They are not Dead, O Comrades!

By Louis C. Fraina

The assassination of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg by hirings of the old regime, and characteristic of the regime, was a brutal act. But the American press, which hysterically condemns the "terror" in Russia, indicates its delight, after perfunctory expressions of regret, purely formal, by smug variations upon the theme—they that take the sword shall perish by the sword. The word, used in the service of Capitalism, evokes approval and applause; the sword, used in the liberating service of Socialism, evokes condemnation and moral attitudes—they that take the sword shall perish by the sword, . . .

The condemnation and moral of reaction and coldly brutally. assassinated eur official murderers were and protected Marshal many and in Russia. there was a reactionary war & the proletarian revolution: they retained in authorityanny units and brought scoundrels. their official murderers were dripping with the blood of slaughtered millions, for a new sword, tempered, was forged a new sword, tempered, -the sword of the proletarian revolution, of the universal war there Universal war there there have been martyrs in every cause, good and bad. It is easier to die greatly than to . . .

Not in their death, but in their life—not in their bodies are in death. Accept our homage, great comrades. who have met death in the new, new life, new energy and courage. We shall avenge their death—not in Germany, it is true, but Germany is merely one part of the universal field of battle; we shall avenge their death by a new and more intense struggle for the Social Revolution. We shall not say farewell, O comrades, for you are still among us; you are still struggling, and you are still in the spirit of our cause.

The flaming beauty of their death is a challenge. It is a challenge to each of us; it is a challenge to Socialism. But the beauty of their death is not all: there have been martyrs in every cause, good and bad. It is easier to die greatly than to live greatly. The beauty of their death is in this, that it was the final measure in the full cup of their devotion to revolutionary Socialism.

Their tribute is a revolutionary tribute—out of their death shall we snatch new life, new energy and courage. We shall avenge their death—not in Germany, it is true, but Germany is merely one part of the universal field of battle; we shall avenge their death by a new and more intense struggle for the Social Revolution. We shall not say farewell, O comrades, for you are still among us; you are still struggling, and you are still in the spirit of our cause.

The flaming beauty of their death is a challenge. It is a challenge to each of us; it is a challenge to Socialism. But the beauty of their death is not all: there have been martyrs in every cause, good and bad. It is easier to die greatly than to live greatly. The beauty of their death is in this, that it was the final measure in the full cup of their devotion to revolutionary Socialism.

... their official murderers were dripping with the blood of slaughtered millions...
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The Future Belongs to the People

The future belongs to the people," declared Liebknecht when he was liberated from prison by the German junks in a frantic effort to stay the Revolution that a few days later flamed throughout Germany. And today, awakened to the truth of his words by his brutal murder and the savage lynching of Rosa Luxemburg, the proletariat of Germany are moving to action and the ultimate conquest of power that will ensure the future for the people.

Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht have fallen. Victims of the desperate savagery of the bourgeois classes, who feel that their power is on the wane. Although they have succeeded in striking down these two valiant fighters, in a physical sense, they have not succeeded in killing their ideas or their words. On the contrary, Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg speak with voices that now echo round the world.

"Socialism does not mean the conveyance of Parliaments and the enactment of laws; it means the overthrow of the ruling classes by the proletariat," said Rosa Luxemburg on her release from prison which took place about the same time as Liebknecht was freed. They both threw themselves into the struggle and around them centered the revolutionary proletariat—"against majority Socialism, which having acted ever since the outbreak of the war to prevent the revolution, now sought to divert it into the blind alley of bourgeois democracy. They both fell, victims to the rage of the reactionary forces, but in falling they sealed the fate of the bourgeoisie and its apologist, majority Socialism.

The Constituent Assembly, the instrument of reaction, has proved true to its mission and Germany faces a bourgeois capitalist government, as both Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg foretold. The bourgeoisie and Majority Socialism have triumphed—at the polls. But the proletariat is massing for action.

"The future belongs to the people!"

All over Germany the workers are conducting mass strikes, strikes against the bourgeoisie and against the majority Socialists. Already these strikes are taking on the character of mass demonstrations; tomorrow these demonstrations will become mass uprisings—these are the revolutionary movements of the proletariat—and then the ballot-box triumph will become ignominious defeat.

At Bremen, Cruckhaven, Dusseldorf, Hamm, Bremen, Rendsburg, throughout the coal-mining regions and the great industrial districts the workers are bringing their economic might to bear, and before this might the proclamations of governments, the ballot-box victories, "the convening of Parliaments and the enactment of laws" are helpless. In revolutions as in peace, or during imperialistic wars the bourgeoisie is helpless once the workers realize their power and decide to use it. The mighty Hindenburg Line—which Allied generals pronounced as almost impregnable—crumbled before the will of the proletariat, almost over night.

