Communism as a system of society means the common ownership of property in the means of wealth production. It applies to any stage of society in which such property is collectively owned by a social group.

A slightly different conclusion is drawn from the question, “What constitutes communism?” Primitive society is communist—the means of production, hunting grounds, rivers, and at the early stages of domestication of animals, the herds, are owned in common. Even the Owemite and other colonies that have been so numerous in America, could be called communist, but neither primitive society nor the co-operative colonies could be called socialist societies.

Socialism, as a system of society, presupposes social production, the use of gigantic and complicated machinery which is owned by society as a whole, instead of by small groups, as in the previous illustrations.

We have today social production, but ownership of the necessary means and implements is in the hands of the few. Those who own the means of wealth production at all times own the products. Consequently, capitalism presents a contradiction—on the one hand, social production; on the other, private, or class, ownership of the means of production.

This contradiction brings about the necessity of ownership by all, which we call socialism, and makes that form of society inevitable if social progress is to continue.

Socialism can also be explained in another aspect as the science of society. It is the gathering of data offered by history and gotten from observation of existing peoples. An analysis of such data and the formulation of social laws, viz., historical materialism, the class struggle, and the law of value. Past and present society is then reexamined, comparison is made and the truth of these laws proven.

Again, socialism is defined as the theoretical expression of the best interests of the proletariat in the class struggle of present society.

All of these definitions are correct. Indeed, it seems as though at least three aspects should be stated in answer to the query, “What is Socialism?”

During the debate in the Prussia State Legislature regarding compensation to the Hohenzollern family, the “Yellow” Socialist deputies maintained that no compensation for property seized by the State should be made but that a moderate yearly allowance should be paid.

A new defense for imperialism in general, and the policy of the United States in Haiti and Santo Domingo in particular was furnished in a speech by Reverend Gray, Sec'y for Latin America in the Department of Missions of the Episcopal Church. Said the holy father, in apology for the White Terror in those black republics: “Perhaps we should resort to that fundamental political aphorism which sums up the theory responsible for every step forward that the human race has made, which epitomizes that principle from which law and order have originated: ‘Might makes right till right is ready.’ Tho it sounds like Nietzsche, it is really quite the opposite, and in the present case, I am prepared to affirm that our might makes our right to protect our canal and to protect our people until our neighbors are ready to do so.”

There are now 60 days forced labor for every native in British East Africa.

The Act decreeing it was not issued by the Bolshevik Trotsky, but by His Britannic Majesty's Government, and it is called The Native Authority Amendment Ordinance, 1920.

* * * *

A British correspondent in writing on tendencies of the time has this to say: “More and more, consciously or unconsciously, the average citizen is coming to look upon the House of Commons as a mere ‘talking shop.’” Men everywhere, and by various methods according to their political bias, are seeking to express, unconstitutionally, the will for which constitutional expression is denied.

* * * Beneath the surface vast territories of social change are slipping away from the control of Parliament.

* * * Again and again, even against the advice of their leaders, bodies of workers in essential industries have rejected the proposals of the government because they distrusted its motives, and rely more and more upon their own power to effect reforms. Instances could be multiplied of this gradual landslide of the initiative in social reform from parliament to the people. The general effect, however, is a widespread sense of impending social change.”

* * * *

A Salvation Army appeal in a campaign for Home Service funds—“What breeds Bolshevism? Your money will stop it!”

* * * *

A reader informs us that in passing through the lobby of the Chicago Public Library recently he noticed a bulletin board bearing the legend, “What our government wants us to know”—and there was nothing on it.
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"**Left Wing"** Communism

AN INFANTILE DISORDER

By Nikolai Lenin

Should Revolutionaries Work in Reactionary Trade Unions?

The German "Left" consider the reply to this question to be decidedly in the negative so far as they are concerned. According to their opinion, mere declamations and angry ejaculations (as done by K. Honer in a particularly "solid" and stupid manner) against "reactionary" and "counter-revolutionary" Trade Unions are sufficient to prove that it is not only useless but also not permissible for revolutionaries and Communists to work in the yellow, social-chauvinist, temporising and conservative organizations of the type of the Legien Unions. But, however strongly the German "Left" may be convinced of the revolutionary nature of such tactics, these are in reality fundamentally wrong, and contain nothing but empty phrases.

In order to explain this, I shall begin with our own experience. In so far as it coincides with the general scheme of the present article, the aim of which is to apply to Western Europe everything that is of general significance in the history and the present tactics of Bolshevism.

The relation between leaders, party, class, masses, and at the same time the relation of the proletarian dictatorship and its Party to the Trade Unions, present themselves to us in the following concrete form. The dictatorship of the proletariat is carried out by the proletariat organised in Soviets, which is led by the Communist Party (Bolsheviks), which, according to the data of the last party Conference, in April, 1920, has 611,000 members. The number of members varied greatly both before and after the October Revolution, and was considerably less even in 1918 and 1919.

We are afraid of too wide a growth of the Party, as place-seekers and adventurers, who deserve only to be shot, do their utmost to get into the ruling Party.

The last time we opened wide the doors of the Party for workers and peasants only was in the days (winter, 1919) when Yudichev and a few others from Petrograd, and Denikin was in Orel (about 300 workers from Moscow); that is, when the Soviet Republic was in mortal danger, and when the adventurists, place-seekers and charlatans, unable to make, generally could in no way rely upon making a profitable career (in fact could sooner expect the gallow and torture) by joining the Communists. The Party, which convenes annual Conferences (the last on the basis of one delegate for each 1,000 members), is directed by a Central Committee of 19, elected at the Conference; while the current work in Moscow has to be done by still smaller boards, viz., the so-called "Orgbureau (Organising Bureau) and "Politbureau" (Political Bureau), which are elected at the plenary sessions of the Central Committee, five members of the C. C. for each Bureau. This, then, looks like a real "oligarchy." Not a single important political or organizing question is decided by any State institution in our Republic without the guiding instructions of the C. C. of the Party.

In carrying out its work, the Party rests directly on the Trade Unions, which, at present, according to the data of the last Conference (April, 1920), comprise over 4,000,000 members, who are formally non-party. In reality, all the controlling bodies of by far the greater number of unions, and primarily, of course, of the All-Russian Central Council of Trade Unions consists of Communists, who carry out all the directions of the Party. Thus it is obtained, on the whole, a formally non-Communist, flexible, comparatively extensive and powerful proletarian apparatus, by means of which the Party is closely connected with the class and the masses, and by means of which, under the guidance of the Party, class dictatorship is realised. Without the closest connection with the Trade Unions, without their hearty support and self-sacrificing work, not only in economic but also in military organisation, it would have been, of course, impossible to govern the country and to maintain the dictatorship for two and a half years, or even for two and a half months.

It is clear that, in practice, this closest connection means very complicated and varied work in the form of propaganda, agitation, conferences—held often and at the right time, not only with the leading but also with the generally influential Trade Union workers; it also means a determined struggle against the Mensheviks, who still have a certain, though quite a small, number of adherents, in whom they teach various counter-revolutionary tricks, such as lending moral support to the cause of (bourgeois) democracy, preaching the "independence" of Trade Unions (independence of the proletarian State!?) and even sabotage, unions, proletarian dictatorship, etc., etc.

The connection with the "masses" through Trade Unions we admit to be insufficient. Practice in the course of the revolution has given rise to non-party workers' and peasants' Conferences and we endeavour, by every means and in the course of time, to extend such institutions in order to maintain a close contact with the disposition and state of mind of the masses, to respond to their inquiries, to pick up in the back of the workers to take positions in State institutions, etc., etc.

In one of the last decrees concerning the transformation of the People's Commissariat for State Control into the "Workmen's and Peasants' Inspection," non-party Committees of this kind are given the right to elect members to the State Control for various sorts of State inspections.

Thus, of course, all the work of the Party is done through the Soviets which unite the laboring masses irrespective of the difference of their trade or profession. The County (Uyezd) Congresses of Soviets are a democratic institution such as has never yet been seen in the most advanced bourgeois republics. Through these Congresses, whose proceedings are followed by the Party with very careful attention, as well as through the constant delegation of class-conscious workers to occupy various positions in the countryside, the city fulfils its function of leading the peasantry. Thus is carried out the dictatorship of the proletariat, and the systematic struggle against the rich, exploitive, and speculating bourgeoisie.

Such is the general mechanism of the proletarian State considered from "above," from the point of view of practice in the realization of the dictatorship. It is hoped that the reader will understand why, to a Russian Bolshevik very acquainted with this mechanism and having watched its growth out of small underground circles during twenty-five years, all talk of "from above" or "from below," "the dictatorship of leaders" or "the dictatorship of the masses" cannot but appear as childish nonsense. It is something like discussing whether the left or the right arm is more useful to man.

Nor is there anything nonsensical appearing to us important, learned and horribly revolutionary disquisitions of the German "Left" as to why Communists cannot and should not work in reactionary Trade Unions; why it is permissible to refuse such work: why it is necessary to leave the craft unions and to create in their stead quite new and quite pure "workmen's unions" invented by exceedingly nice (and, for the most part, probably very "youthful" Communists, etc., etc.,

Capitalism inevitably leaves, as an inheritance to Socialism, on the one hand, old professional and craft differences created among the workers in the course of centuries; and on the other, Trade Unions, which only a short time ago, and for a few years, and will and will develop into broader industrial rather than craft organizations (embracing whole industries and not merely craft trades and occupations). These need to be strengthened; in their turn, lead to the abolition of division of labor between people, to the education, training and preparation of workers, who will be able to do everything. Communism is moving in this direction, and if we attempt to practice this course of action only a few years, the revolution will be like trying to teach a four-year-old child higher mathematics.
We can and must begin to build up Socialism, not with the fantastic human material created by our imagination, but with the initiative and work of the proletariat. But the initiative must come to us by way of a hard fight. The problem is very "difficult," but every other way of tackling the problem is no less serious to our eyes.

