialist Party. The censor prevented our asking for explanations. So we arrived in Berne. But no sooner had the true spirit of the Conference become clear to us, than we declared to the Bureau of this International Conference, that it must not consider us as delegates. Comrade Camalini, having noticed his name in the list of delegates, informed the Bureau by letter that his name had been inserted in the list by mistake. We remained at the conference in the capacity of journalists only, in order to inform our press and our Party on the proceedings of the Conference and on the opinions hostile to us.

After our Italian Comrades had convinced themselves of the character of the Conference an energetic campaign against it began in the *«Avanti»*. This paper wrote: «It is certainly true that not all the participants of the Conference were animated by such (that is Social-Patriotic) sentiments and some of them held high the standard of our principles; but we find that the simple fact of their presence, even in the quality of an opposition, might prove of benefit to the other side. Their presence at the very least gave a stamp of legitimacy to an inadmissible and arbitrary part — the attitude of the International Bureau in leaving to the judgment of one group of participants the power to invite or pass over certain fractions of the International — according to the

tastes and sympathies of the ruling classes, with whom, properly speaking, the Socialists have nothing in common.— «The Italian Socialists, together with the Swiss, Russian, (English Socialist Labour Party), Americans, Serbians, Bulgarians (Tesniaks) and all who have remained true to Socialism in peace time, as well as in the time of war, most decidedly refused to acknowledge such rights pertaining to the Bureau. Constantine Lazzari was perfectly right when recently writing in most decided terms: «The Italian Socialists can not take part in the meetings of such parties and groups, that have united their cause with the cause of the bourgeois governments, and especially of those, whose conscience is burdened with the double murder of Karl Liebknecht and of Rosa Luxemburg. We suppose that those of our comrades, who confidently thought of taking part in the Berne Conference, will now be convinced that the best thing for them is to *keep themselves aloof* from people, who only seek forgetfulness for their past sins and their recent crimes. Thanks to this forgetfulness, all the adherents of the war have managed to unite so fast.

With this sort of International we have nothing in common; and all our comrades throughout the world who stand on the basis of class struggle are with us. The Socialistic proletariat will not allow itself to be deceived: it sees the abyss yawning between these men and itself. Everything must and will be built up afresh. This concerns the International also. But that new International will be the International of the proletarian socialists, the first spark of which was struck in gloomy, tragic days in the small village of Zimmerwald, amidst the accusations and persecution of that bourgeoisie, which has turned the world into a sea of blood; amidst calumny and animosity from the greater part of those, who yesterday at Berne dared to play the role of Defenders of Socialism.

Morgari.

Programme

Of The Committee For The Establishment-Of International Relations Carried at the Socialist Section

Congress of April 20-th, 21-st and 22-nd 1919.

France.

The socialist party lays it down that since August 1914 events have brilliantly justified the assertions of socialism before the war.

In its struggle against the catastrophe which it saw approaching the socialist International never ceased to denounce the terrible danger that threatened the peace of the world through the policy of imperialism, colonialism and armament pursued by all the governments.

With daily growing force and clearness it defined the capitalistic character of the conflict, from the awful consequences of which it endeavoured to rescue mankind. In 1912 at Basle it solemnly condemned the policy of secret treaties and original intrigues carried on by the monarchist and republican stage-managers that rendered the conflagration inevitable.

The war broke out, confirming the apprehensions of the socialists. In all the phases of its monstrous develop-

ment it bore witness to its real character, — carefully hidden from the masses — and made evident the responsibility of the rule of spoliation and violence that constitute the capitalistic regime for all its horrors.

By force of secret agreements and contrary to international law the governments of the two belligerent groups proceeded to divide the world anew for their own profit. Everywhere and always each military success was accompanied by an intensification of capitalist greed and by the abuse of brute force.

Germany, for an instant having become master of the situation imposed upon Russia the odious treaty of Brest-Litovsk. Victorious in their turn, the governments of the Allied nations — allied merely in their common hatred of socialism, but at variance in their annexionist ambitions — give evidence of the same disregard of the principles of justice and right behind which they

had ensconced themselves by drawing up a new map of Europe. Thus, by means of secret treaties they endeavour to tear Germany to pieces, to annex or put under their own control the left bank of the Rhine, the Sarre district, the Eastern coast of the Adriatic, Asia Minor, Syria, Mesopotamia, Persia, the German colonies...

The daily growing conflicts of the imperialists which at the Peace Conference set the small nations at variance with the great ones and the great nations with one another, show but too clearly that the capitalistic and political appetite of spoliation and conquest are independent of the form of power and that no bourgeois government can ever wage a "war for justice".

The Socialist International counted chiefly upon the proletariat to frustrate the criminal designs of capitalism, wreck the plans of diplomacy and avert slaughter. The failure or impotence of bourgeois democracy in face of the dominating power of capitalism proved during the whole course of the war that this attitude was justified.

The Socialist International was of course well aware that the proletariat, systematically kept in ignorance and hampered as it was in its efforts of organisation by the bourgeoisie in power, could not prevent the conflict. But it foresaw that the progress and aims of the imperialist war would create a revolutionary situation and at Stuttgart it urged the socialists to take advantage of this position in order to shorten the war and "with all their might to profit by the economic and political crisis for rousing the masses of the population and hasten the downfall of capitalistic rule".

In its duration, in its monstrous devouring of human lives and in the false wealth it has created this war has by far exceeded all prophesies.

The bourgeoisie appears impotent to solve the numerous problems that its blind and bellicose policy has called up and under the weight of which it now writhes and succumbs. The considerable discrepancy existing every where between revenue and expenditure render it impossible for capitalism to reestablish the financial equilibrium by its own force, to reconstruct the ruins and renew the harmony between wages and the cost of living, steadily continuing to go up in spite of all palliative measures, and to bring back to their normal condition the means of production and exchange.

It is because of this situation being general, because all the civilised nations are to-day plunged into an abyss of disorganisation and destitution that the capital of one nation cannot expect to make some other weaker or defeated nation pay. The failure of the formula "Germany will pay" has already been officially announced, showing to the proletariat — which may have become intoxicated with the illusion of victory, — that all is not well with the ruling classes. The latter have no means of saving themselves, except by reducing the workmen and peasants to a state of economic servitude which they cannot possibly accept.

Thus the proletariat is confronted by a greater crisis, a situation more revolutionary than the Socialist International had foreseen. Events force it to take more immediate and greater responsibilities upon itself.

Social revolution has begun and the theoretic and abstract idea of the gradual change of capitalism into a socialism no longer holds good.

In Russia all power is in the hands of the proletariat. In Germany the workmen and peasants reject the would-be democracy born of a compromise bet-

ween social democrat traitors and military reaction and, notwithstanding the bloody reprisals the present government took recourse to the revolutionary process is the same as in Russia.

Hence the evolutionist doctrine no longer corresponds to the facts of the situation. The course of history cannot be arrested. Every attempt, be it to dispossess the working class where it has come into power, to hamper the soaring of each present revolution, or to paralyse the development of the future international social one by means of helping the governing classes to solve within the frame of bourgeois democracy the difficulties that bear them down, can to-day serve only the purposes of pure reaction.

The Socialist Party further wishes to point out that the International always was revolutionary and that the entire tactics of modern scientific socialism are summed up in the following expression of Karl Marx: "The working class is either revolutionary or does not exist at all".

It never was the final aim of the International to attain power by universal suffrage or by the development of parliamentary and democratic institutions. If in normal times the Socialist International had a programme of reforms, it never regarded those reforms as an end, but merely as a means — adapted to circumstances of time and place — towards the raising of the power of action of the masses for the day of inevitable revolution. It knew that democracy must needs become an impossibility as soon as it reaches a stage of development which might endanger the existence of the leading capitalist bourgeoisie. It knew that in the face of such a serious menace the government as mouthpiece of the bourgeoisie, would without the slightest hesitation suppress the liberties and privileges previously granted. History knows no example of a class in power letting itself be ousted by legal measures.

Thus revolution is a necessity, and as soon as the proletariat attains to power it has to establish its dictatorship until its conquests are safe from all attempts at capitalistic reaction.

Prior to being put into practice by the Soviet Government of Russia this idea was advocated by the International, the latter having never admitted the hypothesis of an evolution ending in peaceable dispossession of the unresisting bourgeoisie.

The socialist party energetically repudiates all attempts at representing the revolution as premature and the proletariat as insufficiently prepared for the exercise of state power.

The moment for the outbreak and development of social revolution are not exclusively dependent upon the necessary preparation for it of the working class, nor upon the degree of capitalist concentration; they also depend upon the general situation brought about by the bourgeoisie and by the latter's impotence to find suitable means for prolonging its rule. The proletariat may be forced by necessity to make revolution and take power. It has to answer the call even though its stage of preparation may seem insufficient.

From the above facts, i. e. the disintegration of bourgeois society on the one hand and the reality of the revolution on the other it follows that the world proletariat is placed before the alternative: either to take the path of revolution or to strengthen the capitalist bourgeoisie and suffer the latter's dictatorship.

Only the complete possession of power by the working class can solve the problems of social organisation.

Revolution to-day having left the sphere of theory and become a reality, the stage of a democratised League of Nations tending ultimately to evolve towards socialism has outlived its time. The idea of such a League under present day conditions is at once chimerical and counter-revolutionary. The conflict of the various imperialisms at the Peace Conference, the unchaining of the same cupidity in the newly created countries testify that the bourgeoisie is incapable of organising such a League or of making anything of it except an instrument for consolidating its own power. Moreover, the implacable antagonism among the capitalists of the various countries, as well as the necessity of guarding against revolutionary outbursts prevent the bourgeoisie from carrying out its plans. Thus it is in order to gain profit and at the same time to avoid a revolution that the French bourgeoisie demands indemnities and territories.

Being in a state of total decomposition the bourgeois class can only carry out its designs if they are backed up by the proletariat. But the latter is not interested in giving such support. On the contrary, it must fight by the circumstances that permit it to seize the power with a minimum of effort. Every adhesion of the proletariat to the policy of President Wilson characterised by the Soviet Government as «the vassal of world imperialism» — is a denial of the possibilities of the revolutionary situation and an attempt at reestablishing a regime that has irretrievably failed.

Nothing but revolution can bring about a speedy and complete solution of the problems of social reorganisation. Revolution alone can relieve mankind from the nightmare of war, regenerate and liberate work by building up society on production, and eradicating profiteering and with it the high cost of life.

Revolution alone is capable of bringing about international harmony that will justly and without delay solve all those national questions which the rule of violence and arbitrariness now to be imposed leaves unanswered as so many threats of future wars.

Only by immediate and general abolition of the parasitic taxes imposed upon the community by capital for the greatest part finding their origin in the public debt — can reestablish financial balance and find the necessary resources for giving healthy dwellings and the

benefits of science, social assistance and insurance to the working masses decimated by consumption and other diseases of poverty.

And, again, only by acknowledging the value of all profitable labour will it enable woman to take the place in society she is entitled to and automatically (the present revolutions gives an example of it) set up complete equality of the sexes.

Only by becoming wholly master of its destiny will the working class be enabled to rebuild the ruins of the war, to proceed to repair the means of transport, the instruments of industrial production agricultural machinery, etc. thus ensuring the speedy regeneration of the ruined nations.

Whatever reforms it may concede, the capitalist bourgeoisie will never of its own free will consent to change the general character of education, that most powerful instrument of dominion. Only victorious Revolution will create the real system of education, secular, compulsory and free of charge in all its stages, a system that will no longer be content to teach the children of the people merely what everyone should know of, but which will place all the children on a footing of complete equality and thus ensure to every one of them full development of its faculties.

Thus the socialist party submits the following programme to the proletarian masses and summons them to carry it into being:

1) Complete taking over of power by the proletariat.

2) Introduction of compulsory work.

3) Socialisation of the means of production and exchange, of land, industries, mines, means of transport, under the immediate management of peasants, workmen, miners, railwaymen, sailors . . .

4) Distribution of products by means of cooperative and municipal stores, under the control of the community.

5) Municipalization of houses and of hospitals.

6) Transformation of the bureaucracy under the direct management of the workers.

7) Universal disarmament as a result of the union of all the proletarian republics within the socialist International.

Resolution proposed by Frassard, Paul Faure, Vereuil, and Leriot at the Berne Conference.

Why did the British delegates from the Labour Party and I. L. P. oppose this resolution?

«The International Socialist Conference refuses to hold a debate which tends to condemn the dictatorship of the proletariat in the name of democracy; just as it would refuse, if the proposition were put forward, to condemn democracy in the name of the dictatorship.

The Conference has no mandate, and is even disqualified (owing to the absence of a certain number of national sections) to discuss the régime established in Russia by the Soviet Government. The Conference considers that such a debate could not arrive at theoretical and practical conclusions of any value, so long as the blockade and the censorship in certain countries prevent the reunion of those able to give information on the re-

gime of the Soviets, and to help us in establishing an authoritative opinion.

«Above all, the Conference considers the very fact of criticising a régime which the capitalist classes of all countries pursue with an implacable hatred would help the designs of the governments, which, by the economic blockade and military intervention, dream of annihilating, in the name of what they call Bolshevism, an effort for liberty attempted by the Russian workers and peasants.