The unanimous alliance of "Socialists" with the bourgeois imperialists cannot stand before the revolution. Once they realize clearly. In the first days of the revolution majority Socialism succeeded in deadling the masses. Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg bravely undertook the task of awakening the proletariat to the real situation. But such a task takes time. In Russia where the bourgeoisie was comparatively weak and unorganized this task took over a year. How well Liebknecht, Mehring, Rosa Luxemburg, Klara Zetkin and the Spartacists generally, succeeded, can be judged from the extent of the fighting in Berlin a few weeks ago and by the number of towns throughout Germany, particularly in the north, where the dictatorship of the proletariat is actual in operation. But those sections of the workers which were not reached by the Spartacus Group while Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg were alive, are now rallying to the standard of revolutionary Socialism, awakened to the realities of the situation by their deaths.

The press reports: "Strikes of miners on a great scale to the people. Only by extending to nearly every colliery district in Germany. The movement, which originated as a protest against the killing of Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, is of a political character, directed against the 'Siber-Schöldeman' Government. In Upper Silesia fresh strikes have broken out and nearly 10,000 miners are idle... The employers of the famous Deutsche Kaiser mine have issued a declaration that their action is a demonstration against the government. At Remscheid there is a general strike against the killing of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg. In Berlin the electrical workers, the bank clerks, the street car and subway employees, the telephone operators, the wail of the gas workers and various others are on strike with the result that the city is completely tied up. The German proletariat is beginning to move... The future belongs to the people."

But it is not alone in Germany that the workers are on the march. Britain has over 150,000 workers on strike, with the railroad workers threatening to stop work at any moment; while in Ireland, the biggest industrial center in the country, Belfast, is paralyzed; over 100,000 men and women are out. The city is in darkness and clashes between the strikers and the police and military are of daily occurrence. In Italy the situation is critical; in France mass strikes are looming ahead; in Austria, the press reports that strikes will be solely confined to demands for higher wages or shorter hours the situation would not be remarkable, but even the recent press reports that under the various governments there is no doubt that all these strikes are on a large scale and are symbolic of the awakening of the working masses of a realization of the truth of Karl Liebknecht's words, "The future belongs to the people." This in itself is encouraging, but signs are not wanting that the masses are going beyond the words of Liebknecht's phrase, are carrying the inference—the inference that if the future belongs to the people, the proletariat will conquer power in order to ensure that they will control what belongs to them.

In 1915 Liebknecht replied to John Reed's query regarding the chances of World Revolution by saying: "To my mind nothing else could have come out of the war. He saw clearly then and his vision was not dimmed when he was released from prison. But, unlike many others who foresee revolution as the result of the war, Liebknecht had a very clear idea of how the revolution would operate. He called for a revolt against the government while the war was at its height, and was sent to prison as a result. Released from prison by the approach of the revolution he had called for, he sounded the call to revolution by his words: "The future belongs to the people." Liebknecht's words were not so much a statement of fact as the recognition of the trend of events; they were and are a battle-cry, a call to action to the workers to take over the power and mould the future to their desires.

Bolsheviks

We call the following from the press:

"When the body of Francis Joseph was carried to the Chapel of the Capuchins in Vienna for internment, the commanding officer of the Life Guards, clad in black and steel, thumped with his mailed fist at the barred gate, asking for the body to be admitted. A monk within, according to the rite, asked in Latin: 'Is there anyone at the door?" The officer answered: 'Franciscus Josephus, a poor erring wanderer, is seeking rest.

Throwing open the gates the monk replied: 'Bring him in.' A few moments later: 'Speak again."

Then another officer said in a low voice: "Franciscus Josephus, a poor erring wanderer, is seeking rest."

No answer has been returned to the invitation of the Peace Conference to send delegates to Princes Island because the Soviet government realizes that every to miles the Allies are forced to retreat in Russia will bring the conference between the Russian delegates and the Allied representatives to miles nearer Moscow, and as the Soviet government has spent quite a lot of money in railroad fares when Trotsky and Lenin were gadding about the country and even visiting remote parts of the world, it has decided to wait and put the burden of "expense on the Allies."

It is rumored that Sir Edward Carson is opposed to the establishment of a Soviet in Siberia.

To the list of our special colored Terrors we have now added the Orange Terror—they are breaking windows in Belfast.

Averting the Peace Conference this interesting query presents itself to us: Does five minutes constitute a dictatorship?
T HE German Social Democracy handed in its political resignation on August 4, 1914. On the same day the Socialist International collapsed. All attempts to deny this fact or to conceal it merely served to perpetuate the conditions which brought it about.

This collapse is without a parallel in history. Socialism, which was the alternative which summed up the political life of the various labor parties of the world during the past decade. In Germany especially it has formed the basis of countless programs, discussions and publications. One of the chief purposes of the Social Democracy has been the correct formulation of thought and sentiment with regard to this alternative.

With the outbreak of the war the word became flesh; the alternative changed from a historical tendency to a political situation. Face to face with this alternative the fact that Social Democracy which had been the first to recognize it and bring it to the consciousness of the working class, struck its tails and without a struggle conceded the victory to Imperialism.