Trade Unions marked a gigantic step forward of the working class in the development of capitalism, the resignation of the workers from the abolition of class organizations, and the dictatorship of the proletariat. The trade unions are the first form of proletarian revolutionary heads of the Trade Unions, they jump, by some inexplicable mental process, to the conclusion that it is necessary to work against the masses, and to work in them! They invent new "invented working-men's unions!" This is an unpardonable blunder, and one by which the international proletariat must be considered as left entirely at the mercy of the bourgeoisie. Our Mensheviks, like all opportunists, social-chauvinists, and Prussian leaders of Trade Unions, are nothing more nor less than the "agents of the bourgeoisie in the labor movement" (as we say about the "agitators")! According to the excellent and highly expressive summary of the followers of Daniel DeLeon in America. Not to work in the trade union means to leave the insufficiently developed or backward working masses to the influence of reactionary leaders, agents of the bourgeoisie, labor aristocrat—bourgeoisish workers. (See Engels' letter to Marx in 1852, concerning British workers.)

It is just this absurd "theory" of non-participation by Communists in reactionary Trade Unions that demonstrates most clearly how light-mindedly these "Left" Communists regard the question of influence over the "masses," how they contradict their own outcries about the "masses." In order to be able to help the "masses" and to win their sympathy, confidence, and support, it is necessary to exercise a powerful, single-minded influence, to be given later into the hands of all the laboring masses.

A certain conservatism of the Trade Unions, in the sense mentioned, is unavoidable under the dictatorship of the proletariat, and this must be completely understood and the fundamental conditions of the transition from capitalism to Socialism. To fear this reactionary tendency, to try to avoid it, is foolish, as it can possibly be; it involves a lack of confidence in the role of the proletarian vanguard to train, educate and enlighten, to infuse with new life, the most backward groups and masses of the working-class and the peasantry. On the other hand, to prepare the realization of the proletarian dictatorship until such a time as there is not left a single professionally narrow-minded man, until all are quite free from craft and Trade Union prejudices, would be a mistake. A correct understanding of his own ends, the art of politics lies in correctly calculating the conditions and the moment when the proletarian vanguard can take over power successfully. He must decide when, after this assumption of power, that guardian will be able to obtain adequate support from sufficiently inclusive strata of the working-class and non-proletarian laboring masses, and when it will be possible to consolidate and extend its supremacy, educating, training and attracting even widening circles of the laboring masses.

In countries more advanced than Russia, a certain reaction has already taken place, and it is bound to reveal itself in the Trade Unions much more strongly than in our own, our Mensheviks had (and in a very few Trade Unions they still support all of them, because of their craft narrow-mindedness, professional selfishness, and opportunism) in the West the Mensheviks have acquired a much firmer footing in the Trade Unions. There a much wider stratum of labor aristocracy—those professional, self-minded, selfish, brutal, jealous, petty bourgeois elements—has cropped up, empirically inclined, and bribed and corrupted by imperialists. This is not to say nothing of the influence of the Social-Democratic and Social-political type. This struggle must be mercilessly conducted until, as was done in our case, all the incorrigible leaders of opportunism and social-chauvinism have been completely driven out of the Trade Unions, to conquer political power, and the conquest should not be achieved until this struggle has reached a certain stage. That the Trade Unions must vary in the different countries and different circumstances. Only clear-minded, experienced, and well-informed political leaders are able to estimate it correctly. In Russia, incidentally, the measure of success in this struggle was the fact that P.L. Miliutin, a prominent representative of the Socialist Revolutionists (October) of 1917, a few days after the proletarian revolution of October 25, 1917, in those elections the Mensheviks were totally defeated. We obtained 8 million votes (1.4 millions of the vote of Trans-Caucasia be added) as against 9 million votes obtained by the Bolsheviks.*

We carry on the struggle against the labor aristocracy in the name of the working masses. In order to gain them over to our side; and we do battle against the opportunists and social-chauvinists leaders in order to achieve the same object. To forget this most elementary and self-evident truth would be a great mistake. But the Communists commit this stupidity when, because of the reactionary and counter-revolutionary heads of the Trade Unions, they jump...
Unions and of refusing to work in them. Undoubtedly the leaders of opportunism will have recourse to all the tricks of bourgeois diplomacy, to spies, publicity, to the help of bourgeois governments, to priests, police, courts. In order to prevent Communists from entering the Trade Unions, by all and every means to put them out, to make their work inside these organizations impossible as possible toodafone and persecute them. It is necessary to be able to withstand all this, to go the whole length of any sacrifice, if need be, to resort to strategy and adroitness, illegal proceedings, reticence and subterfuge, to anything in order to penetrate into the Trade Unions, remain in them, and carry on Communist work inside them, at any cost. Under Czarism until 1905 we had no "left" "left" workers, but when the new epoch, which created an agent, organized Black Hundred workers' meetings and workmen's societies for the purpose of ferreting out revolutionaries and rooting them out, sent members of our party into these meetings and societies. (I personally remember one such comrade, Babushkin, an eminent Petrograd worker, who was shot by the Czar's generals in 1906). They put us in touch with the masses, acquired much skill in conducting propaganda, and succeeded in wresting the workers from under the influence of Zubatov's agents. Of course, in Western Europe, which is soaked through and through with invariable legalists, constitutionalists, bourgeois-democratic prejudices, it is more difficult to carry on such work; but it can and should be carried on, and carried on systematically.

The Executive Committee of the Third International should, in my opinion, directly condemn the policy of non-participation in reactionary Trade Unions; and they should suggest to the next Second International the proposal of issuing a general condemnation of such policy, stating in detail the reasons for the irrationality of non-participation and the excessive harm it brings to the cause of the proletarian revolution. They should specify in particular the conduct of some Dutch Communists who, whether directly or indirectly, openly or covertly, wholly or partially, supported this erroneous policy. The Third International must break with the tactics of the Second, and not evade or belittle sore points, but face them squarely. The whole truth has been put squarely to the German Independent Social-Democratic Party; the whole truth must likewise be told to the "Left" Communists.

Should We Participate in Bourgeois Parliaments?

The German Left Communist, with the greatest contempt—and the greatest lightmindedness—replied to this question in the following words. The author of the quotation cited above said: "To refuse most decisively any return to the historically and politically worn-out forms of struggle of parliamentarianism is said with absurd pretentiousness, and is obviously incorrect; "Returning" to Parliamentarism! Does that mean that the Soviet Republic already exists in Germany? It does not look as if the German Communist Party of the International could bring about a general condemnation of such policy, stating in detail the reasons for the irrationality of non-participation and the excessive harm it brings to the cause of the proletarian revolution. They should specify in particular the conduct of some Dutch Communists who, whether directly or indirectly, openly or covertly, wholly or partially, supported this erroneous policy. The Third International must break with the tactics of the Second, and not evade or belittle sore points, but face them squarely. The whole truth has been put squarely to the German Independent Social-Democratic Party; the whole truth must likewise be told to the "Left" Communists.
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November, 1917. Were our tactics right or not? If not, this should be clearly stated and proved; this is essential for the working out of the right tactics for international Communism.

If, on the other hand, we were right, certain inferences should be drawn. Concerning experiences in Russian conditions to the conditions of Western Europe. But where the special question of the phrase "parliamentarism has become worn out" is concerned, it is necessary for all means to gauge our experiences; since, without a proper estimate of concrete experiences, such conceptions too easily resolve themselves into empty phrases.

Had not we, Bolsheviks, defeated the Constituent Assembly (November, 1917), more right than any Western Communist to consider that parliamentarism in Russia had become politically worn out? Undoubtedly we had, for the bourgeois democratic parliament, with its second bourgeois revolution (February, 1917), and then for the Socialist revolution (November, 1917). In the second place, this phrase is strikingly illogical. If Parliament becomes an organ and a “centre” (by the way it has never been in reality, to all intents and purposes, so), then it is necessary for the workers to create the tools of their power in the form of Soviets, it follows that the workers must prepare themselves—ideologically, politically, technically—for the struggle of the Soviets against parliament, for the dispersion of parliament by the Soviets. But it does not at all follow that such a dispersion is made more difficult, or is not facilitated, by the presence of a Soviet government. After the October revolution, the workers gained a victory against parliament.

In the course of our victorious fight against Denikin and Kolchak, it never occurred to us that the existence in their position of a Social-Democratic, or Bolshevik, parliament would be an obstacle to our victories. We know perfectly well that the dispersion of the Constituent Assembly on January 5, 1918, was not made more difficult, but was facilitated by the fact that, within the dispersion of parliament revolutionary Constituent Assembly there was a consistent Bolshevik, as well as an inconsistent Left-Social Revolutionary, Soviet opposition. The authors of the theses got into a muddle; they forgot the experience of many, if not all, revolutions, which proved how particularly useful during a revolution is the coordination of mass action outside of parliamentary parliament with an opposition inside the parliament which sympathizes with—or better still directly supports—revolution.

These Dutchmen (and the Left in general) altogether argue as doctrinaires and revolutionists in a real one, or never deeply reflected on the history of the revolution, or naively mistake the subjective “denial” of a reactionary parliament for its destruction in reality, by the united forces of a whole series of political parties. The surest way of discrediting a new political (and not only political) idea, and to cause it harm, is, under pretext of defending it, to reduce it, to make it appear absurd; and, under the conditions mentioned, is even bound to fall in with the conditions of perpetuating the power of the opposite party. By every truism, just as the senior said, if it be “carried to excess,” if it be exaggerated, if it be carried beyond the limits of actual application, can be reduced to absurdity; and, at the conditions mentioned, is even bound to fall in with the conditions of perpetuating the power of the opposite party. Help, the Dutch and German “Left” did unwittingly harm to the new idea of the superiority of Soviet power over bourgeois-democratic parliaments. Of course, anyone who should say, in the old sweeping way, that refusal to participate in bourgeois parliaments can under no circumstances be permissible, would be wrong; cannot attempt here to refute the conclusions under which a boycott is useful, for the scope of my article is more limited; here I only want to estimate all the possibilities of Russian experience in connection with certain burning questions of the day, questions of international Communist tactics.

Russian experience has given us one successful and correct application of the boycott (1905), and one incorrect application of the Bolsheviks (1911). In the first case, a successful and correct experience in preventing the conviction of a reactionary parliament by a reactionary government, under conditions in which revolutionary mass action (strikes in particular) outside parliament was growing in strength, in exceptional periods, the action of even not a single element of the proletariat of the peasantry gave any support to the reactionary government; the proletariat secured for itself influence over the backward masses by means of strikes and agrarian movements. It is quite evident that this experience is not applicable to present-day European conditions. It is also quite evident, on the strength of the foregoing arguments, that even a conditional defense of the refusal to participate in parliament, on the part of the Dutch and the “Left,” is thoroughly wrong and harmful to the cause of the revolutionary proletariat.