The conference considers that the intervention and blockade menace the very existence of the Russian Revolution and the even course of its development, and affirms that the international proletariat has the right

to be impartially informed on the Socialist experience which is being gained in the Soviet Republic.

«The Conference declares that it is the duty of the Socialist Parties to fight with all their energy to force the governments to retire from Russia and to liberate the troops which are still fighting there, as well as to raise the blockade, which strangles the Russian people economically. The Conference decides that a Socialist

and International Worker's Commission shall be charged with the least possible delay, to go and procure on the spot all the facts, which alone can enable the International to bring to bear an enlightened and definite judgment on the action and the methods inaugurated by the Russian Revolution and by the German and Austrian Revolutions».

Text of the agreement, concluded in the Budapest prison between the communist party and the social-democratic parties of Hungary.

The Social-Democratic Party of Hungary and the Communist Party of Hungary at the conference of party-leaders on March 21 of the year 1919 resolve to unite both parties completely.

The united party will be named Socialist Party of Hungary, until the revolutionary International gives the party another definite name.

The union was accomplished on the agreement that both former parties were to take part conjointly in the direction of the new party and that governmental power should immediately be taken into the hands of the party in the name of the proletariat. Dictatorship was to be

realized by means of workmens soldiers and peasants councils. By force of this the project of a National Assembly completely falls away.

A class army of the proletariat class must immediately be organized and is to proceed to disarm the bourgeoisie.

For the sake of securing the power of the proletariat and resisting Entente imperialism, a close military and spiritual alliance with the Russian Soviet Republic is to be concluded.

Signed. The Social-Democrat Party of Hungary.
The Communist Party of Hungary.

Greeting of the Irish socialists to the Russian Communist party and to the congress of the Communist International.

New-York 20-th March 1919.

In the name of the Irish revolutionary socialist proletarian movement we send you greeting. Transmit it to the revolutionary comrades of the Russian Communist party and the Communist Congress.

I would have liked to transmit this greeting personally, and would have done it, if this government had

not refused me the permission to come to you. I take advantage of this opportunity to send you greetings. Rest assured that your Irish comrades are with you in everything you might undertake.

Yours for the revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Jigs Larkin.

Proceedings of the Central Executive Committee of the Communist International.

An Appeal from the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

(by wireless.)

To all, To all

An unheard-of crime is being committed which puts in the shade the crimes committed by the propertied classes during the war. The English and French imperialists surround the Hungarian Soviet Republic on all sides in order to drown the Hungarian Revolution in the blood of Hungarian workmen. The Roumanian feudal lords throw their deluded troops against Hungary. The Czechoslovak urged on by the same French imperialists, move upon Hungary from two other directions. The Soviet Government of Hungary has expressed its willingness to accept the very hardest conditions of peace and to satisfy all the unheard of claims of the Roumanian and Czechoslovak reactionary governments. The reactionary armies of the abovementioned governments are none the less continuing their advance in Hungary.

The significance of these events is clear. The Hungarian Soviet Republic did not and does not want war. The Hungarian Soviet Government expresses the will of all the workers of Hungary. The Hungarian workmen have overthrown the power of the capitalists—that is their only crime. The advance of the imperialists against Socialistic Hungary is obviously going on with the sympathy and support of the social-traitors, who call themselves social-democrats. The conference of the yellow «International», which is now being held in Amsterdam, did not by a single word of protest show disapproval of the brutal campaign against Soviet Hungary.

The Executive Committee of the Communist International addresses itself to the Roumanian, Czechoslovak and Yugoslav workmen and soldiers. Comrades, refuse to play the part of butchers of the Hungarian workmen: lend a friendly hand to our brothers, the Hungarian soldiers and workmen! The workers of the world will turn with scorn from those who did not do their duty at such a responsible moment.

Workmen and soldiers of France! The bourgeoisie of your country is most of all to be blamed for the revolting campaign against Soviet Hungary. Lift your voice in protest! Take power from the grasp of the greatest evil-doers that ever existed! Strike the knife from the hands of the would-be murderers of our brothers, the Hungarian workmen!

The heroic deeds of the Hungarian workmen, who have instituted a republic of labour, are the pride of all class conscious workmen throughout the world. To you,

Hungarian workmen, surrounded on all sides by enemies, the communist workmen of the world send their most ardent greeting. The Russian proletariat in the course of the year and a half of its dictatorship saw itself in a no less difficult position more than once; yet it overcame all obstacles and came out victorious. We are firmly convinced that you will emerge greatly strengthened by this trial.

Down with the international brigands!
Long live the Hungarian Soviet Republic!

G. Zinoviev.

Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

How the Bourgeoisie Fights against the Communist International.

(by wireless)

Friedrich Platten, member of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, and citizen of the Swiss Republic, who was arrested on April 8-th in Finland as a Russian hostage, was permitted to return to the Russian frontiers on May 14-th and is now in Petrograd. Comrade Platten categorically refused to give his consent to be exchanged for the Finns arrested in Russia; he refused likewise to «express the desire» of returning to Russia. It was only on the Finnish frontier, that com. Platten made, in order not to prevent the counter-exchange of Russian citizens, who had already been under arrest for some months in Finland, the following declaration:

«On the 14-th May of 1919 it was announced to me in Helsingfors Prison that I was to be immediately sent back to Russia. Putting aside my personal wishes and counting with circumstances I make no more objections to my being returned to Russia». Platten had been assured that his being sent back to Russia had nothing to do with the former ideas of exchange.

The case of Platten has been discussed in the Finnish Parliament. It is being communicated from an authentic source that the conduct of the government in proclaiming a Swiss citizen a Russian hostage created a strong opposition and members of the government have declared that the decision of the Parliament may lead to the fall of the ministry.

The bourgeoisie everywhere opens hospitable doors to the yellow Berne «International». But in their struggle against the work of the Communist International no means are considered bad enough. The workers of all countries will judge this conduct of the bourgeoisie according to its merit.

G. Zinoviev.

Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

To the congress of the Swedish comrades.

Dear Friends.

In the name of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, I tender your Congress the heartiest greetings. The Executive Committee is convinced that your Party, one of the first to raise the banner of struggle against Social-Chauvinism, will now assume the appellation of Communist Party, and of course, fully accept the programme of the Communist International. The bourgeoisie of the Allied countries has proved incapable of putting the plan of open intervention against Soviet Russia into practice: workmen and soldiers prevented their doing this. At present the Allied imperialists are pursuing a system of veiled intervention into Russian affairs, by trying to set Finland, Esthonia, Poland, etc against us. To expose the true character of this fresh attack is one of the most important duties of the proletarian parties of Europe. We are sure that your Party will be in the first ranks in the achieving of this task. The Communist International is growing and gathering force from day to day, all the powers of hell will not overcome us. The hour of complete victory is near for the workers of the world.

G. Zinoviev.

Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

Petrograd, May 29-th 1919.

To the Organizations of the Proletarian Youth of the World.

Dear Comrades.

In the great imperialist slaughter, it is the young workers and peasants that have suffered the heaviest losses. Millions and millions of workers in the prime of life perished in order to satisfy the greed of a gang of capitalists. The bourgeois Governments deliberately sent working-class youth to be massacred, with a double aim: first, to vanquish their bourgeois rival, in order to increase their own gains; and, second;

to destroy the most „unruly“ exacting and revolutionary elements among their own working class.

It was working youth that suffered most from the War of 1914—1919; and it was they who first raised their voice in protest against the monstrous carnage.

When the official „Socialist“ and Social-Democrat Parties went over to the side of the bourgeoisie, and began to exalt this predatory war, as a „just“ and „liberating“ war — the organizations of youth were the first to rise up against such treachery. The Scheidemanns and Eberts in Germany; the Renaudels and Thomas in France; the Hyndmans and Hendersons in England; the Renners and Auerlits in Austria; Gompers in America, and other frauds and traitors in other countries, came up against the opposition of proletarian youth. Now is the hour to organize the International of youth. The Young workers of the world, must definitely choose their path.

The Communist International, founded in Moscow, in March 1919 summons all young organizations to join its ranks. The Communists look upon the work amongst the youth, as one of the most important and pressing tasks. Karl Liebknecht, the great champion of the Communist International martyred by the Social-traitors, was one of the most ardent advocates of the Young labour movement as well as one of its foremost organizers. The Russian Soviet Republic places all its resources, all its strength at the service of the Young workers and peasants.

The Yellow „International“ has been founded in Bern. The murderers of Karl Liebknecht have gone united with the betrayers of the French workmen. This „Yellow International“ is but a tool in the hands of the Imperialists of the Entente Kautsky, who defends the „unity“ with Scheidemann, is, in reality a lackey in the service of the Bourgeoisie.

We are sure that working youth will not wish to have anything in common with this International of deception, falsehood and treason, but, as, one man, will hasten to join the fighting International, the Red Communist International. The long-expected moment has at last come — the supreme moment of struggle for the power of the workers; for the dictatorship of the proletariat; for Communism. The working class its taking its revenge for the outrage, inflicted on the proletariat during five years of war. All over the world, the workmen will organize Soviets, realize Socialism. Against the black army of the bourgeoisie, we shall oppose our Red Workers' Army, whose youth will fight on the foremost barricades, in the name of Soviet Power.

Long live Proletarian Youth! Long live the Communist International of Youth!

G. Zinoviev.

Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Communist International.

Petrograd, May 19-th, 1919.

Resolutions of the first Congress of the Communist International

Report of Comrade Albert.

(Germany.)

Dear comrades,

As late as November 8th 1918 even the adherents of the independent social democrats declared it impossible that Russian conditions could ever arise in Germany, that is to say, that there would ever be a revolution in Germany. Yet as early as November 9th the old structure of the capitalistic regime collapsed. As early as November 9th we had the very thing in Germany, that up to that moment had been criticised so severely with regard to Russia, the thing one had thought impossible for Germany.

In the beginning it is true, the whole movement in Germany appeared to be nothing but a soldiers' revolt, an outgrowth of the discontent of the Soldiers with the Draconic severity of their commanders, a result of their aversion to the war. Yet the Soviet system was introduced overnight; Soviets were formed overnight even in the small towns. We were thus witnessing not merely a soldiers' mutiny brought about by discontent with the war. We were witnessing the realisation of the will of the proletariat to firmly establish the new system it had fought for so long; to set up a socialist regime in place of the old order of things.

The labour councils that had sprung up overnight were, of course, very unstable as yet. The majority socialists and the adherents of Scheidemann, much better organized than workmen managed to sneak into government, seize government posts and gain a firm footing in the Soviets. The old notion of the workmen that the new order of things could be built up by merely putting a few social-democrats in place of the former rulers and ministers, was the reason why the independents and majority socialists were represented in the government of Germany.

In the first days of the revolution the workmen's councils proposed to the adherents of the Spartacus-Union to take part in the government, and comrade Liebknecht was offered a seat in the ministry. Liebknecht declared he would go into the cabinet for three days only, in order to help the conclusion of the armistice. The majority-socialists not agreeing to this, comrade Liebknecht, and with him the other members of the Spartacus Union, refused to participate in the government. We believed the moment had not yet come for Germany; to replace the old capitalistic state by a new social system, and we knew it would not do to merely drive away a few lackeys of royalty. The chief thing was to destroy the old state machine and construct our own mechanism of power. The main thing was to show and teach the working masses, that in the first place a system of soviets had to be built up, i. e. that first of all the proletariat had to take over dictatorship. A little later measures of the government were to prove that our comrades had been quite right in not

entering the cabinet. All the first decrees of government were aimed at depriving the workmen's councils of executive power.

Haase, Dittmann, Barth and others were of the government too. Both governmental opinions had joined in issuing the first decree. Only a few days passed and they came into collision with the Central Council. The government placed itself above the system of soviets. The officers that had been removed had their commissions returned and received their old command back again. The powers that were thought it premature to introduce socialism and proposed to postpone it for some later time. The demands of the workmen were refused, because—so they said—it was impossible to change the existing state mechanism, because the enemy was at the gates, because the Allies would not permit any changes whatsoever.

But when the protest of the proletariat against these doings became ever stronger, when the workmen would not consent to tread the old paths, the government showed its true face.

It is characteristic of German conditions that the very third day after the outbreak of the revolution the conservative press organs declared that the revolution simply did exist and could not be so easily explained away. The chief thing was—so they contended—for the government to take care that democracy should really be carried through in Germany, that democracy should be realised in practice. What they meant was a democracy of the bourgeoisie, the calling of a National Assembly. The Spartacus-Union immediately pointed out that there was to be no such thing; that we needed dictatorship of the proletariat, that had created its own mechanism of organisation the soviet system, and as it was the proletariat that had achieved the revolution in Germany, it ought to be the only class called upon to build up the new state. We demanded relentless class-struggle, until final annihilation of the capitalist system. But this was not to the taste of Messrs. Scheidemann and Ebert. They declared themselves in favour of a National Assembly. Preparations for the elections were made with incredible speed. This gave the workmen their cue. The whole nation split into two groups. The representatives of capital, supporting the National Assembly stood on the one side, the Spartacus-Union with their demand for a soviet system and the dictatorship of the proletariat on the other. Such was the parole all through the contests that you know about.

Our comrades, adherents of the Spartacus Union, had formerly been organized in the Independent Social Democrat Party. At the beginning of the war only one social democratic party existed in Germany that was being exalted to the very skies in the rest of Europe. The fact of the social-democrats and their leaders having gone over to nationalism

at the outbreak of the war and fighting side by side with the bourgeoisie made it impossible for the members of the Spartacus-Union to remain in that organisation any longer. There was yet another fraction that did not agree to voting the war credits this was the fraction of Haase and Ledebour. But with regard to other questions of home defence they were at one with Scheidemann and Ebert. After showing open opposition they were ejected from the party and proceeded to form the Independent Social Democratic Party.

The friends of the Spartacus-Union had no possibility of working and developing their activity. The Spartacists were either thrown into prison or sent to the trenches. Only a few of them could continue work in so far as they happened to be at liberty. When the Independent Social Democratic Party was formed at Gotha we were ready to join it, but divergencies, even irreconcilable ones existed at the very outset. After the outbreak of the revolution the Independents entered the government, declared themselves in favour of bourgeois democracy and endeavoured to strangle the soviet system. Thus we could no longer work with them. On January 8th 1919, at the conference of the Spartacus Union in Berlin, we inaugurated the Communist Party of Germany. As soon as our party had come into being the government, under the leadership of Ebert-Scheidemann, began a relentless war against the communists. All the old methods of oppression that had formerly been practiced by the old regime were now ruthlessly applied by the new government in order to crush the Communist Party. The workmen revolted against such policy; the proletariat took recourse to strikes to prove that it would not let itself be oppressed by the old methods. At this the representatives of Ebert and Scheidemann declared merciless war upon the proletariat and first had Maxim-guns and cannons wheeled out into the streets of Berlin against the working masses. On December 6th 1918 Maxim-guns and cannons fired on peacefully demonstrating workmen in the streets of Berlin, and a large number of our best comrades were killed or severely wounded. It is characteristic that persecution was most relentless against soldier-members of the communist party.

What about the German army of to-day? Having spent four years in the war and on the 9th of November overthrown the old regime by revolt the soldiers no longer wish to continue the old game. The old regiments have been dissolved. After the outbreak of the revolution they simply cut and ran without caring whether it pleased Scheidemann or not.

The military units in Germany were dissolved within a few days after the revolution. Whole districts whose leaders belonged to the communist party carried through demobilisation at their own risk. The Brunswick Republic announced demobilisation for the 23rd of December. The Government Imperial protested, but the soldiers had already been dismissed. Moreover, it had but little sense for the government to keep back the old soldiers, for they could no longer be of any use for its aims. The old front regiments refused to fight the external enemy. Armistice or no armistice, they simply ran away, as fast as their legs could carry them. I have to say that Russia took active part in the crumbling up of our army. The prisoners of war arrived from Russia. Wherever they appeared it did not take long for all desire for war to vanish.

Some regiments at the fronts could not be reached by propaganda and continued to remain under the command of their officers, but they very soon ceased to be fit for action.

General Legius, the military commander of Berlin, declared in the beginning of January that a 6 days presence in Berlin would suffice for the complete demoralisation of his troops at present still in kept hands by their officers. It was only owing to forces returning from the fronts where agitation had not yet penetrated that weapons were made use of against the workmen in the streets of Berlin. Thus it was on December 6th 1918 that the troops just returned from Finland, by order of the government, shot down soldiers coming from a meeting of the red soldier's union. When a few days later the sailors forming the foundation and chief support of the revolution (mostly workmen that before too had been party-members) refused to leave Berlin by order of the government, the latter detailed a regiment from the battle-front against them and the sailors were pelted with hand grenades. The cabinet members Haase, Barth and Dittman declared that they were not present at the sitting where it was decided to fire on the workmen, and the Independents withdrew from government. They were thrust out, and great was their lament at it.

The Spartacus group could no longer work with them. With such people all work was illusory. The formation of a separate Communist Party was imperative, the more so as within the existing party splits were becoming more and more numerous. The majority party works harmoniously, but within the Independent Party something is rotten. Each leader represents a separate point of view, each of them urges the formation of a different party. In particular Ledebour and Däumig coveted the idea of founding a universal German party. Had this actually been done another Independent Social Democratic Party would have arisen, leaning neither to the right nor to the left, failing to advocate the cause of the extreme radicals, the Spartacus-Union and the dictatorship of the proletariat. This prompted us to immediately separate ourselves from these men and thus to counteract the formation of a new hybrid party.

The task of the communist movement was not only to found a new party but, first and foremost, to educate the masses, to prepare them for the introduction of the socialist order of things where each single man's work will be of account. Every now and then theydea takes hold of the workmen that all they have to do is to replace some cabinet ministers by social democrats. It was our task to point out that the struggle against the bourgeoisie could only be carried on by means of mass-action. From the very outset it was clear to us that the revolution of November was nothing but a weak attempt at destroying the old regime, that the real revolution in Germany was yet to come.

It became evident in the course of a few weeks that the reconstruction of society on a new basis would still demand bloody fights, that civil war would flake up with a passion until now unknown to history. The masses have to be shown that their only salvation lies in the soviet system. All our agitation is directed towards making this clear to the workmen, towards inducing them to form their soviets.

How about these soviets? At first councils were formed everywhere. In works and workshops the workers elected councils with the aim of improving their conditions of work within their own establishments. For us, the import of these councils lies in their having ousted the influential German trade-unions which were at one with the yellow socialists, which prohibited strikes, opposed every open movement of the workers and attacked them from behind on every possible occasion. Since the 9th of November the trade-unions have ceased to play any role whatsoever. Since the 9th of Nov.

vember all economic movement has been carried on with out, nay, against the trade-unions that had not once succeeded in pushing through the economic demands of the working men. Only recently did the shop-assistants' union begin an open movement, the reason being that members of the communist party were among its leaders.

What are the prospects of the future struggle in Germany? If one is to judge by the numerical results of the elections for the National Assembly the majority socialists in Germany have the support of the overwhelming mass of the population. The Socialdemocrats obtained 11 million votes, the independent socialists 2 millions. But closer investigation of the movement shows that the workmen do not at all stand in such serried ranks behind the government as the latter professes they do. On the contrary, it appears that whenever the workers endeavour to gain their own ends independently and in spite of the government they follow the cry of the communists. In Rhineland-Westphalia there is a wide-spread movement among the miners. A central council was elected and entrusted with the control of the coal mines. It was not only the workmen who took part in the socialisation of the enterprises: the staff of officials declared themselves ready to carry through socialisation independently of the former owners and to join the miners in managing the works without sabotage. Of course, it is impossible to proceed to socialise a single branch of industry in a state, but it is symptomatic that the workmen understand the only way for abolishing the old economic order to be the socialisation of the works, in fact, of economic life as a whole. The prospects for the future struggle are favourable because the economic development in Germany shows a rapidly descending curve.

It is less favourable that the government deals sharply with the workmen, but the latter are not easily to be intimidated. Wherever complications arose in Germany the soldiers declared: "We will not fight against the workmen". But military forces that keep neutral are of no use to the government. The latter therefore proceeded to organise white guards out of volunteer regiments, after the Russian pattern. New regiments were formed to defend the Eastern frontier, the pretext was to keep down the Polish insurgents, those Poles that were oppressed by the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie and that to-day are maltreated exactly as before. On the other hand the military forces were made use of to beat back the onset of bolshevik red guards. In Germany the red guards were pictured as a gang of murdering and pillaging robbers. Active propaganda is being carried on by the government in order to win soldiers for the struggle against the bolsheviks.

These soldiers were also made use of to fight the workmen in the streets of Berlin and to crush the working men in their struggle. The first movement arose in Berlin in January 1919. The government had dismissed the prefect of the police and put a majority man in his place whose treachery had formerly won him the hatred of the working men. Thus the danger arose for the proletariat that the new prefect would proceed against them with the most brutal measures. Without waiting for a signal or instructions from the party, least of all for those of the Spartacus Union, the workmen on January 19th occupied several printing-offices, in the first place the office of the "Vorwärts" which paper had long been an eyesore to them. After several days of struggle and occupation the majority men under the leadership of the government sent out the first white guards to restore order in Berlin. The atrocious and brutal way in which they proceeded is evidenced by the fact that the first parliamentaires issuing from the

"Vorwärts" — building with the flag of truce were simply flogged to death by the soldiers. After having crushed the movement the white guards proceeded to arrest and imprison all those who openly adhered to the Spartacus Union. Thus did our best leaders, Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg fall into the hands of the butchers, who murdered them in the street. All the yarns about the attempted flight of Liebknecht and of the dragging away of comrade Luxemburg by the workmen is rank fraud. We are already in possession of evidence proving that Liebknecht was beaten over the head, with the butt-ends of rifles by soldiers of the white guard, was carried away in a motor-car severely wounded and thereupon shot dead. As to Rosa Luxemburg, she was killed by two blows of the butt and her corpse dragged away. The murderers and officers are known, the evidence has been published, but the murderers still walk the streets in liberty. The government never thinks of proceeding against them.

The fate of Liebknecht and Luxemburg has been shared by many other Spartacists. They were killed by fanatic soldiers and officers and their bodies thrust into the earth without much ado. Our Russian comrade Karl Radek was arrested, loaded with heavy iron chains and thrown into a damp and cold cellar, a cell, formerly the place of confinement for murderers. So you see that terror in Berlin is at its height. The struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie is no longer carried on by means of leaflets and pamphlets. To-day the proletariat fights with powder and shot. The panic-stricken bourgeoisie has no other course but to keep the proletariat down by force. It has no other means at its disposal.

The economic conditions of Germany are hopeless. Works are being closed by the dozen; by means of economic movements and strikes the workmen have won for themselves wages which make the enterprises no longer appear a paying business to the capitalist. So the simply closes shop, because it does not yield a surplus big enough for him. On the other hand the reluctance of the workmen to work is steadily growing. It is not to be wondered at that to-day, when they might have the business in their own hands, the workmen no longer want to fill the pockets of the capitalists. Their aversion is becoming greater day by day. Raw materials are scarce and wherever they are to be got at all they are being smuggled from hand to hand. That is why the capitalists close their enterprises. When I left Berlin the number of the unemployed was 200,000. The economic collapse of Germany is approaching fast.

Communication in Germany is bad. I was told at home: "If you go to Russia you will witness things!" Comrades, as compared to Germany, I travelled from the frontier to Moscow luxuriously. The English and French have taken our best locomotives. The way from Berlin to Leipzig that formerly used to take two hours now frequently lasts 9 to 10 hours. Where express-trains used to run every hour, there are only one or two slow trains a day now. It is evident that the former method of management cannot be continued.

The food question is becoming more and more complicated. The prices for foodstuffs are continually rising, or else they are not to be obtained at all. The rations are insufficient for keeping alive and recourse has to be taken to smuggling and illegal food trading. The workmen are not in a position to purchase the necessary food-stuffs. As a direct result riots take place everywhere. The white guards are only waiting for the moment to advance against the proletariat. Thus armed collisions are unavoidable.

All this and the peace with the Allies in particular will show that the proletariat carries on its struggle in the firm hope of a successful end. The government puts the workmen off from one day to the next saying: we must not do anything; peace with the Allies is a matter of a few days. But the working masses will no longer be deceived by such lame excuses. For months we have been told that we must fight against Russia in order to win favour in the eyes of the Entente. But so far we have seen no signs of their favour, nor shall we ever do so. The few tins of condensed milk have been offered us at a price that capitalists may be able to pay, but not workmen. The Scheidemannists who four years ago sanctioned and supported the policy of war against the Allied countries, are now crawling on their bellies before the Allies and whining and praying for mercy. They are afraid of the peace. The German government, the Scheidemannists and their act have shown the Allies how peace with a vanquished enemy is made: England and France can point to Brest-Litovsk and say "you have taught us how to make peace"; and if the conditions of peace will be heavy it is because the representatives of the Entente, Wilson, Clémenceau and Co are but the head clerks of their respective capitalistic states and regard the conclusion of peace as a business deal that

is to be made the most of. Not by the government's creeping on its belly and whining is anything to be got out of the Allies, but by the proletariat continuing its revolution with energy and passion. The confidence of England and France has to be won and the struggle for the world — revolution carried on in union with these countries.

This is the opinion of the Communist Party, and by our propaganda we will succeed in winning that part of the German proletariat for our ideas which has not yet joined us. I believe I am not too optimistic if I say that the Communist Party of Germany, as of Russia, continues its struggle in the hope that the time is not too far off when the German proletariat will succeed to bring its revolution to a glorious end: when proletarian dictatorship will be established in the teeth of all the National Assemblies of the world, in the teeth of all Scheidemann and bourgeois nationalism. For this struggle it is imperative that the proletarians of Germany take the field in close union with the proletariat of other countries. It is because I am convinced of this that I have gladly accepted your invitation, trusting that very shortly we shall fight side by side with the proletariat of all other countries, especially that of England and France, for the realisation of their revolutionary aims in Germany.

Report of Comrade G. Zinoviev.

(Russia).

Comrades.

You will understand that I can only pick out a few things at random from the abundance of material at my disposal. We are now for the first time in a position to hold an international conference on Russian soil and to lay before our comrades an immense quantity of material concerning our movement. We are no longer forced (as once upon a time) to appear as emigrants and to voice merely the feeble echoes of the Russian labour movement. Much of what we have heard from comrade Albert about Germany we could repeat in another strain about our own past. It reminds us of what we had here during the era of Kerensky, of what we experienced in Russia in August 1917 or thereabouts.