In Western Europe and America, parliament has become an object of special aversion to the advanced revolutionaries of the working class. This is self-evident, and is quite comprehensible, for it is difficult to imagine anything more abominable, base, and treacherous than the behavior of the overwhelming majority of Socialists and Social-Democratic deputies in Parliament, during and after the period of the war, which would be, not only unreasonable, but obviously criminal to yield to such a frame of mind when solving the question of how to struggle against this generally admitted evil. In many cases, the revolution of Western Europe has, to no small extent, given rise to such a frame of mind, which could, for instance, a “novelty,” a “rarity,” which has been too long expected, vainly and impatiently it may be; and it may be the beginning of this that makes it so cruelly difficult to scotch it in the mind. Of course, without a revolutionary disposition on the part of the masses, and without conditions tending to enhance this disposition, revolutionary tactics will never materialize. But we have come to the final stage of revolution in Russia (in 1905), to prepare the way for the
impossible to build up revolutionary tactics solely on revolutionary dispositions and moods.

Tactics should be constructed on a sober and strictly objective basis of the forces given control over the country and the huge army of the countries surrounding it, and of all countries, on a world scale, as well as on an evaluation of the experience of other revolutionary movements. To manifest one's revolutionism solely by dint of shouting at parliamentaries and rejecting participation in parliamentary activity is too easy and, yet, because it is too easy, it is not the solution of a difficult, a molar, task. In most Western states, the creation of a really revolutionary parliamentary group is much more difficult than it was in Russia. Of course. But this is only one aspect of the general truth that it was easy for Russia, in the apathy of a relatively undeveloped situation on the world political map, to begin a social revolution, whereas, to continue it and complete it will be more difficult for Russia than for other European countries.

Already at the beginning of 1918 I had occasion to point out this circumstance, and since then an experience of two years entirely corroborates this point of view. Certain specific conditions existed in Russia which do not at present exist in Western Europe, and a repetition of such conditions in another country is not very probable. These specific conditions were (1) the possibility of connecting the Soviet Revolution with the collapse of the Monarchies to it, of the imperialist war which had exhausted the workers and peasants to an inextinguishable extent; (2) the possibility of making use, for a certain time, of the dead struggle of two world-powerful groups of imperialist plutocracy, unable to understand the Soviet situation in Russia; (3) the possibility of withstanding a comparatively lengthy civil war, partly because of the gigantic dimensions of the country and partly by the means of communication; (4) the existence of such a profound bourgeois-revolutionary movement amongst the peasantry that the proletariat party included in its programme the revolutionary demands of the peasant party (the Socialist Revolutionaries, a party sharply hostile to Bolshevism), and at once realised these demands through the proletarian conquest of political power.

The absence of these specific conditions—not to mention various minor ones—accounts for the greater difficulty which Western Europe must experience in beginning the social revolution. To attempt to “circumvent” this difficulty, by “jumping over” the hard task of utilising reactionary parliaments for revolutionary purposes, is absolute childishness. You wish to create a new society? And yet you fear the difficulties entailed in form- ing, in a reactionary Parliament, a sound group composed of convinced, devoted, heroic Communists? Is not this childishness? Karl Liebknecht in Germany and Lenin in Switzerland succeeded, even without the support of the masses from below, in giving examples of a truly revolutionary utilisation of a reactionary parliament. Why, then, should a rapid revolutionising mass party, under conditions of post-war disappointment and exasperation of the masses, be unable to harness itself to a Communist faction in the worst of parliaments? It is not because, in Western Europe, the masses become revolutionaries; the workers and the smaller peasantry are much more strongly imbued with bourgeois-democratic and parliamentary prejudices than they are in Russia, that it is only in the midst of such institutions as bourgeois parliaments that Communists can and should carry on their long and stubborn struggle to expose, disperse, and overcome these prejudices, stopping at nothing.

The German “Left” complain of bad “leaders” in their party and give way to despair, going to the length of a laughable “expatriation” of the said “leaders.” But when conditions are such that it is often necessary to hide the “leaders” underground, the preparation of good, reliable, experienced, and authoritative “leaders” is an especially hard task, and these differences cannot be successfully overcome without co-ordinat- ing legal with illegal work, without testing the “leaders” in the parliamentary arena, among others. The most merciless, cutting, uncompromising criticism must be directed, not against parliamentaries or parliamentary action, but against those leaders who are unable—and still more against those who do not wish—to utilise parliamentary elections and the parliame- ntry revolutionary prerequisites of Communists should. Only such criticisms—are, of course, to the expulsion of worthless leaders and their replacement by capable ones—who will constitute a useful and fruitful revolutionary work. Thus will both the leaders themselves be trained in the working-class and the toiling masses, and the masses learn correctly to understand the political situation, and to under- stand the complicated and intricate problems that originate from such situations.

The Next War

When the Great War was raging, we were solemnly told by a perverted press that it was a “war to end all wars.” We were told that once the terrible Hun was defeated, our future existence on this earth was to be so sublime that compared to it Adam and Eve’s existence in the Garden of Eden was eternal torture and slavery. Under the hypnotic spell of such a rosy future, the worker went out to crush what he considered the only obstacle in the way of the consummation of such a blissful existence. But, alas! Things are not always what they seem, and the returned soldier is beginning to feel somewhat like the country youth who has been enamored of the painted demi-monde of the city when he sees her away from the blinding influence of the white lights. The tinsel is fast dropping from chauvinism, and underneath all, the cruel facts of capitalism are being manifested. The democracy that the workers went forth to save is proving to be nothing more nor less than the dictatorship of a few Imperialists and a system of brutal exploitation and enslavement of the masses. Already we have unemployment and starvation throughout the world, and on every hand we see degradation and misery among the working class. How does the master class account for it? The truth is, they don’t! They say it is a sign of a return to a “normal” state of affairs; and in this they are correct from their point of view, for, as the socialist has long pointed out, a large unemployed army is essential to the capitalist. With its aid, he is enabled to break down the resistance of those engaged in production and so reduce the standard of living very appreciably. Aside from this, the unemployed army is one of the most fertile fields for producing recruits for the army and navy, which are used not only to settle the masters’ quarrels abroad but also to crush any attempt on the part of the workers at home to fight for better conditions. That an army and navy of considerable size will be needed in the near future can easily be seen by a careful observer of world events, and that the capitalist can see it can be proved from quotations from their own press. The “Bankers’ Magazine” for July, 1920, in an article dealing with Anglo-American relations, quotes the “London Dispatch” of June 16th as follows: “British big business is rapidly mobilizing for the war after the war—the battle for the world’s trade. Britain’s logical enemy is the United States, and British business men are preparing to fight with America’s own weapons, the ‘trusts.’” To the uninstructed in Socialism this statement does not seem to convey much, and the average worker weaned on bourgeois sops, would dismiss it with the remark that it is only a sign of a healthy competitive spirit, but that it is something more than this a further quotation from the same organ will prove—“Because if foreign trade is nothing more than an economic war it will surely lead to a world-wide military conflict.” There we have it! Socialists for saying the same in regard to the last war are rotting in prison today, whilst others in European countries who stood by their convictions were lined-up and shot. What becomes then of all the clap-trap of the protection of small nations and other idealistic bunk that was peddled broadcast in order to arouse the necessary enthusiasm in the workers?

The cat is out of the bag, and they are now showing us that they need a larger navy and mercantile marine, for to further quote the above—“Then there is our growing naval power, which is already receiving the

(Continued on Page Thirteen)
International Notes

By John Keracher

Asia Minor. The Encyclopaedia Britannica says: "Asia Minor owes the peculiar interest of its history to its geographical position. 'Planted like a bridge between Asia and Europe,' it has been from the earliest period a battle-ground between the East and the West."

Asia Minor, apart from the struggle over its oil resources, is continuing its historic role as a battle-ground. The Assembly of the League of Nations, in session at Geneva, Switzerland, is confronted with this fact.

When the Allied Powers, at the peace table, chopped up Asia Minor into several mandatory states, all that they left of "Turkey in Asia" was an isolated portion, hemmed in by territory on the west held by Greeks, territory under Italian mandate on the south, French mandatory territory on the southeast, while due east was Armenia. Thus, Asiatic Turkey was shut off effectively, having access only to the Black Sea, the British holding the entrance at Constantinople.

Armenia and Turkey clashed over boundary disputes. Under the leadership of Mustapha Kemal Pasha, the Turks more than held their own against the, then, petty-bourgeois republic. With Wrangel’s army swept out of the Crimea and most of the northern shore of the Black Sea, and the Caucasus to the east cleared of other anti-Soviet forces, Soviet influence is rapidly swinging along the southern shore.

By way of bringing the United States into the League of Nations, the Assembly offered this country a mandate over Armenia, the acceptance of which, would have called for military assistance to that republic in its conflict with the Turks.

A permanent Mandate Committee of nine members, drawn from different nations, has been appointed. One of the duties of this committee is to seek for a nation that will accept mandatory power over Armenia. Another project put forth by the assembly was the raising of a force of 60,000 men to send into Armenia, at a preliminary outlay of $20,000,000 to be raised by appealing to "American Philanthropy." In this connection telegraphic appeals were sent to the United States Government, the American Red Cross Society, and several other Governments and large societies.

"The Committee on Armenia has been assured by military experts here that troops for the expedition are available," Lord Robert Cecil is reported as having stated, and that "only the money necessary to finance the movement is required." Suggestions were put forth by some of those in attendance at the Assembly, that the remnants of General Wrangel’s army be used as a nucleus, and that the $20,000,000 could be raised in the form of a "popular loan" to the Armenian Government.

The whole hoax of helping Armenia against the Turks, under Mustapha Kemal Pasha, was in reality a new blox being prepared against Russia. This "wonderful" scheme has suddenly been upset by the Armenians themselves, as almost simultaneously with these reports, comes the news that the Armenian people have abolished their warring government and set up a Soviet form of government in its place.