As you know, our party was the only one to proclaim proletarian revolution in Russia. All the other parties were against the October revolution, and it was evident that the communist vanguard of the Russian proletariat had to take the whole burden of the struggle upon itself without any assistance whatsoever, nay, in spite of manifold obstacles.

Previous to the October revolution our party counted about 10,000 members. Now that we are standing before our 8th regular conference of the Communist Party we have about 500,000 members. Perhaps this is not much, but you will understand that we cannot

throw open our doors to all the elements that now wish to enter our party. As a matter of course, the best elements of the working class, the best elements of working youth join our party and these elements are heartily welcomed by us. But now that our party is at the helm of the state numbers of careerists and dubious elements of the small bourgeoisie, naturally, often seek admission into our party. We have however firmly and irrevocably decided to put serious obstacles in the way of these elements. Our Central Committee has even resolved to deprive some categories of party-members of the vote for the party conference elections. It seems rather strange that we should have recourse to restricting suffrage inside the party itself, but I repeat, this resolution has the support of the whole party because we want its members to be of one mould because we want only true communists to be admitted to the party. It is a question only of the 500,000 members that hold the whole state mechanism in their hands, from top to bottom.

The nucleus of the party are the working men. Intellectuals are very scarce in our ranks. Only lately has a change been noticeable. A number of intellectuals are now prepared to work with us in the soviet institutions, but admission to our party is not so easily granted.

The trade unions furnish the second form of our labour organisation. With us the historical evolution of the trade unions was different from that of Germany. In the memorable years of 1901 to 1905 they played a prominent part in the revolution, and now they go on parallel lines with us in our struggle for socialism. The membership of the Russian trade-unions now amounts to about 3½ millions. This is the figure furnished by the last trade union congress. The overwhelming majority of the members stand on the platform of our party and all resolutions are exclusively in the spirit of our party. It is only a very small minority in the trade unions that pleads neutrality for the unions, that advocates their «independence». The majority supports the idea that they have to work hand in hand with the communists. There is a fairly strong tendency in favour of the nationalization of the trade unions, i. e. in favour of the trade unions formally becoming a part of the soviet government. As a matter of fact, the trade unions act as a part of our state machine. Thus with regard to the question of wage rates the decisions are formally taken by the Council of People's Commissaries, but the final word in the matter belongs to the trade unions. It is the same with regard to all questions of workmen's insurance and many other questions of vital importance for the workers.

A third kind of organisation are the cooperative societies. We have now twenty-five thousand cooperative societies, the workmen's societies in the towns counting two million members and the rural societies in the country with ten millions. Adding to these numbers the families of the members of the cooperative organisations comprise a membership of about fifty millions.

However, as everyone knows, our chief organisations are the soviet institutions. It is difficult to say precisely how many persons — workmen and peasants—are organised in our soviet institutions. But one thing we can say: after our soviet constitution had been drawn up we saw that we could gradually extend suffrage to a part of the middle strata of the population. Thus, for example, the elections for the Petrograd Workmen's Council offered the following picture: Petrograd has about 650,000 voters. Over two thirds took part in the elections, and more than nine tenths of the population have the right to vote. I believe the example furnished by Petrograd is fairly typical for our cities, and I think I can say that more than one hundred millions of the population possess and exercise the right of vote.

As a matter of course the whole burden of the work in the soviet institutions is borne by the common workmen. This fact is important for our comrades in other countries too. We too had been intimidated and even the workmen themselves believed we could not manage so complicated a task with our own forces. No doubt, many mistakes are still being made. But the working masses of Russia, although by far not the most intelligent in the world, have shown that they are able to solve these

complicated problems if they are given political power and have an organised party to lead them.

Until lately our party was mainly a party of the urban proletariat. This is natural, for our first members came from the factories; our organisation was born in the workers' quarter. But now our party is becoming the party of the working masses in town and country. We have not been working in the country so long as in the towns, and perhaps with less energy. But we can say that this year of work in the country has brought our party numerous new forces and that we have succeeded in ousting all other parties there. The communist party enjoys great and ever-growing popularity in the villages. The peasant youths, the former soldiers, the workmen from the towns and chiefly the workmen from Petrograd and Moscow have achieved a great work in the country, — the Petrograd workmen in particular. In the course of the last year 280,000 workmen emigrated from Petrograd to the fronts and into the country. It was, of course, very unfortunate for Petrograd, but all the more fortunate for our revolution that the vanguard of Russian workmen left the city and continued their fruitful activity in the villages. Within these last months the communist revolution has reached the country. The poor peasantry of Russia is at present passing the phase of the October revolution, and from this source many new forces for the communist revolution will emanate.

Our party and our proletariat were the first to be able to carry through state propaganda for communism. And we made the most of our chance. We are only at the beginning of our work. Much has been done, but still more has yet to be done. Our party has thirty-five party organs. Over a hundred soviet newspapers appear in Russia, newspapers for peasants and soldiers. This is the true freedom of the press. If we are now able to publish, in small country places newspapers meant for and for the greater part written by the peasants themselves, this is the best freedom of the press that the working classes require.

The circulation of our newspapers are fairly large. The central organ of the soviet government, the «Izvestia» sells 400,000 copies, the «Krasnaya Gazeta» in Petrograd — 280,000. It is only owing to the shortage of paper that the number of copies cannot be increased. The central organ of our party, the «Pravda» sells 150,000 copies but would be able to sell much more. We have established many proletarian and peasant universities which are working with great success, and are pouring a large number of educational forces into the country, that subsequently work for communism in the villages. Our soviets in the larger cities have all organised publishing offices. Thus for example the publishing office of the Petrograd Soviets brought out 11½ million pamphlets and books in the course of the last year; our central office in Moscow published a still greater number. In this respect the Commissariat for Public Education

has to be taken into consideration in the first place. This commissariat is at present partly doing propaganda work, and our party now requires it to organize its work on a communistic basis right through. To give only a few figures: in the year 1917 the expenditure of the Ministry of Public Instruction amounted to 300,000,000 roubles, in 1918 the Commissariat expended 3 milliards, while the estimates for the first half year 1919 equal 4 milliards. This shows you the work the Commissariat has to do. You will have seen in the bourgeois press of Germany and France that even certain bourgeois authorities cannot help acknowledging the astounding achievements of Soviet Russia in this respect.

Much has been said abroad about our economic conditions. Kautsky speaks of a «poverty socialism» in Russia. No doubt, the country is poor. We have received it bleeding from countless wounds, and we really were and still are in a difficult position. Yet, in the course of this year, we have managed to achieve something. We have the economic organisations in our hands, we have a mechanism working more or less satisfactorily; it urgently requires perfecting, but nevertheless it works. For the Supreme Council of Economy and other economic organisations 10 milliards of roubles are to be expended in the coming year. This figure will give you an idea of the greatness of the task and of how much is still to be done.

With regard to the housing question we have not yet attained everything, but a number of most important first-steps have already been taken. In the large centres of population, particularly in Petrograd and Moscow, as well as in a number of other cities, the housing problem is on its way to solution. The working masses, the picked troops of the proletariat, feel that we have done everything we could in this question, and that great, though not exhaustive, improvements have been attained wherever possible. We have expropriated bourgeois flats, have partly distributed them; we have confiscated the most necessary furniture and distributed it among the workmen. There are whole streets recently forming bourgeois quarters that now are the quarters of proletarian-communist workmen, for workmen-communists have settled there, workers of whole factories, and so on.

I do not wish to say much about the Red Army. It is a subject by itself. I leave it to more competent comrades, perhaps to comrade Trotsky, to give information on this point.

Further, we considered it our foremost duty to render the greatest possible material assistance to the Labour movement in other countries. It is not in vain that the bourgeoisie of all countries rages against us. We have done our duty in this respect and shall continue to regard it as our duty to support every labour movement standing on a communistic basis.

Never before did our party represent so harmonious a unity as now that it is standing before its eighth party conference. At the beginning of the revolution there were schisms in the party; passions rose particu-

larly high during the Brest negotiations. The chief argument against us was that we may weaken the international position of our German comrades by concluding the Brest peace. This argument was a very serious one. More than of anything else we were afraid of injuring the position of the workmen in Germany and other countries by an erroneous step. Fortunately for all of us this was not the case. The working classes of all countries understood us. Our measures, I hope, have not impaired but improved the position of the workers. And were we once more to be confronted with a similar question, as for example a conclusion of peace with the Allies, I believe that our party would this time approve the decision of the Central Committee and the Soviet Government unanimously. And the workmen of France, Great Britain and America would understand us and be in full solidarity with us.

It may be said that our workmen are thirsting for international connections. This used formerly to be the case too: at the beginning of the revolution when the mensheviks were in power the workmen of Petrograd and Moscow were glad to see even such men as Messrs Albert Thomas, Henderson etc. When they came to Petrograd, in order to fraternize with Messrs. Tseretelli, Kerensky etc., our workmen at first took them seriously. But our proletariat has realised by now that these are but margarine socialists, and the plainest workman of Petrograd and Moscow knows perfectly well the three chief directions existing within the international movement.

Now a few words on the so-called red terror. I know from what our foreign friends have told us that abroad the red terror is the chief point in the argument against us and that sometimes even our friends could not agree with us in this matter.

Yet after what we have witnessed in Germany, after we have seen that civil war is much fiercer there than with us, after we have seen Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg murdered, I believe that even those of our friends who have lived in peaceful surroundings too long and cannot understand everything that is going on, even they will comprehend the reason why we had to resort to the sharp weapon of red terror. Nor will an impartial socialist historian censure us for having employed terror too much, but rather for having been too magnanimous at times. Indeed, almost all the ministers of Kerensky's government have been released by us. Many escaped the country and are now waging war against us. Konovaloff, Baklakov, all the honourable gentlemen who are now fighting us from Paris were in our power. We released them. The former War Minister, General Verkhovskiy who was against us before, has been released and recently offered his services to us. Even Alexinsky who in July 1917 was the chief stage manager of the whole Dreyfus case against the comrades Lenin, Trotsky, Zinovieff and others, has been released by the Moscow Soviet and is now working in Moscow. If you will look into the surroundings more closely you will find

that historical necessity forced the weapon of red terror into the hands of our party.

As you all know, the parties that called themselves socialists and took up arms against us have all suffered bankruptcy and form but a dwindling minority. The right social revolutionaries have capitulated to us. I have already quoted the results of the last elections in Petrograd. Out of 1500 members we have 8 social revolutionaries of the left wing, 5 or 6 of the right wing, about 10 are mensheviks; all the others are communists or candidates for admission to the communist party, working on the same platform. For the greatest part the elections took place by secret poll; no power on earth could have kept the workmen of the Koptiloff works, for instance, from electing members of other parties, if they had wished to. But this was not the case.

There are dissatisfied elements among working masses because of the acuteness of the food crisis, in particular of the bread question. But when it comes to elections and to votes of confidence, the nucleus of the workers, the greatest majority of them places unlimited confidence in us. This is the best testimonial that we have done our duty towards Russia, notwithstanding the tremendous difficulties in our way. We have tried and from the very beginning set ourselves the task to comprehend the whole work of the Paris Commune, to carry on under new conditions the work that the Paris workmen of 1871 have shown to the world. As a matter of course we

have to place a considerable part of our achievements to the credit of former pioneers of the working class of France. Comrades, we are perhaps already nearing the turning point. We may breathe more freely now, we believe the chances of the Entente bourgeoisie leaving us alone, of its being forced to leave us alone are great. Lloyd George's statement to the bourgeois parties that they would not be so persistent in demanding war did they but know the number of soldiers required to crush Russia, witnesses to it. That figure, he whispers into their ear, equals one million or more. So many white guards are not easily to be found and to proceed against us with worker-soldiers will be very difficult indeed. There was a time when we were surrounded by enemies. But the picked troops of Russian communists felt that the greatest part of the workmen all over the world would stand up for us. We have lived to see the moment when the best elements of the working classes of all countries consider it an honour to organize themselves as communists and to tread the path we were the first to enter on.

Comrades, we build all our work on the experience inherited from the heroic Paris Commune of 1871. Our great master Karl Marx has taught us to love the Commune. Its heritage is sacred to us. To develop this heritage further, to help the international working masses triumph over the bourgeoisie — such is our greatest ambition.

Report of Comrade Stange.

(Norway).

The Norwegian Labour Party is the only socialist party of Norway. It counts among its members adherents of all the shades of socialist opinion. The Norwegian party is a legal organisation, working on a parliamentary basis, yet it always remained a revolutionary social democratic party.

In winter 1916—17 we had great difficulties with the food and fuel supplies for Norway. The workmen were pretty revolutionary-minded. The central committee of the party and the trade-unions declared that unless the government granted the demands of the workers, they would use sharper means against the state power and that a party and trade-union congress would immediately be called. Neither congress nor "sharper means" however were ever realised, much to the disgust of the workmen.

The first workmen's and soldiers' councils were formed in winter 1917—18, and in spring 1918 they called their first congress. The latter issued a proclamation declaring that the councils would immediately carry through various measures, as for example: the introduction of the eight-hours' day, and announcing their intention of taking the whole administration of Norway into their hands. Meanwhile the various party organs and workmen's societies entered upon a heated controversy as to the position the party ought to take up.

The central committee and the chief press organ edited by Vidnes decisively declared themselves against the workmen's and soldiers' councils, against bolshevism as such and all revolutionary tendencies in general. They desired no dictatorship of the proletariat, but merely further evolution of democracy. Their views were opposed by a large majority of various local party papers.

Towards Easter 1918 the revolutionary minority of the Central Union proposed to the party-conference to declare the party a revolutionary organisation, yet one that would in the first place work parliamentarily, at the same time gladly welcoming the workmen's and soldiers' councils. This proposal was accepted by the party-conference with 159 votes against 126. Moreover, having formerly belonged to the International, the party decided now to join the Zimmerwald International. The right wing refusing to enter the central committee, the whole committee was composed of members of the left wing. Under the new leadership, the principal press organ "Socialdemokraten" has taken up the cause of Russian bolshevism, the Spartacus Union and other left social democratic parties.

As you can see, the party is a legal and parliamentary one, at the same time taking recourse to revolutionary methods of struggle. It has not declared itself against demo-

cratic parliamentarism, nor for the soviet system, although it has acknowledged the workmen's and soldiers' councils as revolutionary organs of struggle. However, the question of the Constitution is being discussed with great interest in all the papers and workmen's societies. The trade-unions were formerly altogether in the hands of the right wing and all the more important proposals of the so-called „professional opposition“ were rejected with a large majority at the trade-union congress of autumn 1917. However, the sympathies of the trade organisations have greatly changed since that time and in 1918 the great unions „Arbeidsmannsbund“ (the union of miners and builders) and the „Iron-and metal-worker's Union“ went over to the left wing.

The revolution in Germany did much towards strengthening the revolutionary spirit of the Norwegian workmen. The two wings of the party could now join in common revolutionary work. The central committee of the party and the trade-unions have now come to an agreement on the following points:

- 1) With all possible means to work for the realisation of the social democratic programme.
- 2) To prepare for the formation of workmen's councils, but to abstain from introducing them immediately.

Without delay to organise soldiers' councils as a means for carrying on propaganda in the army.

Clearly, it is a question of the highest importance for the Norwegian Labour party whether or not the party is to wholly abandon the democratic line and to declare itself in favour of proletarian dictatorship, to be exercised through the soviet system. I personally am convinced that the development of the world revolution will make the party adopt a definite position on this subject.

So far, however, the leaders of the party had no opportunity to define their attitude regarding this question. Nor had they received an invitation to this congress when I left Christiania. For this very reason I regret to be unable to take up a definite position with regard to the new Communist International without previously consulting my colleagues of the central party committee. I will however, take part in the preparatory work with the greatest interest and submit the results of our activity to the Norwegian Labour party. I earnestly hope that the Norwegian party, having hitherto developed on revolutionary lines, will be able to actively contribute towards the victory of international revolution.

Chronicle of the Revolutionary Movement.

FRANCE. It is a fact that the control over the revolutionary masses is escaping the hands of the leaders of the United Socialist Party; yet a new note can be detected even in their speeches. The Special Commission of the United Socialist Party has drawn up an electoral platform in which we do not find one bold demand, the authors contenting themselves with repeating the paragraphs of the old programme, requiring the convocation of the Constituent Assembly, direct suffrage for both sexes etc.; still they could not ignore the new revolutionary conceptions. Citizens Thomas, Renaudel, Froissart, Cachin, Longuet, Sembat, united for once, signed the following lines:

"The dictatorship of the proletariat represents the transition from the abolished order to that which is to be established.

"The new order which the proletariat is creating, will be established by one class, but for the benefit and well-being of all men, just as the new law that is to come preceded and prepared by the impersonal dictatorship of the proletariat, will be realized in the name and interests of mankind as a whole".

Other symptoms: at the Socialist congress of the Seine district Lorient's proposal to join the Communist International immediately, got 2114 votes on the 14-th of April, and Verfeull's proposal, which really only delayed their joining, got 3000 votes to the 1325 votes of the majority representatives, which gives to the representatives of the revolutionary currents four fifths of all mandates.

The growth of revolutionary feeling in the labouring masses frequently causes the bourgeoisie to beat a retreat and abstain from excessive reprisals. We mention here the acquittal of Contin, Secretary of the Anarchists Federation, author of a communistic proclamation, and of the printer Fabro, accused of printing Trotsky's and Sadoul's pamphlets. Both were indicted on the ground of a special law which the journalist Clemenceau some time had called an "abominable law". Both were acquitted after nearly a year's detention in prison.

At the time of the recent demonstrations (See "Letters on France"), the sympathy of the French proletariat in favour of their brethren in Russia, Hungary and Germany have grown more and more apparent. This explains the wretched subterfuges to which the Government is driven while hypocritically and secretly organizing a campaign against Soviet Russia. On the 29-th of March the Under-Secretary of War officially declared in the Chamber of Deputies that "not another unit should be sent to Russia". Only 15 days in later the "Humanité" revealed the fact that the soldiers of the 14-th Infantry regiment in garrison at Mont-Valerien had been officially invited to take part in the campaign against Russia at a salary of 5 francs a day. One newspaper remarked on this occasion that a French soldier received only one franc when defending his own country against foreign invasion and now was offered five times as much for firing at his own socialists. Abram is compelled to call the French regiments appointed to be

sent to Russia "Polish". Real warfare is of course impossible under such conditions. This war with Russia amounts simply to a disgusting political adventure.

Disgusting as a whole, disgusting in its separate episodes. The English Socialistic periodicals give an account of the woeful Odyssey of the Russian legion, formed in France by General Lochvitaky under the auspices of sundry republican and democratic leagues. This legion took part in engagements up to the very armistice, frequently displaying true heroism. It lost two thirds of its men. What was to be done with the survivors? They were sent to Marselles, and there embarked on board vessels bound for an unknown destination, and it was only in the open sea the legionaries learnt that they were being sent to reinforce Denikin's monarchical-antisemitic forces -- or rather, to speak more plainly, robber gangs. The Russian legionaries mutinied in open sea, had to be taken back, and the help of Senegal blacks had to be called in to put down the revolt. 150 men were arrested; what became of them we do not know; the remainder under pain of being shot, had to join the white guards. This is not a solitary case. Even the bourgeois "League of the Rights of Man" protests against the terrible situation in which the Russians were placed in France.

GREAT BRITAIN. Great Britain's financial and economical situation is little better than that of defeated countries. In a speech lately delivered by Lord Robert Cecil there are sentences like the following: "The entire Christian civilization is endangered. The old forms of production and distribution no longer answer modern requirements... The war has disorganised transport and created famine... A bourgeois statesman cannot be suspected of exaggeration. In Lancashire and Cheshire alone there are 275,000 unemployed. Altogether there are more than a million and the Government pays them from 25 to 29 shillings a week.

The criminal and absurd blockade of revolutionary Europe reacts heavily on England herself. The cotton industry has suffered, the markets of Central Europe and Russia being at present closed to her. The flax and linen industries are passing through a distressing crisis. The "Labour Leader" a paper which is conducting a campaign against the blockade, emphasizes the fact that England, in her own ruler's words, is on the brink of bankruptcy leading to a general economic crisis.

The Labour movement in England is entering on a new and significant stage. England's three most powerful and influential unions, -- "the National Union of Railwaymen" "Miners' Federation of Great Britain" and the "Transport Workers' Federation" have formed the so-called "Triple Alliance". All three organizations are pledged to support and assist one another and always to act together in the struggle. Capitalistic England was literally thunderstruck when the news appeared in the press of the unification of the three most powerful labour organizations and the

formation of the „Triple Alliance“, for it unites about 2,000,000 men, which, together with their families, makes up one fifth of the entire population of Great Britain.

In February last, the Triple Alliance decided to launch its first attack on capital. The Miners Federation put forward demands for a six hour's day, 80 % increase in wages, and the nationalisation of mines. The Railwaymen and Transport workers demanded a 48 hour's week, war wages to be regarded as permanent wages*) a raising of the permanent wages of lower grade men, the nationalisation of railways and share in management. A general strike of the three organisations was threatened in the event of the demands not being fully conceded. The „great“ leaders of the Alliance, Robert Smille, J. H. Thomas and Robert Williams toured the country rallying the forces of labour for a determined battle with capital. They thundered against the predatoriness of the employing class, the evils of private ownership, and vehemently demanded the national ownership of national resources. Preparations were made for a strike. The railwaymen in fact took a ballot of members which resulted in favour of a strike. Great Britain seemed on the eve of the greatest conflict in the history of the labour movement. A wave of consternation spread through the ranks of the bourgeoisie, and the press set up a wail about the impending national ruin.

But the government knew with whom it had to deal. It had had dealings with these men all through the war, and had found in them its most energetic helpers in preventing rather than creating strikes. It knew what meek lambs were concealed beneath those terrible lion skins. The government resorted to its customary dodge—commission. An inquiry commission was appointed under the chairmanship of Lord Justice Sankey to inquire into the conditions of the mining industry and make recommendations on the extent of the concessions the industry could stand. Joint commissions were appointed for the Railway and Transport workers.

The proceedings of the Coal Commission created quite a sensation. Numerous witnesses were examined. Damning evidence was brought forward proving the dangerous character of the mining industry, the appalling number of deaths and injuries through preventable accidents, the bad housing conditions (houses in mining districts are usually the property of the mine-owners), the extortion of royalties and wayleaves, and the profits of the owners. The mine-owners also gave evidence of how little they gained out of the industry: but even the capitalist press confessed that they made a very poor show.

Eventually the Commission brought forward its report. It condemned the conditions of labour prevailing in the industry, and justified the miner's demands for improvement. It recommended, however instead of six-hour day—seven, instead of 80% increase—20%, instead of nationalisation of mines—further consideration three months hence. For the transport and railway workers, the 48 hour week was conceded, but the wage demand was rejected, and nationalisation to be considered.

The railwaymen rejected the offer of the commission, and voted for a strike. Later some concessions were made on wages. After a meeting of the Executive of the Triple Alliance, it was decided to urge the workers to accept the offers made. The whole weight of the official machine was used to influence the workers against a strike, which ultimately was avoided. The leaders shrank from testing the

*) Most of the increase of wages secured by the workers during the war were „war wages“, and were regarded as temporary increases only.

tremendous weapon at their disposal, and capitalism could breathe again.

Important concessions were of course obtained by the mere potentialities of the Alliance, and the necessity for using it has by no means been obviated. That the temper of the rank and file is firmer than their „leaders“ is proved by the difficulties which the latter had in getting the railwaymen to reverse their strike decision, and that in spite of the decision of the miner's conference not to strike, strikes did break out among the miners in Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire, and South Wales. The Triple Alliance will become an effective weapon in the class struggle, in spite of its leaders.

The British Government is seeking a way of securing perfect harmony and peace between capital and labour. A conference of workers and employers was called at the end of February. That Conference appointed a joint industrial council, consisting of an equal number of employers and workers, and instructed the Council to draw up a report. The Council met to consider the causes of the present unrest, and the steps necessary to best safeguard the interests of the employers, workpeople and the State, and especially to consider (1) Questions relating to hour's, wages and general conditions, (2) Unemployment and its prevention, (3) The best methods of promoting co-operation between capital and labour.

The Council presented a report to a further conference of workers and employers in London, at which all the „big lights“ of capital and labour were present when the report was accepted to the extreme gratification of the capitalistic press. But if either capitalists or labour leaders believe this „treaty“ will bring permanent industrial peace they are mistaken. The class struggle during the war should have taught them differently. The fact is, that compromising labour leaders may make any kind of agreement they like with the employing class, but the class antagonism operates just the same. The fight will be carried on by the masses, who are gradually perfecting their own fighting machine, the Shop Steward's Committee. There can be no industrial peace until capitalism is finally abolished.

A special feature of the English labour movement, — during nearly the whole period between Chartism and the world war, — was its non-political character. We will not touch here on the causes of this phenomenon (they have more than once been discussed in Marxist literature; the fact is patent, that the English working man, while highly trained in economic conflict, remained a child in politics and was easily entrapped by the most fallacious, exploiting bourgeois ideology. A slight change in this respect was observable from the period of colonial wars of the end of the XIX-th century, but, if, at that time, only scarcely perceptible „moods“ could be spoken of, the present war and post-bellum crisis were bound to and did call forth a downright revolution in the consciousness of the proletariat. A glance at the labour press, — the „Labour Leader“, the „Call“, „The Worker's Dreadnought“, — suffices to convince us of the depth and wide scope of this intellectual revolution which is paving the way for the social revolution. Every line in these substantial and glowing organs, as well as every word of the leaders (of all „left“ currents), turns on one fundamental idea: all power to the proletariat!

To adopt this watchword and embrace it, means taking one's stand under the banner of the Communist International, adopting the system of Soviet government and the revolutionary methods of fighting for that system; it means going over to the side of the Soviet republics and declar-

ring uncompromising war on the bourgeoisie of one's own country, which is organising a ruffianly invasion of Soviet Russia. And such in fact are the contents of the labour papers. Recalling the troops from Russia, raising the blockade of Russia and Germany, organizing a revolution after the Russian experiment, unmasking the cynical policy of the English bourgeoisie, the lies and calumnies of the bourgeois press on "the Russian question" and the struggle against Bolshevism; transplanting bolshevism on English soil, — such is the burden of the English Labour press.