This change resulted in immediate peace with the Turks. The masses of Armenia and Turkey will be able now to live in peace, especially if the capitalist-imperialists and their reactionary adherents can be driven out of these territories entirely. The Turkish Nationalists take the attitude that Soviet Russia is the "warden of the Orient" and not the Allied Powers, whose imperial policies they oppose.

Part of the forces under Mustapha Kemal Pasha have been transferred to the Smyrna front against the Greeks, who have fallen out with their imperial overlords, through their wayward returning to power of the former puppet of Teutonic imperialism, King Constantine.

This anti-imperialist policy of Soviet Russia and its rapprochement with those subject peoples may bring, in the course of time, the whole of Asia Minor under Soviet control. The Allies are conscious of this menace to their control, so we can look for them to make some move to head off the advancing power of Soviet Russia.

Great Britain. When Premier Lloyd George announced "martial law" for Ireland, those who have followed recent events there must have realized that another storm was brewing.

On the evening of December 11th the storm burst over the City of Cork, the storm-center of the Sinn Fein rebellion. Within a few hours after the public proclamation of martial law the heart of the city was in flames, $28,000,000 worth of property being destroyed, including the City Hall, Carnegie Library, the Market building and many others. An auto truck full of "black-and-tans" (auxiliary police) was bombed and several of its occupants killed and wounded. Big drygoods stores in the main streets were bombed and reduced to ruins by the fires that followed. This appears to be the most extensive outbreak that has yet taken place amongst the long list of such clashes. The cause is charged up to reprisals on the part of the "black-and-tans" for recent killings of officers and also the before-mentioned truck and its passengers.

Britain’s new policy is to send regular troops in where the Royal Irish constabulary and auxiliaries formerly had charge of things. Since the clash, it appears that regular troops are in charge. This is equal to an open declaration of civil war with the "Republic of Ireland." The government of Britain is ready to negotiate peace, but its first proposal is for negotiation with individual members of the Dail Eireann, the so-called republican parliament, or other individuals representing sections of Sinn Fein. Arthur Griffiths, credited with being the founder of the movement, and recently thrown into prison, seems to be alert to the attempt to divide Sinn Fein’s forces, and is warning his colleagues not to negotiate unless for the movement as a whole. This would amount practically to a recognition of the "Irish Republic," so an immediate settlement is unlikely.

In addition to the Irish war the general class conflict between capital and labor steadily ripes, although just at present there are no extensive industrial disputes going on. The number of unemployed is very great and the menace to capitalist rule in this direction is the real reason for the erection of barricades at the entrance to the Premier’s residence.

The heart of London, especially near the parliament buildings, is heavily policed. The ruling class of Britain is watchful and its government seems to be preparing for any emergency.
Japan

The general economic conditions and the political situation reflected therefrom, is giving the ruling class of Japan a hot time of it.

Japan's troubles are not confined to the island kingdom itself, but, as a reward for her imperial expansion they exist in many parts of the world, threatening her with revolt at home and warfare abroad.

The problems of ruling Korea, and dictating policy to China, are supplemented by the necessity of competing with leading world powers in the construction of naval armaments. Viscount Ishii states that Japan will continue to increase its armaments so long as the United States keeps on building ships. Since the conclusion of the great war, Japan has launched five modern ships and is rushing the work on more. This competition in battleship building has no limitations, once started upon. The maintenance of a huge army and navy is a spur to more intensive exploitation of the working masses. Much of the raw material for Japanese industry has to be imported from China, Korea, and elsewhere. They have attempted to grow cotton, but the climate is too moist and the soil that can be used for agriculture is taken up for the raising of rice, the staple diet of the masses.

The colonization of more islands in the Pacific ocean, the battle for control of cables, and the trouble with the United States over the influx of Japanese into California are but some of the factors leading to the precarious position that the ruling class is now confronted with.

The exceedingly rapid expansion of Japan, from barbarism to capitalist-imperialism, has prevented the slow development of a docile, capitalist-minded proletariat such as that of western Europe and the United States. The Manifesto of the Second Congress of the Third International expresses it thus: "Japan, torn within her feudal shell by capitalist contradictions, stands on the verge of a great revolutionary crisis which is already paralyzing her imperialist aspirations, in spite of the favorable international situation."

The proletariat of Japan showed its capacity for revolutionary action during the rice riots of August, 1918. It therefore would not be surprising if the capitalist lid blew off, in Japan, at any time.

Norway

The capitalist class of Norway has recently been carrying on a campaign for thrift, in the form of mass meetings against the importation of luxuries. Amongst the speakers at the meetings were Premier Halvorsen, a former Premier, Knudsen, and the famous Dr. Nansen who is one of the chief lackeys of Norwegian capitalists, representing them on the League of Nations.

This sort of campaign indicates that the general economic conditions are far from being sound in spite of their years of war prosperity. It is a well known fact that one of their main industries, namely fishing, is in a state of collapse. The country lately had a period of excitement over labor disturbances at Bergen, through which a Danish labor leader, Robert Vilsen, was deported. The editor of "Ny Lid," on his way home from Moscow, was arrested at Tromsø for trying to take into the country 250,000 kroner in Russian gold. He stated that the money was for the purpose of organizing a Russian consular and diplomatic service in Norway.

The Soviet representative, Litvinoff, spent some time in Christiania negotiating trade relations with the Norwegian government. Litvinoff's proposition was that they send to Russia a delegation of thirty with full diplomatic privileges. The Norwegian government rejected the proposition as it practically meant the recognition of the Soviet Government, but to meet pressure brought to bear upon them by the fishermen, they offered to receive ten Russian delegates, without diplomatic rights, and who as individuals would have to meet with the approval of the Norwegian government. Litvinoff rejected the offer, according to reports, and returned to Russia.

The Norwegian Labor party supports the Third International and had delegates at the second congress. This much we gather from meager newspaper reports, but it would appear that there is a dispute on, over the acceptance of the program, and it will be fought out at the National Labor Congress to be held soon at Christiania.

The revolutionary movement in Norway, like that in most countries today, moves steadily to the left, a condition that is greatly hastened by the economic depression within the country itself.

The Third International

On January 24, 1919, a wireless message from Moscow invited the revolutionary groups and parties in other countries to send delegates to a Congress for the purpose of forming a Communist International.

This Congress met in Moscow, March 2nd to 6th, 1919. Seventeen groups were represented by official delegates, a like number being unofficially represented.

The work of the first Congress was hampered in many ways; it was not then possible to perfect the new world-organization, but the foundation was laid, the general principles and structure outlined, and when it adjourned, the delegates returned to their respective countries to take up the actual work of organizing the world's proletariat into a compact fighting machine.

The Second Congress met under more favorable circumstances in July, 1920. The intervening months saw many changes in the various national groups. It was a period of intense activity—tearing down the old, building up the new. In some countries whole parties withdrew from the Second International and affiliated immediately with the Third; in others, parties severed their old connection but hesitated, not fully endorsing the Third. When the Second Congress met, thirty-three countries were represented, in all of which Communist parties had either been formed or were in the process of formation. The following is a complete list of countries: Russia, Germany, Austria, France, England, America, Italy, Norway, Switzerland, Denmark, Holland, Belgium, Spain, Sweden, Hungary, Galicia, Poland, Latvia, Czecho-Slovakia, Estonia, Finland, Bulgaria, Jugo-Slavia, Georgia, Armenia, Turkey, Persia, India, Dutch India, China, Korea, and Mexico.

Full details of the development in all countries are not available, largely because there is at present no agency in this country for the dissemination of such information.

The following brief summary indicates the general tendency in the leading countries:

GERMANY

The German Communist Party was founded in Decem-
ber, 1918, and absorbed what was formerly the Spartacist Union. At the Congress of October, 1919, a split occurred over the question of participation in parliamentary elections and action within the existing trade unions. The majority, which retained the name Communist Party, favored parliamentary action and a policy of permeating the trade unions. The minority adopted the name Communist Labor Party and refused to participate in elections and favored the formation of new industrial unions of the One Big Union type. The majority was officially affiliated with the Third International; the minority maintained an unofficial connection.

The German Independent Socialist Party was formed in 1917, out of the elements opposed to the war policy of the Majority Socialists, and was affiliated with the Second International until December, 1918. The party was made up of various elements on the right, led by Kautsky, Bernstein and Hilferding; the Center, led by Ledebour, and the Left, led by Stoecker.

At the Leipzig Congress, December, 1919, a motion by Stoecker calling for immediate affiliation with the Third International was defeated by a vote of 169 against 114. The following compromise resolution was finally adopted by a vote of 227 to 54:

Resolution of the German Independent Socialist Party at the Leipzig Congress, December, 1919:

"This Congress declares that one of the most important tasks of the Independent Socialist Party is the ruthless prosecution of the working-class struggle to the exclusion of any policy which aims solely at the realization of reforms within the Capitalist State. This Congress, therefore, decides to sever all relations with the Second International. All participation in the Geneva Congress is accordingly rejected by the Independent Socialist Party. The German Independent Socialist Party is in agreement with the Third International in the conception of realizing socialism by the dictatorship of the proletariat based upon the Councils system. There is room for an effective working-class International by the union of our party with the Third International and the revolutionary parties of other countries. For this purpose the Congress instructs the Central Committee to enter into immediate negotiations with these parties on the basis of the program adopted by the Party in order to bring about this union and so, in conjunction with the Third International, to bring about a clearly defined and effective working-class International which shall prove a decisive weapon of world revolution in the working-class struggle for emancipation from the chains of international capitalism. If the parties of other countries should not be willing to enter into the Moscow International with us, the adherence must be undertaken by the German Independent Socialist Party alone."

At a Congress held in October, 1920, the Independent Socialist Party decided by an overwhelming majority to join the Third International. This was a distinct defeat for such leaders as Bernstein, Kautsky and Hilferding. Shortly after, it was announced that through the efforts of Linoviev, the Independent Socialist Party, the Communist Party and the Communist Labor Party had been united in one organization known as the United Communist Party of Germany, with a membership of about two million.