That this press does indeed reflect the feelings of the masses is attested by a long series of facts. As an illustration here is a brief account of two well nigh simultaneous meetings. One was organized in London by the notorious renegade, former "Marxist" since 1914 an adherent of "war to complete victory, with annexions and contributions", H. M. Hyndman, under the watchword "Down with Bolshevik outrages!" The speakers at this meeting were to be Hyndman himself and his two closest assistants, Dan Irving and Jack Jones. (These two gentlemen, also former socialists, have not long since been elected to Parliament, on the patriotic platform. They could not get into Parliament as socialists, so they renounced socialism and got in as patriots). The meeting was broken up. Shouts of "Down!" "Get out there!" "Editors!" drowned the orators' speeches. Hyndman was not permitted to speak; no one would listen to Jack Jones. They were forced ignominiously to leave "their own meetings".

Very different was the "Bolshevik meeting" called in Albert Hall by the British Socialist Party. It was devoted to the memory of Carl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg. The huge, overcrowded hall was adorned with red flags and black draperies. The numerous crowd enthusiastically greeted Comrade John Mac Lean. Stormy applause interrupted his fiery, "truly" "Bolshevik speech". Another orator, Israel Zangwill, — not a Bolshevik nor even a socialist, but a friend of Soviet Russia, and a sworn foe of the hypocritical English bourgeoisie, — met with a similarly enthusiastic reception. The bourgeois English papers overflow with articles and letters, severely blaming Zangwill, for having "sunk so low as to appear on the same platform with Maclean".

The chairman Balford (Sheffield) opened the yearly Congress of the B. S. P. with a speech in which he welcomed the revolutionary movement of the proletariat, directed towards the conquest of political power and the establishment of the Soviet system. He epitomized the party's tactics as follows: "We stand for all effective methods, from ballot box to bombs".

The British Empire rests on three historical wrongs, — not counting hundreds of others: — which constantly threaten its inner and outer safety: Ireland, Egypt and India. The Westminster Statesmen must be possessed of more than ordinary assurance to talk of "the rights of nationalities" of "democratical liberties" while oppressing those three countries.

In Ireland the revolutionary movement is not abating in force. The Government's terror merely provokes an answering terror on the part of the Sinn-feiners. The latest campaign undertaken against the English police was marked by many murderous attempts; many police agents were killed at Tipperary and Limerick. The "Daily Telegraph" (April 28th) estimates the Sinn-feiners' forces at 120,000 men organized into 1440 clubs and all ready for armed insurrection. The paper arrives at the conclusion that only energetically conducted military occupation is able to strengthen English rule. Such proposals still more

decidedly impel the popular masses on the road to revolution. In April, at a meeting held in Dublin the leaders Johnson and O'Shannon, after subjecting to acute criticism the efforts of the yellow International, proclaimed the solidarity of the Irish proletariat with the Russian and Hungarian Communists and declared that only the dictatorship of the proletariat could save their country.

In Egypt as in Ireland the national movement combines with pure revolutionary propaganda in the socialistic spirit. There tumults, outbreaks, attempts at assassination never cease. In Luxor eight English officers were killed; in villages and towns crowds raid the shops. During a rising in Cairo the troops had to resort to arms. Martial law and the state of siege had to be declared. The killed and wounded were counted by hundreds. In Cairo the offices of the "Times" were set on fire. Students marched at the head of the demonstration; armed motors drove about the city; the fellahs used sulphuric acid against the yellows, notwithstanding that this offence was punishable with death. In several places the insurgents blew up the railroad bridges and destroyed the road bed. The causes of these insurrections lay very deep, — not in Egypt's political situation alone, but rather, and to a far greater degree in the fellahs' terrible poverty. Millions of them had been slaves for centuries, and now, although endowed with the patience and endurance of beasts they had arrived at the conviction that war had placed them in utterly hopeless conditions. Their camels and mules, their only valuable possessions, had been commandeered; and, labour being needed, they themselves were seized and incorporated in the labour army, a corps of labourers subdivided into squads, according to destination. The proposal to enlist in this corps for six months not having met with success, the English recruiting officers travelled all over the land; surrounded whole villages and simply pressed very nearly all of the male population (in exactly the same way as the French recruit negroes in Senegal). "Volunteers", from 17 to 70 years of age, were registered under the lash. "They died like flies", writes the physician, Dr. Haden Guest in the "Labour Leader", and sadly remarks. "There was need not of machine guns, but of a little common sense and human kindness. The Egyptians are human beings like ourselves". No, say we, slaves are not human beings in their masters' eyes. Their salvation lies in their own strength, in their revolutionary consciousness and the victory of the world wide proletarian revolution.

It is now three weeks that riots in India appear to have ceased, but the revolutionary feeling, more concentrated and deepened, assumes an even more threatening character. Ramsay MacDonald exclaims concerning the senseless policy of reprisals: "English Imperialism has gone mad". "New India" warns the Government that it is provoking a catastrophe, that "Bolshevism" is progressing "and that they", the Government, "will bear the responsibility before God and mankind." For the restoration of order the Vice-regal government relies solely on court-martials and the "Disorders Act" — a war law, instituting a whole category of "suspects", whose fate depends wholly on the military courts. Hindoos of all classes respond to this by taking the oath "Satyagraha", pledging them to passive resistance: "You swear not to obey the law". But the "Times" accuses the directors of the movement; Ghandi and Horniman, of fomenting the insurrection, since passivity is an utopia and invariably urges the masses on from passive insubordination to revolutionary insurrection. In the Punjab, the insurgents are ruining the railroads, cutting the telegraph wires, burning the station buildings. The treasury in Amritsar was raided and two English officials

were killed; English wares are boycotted. In Ahmedabad order was restored, but 800 of the inhabitants were killed or wounded. In several localities English aviators threw bombs into the crowd. In Delhi and Lahore arrests are made and educated Hindoos are being expelled. A characteristic psychological feature of the present movement is that it unites Mohammedans and Buddhists against the common foe — English imperialism. Indeed hunger cares neither for race, nor for religion, — and the principal cause of the movement is famine, which visits enormous areas. Thousands of tons of wheat have been exported from India to feed the armies in Europe, while the peasants who sowed and harvested it literally starved. It is supposed that five to six millions of human beings have died this year, partly of epidemic diseases generated by hunger, partly of hunger outright. The Bombay district suffered most all, lack of textiles being added to the shortage of food stuffs. Such is the „civilizing“ work done by „democratic“ England in the home of the oldest of cultures.

In Johannesburg. (South Africa) a whole series of serious strikes have broken out. The strike movement has taken hold of the natives also. The workmen and the officials of the municipal electrical power station were the first to strike. They demanded a raise in wages, shorter hours, and participation in the management. The union of mechanics and firemen made all its members stop working in the various city concerns. The city was left without light, tramway traffic was interrupted. The workmen of the building trades also struck. At the strikers' meetings and assemblies, the English papers tell us, „bolshivism is openly preached and the Soviets are applauded. In Johannesburg the red flag has been hoisted on the City Hall“.

ITALY. The Italian Socialist Party, the only one of the „big“ socialist parties which remained true to internationalism, was the first to join the Communist International; it represents a numerous proletariat, which, owing to the war, endured unending hardships, and whose revolutionary instinct could not adapt itself to the procrastinating and hypocritical ways of parliamentary politics. Just now the revolutionary ferment is at work in all the principal cities. The most serious events took place in Milan in mid-April. During the one-day strike it came to conflicts between the crowd and the troops. There were wounded and killed (two soldiers). Next day a general strike was declared in Turin, Bologna, Genoa and Florence, in token of solidarity with the Milanese workmen. Bolshevism and anarchism are the order of the day. The labour manifestations in Milan simultaneously unfurled red and black flags; the papers report that there were cries of „Long live Lenin“. This labour manifestation collided with a patriotic countermovement, organized by staff officers, which raided the offices of the „Avanti“. Next day, in token of protest against the „patriots“ the printers struck and not one bourgeois paper could come out. The Italian Socialist Party and the Labour Confederation demand an amnesty for all political and military offenders, the demobilization of the army, the instant withdrawal of Italian troops from Russia, an eight hour's working day and the English week. At the congress in Bologna the „General Federation of Labour“ determined to take every measure including a general strike, in order to obtain the „eight hours“ day. It is the prevailing opinion that „the present moment admits of no compromise with the government“.

The left socialists have adopted the communist programme, which includes the dictatorship of the proletariat.

In order to effect the immediate socialization of wealth. The Executive Committee of the Socialist Party expressed its disapproval of the parliamentary group's supineness and toleration of the governmental policy with regard to Russia. It forbade socialists collaborating in the bourgeois press, unanimously adopted Lazzari's resolution condemning Italian imperialism, declaring that the war has created conditions favourable to the proletariat and admitting in principle the general revolutionary strike as a means of conquering political power. Under such external pressure the parliamentary groups of the party demanded the reinstatement of civic liberties, the amnesty, the abolition of censorship and the withdrawal of the troops from Russia. In the Chamber of Deputies Labriola attacked the League of Nations and gave a brilliant defence of Russian communism. On the whole there is complete solidarity with the Russian revolution. In all large cities there are manifestations against intervention.

SWEDEN. — Here also, as everywhere, the line of demarcation between the two worlds is growing ever sharper, and deeper, and the hour of the decisive conflict approaches nearer and nearer. It seems but yesterday that a considerable portion of the Swedish working people followed the patriot Branting, — and lo! we now see the servile policies he pursued under the auspices of the gentlemen of Versailles so thoroughly exposed that even the bourgeois papers audaciously deride Branting's faith in „the Allies“, and those great blessings which their victory was to have brought to all mankind, particularly to the „small nationalities“. Among the workmen Branting's authority is sinking lower every day. Having fraternized with the bourgeoisie during the war, such „socialists“ as Branting or Thorson cannot now tear themselves away from it. Thus they recently declared in favour of a reduction of wages, which had risen enormously in the course of the war; the national industry, in their opinion, cannot stand so exorbitant a rate of wages... Naturally enough, such a declaration from „representatives of labour unions“ called forth a burst of indignation in the labouring masses.

But it will not do to keep hitting the labourers alone, — in order to retain a shred of claim to the name of „social-democrat“, it is necessary occasionally to criticize the bourgeoisie and the coalition governments. So during the discussion of the navy budget the bill introduced by the Minister of the Navy, the social-democrat Baron Palmsehorn for the allotting of 10 millions for a programme of naval construction was met by vehement criticism on the part of the social-democratic fraction.

The situation of the cabinet socialists is growing from day to day more untenable, since the „potry“ for the sake of which the social-democrats joined the government amounts to endless balancing tricks and unlimited groveling before the Entente, though it be to the prejudice of their own country.

Disrupted by the war and the blockade the economic life of the country longs for the restoration of normal conditions and relations with the suppliers of raw materials and the consuming markets. Economic Sweden urgently needs the renewal of relations with Russia, in the absence of which her industry languishes, and the number of the unemployed increases with appalling rapidity. This is thoroughly realized in the bourgeois circles as well, and a renewal of trade with Russia would be to the advantage of many groups of the bourgeoisie. But the „bosses“ will not hear of it, they are determined to extirpate bolshevism

in the whole world first, and only after that will they drop a few crumbs from their board for their subservient followers.

The proletariat is beginning to understand these cunning machinations and the watchword: „stop every assistance, however indirect, to the campaign against Soviet Russia!“ sounds ever louder and more insistent at the workmen's meetings, together with the demand for the renewal of economical relations with her. Another watchword has become popular of late in labour spheres: „boycott Finland for the assistance she gives to the Russian white guards“.

All this brings to the front the fundamental question of our time: the relations to bolshevism, its programme and tactics. This question is being hotly debated in labour circles. On the 2nd of March, — the „red Sunday“, a resolution was passed at numerous meetings at the suggestion of the executive committee of the left social-democratic party, expressing „the warmest sympathy and solidarity with the Russian proletariat and its steadfast, wonderful struggle for life, freedom and right“, and „an energetic protest against the boundless lies and calumnies against the Russian Revolution which are now broadcast by the bourgeois and right-socialist press... and against the intervention adventure, undertaken with the object of strangling the Russian revolution in the interest of the capitalists of the Entente and the Russian bourgeoisie. The resolution concludes with „calling on all“ genuinely socialist forces to unite on the ideas, programme and platform of „bolshevism“ and „spartacism“. — This resolution produced a great sensation; the parliamentary section being asked a point-blank question; answered evasively that „the party so far, had not adopted the bolshevist program“. This declaration called forth an outbreak of indignation in the masses and in the party and assisted in making clear the fundamental essence of communism, as well as in its recognition by all genuinely revolutionary elements.