FRANCE

The Socialist Party of France is reported to have a membership of about two and one-half million. All sections being included: the Right, under Renaudel supported the war; the Center, under Cachin and Longuet favored independent action during the war and became the Majority and took control of the Party in July, 1918; the Left, under Loriot, opposed the war, participated in the Zimmerwald Conference and favored affiliation with the Third International. At the Easter Conference, 1919, a motion was adopted to join the Third International received about 270 votes; to remain in the Second International, 275 votes; the majority resolution, known as the "Reconstruction resolution," provided for remaining in the Second International temporarily and attempting to "purify" it. This resolution received 894 votes. Since that time there has been a marked tendency toward the Left.

At a recent conference of the Socialists of the Department of the Seine, which includes the city of Paris, a motion by Cachin, editor of "L'Humańitē," for affiliation without reservations received 1,498 votes; a motion of Longuet for affiliation with reservations received 2,144 votes; a motion against affiliation received 1,061 votes. It is quite likely that other cities will follow the example of Paris, and that the French party will shortly be added to the list of Communist parties.

ENGLAND

There are at present two distinct Communist parties in England. In addition there are several revolutionary groups which have endorsed the principles of the Third International. These parties and groups have been instructed by the International to merge into one party. A unity conference, at which a representative of the International will preside, is to be held in January.

UNITED STATES

The Socialist Party withdrew from the Second International and applied for admission to the Third. The result of the referendum was: For affiliation with reservations, 3,475; against, 1,444. The application, however, was finally rejected.

The Socialist Labor Party claims to endorse the Third International, but is not affiliated.

The referendum of the I. W. W. for affiliation was defeated by an overwhelming vote. Its official organ, the "One Big Union Monthly," in December printed a bitter attack upon the Soviet government. The protests that poured in from the membership compelled the resignation of the editor, John Sandgren.

The Communist Party and the United Communist Party were instructed by the International to combine, but the unity conferences which have been held (in secret, of course) failed to produce the desired result. The report sent to the International by the United Communist Party reveals a condition which has existed since the formation of the Communist and Communist Labor Parties in September, 1919.

From the time of the Left Wing Conference, (June 1919) there has been an uncasing and bitter factional struggle for control. This was, in fact, the sole reason behind the formation of two Communist parties. And within the parties the struggle continued unabated until the present time. There have been charges and counter-charges of "spy," "centrist," "menhevik," "legalist," "betrayer of the revolution," each accuses the other of misappropriation of funds, violation of discipline, and every conceivable breach of revolutionary ethics.

The Industrial Socialist League, made up of expelled sections of the Socialist Labor Party, and the Proletarian Party, (known also as the "Michigan Group") are distinctly Communist groups, the latter endorsing without reservations the principles of the Third International. In addition, there are in every large city independent Communist groups, many being in the form of educational societies. If we take into account the thousands of individual Communists who are "unattached," it will be seen that of the workers who agree with the aims and methods of the Third International, the majority remain aloof from those claiming to be the Communist Party.

In the main, there are two reasons for this. First, the incessant struggle of the various factions for control; second, objection to the programs and form of organization.
Both parties have adopted programs implying that this country is on the verge of actual revolution, and are on that account illegal, secret organizations. This revolutionary situation, however, exists only in the distorted imagination of perfervid zealots. In reality, the American working class is politically backward. There is a real need for general Communist agitation, propaganda and education. The Communist parties, having tied their own hands, cannot fill this need.

This country has earned for itself a reputation as the breeding ground of freak movements—religious, political and economic. Happily, we are not to be allowed to have our own sweet way in the matter of Communist parties. The International has specified that there must be but one party, and that it must be so constituted as to do the work required of it. That such a party, embracing all genuine Communist elements, does not exist must be admitted. All sincere Communists should therefore work for the establishment of a united and efficient party.

A. J. M.

The Marxian Law of Value

I think no proof is needed to show that the tendency of capitalism is to increase the constant portion of the total capital invested in proportion to the variable. Every invention, every bit of new machinery installed, has for its purpose the saving of human labor. Instance after instance could be cited where the introduction of new machinery has eliminated whole crafts. We may safely say, therefore, that the purpose of machinery is to save labor. Saving labor naturally means that Mr. Capitalist is thereby enabled to produce the same amount of commodities with less labor, or, a larger amount of commodities with the same amount of labor. The following formulas will readily explain the phenomenon, and show at the same time upon what Marx based his teaching that capitalism will collapse.

In the early stages of capitalism, the greater portion of capital was invested in that portion known as the variable, or at any rate, we will be well within the truth when we say that his proportion invested in variable was greater than it is now. Assuming again that the rate of exploitation is 100%, in the following we would have

\[ 50C + 100V = 100S \]

A profit of 66 2/3% on a total investment of 150. Now let us assume that the constant portion is increased, and the variable remains the same, then we would have

\[ 100C + 100V = 100S \]

Profit 50% on a total investment of 200. Should the constant be increased again, we would have

\[ 200C + 100V = 100S \]

Profit 33 1/3% on a total investment of 300.

\[ 300C + 100V = 100S \]

Profit 25% on a total investment of 400.

\[ 400C + 100V = 100S \]

Profit 20% on a total investment of 500.

The greater the portion of constant to the variable, the less will be the profit, and the more capitalism develops, the bigger and larger grows the constant in comparison with the variable. Let us quote Marx: "In this way, the same rate of surplus value, with the same degree of labor exploitation, would express itself in a falling rate of profit, because the material growth of the constant capital, and consequently of the total capital, implies their growth in value, although not in the same proportion."

Now we have seen that it is one of the laws of capitalist production that its development carries with it a relative decrease of variable as compared with constant capital, and consequently as compared to the total capital, which it sets in motion. Therefore, "Every individual product, taken by itself, contains a smaller quantity of labor than the same product did on a lower scale of production, in which the capital invested in wages occupies a far greater space compared to the capital invested in means of production."

This mode of production produces a progressive decrease of the variable capital as compared to the constant capital and consequently a continuously rising organic composition of the total capital. The immediate result of this is that the rate of surplus value, at the same degree of labor exploitation, expresses itself in a continually falling average rate of profit.

* * * This progressive tendency of the average rate of profit to fall is, therefore, but a peculiar expression of capitalist production for the fact that the social productivity of labor is progressively increasing.

* * * Since the mass of the employed living labor is continually on the decline compared to the mass of materialized labor incorporated in productively consumed means of production, it follows that that portion of living labor, which is unpaid and represents surplus value, must also be continually on the decrease compared to the volume and value of the invested total capital.

Here it might be well to point out that as productivity increases, and the constant portion of the capital increases in proportion to the variable, capitalism is not able to extract as much surplus labor as on a lower plane of production. To illustrate: Let a capital of 100 consist of 80C+20V, and let the variable stand for 20 laborers. Let the rate of surplus value be 100%, that is to say, the laborers work one-half of the day for themselves and the other half for the capitalist. Now take a less developed country, in which a capital of 100 is composed of 20C+80V, and let the 80 variable stand for 80 laborers. But let these laborers work two-thirds of the day for themselves, and only one-third for the capitalists. Assuming all other things to be equal, the laborers in the first case will produce a value of 40, while those of the second will produce a value of 120. The first capital produces

\[ 80C + 20V = 20S = 120; \text{ rate of profit } 20\% \]

The second capital produces

\[ 20C + 80V + 40S = 140; \text{ rate of profit } 40\% \]

In other words the rate of profit in the second case is double that of the first case, and yet the rate of surplus value in the first case is 100%, while it is only 50% in the second case. But a capital of the same magnitude appropriates in the first case the surplus labor of only 20 laborers, while it appropriates that of 80 laborers in the second.

We must not assume, however, that the total profit of the capitalist decreases, but to the contrary, the absolute mass of the total profit increases. Let us again turn to illustration:

1. \[ 4C + 2V + 4S \]
2. \[ 15C + 3V + 4S \]

In the first capital, the exploitation is 100%; the profit is 33 1/3%. In the second capital, the exploitation is also 100%; the profit is only 16 2/3%. The absolute mass of surplus has increased 50%, whereas the rate of profit has
decreased 50%. From this it will be seen that in spite of the progressive fall of the rate of profit, there may be an absolute increase of the labor set in motion by it, an absolute increase of the mass of surplus labor absorbed, a resulting absolute increase of the produced surplus value, and consequently an absolute increase in the mass of the produced profit. This increase may be progressive. It may not only be so. On the basis of capitalist production, it must be so, aside from temporary fluctuations.

Examining the situation, it is clear that there is a tendency for the rate of profit to fall, and that the lower it falls the greater will be the absolute mass of the profits. There have been many who have argued that if the rate of profit should fall to one per cent or to only one-tenth of one per cent, the amount extracted from each laborer would be so infinitesimal as to be hardly noticeable, but these gentlemen fail to realize that before such a condition could exist, there would have to be an immense concentration of capital, a gigantic army of unemployed, an intense exploitation of those who were employed, and in addition those with small fortunes, say of $100,000 would be put on a level with the proletarian. For the student of sociology, it would be very interesting to observe, but fortunately, capitalism is in a state of collapse, and the student will have to content himself with speculation.

The reader, by this time, will no doubt have asked himself the question, that in view of the rapid development of industry, why does not the rate of profit fall more rapidly, and there may be some who will point to the fact that in recent years, the rate of profit has not declined, but as a matter of fact, the rate of profit has risen. In analysing the situation, and in stating the law, Marx stated that it was merely a "tendency," and the title of the chapter is "The Law of the Falling Tendency of the Rate of Profit." There are many countering causes, such for instance of raising the intensity of exploitation, depressing the wages below their value, cheapening the elements of constant capital, foreign trade, etc. These countering causes, and the many contradictions which develop, and come to the surface in the analysis, would require considerable space for discussion, more than is allotted for this article. Nevertheless, in spite of all these countering causes, the tendency for the rate of profit to fall is dominant, and will continue to operate.

This phenomenon has puzzled more than one economist, and Marx was the only one to solve it, and he solved it not alone by superior intellect, but by virtue of the law of value. The law of value has solved not only this problem, but also all the rest of the problems of political economy. It is the rule which has given us the solution. The law of value has been as important for political economy as the struggle for existence has been to biology.

**Bertrand Russell on Bolshevist Theory**

**By MURRAY MURPHY**

In his second article on Bolshevist Theory, Bertrand Russell attacks the method by which the Bolshevist revolution was, and is, carried on. "Not only must there be armed conflict," he says, in reference to this matter, "but they have a fairly definite conception of the way in which it is to be conducted. This conception has been carried out in Russia, and is to be carried out before very long in every civilized country."

There are two things wrong with this declaration: It is, to be sure, true enough that Communists have a "fairly definite conception" of the probable course of the revolution, and experience has in every case verified their expectations; but Professor Russell states this truth in an ambiguous way, implying an absurd degree of mechanical exactness in the supposed course of the revolution, as though every slightest detail of the events in Russia must, according to Bolshevist theory, be exactly reproduced in every other country. But "Our teachings are not a dogma," said Marx and Engels, as quoted by Lenin, "but a guide to action." The characteristic conditions in each country must, as Lenin has shown, determine what specific and emergency tactics are necessary.

The second objection to the statement lies in the intellectual setting, so to speak, into which it is introduced— the abysmal ignorance and incredible prejudices of the people to whom the unqualified assertion is made. The majority of the American public still believe that the Bolsheviki are carrying on their work by means of unprovoked murder, arson, rape, and whatnot; then comes Russell, and, without correcting this notion of Bolshevist tactics (which he knows is not true), exclaims that Bolshevism advocates the same measures in every civilized country!

The bulk of the article is occupied, however, with three specific questions: "First, would the ultimate state foreshadowed by the Bolshevists be desirable in itself? Secondly, would the conflict involved in achieving it by the Bolshevist method be so bitter and prolonged that its evils would outweigh the ultimate good? Thirdly, is this method likely to lead in the end to the state which the Bolshevists desire, or will it fail at some point and arrive at a quite different result?"

Professor Russell answers the first question in the affirmative. He concedes, without argument, the desirability of communism, but gives an unfavorable answer to the other two questions. Let us consider these at some length.

Briefly, Bertrand Russell's first charge is that Communism isn't worth the price that must be paid. There must be much war, he says, and, as a result, much misery and loss of life. Why does he not recall the French Revolution in this connection? Would he return to Feudalism if the French Revolution could be undone? Too much war to establish Communism, he says! Does he mean to assert that Capitalism has no wars? Is he ignorant of the bloody wars of the last half-century—the Spanish-American War, the Russo-Japanese War, the Great European War, and many others—about one in every six years? Too much war! Is it better, we may ask, to fight wars for our masters' profits than for our own emancipation? Again, is it better to face an infinity of capitalist wars than by one courageous conflict to end wars forever? Ten million were slaughtered in the last imperialist war; at this moment workingmen in a time of "peace" are being shot down in the Virginia coalfields. Professor Russell, in the face of all this, fears that the Bolshevists are paying too great a price in fighting to free themselves forever from this class slavery. His is, indeed, a "peace at any price" philosophy!

Furthermore, he complains of "the almost universal poverty" and the lack of "every kind of liberty" under the proletarian dictatorship. Does he really think that the
proletariat of Russia never has known poverty or the lack of liberty? But (not to speak of the gross exaggeration of such statements) we may refer to an article in The Nation of last July, in which he gives his experiences while on a personal trip to Russia: "It is said—and all I saw confirmed the assertion—that the peasants are better off than they ever were before. I saw no one—man, woman, or child—who looked starved in the villages." Yet in the face of this very statement by himself, he contends that the present poverty of the Russian people is too high a price to pay for Communism! Is it possible that Professor Russell refers to the poverty of the former Russian bourgeoisie?

I wonder! Anyhow, why does he blame the Bolsheviks for the distress which may exist in Russia? He could better employ his time in lecturing the Allies on the ethical objections to the Russian blockade.

Speaking of Gorlcy (see the Nation quoted above) in contrast with Lenin, he said: "The materialistic conception of history is all very well, but some care for the higher things of civilization is a relief." Indeed! Then why does he oppose the Bolsheviki, who are willing to fight for the "higher things of civilization?"

Professor Russell’s comment on the poverty and governmental restrictions in Russia is particularly hard to understand in view of his assertion in The Nation before referred to that Kerensky’s regime had led to chaos, and that "some stern discipline was obviously necessary if the country was to be saved from utter destruction," and, further, "it has to be remembered that the lack of freedom is traceable to war and the blockade as its prime cause."

Still further, the British Labor Report, which Bertrand Russell quotes in the New Republic, states that in spite of the blockade, the war, and the miserable conditions inherited from Tsarism and the Kerensky government, "a great and efficient sanitary organization has been created by the Commissariat of Public Health," and "a great sanitary propaganda has been carried out, through soviet and trade unions, in both towns and villages, and these epidemics (which had been raging, M. M.) are now controlled." And as far as governmental oppression is concerned, the same authority says: "One effect of the present crisis has been to rally all parties to the support of the Government for the purpose of national defense—whatever their differences on questions of internal politics." Would this be the case if the Bolsheviks were a cruel and domineering minority?

The reader may judge whether the poverty and tyranny in Russia are as great as Professor Russell makes out. Then when he reflects that the Bolshevists are having constant military success, he may likewise judge whether the Russians themselves think the struggle is worth while.

But we must pass on to the second charge, namely, that the Bolshevist methods will not, after all, result in Communism. Their success in battle, he contends, is making them Nationalistic and Imperialistic. The exercise of power is corrupting them, making out of the Communists proper a new aristocracy. In the article in The Nation previously referred to, he puts the charge much more directly: "If the Bolsheviki remain in power, it may be assumed that their communism will fade, and that they will increasingly resemble any other Asiatic government—for example, our own (i. e., the British—M. M.) government in India."

This is the sort of argument that is made by one who does not know the basic facts of the Russian Revolution, who interprets such facts as he does know, and who does not understand the principles and factors and conditions back of the concrete facts. It is the old bourgeois fright at the phrase, "proletarian dictatorship," thinly veneered by a sentimental pseudo-logic.

In the first place the idea of nationalism and imperialism and exploitation is utterly abhorrent to Bolshevist psychology; it was opposition to those things that characterized them as an exploited class, it was opposition to those ideas that put them in power, and it must be continued opposition to those very things that will keep them in power. Furthermore, Professor Russell forgets—or, rather, never knew, since he does not understand Historical Materialism—that nationalism and imperialism arise out of the nature of the capitalist system, since they further the interests of the bourgeoisie. With capitalism and the capitalist class overthrown, there is no longer a reason for the existence of either nationalism or imperialism; the material conditions for such ideas no longer exist. With characteristic bourgeois psychology, however, he bases his belief—that the Bolshevists will develop an aristocratic tyranny—on abstract notions of "human nature," never taking into consideration the material conditions which determine the reactions of "human nature." Still further, although he accuses Marxists of making no allowance for idealistic motives (which is false, as I showed in my first article—M. M.), he himself is guilty of the same thing in his thinking, for he entirely leaves out of account the powerful international psychology developed by the revolutionary movement, and the significance and even more powerful propaganda by the Bolshevists themselves against the very plutocracy and imperialism that Russell thinks they will establish!

No, Professor Russell's fear of a future Bolshevist imperialistic oligarchy is not based on a correct understanding of all the factors involved; he is, after all, despite his evident sincerity, only a closet sociologist; bookish psychology, bookish information, bookish philosophy—these characterize his writings and limit his powers of analysis.

"I went to Russia believing myself a communist," naively remarks Professor Russell, but his experiences there, he says, intensified his doubts a thousandfold. But if he dreamed of himself as a communist, we may remember the significant words of Marx: "I sowed dragons teeth and I reaped fleas."

The Next War

(Continued from Page Seven)

official notice of the British Government. Do we mean to challenge the naval superiority of Great Britain? And if so, will that challenge be met by an expanded British naval program with which we must continually strive to keep pace?" Secretary Daniels' statement will well answer this—In 1924 our navy will equal Great Britain's—or words to that effect. Our masters are still preparing for future wars, and the Church, College, School and Press can be relied upon to prepare the minds of the workers.

But "the best laid plans of mice and men gang aft aye." Already there is arising on the horizon the Nemesis of capitalism. In Russia the workers have settled with their enemies, the capitalists of their country, and have incurred the wrath of a frightened bourgeois world, and sooner or later a case is going to be cooked up in order to get the workers of other countries to go in and shoot down their Russian comrades. Are we going to do this? The answer remains with the workers, for they alone can settle the question, and that effectively, by dealing with their own bourgeoisie.

JAMES CONLAN.
Lenin vs. Kautsky

By ERN REEN

When Kautsky avoided the question of his activities during the First World War, he ignored the charge of chauvinism put against him by Lenin, he avoided a very important question. It was a question concerning the soundness of the socialist principles on which the Second International was founded, and a challenge to the future policy of socialist parties.

We tried to find an excuse for him in the fact that a greater event, the Russian Revolution, forced into the background the discussion of all that had happened before. But there seems to be no excuse now, when talking about the situation in Russia, Kautsky again ignores Lenin’s argument. Instead of an honest analysis of the charges and the questions in the controversy, his book, “Terrorism and Communism,” is a general statement which are meaningless and contrary to fact, repeated by Kautsky time and again. In the “Dictatorship of the Proletariat” Kautsky stated that “Dictatorship means a sovereignty of a single person.” “Reviling, Lenin pointed out numerous examples in history of the dictatorship of a class. It was up to Kautsky now to prove that Lenin was wrong and to show his mistakes or admit that he had been in error. Instead, Kautsky repeats several times the same statement: “Dictatorship means dictatorship of a single person,” never discussing it, taking it as an unquestionable truth. (See page 38).

Another important question discussed before was that of the agrarian problem. Kautsky accused the Bolsheviks of confusing the petty bourgeois interests of the peasants with the proletarian interests of the city workers. Lenin replied that in 1905 Kautsky himself was in favor of an alliance of the workers with the peasants and not with the liberal bourgeoisie. Kautsky states: “He does not mention Lenin’s reply. But it is convenient for him to make the reader believe that the Russian revolutionary element is reactionary in character and without any hesitation he repeats: “Some Russian comrades think that the poorer peasantry has the same interests as the city proletariat,” while in reality “the peasants’ support forced on the Russian revolutionary movement an economically reactionary element,” which is of course very detrimental to the purity of the movement. (Pages 26, 70).