In connection with the process of „self-determination“ it is interesting to note the words of Branting's organ „Sozialdemokraten“ on the liquidation of Zimmerwald: „This decision came as a heavy, but salutary trial to all the hesitating elements of the international socialist movement. Zimmerwald was the only refuge for all who stood with one foot in one camp and the other foot in the other... Where Berne was silent, there Moscow spoke: Berne or Moscow, — there is no third issue. It is „With us or against us!“ — „Quite right!“ replies the „Folkets Dagblad Politiken“, — but not for the genuine socialists of the class conflict, not for revolutionary minds and hearts, not for Marxists, not for internationalists; they will know how to choose the right path... The struggle against bolshevism is the struggle against the spirit of the time, against life, against the mighty forces of humanity. Therein lies its condemnation...“

IN NORWAY. — The party is united, but the majority is secured by the lefts, who take their stand on the communistic point of view. The executive Committee of the party has entered for the impending congress the proposal to officially join the Communist International and is preparing a series of purely communistic resolutions. Curious that the right socialists, of the same brand as the former editor of the party organ, Jacob Widenes, a decided adversary of bolshevism, are compelled to have their articles printed, either in Branting's Norwegian paper, or else in the Norwegian bourgeois papers.

The economic situation of the country is suffering from the same disease; there is no regular import or export,

scarcity of products, unemployment. The strike movement is unceasing and assumes tempestuous forms; the bourgeoisie accuses its organizers of bolshevism and syndicalism.

There are in Norway very strong soldier organisations. They already have a history many years old; now they have assumed the form of „Soviets“ united into a Federation of Soviets, and are conducting vigorous agitation of purely communistic character, calling on the soldiers to help the workers overthrow bourgeois rule; in particular, they urge the soldiers to remove the officers.

IN DENMARK the strike movement does not abate. Strikes break out against the will of the leaders of the trade unions and are assuming a more and more belligerent character; the bourgeois papers call this new phase of the trade union movement by the name of „syndicalist-spartacism“. The „professional opposition“, which makes up the minority of the „leading“ organs, have, for some time already, enjoyed greater attention on the part of the masses than the old leaders.

The bourgeoisie, defeated in strike after strike, has resorted to the courts for „self-defence“, — as well to the civil courts, — (it has already sued the trade unions for 2,000,000 crowns), — as to the political ones, striving to get the more ardent revolutionaries imprisoned. Thus the Supreme Court of Appeal recently confirmed the sentence of the common court which condemned the editors of the „Solidarity“: Christensen, Hansen and Jonsen, for taking part in a demonstration to imprisonment for 8, 12 and 18 months respectively. For similarly participating in a street demonstration the well known Marie Nielsen, an active promoter of the movement, is now serving a sentence in prison.

FINLAND. — It is difficult to imagine the depression and demoralization which have seized the bourgeoisie, great and small. So many disappointments! After such „lessons“ to the proletariat as the June days the Paris Commune, the bourgeoisie got used to the long years undisturbed in the „pacified“ country. And now, after repeating those bloody massacres in Finland, the bourgeoisie finds itself cheated of the fruits of its prowess. All the methods of Cavaignac and Gallifet were resorted to, but history did not repeat itself this time; conditions are different the world over, so are the proletariat's attitude and methods... Where is the wished for „calm?“ where the „order“, in the name of which thousands of young lives were taken? Where the „independence“ so dear to the patriotic heart?

The new government of Finland is, in form, a government of the „centre“, in fact a government of reaction, Terror within, and support of the white-guard campaign against Russia — such is its program, all of it. This support is now officially acknowledged in the premier's answer to the social-democrats' interpellation; true, he added a timorous reservation: „We are not at war with Russia“. But it is clear to any one what this reservation is, for Finland's „independence“ is recognized by the Entente, under certain conditions, which still have to be published. It is supposed that the gist of these conditions is: financial and economical assistance from the Entente, (Finland's economical situation being deplorable in the absence of relations with Russia), and more accurately defined frontiers to be established in Paris.

The Allies, it appears, are planning to snip off sundry bits, which the great — Finns claim. All this impairs

the bourgeoisie's peace of mind: they dreamed of a Greater Finland; now they are afraid of losing the lesser.

Many instinctively feel that a war against Soviet Russia is at the same time a war against Finnish independence. But the petty bourgeoisie from the nature of its mentality, is incapable of finding its way among all these contradictory, mutually involved complications which at present make up our life, and the higher class of bourgeoisie has no other way out of it all. The Finnish social-democrats, who, after all, reflect the state of mind of that same petty bourgeoisie, are evidently also wrapped in the gloom of depression and mental confusion. The Swedish papers tell that the party discussed the question whether they should not leave parliament, laying down the responsibility for the reactionary policy pursued by the bourgeoisie and leaving it to unravel the tangle which they had made of things with the kind assistance of the so-called socialists. And what scares them now, evidently not the reactionary nature of this policy, but its hopelessness and the uncertainty of its victory.

Whether the social-democrats do or do not go out of the parliament, history passes both them and the walls of the parliament by; history is made way down in the low places, where men gradually recover from the terrible wounds dealt them in the battle with the bourgeoisie. Among the signs of healing we may note here the unceasing strikes in the labour centres — (Helsingfors, Abo, Tammerfors), and the pilgrimages to the tombs of their fallen comrades, which reach imposing dimensions. The Finnish revolutionary proletariat is alive, consequently so is the proletarian revolution. Its hour will strike, and that in the not distant future.

The United States of America.

„Bolshevism within rifle range". On the 3-d of February, a great scandal occurred in the American Senate. A group of Senators brought in an interpellation concerning a bolshevist meeting which had taken place in Washington on the preceding day. We are enabled to offer a few characteristic passages from the speeches of the senators who signed the interpellation.

Senator Thomas, from Colorado: „I think it my duty to call the Senate's attention to an event of the highest importance which took place yesterday in Washington and is described in detail in the „Washington Post". I shall read only the headlines and under headlines — „America to be dyed red" — „Bolshevist orators create a stormily enthusiastic feeling in the overcrowded „Polly" theatres." — „The principal orator Albert Rice Williams, (former Petrograd and Moscow correspondent of the New York „Evening Post") spoke of the work of the Soviets and bolshevist propaganda in America. — „From these headlines alone you can see that the bolshevist have built themselves a nest in the capital of our republic, within rifle range of the Senate".

Senator Myers, from Montana, — I most energetically protest against permitting meetings in which figure criminals, assassins and thieves, who take the liberty orally and in writing, of insulting our Government. The main object of yesterday's meeting was to insult our Government and undermine its authority. The State Department must at once institute an enquiry; the organizers of the meeting must be made to answer before the law.

Senator Borah: Not in America alone, but everywhere positively everywhere, there are adherents and admirers of the Soviet form of government. They want to interna-

tionalize America". More than anything the Senator dreads „internationalization".

Senator Walsh, suggests directing a commission of the Senate to proceed at once to investigate „all attempts at propagating the bolshevist doctrine in the United States". The suggestion is adopted.

CENSORSHIP. — In the same sitting of the Senate the question of subjecting the periodical press to a censorship is discussed. Senator Borah proposes abolishing the censorship for the foreign press. The motion was rejected by a majority of 89 against 25.

THE STRIKE MOVEMENT. — The Russian newspaper „Workman and Peasant", published in New York, thus briefly and accurately, characterizes the situation as it now stands in America:—

„At the present time the capitalists here, in the United States, are carrying on a desperate struggle against labour, and, principally against the labour organizations. Economic conditions do not improve, — on the contrary, have grown worse, on account of the stagnation in production.

The host of unemployed increases every day, and the prices remain as high. The situation of the labourers has grown perceptibly worse".

The cessation of the war has brought about an industrial crisis in America. Hundreds of thousands of workingmen found themselves in the street. „Factory owners, we read in „Workmen and Peasant" want to take advantage of the crisis and the distress of the unemployed. They want to exchange the eight hour's day for one of longer duration and to cut down wages. „The workingmen respond with strikes".

Early in February four mass strikes broke out simultaneously at different points of the United States. The textile workers struck in Lawrence (Massachusetts, New England, the centre of the textile industry). The workers of the silk-spinning and silkweaving mills in Patterson (New Jersey), the miners in Butte (Montana), and the workmen of municipal works in Seattle (State Washington).

„In Lawrence, writes the „Weekly People" (the organ of the Socialist Labour Party) the textile workers demand the 8 hours day and a raise in wages. Street gatherings are forbidden. Mounted police patrol the city. One of the policemen made use of fire arms. There are rumours of regular troops being kept in readiness, in case of emergency.

„In Patterson 25,000 working men and women are on strike. Demands: „the eight hour's day and a raise in wages. The leaders of the trade union were expelled from the precincts of the city.

„In Butte, in connection with the miners strike some kind of „Red Guard" after the Russian pattern was organized. It includes members of the leagues of the Industrial Workers of the World and Socialists, mainly Finns. For the present six battalions have been formed. A captain is at the head of the Red Guard. The „Association of Soldiers and Sailors" promised the strikers moral and material support. Major Jones, who arrived at the head of a battalion of Government troops, declared that he would stop at nothing, that his battalion was armed to the teeth and had machine guns.

„But what troubles our Government most, is the general strike in Seattle. The bourgeois press reports that „Seattle is on the eve of a bolshevist rising". „There have been „disturbances" troops have been called out. The tramway

traffic has stopped in the city there is no electricity; the shops, the restaurants, the schools are closed. 34 „bolsheviks“ have been expelled from the city. („Weekly People“ 15-th of February.)

At the same time, reports the „Workman and Peasant“ 30,000 tailors have been on strike in New York for the last thirteen weeks. The factory owners reports the same papers are resorting to lockouts. The manufacturer of mens and children's clothes have locked out the workers whose organizations count 50,000 members. The same thing was done with the workmen of the building trades. As many as 20,000 men were removed from work. Here also the organization took up the struggle against the capitalists by declaring a strike. The owners of iron works also resorted to lockouts and the workmen were forced to declare a general strike.

Law proceedings.—The courts are issuing sentence after sentence in constantly increasing number. In the cases of Victor Bergen, Arolph Harmer, Ludwig Engel, William Cruddo, Irving St. John and Tucker, the sentences ran as high as 20 years of prison and 10,000 dollar's fine. Eugene Debbs, former socialist candidate for the Presidency, is condemned to imprisonment for 10 years for antimilitarist propaganda.

These sentences provoke protest strikes in all the great centres. The capitalistic press, of course, calls the strikers „bolsheviks“. It must be that Russian communism is really acquiring numerous followers in America, since the Government is at its wit's end to know what measures to resort to in the struggle against it. The Chamber of Commerce in Boston has endowed a fund of 75,000 dollars for antibolshevistic propaganda. An Anti-Anarchistic League has been founded with a fund of 80,000 dollars. In New York State Russian emigrants are arrested and interned, 37 revolutionaries have already been expelled. On the 12-th and 15-th of March 164 arrests were made in New-York. Many of the active socialists have boldly possessed themselves bolsheviks, fearless of expulsion and its consequences.

THE RUSSIAN COLONY.—(In the 6-9-th of January „the second Congress“ of the Russian Colony of the United States and Canada took place in New York. (The first Congress was held in January of last year—1918). At the Congress were represented 40,000 Russian workmen and peasants, who „take their stand on the ground of class struggle and the social revolution and acknowledge the rule of Soviets“. There were present 123 delegates, — „of various parties and currents“ — Order of the day: 1) Greeting to revolutionary Russia; 2) The Soviet system in America, 3) Release of Russians from detention in military camps and prisons; 4) Taking up relations with Soviet Russia, wholesale repatriation of immigrants; 5) Intervention 6) Attitude towards the labour movement in America.

The Congress sent the following greeting by telegraph to „the regular All-Russian Congress of Soviets“:

„The Second All-Russian Colonial Congress of the United States and Canada sends warm greetings through their executive organs. — the Soviet of Soldiers and Peasants deputies to the Russian revolutionary people, who are fighting universal imperialism for the liberation of the labouring masses from the yoke of bondage.“

With regard to the question of the „Soviet system in America, it is resolved that „all the Russian Soviets of Workers Deputies shall be united into one federation“. Russian Soviets were organized in America as early as last year. These are intercity conferences or delegates assemblies, uniting in one all the Russian organizations that stand on the platform of class struggle and support of Soviet power. The object of the Russian Soviets, is in every way to assist Soviet Russia in the struggle against counter-revolutionary intrigues, to carry on agitation and educational work amidst the immigrant masses, to defend the Russian colony's interests. In each given city the „Russian Soviet“ must take the place of a Russian Consulate, while the Central Executive Committee of the „Russian Soviets“ residing in New York the place of the takes (Soviet Russia consenting) of Embassy.

As an illustration of the attitude of the Russian labourers' and peasants' colony towards the Soviets rule we will quote a few passages from the speech of the chairman of the Congress, Comrade Alexander Brailofsky (an old party worker twice sentenced to death):

„Comrades! I declare the Congress opened.—Long live the Soviet Republic! (Applause). The eyes of the workers in the labour movement must always be directed towards the final goal. This goal is established. It is the universal social revolution (Applause). It is clear to all of you what barrier bars the road to that goal. It is — intervention. Therefore, the main task of the moment is—to fight intervention. Let us be active. It is not blunders that ruin revolutions, but supineness. Long live the proletarians and peasants of all countries!“ (Applause).

The Congress resolved to do all they possibly could to organize the connection with Soviet Russia (for which purpose four delegates were to be sent to Moscow at the first possibility), and arrange for sending over to Russia a number of immigrants, Russia needs men of sense, practical men, above all such as can read and write. Therefore the Congress resolved to proceed at once to arrange for brief courses of primary instruction, including besides reading and writing, some knowledge of politics, of practical sciences,—to institute a school for chauffeur, mechanic, surveyors, etc., etc.