Evidently Kautsky holds that the Bolsheviks ought to decline the peasants’ support. It might be an interesting theory, but Kautsky forgets to prove its soundness. One thing Kautsky ought to admit, though, is that in order to be logical: The peasants’ support makes the Bolshevik rule—the rule of the majority. But instead of being logical he keeps on repeating: “Bolshevism holds that the Social Democrats everywhere must be subordinated by the minority upon the majority and that this can be accomplished only by dictatorship and civil war.” (Page 215).

The statement that Bolshevism holds such views on minority and civil war also remains to be proved.

Some of Kautsky’s views have undergone a slight change. He no longer anticipates that the social revolution will be carried out by “peaceful economic, legal and moral means,” he admits now that “not a single class gives up voluntarily the power which it conquered, no matter what are the circumstances that brought it to the top.” It is also allowable then for the Russian proletariat to defend its power, but “A really Marxian Socialist Party would proportion the problems it puts before the victorious proletariat to the material and moral environments. It would not decree an immediate general socialization in a country of undeveloped production. The proletariat ought to introduce Socialism only in as much as it is possible under the present conditions; it could not be done by the swing of the hand.” Evidently Kautsky is not confident any more that capitalist production must be changed into socialist “at once.” It is characteristic that now he condemns the Bolshevists just as strongly for “ordering an immediate socialization” as before for not introducing Socialism at once.

With an equal ardor Kautsky renews his attacks on the “dictatorship.” He does not claim now that Marx spoke of a dictatorship of the proletariat in his different formulations but that he quotes Engels’ explanation of the dictatorship of the proletariat: “Do you want to know, gentle-

men, what is the dictatorship of the proletariat? Look at the Paris Commune, there was dictatorship of the proletariat.”

But the trouble is that the present Russian dictatorship is quite different from that of the Second Paris Commune. The Second Paris Commune respected general suffrage, while the Bolsheviks ridiculed suffrage. Lenin destroyed it. The fact pointed out by Lenin, that during the Paris Commune the only people left in Paris after the flight of the bourgeoisie, were those supporting the revolution and hence they alone had “the general suffrage,” does not seem to trouble Kautsky any at all. Condensation of Bolshevism justifies him to any mutilation of facts.

Kautsky devotes to the subject Bolshevism proper just a small fraction of the book, but all through his work he mentions the Soviet rule on various occasions and draws parallels between it and the Reign of Terror in such a manner as to produce a desired impression without going to the trouble of discussing and proving his statements. Just in such a manner as he dealt with the questions mentioned above. Special attention is given though to the topic not touched upon before—the Terror. It is here where Kautskyism reaches its culminating point and where it finally develops its counter-revolutionary activities. All the slander and lies charged by the reactionaries of the world against the first proletarian State are being revived by Kautsky, and all this is presented by him in a more misguiding manner than it ever could have been done by the bourgeois representatives, and put in that skillful form, made possible by his knowledge of Scientific Socialism and his ability to misrepresent Marx.

A bloody terror reigns in Russia, Kautsky narrates. Bourgeoisie and intellectuals are made the victims of a revengful mob. Bourgeois women are mistreated, socialists are persecuted, and added to all these horrors the workers themselves are turned into slaves. The trouble lies in the generally accepted opinion that terrorism is necessarily connected with revolution because such was the example of the French Revolution. But the conception is erroneous: The Terror is a consequence of the stupidity of the reactionaries of the world against the first proletarian State are being revived by Kautsky, and all this is presented by him in a more misguiding manner than it ever could have been done by the bourgeois representatives, and put in that skillful form, made possible by his knowledge of Scientific Socialism and his ability to misrepresent Marx.

A bloody terror reigns in Russia, Kautsky narrates. Bourgeoisie and intellectuals are made the victims of a revengful mob. Bourgeois women are mistreated, socialists are persecuted, and added to all these horrors the workers themselves are turned into slaves. The trouble lies in the generally accepted opinion that terrorism is necessarily connected with revolution because such was the example of the French Revolution. But the conception is erroneous: The Terror is a consequence of the stupidity of the reactionaries of the world against the first proletarian State are being revived by Kautsky, and all this is presented by him in a more misguiding manner than it ever could have been done by the bourgeois representatives, and put in that skillful form, made possible by his knowledge of Scientific Socialism and his ability to misrepresent Marx.

A bloody terror reigns in Russia, Kautsky narrates. Bourgeoisie and intellectuals are made the victims of a revengful mob. Bourgeois women are mistreated, socialists are persecuted, and added to all these horrors the workers themselves are turned into slaves. The trouble lies in the generally accepted opinion that terrorism is necessarily connected with revolution because such was the example of the French Revolution. But the conception is erroneous: The Terror is a consequence of the stupidity of the reactionaries of the world against the first proletarian State are being revived by Kautsky, and all this is presented by him in a more misguiding manner than it ever could have been done by the bourgeois representatives, and put in that skillful form, made possible by his knowledge of Scientific Socialism and his ability to misrepresent Marx.

A bloody terror reigns in Russia, Kautsky narrates. Bourgeoisie and intellectuals are made the victims of a revengful mob. Bourgeois women are mistreated, socialists are persecuted, and added to all these horrors the workers themselves are turned into slaves. The trouble lies in the generally accepted opinion that terrorism is necessarily connected with revolution because such was the example of the French Revolution. But the conception is erroneous: The Terror is a consequence of the stupidity of the reactionaries of the world against the first proletarian State are being revived by Kautsky, and all this is presented by him in a more misguiding manner than it ever could have been done by the bourgeois representatives, and put in that skillful form, made possible by his knowledge of Scientific Socialism and his ability to misrepresent Marx.

A bloody terror reigns in Russia, Kautsky narrates. Bourgeoisie and intellectuals are made the victims of a revengful mob. Bourgeois women are mistreated, socialists are persecuted, and added to all these horrors the workers themselves are turned into slaves. The trouble lies in the generally accepted opinion that terrorism is necessarily connected with revolution because such was the example of the French Revolution. But the conception is erroneous: The Terror is a consequence of the stupidity of the reactionaries of the world against the first proletarian State are being revived by Kautsky, and all this is presented by him in a more misguiding manner than it ever could have been done by the bourgeois representatives, and put in that skillful form, made possible by his knowledge of Scientific Socialism and his ability to misrepresent Marx.
THE PROLETARIAN

A few pages further on, quoting Marx who calls an attempt on the part of certain French revolutionists to organize an uprising in September, 1870, "a foolish thing," Kautsky ironically remarks that Marx and Kautsky are revolutionists. In the first case, Marx was analyzing the events of 1848 and not de livering an irresponsible threat of a rage blind man. When, in the second case, Marx called an attempt at an uprising "a foolish thing," he did so because conditions then did not favor a successful revolt and not because he disapproved of "active undertakings in general," and believed only in "organizing work," as Kautsky tries to explain. An honest study of Marx's works on the Paris Commune would show Kautsky that Marx was very much in favor of "active undertakings."

It is impossible to discuss this matter thoroughly in this brief review; this and several other important points which had to be omitted, must be discussed separately.

A tendency to justify the terror practised by the proletariat, this "tradition of terror," is especially harmful at the present time when "a severe criticism of revolutionary methods is necessary for a blind praise of a terror." This leads, to Kautsky explains: "I know party comrades, very nice ones, honest, who consider it their sacred duty to rev olutionize the people by false historical dithyrambs in honor of Bolshevism."

This statement is rather too general and vague to have any meaning, but the character of the "false dithyrambs" can be guessed at. Kautsky tells his "true" stories about the Red Terror of Bolshevism, medieval murder, torture, destruction of all culture in Russia; of these all Kautsky accuses the Bolsheviks. Even abuse of women is practised by officers, Kautsky has the authority of M. Pechaliev (who is he?) that such is the case. The following "document" is being quoted: "Thereby the soviet authorizes Comrade Greg orey to requisition and deliver sixty bourgeois girls and women to the barracks of the artillery regiment stationed at Murzillo, district of Briansk." (Page 171).

The English title of the book from which Kautsky quotes the above "document" reminds us that people in America have been fed for months with stories of that kind, in the movies they were shown all the details of the "requisition" of bourgeois women; and yet later even the most irresponsible reactionary sheets were forced, by the impossibility of finding someone any more, to admit the forged character of those stories. At most a year after, in a book written at the end of 1919 on the "suspicious personality" of the Bolsheviks, Kautsky presents the same stories as indisputable facts.

As to the identity of the "document" the following reply was given by L. Trotsky in his book, "Against Kautsky:"

I had an investigation made of every phase of this matter, in order to learn what facts and episodes were at the bottom of this invention. A carefully conducted investigation gives the following results:

"In the district of Briansk there is no place named Murz i llova. Nor is there any such place in the neighboring dis tricts. . . . I also tried to trace this matter by following up various artillery divisions. We have not succeeded in finding anywhere an indirect indication of any event that has the slightest similarity to that indicated by Kautsky."

(Quoted from "Soviet Russia." November 27, 1920.)

It seems that consultation with a text book on geography would be of greater value to Kautsky than the "documents" presented by all the authorities, lately discovered by him.

To make the stories of the bolshevik atrocities appear more credible, Kautsky claims that bloody terror is justified by the Bolshevnik leaders by the pretext of necessity. Quoting Bucharin that "one can denote a country as a mere hell, the more merciless, the more savage, will be its defensive war, and the more bloody will be the proletarian revolution." Kautsky argues that Marx did not display so much mercilessness in defense either in Russia in 1917 or in Budapest. Kautsky misinterprets Bucharin, as before he misinterpreted Marx, for Bucharin does not preach bloodshed and atrocities, he merely analyzes the question and draws the same conclusion. Marx is mistaken when he says that the capitalists were not responsible for the bloodshed in Russia as they did not display a severer terror. Eventually he says that the adventures of Kolchak, Denikin, Wrangel, and others, adventures that have so much workers' blood, do not signify any resistance on the part of the capitalists, and that the Polish offensive did not aim at the destruction of the proletarian State. As far as Hungary is concerned, it is the information which he got from the counter-revolutionaries: even the Germans, which is probably the most reactionary and lying in the world, spoke not as much about the red terror in Hungary as about the general support of the war. The war for Hungary, for instance, is not a war for the "socialists" in the service of capitalists, nor about the desire of whole classes of workers tortured to death in Finland by Mannerheim; he does not say a word about the mass-butchery of the communists in Germany and in Poland by "socialists" in the service of capitalists, nor about the relations of Russia by the allied armies. All that does not mean to Kautsky a resistance on the part of the capitalists. Sheding tears over the fate of the "socialists" persecuted by the Bol shevik, he does not acknowledge that these "socialists" have been efficient tools in the hands of the counter-revolutionists. It was a "socialist," Tzaikowski, who helped to organize the ex-archenemies; "socialists" made up the ministerial cab inets of Denekin and Kolchak: "socialists" called "active," were responsible for the attempts on the lives of the Soviet officials, one of their victims being Lenin. It is a "socialist," Plievendik, who helped the capitalists in their treacherous at tack on Russia; and it was a "socialist," Savinsk, a former engineer of Kerensky, who was among those sentenced to death. To complete this infamous list, it is a "socialist," Kautsky, who supplied the expelling class with the influence over the working masses to lead them astray. The Bolshevnik did not pro secute "socialists," they were as necessary as a bodyguard from the attacks of the capitalists; and it is to their honor that their morale has not been weakened by the action of the comrades to the workers' cause. Neither did the Bolshev nik persecute the intellectuals for merely being intellectuals as Kautsky reports. Even the papers of America know better than to repeat that "the Bolshevnik are killing all the scientists of the world." The general interest in the intellectuals given by Kautsky, is very interesting and very significant, for here in a few lines is fully displayed that vacillating, confused, and contradicting position which is so typical of the effect of the war on humanitarian ideas, Kautsky says: "Humanitarian ideas have been most influential among the intellectuals. They were free from military services longer than the others even after the volunteer system had been replaced by conscription.... as before, the intellectuals oc cupied a privileged position not outside the army, but in its ranks—they served as privileged volunteers, or as officers of the reserve. In this manner the intellectuals longer than others were subjected to the influence of militarism in their thoughts and feelings, and feeling that their class and intellectuals as sociated with militarism became the pioneers of cruelty and violence...."

"What has been said about the intellectuals is true also with regard to capitalist intellectuals, whose humanism is an in conflict first of all with the counter-tendencies of their class." (Page 151).

We might admire the literary skill with which Kautsky, beginning a paragraph with a statement that the intellectuals are the standard bearers of humaneness, smoothly develops it into a conclusion that they are also the pioneers of cruelty. Perhaps he implies that there are two groups of intellectuals: then to be sure there are those who belong to the capitalist class, who hold the privileged positions in the army and are the pioneers of cruelty. We beg to remind Kautsky that in this case we do not constitute a class of their own, but are either to either of the two: capitalist or proletarian, and Kautsky ought to know better than to divide society into intellectuals and non-intellectuals. The Bolsheviks divided society in the same way they divided other people: into those who fought for the proletariat and those who supported the capitalists. Because they supported the capitalists and not for being intellectuals was the second group suppressed.

Kautsky is confused because he can no longer distinguish between a bourgeois and a working man: "It is never possible to draw a sharp line between a bourgeois and a proletarian, arbitrary in the idea of the soviet very flexible for erecting the foundation of the dictatorship of violence." (Page 170).

This is hardly necessary, the Bolshevnik in the definition of a bourgeois. An arbitrary definition: Marx did it long ago. It is strange though that Kautsky has forgotten it.

Kautsky is also mistaken when he claims that, like the intellectuals, the bourgeois have been made the victims of the "blind passion of revenge" for merely being bourgeois; that
they were deprived of all rights including the right to work, and then made to do the most unpleasant, the dirtiest work.

The bourgeois were not denied the right to work. It was those who made the working class of Russia in the class of chaos, refused to work. Kautsky probably forgot about the sabotage of the bourgeois-minded intellectuals, or perhaps he missed that insignificant event while collecting the data on the "revolution" of workers.

Another oppressed class in Russia is the working class. Kautsky proves it: "In the former days there was a feeling of enmity between the government bureaucracy and the capitalist bureaucracy. As a result, we had to secure the rights somewhere, first, sometimes from the other. Now the government and the capitalist bureaucracy are united into one: Such is the conclusive accord of the great socialist transformations that brought about by Bolshevism. This means the most brutal tyranny ever fallen to the lot of Russia...." (Page 199).

Kautsky does not give any examples of the protection afforded the workers by one bureaucracy from the other. He wisely does not attempt to prove the unproveable, for did he try to glance over the history of the proletarian movement, he would find it abundant in examples—proving that he is wrong. Kautsky knows that the strikers in the Lena gold mines, in Siberia, got their rights from the government only in the form of bullets and bayonets. He also knows about thousands of workers being turned out of their homes by the government's own imperialist bureaucracy for rebelling against the capitalist bureaucracy. With a slight effort he could recall countless examples. But Kautsky unlearned that every government is a class government and in most cases a capitalistic government. Some bourgeois liberals divide society into capitalists, workers, and "public," and they insist that the government represents the "public." Kautsky also discovered that the government in capitalistic countries represents this mysterious "public" and that it is not only neutral in the struggles between the workers and their exploiters, but even has a "feeling of enmity" toward the bureaucracy of the "public." But for the present, we must remark, he outstrip the liberals by discovering the fourth class: the before-mentioned "intellectual" class.

A part of the suppression of the people is the suppression of the press. For this, Kautsky blames the naivete of the Bolsheviki. "The justification of the system of suppression of the press," he says, "is rooted in the naive opinion that there exists some kind of an absolute truth and that the communists alone possess it. Such a justification is also based on the belief that all writers are liars by nature and only the communists are the fanatics of truth." As far as truthfulness is concerned we have to repeat after Plutus: "What is truth? There is no absolute truth, there is only a process of learning...." (Page 175).

Lack of space does not allow us to reproduce here in full Kautsky's analysis of the absolute truth, its relation to the bolsheviki's Spanish inquisition and their absolutism from Soviet leaders. We must omit this part, for, to be frank, Kautsky wastes time and energy in vain: the Bolsheviki suppressed revolutions, revolutions suppressed press, not because they were stupid enough to believe in the "absolute truth," but because they were wise enough to understand that in time of civil war the press is a mighty weapon which would serve the reactionaries not for finding the truth but for concentrating their forces and enforcing their position.

A question naturally arises: How could such terrible creatures as the Bolsheviki exist for such a long time? Kautsky easily explains that, "Many revolutionists of the West point with triumph to the fact that Bolshevism is holding power so long—and at a time when these lies are written (May, 1918) it is still very strong. Its critics, on the other hand, predicted its speedy downfall at the very beginning of its domination. It would have come to ruin long ago if the Bolsheviki had remained true to their program: but they gave up one of their positions after the other. They preserved themselves personally, but sacrificed their principles, thereby displaying themselves real opportunists. Bolshevism is victorious in Russia, but Socialism is defeated everywhere."

Did the Bolsheviki give up their position? They assumed power with the view of establishing a proletarian state—dictatorship of the proletariat—for the purpose of suppressing the exploiting powers and abolishing capitalism in society. "The question is not whether the Bolsheviki threatened to betray their ideals, but that they took an anti-Marxian position, not an imperialist one, that they preserved only "the empire personally.""

His remarks that Lenin is trying to imitate Napoleon and that he, like the Corsican, would like "to move his army to foreign lands, and to carry victoriously the banners of his revolution through Europe... are nothing else but quotations from reactionary pamphlets fabricated by the imperialists, attacking Russia.

Kautsky has not been original in his attacks against the Russian Revolution. He repeated what he had followed in the footsteps of the Russian Mensheviki and that later was entirely carried away by his own mis-logic into the camp of the reactionaries. He repeated all he had learned from his discussion on corruption, theft, murder, nationalization of women. Finally he found himself where his friends had arrived nearly a year ago: on the summit of a mountain of lies that they had invented. There was nothing left of which to accuse the Bolsheviki. He had either to stop there and enjoy himself with repetition of what he had already told, or to descend; to resort to compromise, to change his position.

Conditions are forcing him to choose the second course, which he begins on the last pages of his book: "No matter what is the opinion of the Bolsheviki methods, it must be admitted that the fact that the proletarian government not only assumed the power, but in spite of the most difficult circumstances, held it for almost two years, immensely increases self-consciousness among the workers of all countries. By this the Bolsheviki accomplished a great thing for the social revolution, much more than by their emissaries who brought to the proletarian movement more harm than revolutionary influence." (Page 227).

A surprisingly unexpected conclusion, after all that Kautsky has said before! In vain he tries to mask his inconsistency by distinguishing between the influence of the Bolsheviki successes and the harmful work of the Bolsheviki and their emissaries, between Bolshevism proper on one hand and its forms on the other. The distinction is imaginary and artificial. It is false. There would be no successes for Bolsheviki if not for the work of the Bolsheviki.
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The controversy between Kautsky and Lenin reached its logical end. During it Kautsky never took the position of a Marxian socialist though he tried to involve Marx's name several times—and never tried to apply scientific analysis. Vague, general statements, misinterpretations of Marx and Engels, false stories copied from doubtful authorities proved to be a weak weapon against the influence of the Bolsheviki successes. Hence an abrupt change of front. What Kautsky's position will be next will be known.

Of one thing we are confident: Kautsky will no longer succeed in misleading the workers and hampering the emancipation of the proletariat.

Editor's Note: When the above article was written, an English translation of "Terrorism and Communism" was not available. The quotations are from the German edition, translated by the reviewer.

NOTICE

We have been delayed in delivery of the book by Lenin, The State and Revolution, due to an accident in the print shop. However, we have a stock of "The Proletarian Revolution" by the same author and are sending them out as fast as we can fill the orders. We expect to be able to supply "The State and Revolution" by the time this paper reaches our readers. The price of these books is 40c per copy.

"Left-Wing" Communism

We are pleased to announce that about January 15th we will be able to supply "Left-Wing" Communism, An Infantine Disorder, in any quantities desired. This is one of the most important contributions that Lenin has made to revolutionary literature and should be read by everyone who is interested in the movement. We have printed extracts from this work in this issue of The Proletarian. The price will be 50 cents per copy.