The account of the Congress given in the „Workman and Peasant“ is glowing with unfeigned, earnest revolutionary enthusiasm. Among its resolutions we find the following:

„The Congress heartily greets the soldiers of Canada, who refused to act against Soviet Russia. Long live the Canadian soldiers!“

OUR LITERATURE IN AMERICA.—The following writings are widely diffused in America: „Withdraw from Russia,“ „The Constitution of the Soviets;“ — „The actual problems of the Soviet Government,“ by Lenin (published by the „New World“);—„The International War“ by A. Rakofsky.—„Declaration of the rights and duties of labouring humanity“ (published by the New York Russian Soviet). The great New York daily „the World,“ Wilson's semi-official organ, published in February a series of articles on Soviet Russia by Robert Minor, formerly collaborator in the department of the Central Executive Committee for Soviet propaganda. Minor spent about a year in Moscow and Russia.

The social revolution before the courts

Prosecution of the league „Industrial Workers of the World.“

In the September issue of the „Liberator“ (a magazine published in New York) there is an exceedingly interesting article by John Reed, which gives a vivid account of the proceedings in Chicago against 112 champions of peace (members of the league „the Industrial Workers of the World,“ a purely scientific professional organization, founded in opposition to Gompers. „American Federation of Labour,“ which is conducted by henchmen of the capitalist trusts). It was after this article had appeared that sentence was passed, condemning our comrades to imprisonment, some for such terms as 20 years. We borrow the following pages from Reed's description.

Judge Landis, who conducted the judicial procedure, is a thoroughly modern judge. He wears no robe, leaves his seat from time to time and walks about the room, conversing or listening to the lawyers addressing the jury. (In America, such cases are tried by a jury). The prisoners are permitted to take of their coats, to perambulate about the room and read the papers.

Personally the prisoners present such a sight as was never known in history. Over a hundred men: woodcutters, ploughmen, miners, newspaper men, all followers of the doctrine that the riches of the earth must belong to those who extract them by their labour and that the labourers of the whole world must take possession of their property. Before me lies the charter of their industrial democracy: „One Big Union,“—and there in is their crime. This is why the I. W. W. stands before the Court. It is just this sort of idea that will in the long run undermine and destroy the capitalistic structure. If a way could be found to kill these people, capitalist society would gladly seize it,—just as it did to death Frank Little, and, before him, Joe Hill (two well known American revolutionists). This is why the jackal press vociferates: „German agents! Traitors!“—striving to create grounds for the lynching of I. W. W. on a grand scale.

Over a hundred strong men. The majority of the members of the American labour movement belong to the sedentary professions: weavers, textile workers, compositors. Such at least is the case in large cities.

Miners, metalworkers, workmen of the building trades, railwaymen belong to the „American Federation of Labour“ which holds to the capitalistic system as strongly as John Pierpont Morgan himself. As to those hundred prisoners, they are all representatives of migratory crafts,—masons, lumbermen, reapers, freighters—all fellows living by the hardest physical labour. They are covered with the scars of wounds dealt them by industry,—industry and society's hatred. They are utterly fearless. Seeing them at work, when constructing some building, or throwing a bridge across a river, the capitalist will say: „That's the kind of labourer our country needs; such as know their business and do their work, and do not idle around and chatter all sorts of nonsense about class conflict.

That is true: they do know their business and do work. But, strange to say, they also believe in social revolution.

Hear once again their trumpet call, the famous preamble to the program of the I. W. W.

„The labouring and the exploiting class have nothing in common. There can be no peace while there is hunger and want amid the workers and while the exploiting class enjoys all the good things of life. The struggle will inevitably go on between these two classes until the workers become organized all over the world, until they take the food and the means of production in to their own hands and abolish the wage system.“

The author tells how over ninety men who have been in confinement over a year (the rest managed to find bail, although it was fixed as high as 25,000 dollars), march along the streets to the court, and introduce the better known among them: big Bill Haywood, in his invariable black cap, with a face which reminds one of a mountain side pitted with holes; red haired Reddie Doran, with his goodnatured soldierly figure and the green shade over his eyes; Ralph Chaplin, resembling Jack London in his young days; Jim Thomson, the wellknown orator of the I. W. W.—and many others. On the first page of the „Daily Defence Bulletin,“ published by the Central Committee of the organization there is an illustration showing a workman in prison, with the caption: „Remember: we are here in prison for you; you are at liberty out there because of us.“

Now they are behind the bar of the courtroom, all of them together, many without their coats: some reading the papers, others stretched, half lying on a bench; some in; some stand.—They are all typical faces of workers and fighters in some you can guess the orator, the writer; the expressive, passionate faces of foreigners stand out from the rest; all bear the stamp of strength and enthusiasm; many faces are scarred and sad. A hundred men better able to stand up for the social revolution could not have been collected from all America. The public, on entering the room, remarked: „Why, this is some sort of meeting; not a trial at all. As to me, just arrived from Russia, all this reminded me of a session of the Central Executive Committee of the All-Russian Congress of Soviets in Petrograd. It really was hard to believe that all these men were being tried. Nothing like dejection or timidity was observable in them; you saw in them self-assurance, interest in the proceedings, a clear comprehension of the situation. It might have been a bolshevik revolutionary tribunal. For one moment I had the impression as though the central committee of the American Soviet were trying Judge Landis for... let us say counter-revolution.

Later on I noticed a group of uncouth men, with brutish faces, ill-shaped figures, broad hips and eyes which expressed cruelty with a mixture of servility, like a bulldog's: those were detectives, strikebreakers and other watchdogs guarding private property.

Reed further describes how Mr. Nebeker, public prosecutor (also solicitor of a big copper trust), began his speech while the street below rang with agitation in favour of war. War! you can not scare us with that. Are not all these hundred and odd men veterans of that war to which they have given their whole lives, the bloody war against a power possessed of immeasurable forces, which know no peace nor submits to

any laws for humane warfare. They are veterans of the class war, the old guerilla warfare waged by whole generations of labourers against their masters,—a war which has invaded, the entire world,—which seems endless, yet is doomed to end.

The persecution against the members of the I. W. W. began in September 1917. Seven months, until April 1918, they were kept in confinement, and during all that time nothing was done to investigate their case. They were accused of belonging to the I. W. W. organization and agitating for the realization of its program which, to be brief, pursued the abolition of wage labour. This is what they really were indicted for, not for any political action at all. Their "crime" consisted, you see, in wishing to overthrow the government of the United States. They could not well be imprisoned, on so old a charge, so they were incriminated with "obstructing the government's military program."

And while 112 men were pining in confinement, a wild hunt took place all over the country; all premises occupied by the I. W. W. were cleared; their meetings were forbidden; those who took part in them were arrested, their documents seized; reaction was rampant as never before. True, the attempt to present the case as one of "high treason" did not succeed. It was a put up charge, with the sole object of somehow covering up the real reason of the persecution. The government experts who examined the books and accounts of all the "German agents" arrived at the conviction that everything was "all right." Among other things, much noise was made at one period of the enquiry of a certain ex-governor, Tom Campbell of Arizona, who appeared in Chicago "with a portfolio full of proofs that the I. W. W. had taken money from Germany." Whole weeks he stood before the judges' table, and all the time people waited for the publication of his remarkable documents; but one fine day he declared that his famous portfolio had been stolen by a member of the I. W. W. disguised as a sleeping-car attendant.

So as not to give the proceedings a sentimental colouring the prosecution abstained from indicting women, and carefully avoided implicating such persons as had been victims or eye-witnesses of the ruthless, brutal actions of the American capitalists with regard to labourers during the last few years. But, thanks to the skill of the defence, conducted by lawyers Vandever and Cleary, the speeches for the defence proved to be enumerations of the bloody crimes of the great industrial-magnates Colar d'Alene, San Diego, Everett, Joachim Valley, Paterson, Mesaba Range, Itchy, Tools.

Very significant (as in the Swedish trial for high treason in 1916), were the questions put concerning socialism and revolution. When the jurymen were being chosen, the prosecutor had lots of trouble eliminating all radical elements. Among the points on which the jurymen had to answer, the following are worth noticing:—

"Do you, or do you not hold, that all children should be taught respect for other people's property?" — Do you or do you not hold that the fundamental laws of the American Constitution were inspired by the Lord God? — "Karl Marx, the father of this lawless doctrine, is the foul swamp out of which the roots of the I. W. W. draw their sap." — At times the judge

himself thought things were going too far. When the prosecutor said: "A citizen has no legal right to revolution," Landis interrupted him with words: "Yes; but all the question is, how many he can draw after him, or, in other words, in how far he is able to provoke a revolution."

It was easy for the defence to reply to such speeches. Here is a sample: "You said, Mr. Nebeker, that you never read revolutionary literature. Did you at any time read in school about the American revolution of 1776? Or of the French revolution, which dethroned the king and made France a republic? Or of the Russian revolution, which put an end to autocracy and the Tsar? Do you know that 2 per cent of the people in this country own 99 per cent of the national wealth and that two thirds of the people own less than five per cent of national wealth? Is it known to you how the system of wage labour influences infant mortality? Do you know that prostitution has developed chiefly because wages are insufficient for a living? And which side starts employing violence in conflicts with labour? Do you consider the interests of property as higher than human interests?"

And so on, unendingly a whole month. What an education for the jury! And what an instructive influence all this would have exercised on the entire country, had not the Jackal press ignored altogether and utterly distorted the whole story of the legal proceedings against the I. W. W. Day after day, all through this summer, witness after witness from the class war front appeared and played their part in the creation of the great labour epic: strike leaders, soldiers, plain labourers, agitators, members of parliament, policeman detectives...

I heard how Frank Rogers, a youth, whom life made glowing and embittered, his eyes burning with revenge, told in dry, abrupt accents of a fire in the Speculator mine, where hundred of men burned to death because the Company would not spend money on doors for the wooden passages. He also told of the killing of Frank Little, who was hanged by the volunteer police in Montana, and how the miners in Butte had sworn to avenge him; of Oklahoma, of the drenching with pitch and burning of workmen at Tools and Everett, and of the four graves of Sheriff Mac Rave's victims on the hills by Seattle; he told of the exile to Arizona; how police plunderers, armed by the capitalists took labourers in cattle cars out into the desert and left them there, and they vainly appealed to parliament and to Wilson, who seems to take more interest in justice in other countries than in his own, and did not answer the courteous request of the victims, who wished at least to know whether they could expect anything from him.

One of the prisoners told in candid and moving terms how he and others had been seized by the company's private police.

"Yes, they beat us. And their chief asked: 'Are you members of the I. W. W.?' I answered: 'Yes.'—He asked for my membership ticket. I gave it him,—and he tore it up. He also tore up my companions ticket.—There is no sense tearing up tickets, said my comrade;—we can always get new ones." "May be," said the man; "and we can destroy them."—But my comrade retorted: "You cannot tear this out of my heart."



CONTENTS.

	P.
Down with the Treaty of Versailles! Long Live the Communist Revolution! To the Workers of the World. From the Communist International	157
N. Lenin. A Greeting to the Hungarian Working-men	161
A. Pannekoek. The New World	165
E. S. Pankhurst. The New War	171
Maxim Gorki. Two Civilizations	175
N. Lenin. The Heroes of the Berne „International“	177
G. Zinoviev. Social Democracy as an Instrument of Reaction	183
Z. Hoeglund. The International of Action	191
E. Muench. The Swiss Party Programme.	193
V. Roebig. A Soviet Republic in Bavaria.	198
J. Alpari. The Course of the Revolution in Hungary	199
E. Varga. Communist Hungary	201
C. Zetkin. In Defence of Rosa Luxemburg	203
D. Manouïlsky. The Present situation in France. (Observations and Impressions)	207
A. Victor. Letter from France	215
A. Lunatcharsky. Public Education in Soviet Russia	217
Documents of the International Communist Movement.	
Letter from Comrade Bela Kun to Comrade Lenin	223
Letter from Comrade Bela Kun to Comrade Ignatius Bogar.	225
The refusal of the Italian Socialist Party to take part in the Berne Conference (Letter of Comrade Morgari)	229
Programme of the Committee for the establishment of the International Relations carried at the Socialist Section. (France).	231
Resolution proposed by Prossard, Paul Faure, Verneuil and Lorient at the Berne Conference (Why did the British delegates from the Labour Party and I. L. P. oppose this resolution?)	235
Text of the agreement, concluded in the Budapest prison between the communist party and the social-democratic parties of Hungary	237
Greeting of the Irish socialist to the Russian Communist party and to the congress of the Communist International	237
Proceedings of the Central Executive Committee of the Communist International.	
An Appeal from the Executive Committee of the Communist International	239
How the Bourgeoisie Fights against the Communist International	240
To the congress of the Swedish comrades	241
To the Organizations of the Proletarian Youth of the World	241
Resolutions of the first Congress of the Communist International.	
Report of Comrade Albert. (Germany)	243
Report of Comrade G. Zinoviev. (Russia)	249
Report of Comrade Stange. (Norway)	256
Chronicle of the Revolutionary Movement.	
France. — Great Britain. — Italy. — Sweden — In Norway. — In Denmark. — Finland. — The United States of America.	259
The social revolution before the courts. (Prosecution of the league „Industrial Workers of the World“).	273