Never before, since there have been a class struggle and political parties, has there existed a party which, after fifty years of uninterrupted growth, after the attainment of a pre-eminent position of power, has thus by its own act within twenty-four hours wiped itself off the map. The apologists for this act, Kautsky among them, maintain that the whole duty of Socialists in war is to remain silent. Socialism, they say in effect, is a Socialist foot, is a supporter. The Socialists who have discontinued their struggle for peace, they say, are supporting the war as it turns out, after the outbreak of war Socialists are to be guided by entirely new principles. After war has actually begun the greatest question of all proletarians is: Victory or defeat? Or, as an "Austro-Marxist" explains, a nation, like any other organism, must preserve its existence. In plain language this means: The proletariat has not one fundamental principle as scientific Socialism hertofofore maintained, but two, one for peace and another for war. In time of peace, we are to suppose, the workers are to take cognizance of the class struggle within the nation and of international solidarity in relation to other countries; in time of war, on the other hand, class solidarity becomes the dominant feature of international affairs and the struggle against the workers of other countries dominates the proletarian view of foreign relations.

To the great historic appeal of the Communist Manifesto is added an important amendment and it reads now, according to this revision: "Workers of all lands unite!" and cut one another's throats in war!" To-day, "Down with Russians and French!" to-morrow, "We are brothers all!"

This convenient theory introduces an entirely novel revision of the non-interventionist interpretation of history. Proletarian tactics before the outbreak of war and after must be based on exactly opposite principles. This presupposes that social conditions, the bases of our tactics are fundamentally different in war from what they are in peace. According to the economic interpretation of history as Marx established it, all history is the history of the class struggles. Accord­ing to the new revision, we must add: except in times of war. Now human development has been periodi­call­y marked by wars. Therefore, according to this new theory, social development has gone on according to the following scheme: a period of class struggle marked by class solidarity and conflicts within the nations; then a period of national solidarity and international conflict; then a period of the subjugation of the foundations of society as they exist during peace change in time of war. And again, at the moment of the signing of a treaty of peace, they are restored. This is not, evidently, progress by means of successive "catastrophes"; it is rather progress by means of a series of sonatas. Society develops, we are to suppose, like an iceberg floating down a warm current; its lower portion is melted away, it turns over, and continues this process indefinitely.

Now all the known facts of human history run straight counter to this new theory. They show that there is a necessary and dialectic relation between the class struggle and the war. The class struggle develops into war and war develops into the class struggle; and thus their essential unity is proved. It was so in the medieval cities, in the wars of the Reforma­tion, in the Flemish wars of liberation, in the French Revolution, in the American Rebellion, in the Paris Commune, and in the Russian uprising in 1905. [And now in 1917, in Russia, again.]

Moreover, theoretically this new idea leaves one stone of the Marxian doctrine on another. If, as Marx supposed, neither war nor the class struggle falls from heaven, but both arise from deep social-economic causes, then they cannot disappear periodically unless their causes also go up in vapor. Now the proletarian class struggle is a necessary aspect of the wage system. But during the war the wage system does not tend to disappear. On the contrary, the aspects of it which give rise to the struggle of the class become especially prominent. Speculation, the founding of new companies to carry on war industries, military dictatorship.

If, then, the causes of the class struggle are multiplied, strengthened, during war how can their inevitable result be supposed to go out of existence? Conversely, wars are at the present time a result of the competition of various capitalist expansion. Now, these two forces are not operative only while the greatest advance of the proletariat is in peace as well as is precisely in time of peace that they influence our life in such a way as to make the outbreak of war inevitable. For war is, as Kautsky loves to quote from Clausewitz, "the continuation of politics by other means." And the imperialist phase of capitalist rule, through competitive building of armaments, has made peace illusory, for it has placed us regularly under military dictatorship and has thereby made war permanent.

Therefore our revised economic interpretation of history leads to a dilemma. Our new revisionists are between the devil and the sea. Either the class struggle persists in war as the chief life-condition of the proletariat and the declaration of class harmony by Socialist leaders is a crime against the working class; or carrying on the class struggle in time of peace is a crime against the "interests of the nation" and the "security of the fatherland." Either the International must remain a heap of ruins after the war or its restoration will take place on the basis of the class struggle from which it took its rise in the first place. It will not reappear between its actions in the past and the beginning of hostilities. Ready to do everybody's bidding, this theory assures us that the present practice of our party is in the most beautiful harmony with our past theories. The delightfully adaptable theory is likewise ready and willing to justify the present position of International Socialism in reference to its past. The International treated only the question of the prevention of war. But now, "war is a fact," and, as it turns out, after the outbreak of war Socialists are to be guided by entirely new principles. After war has actually begun the greatest question of all proletarians is: Victory or defeat? Or, as an "Austro-Marxist" explains, a nation, like any other organism, must preserve its existence. In plain language this means: The proletariat has not one fundamental principle as scientific Socialism hertofofore maintained, but two, one for peace and another for war. In time of peace, we are to suppose, the workers are to take cognizance of the class struggle within the nation and of international solidarity in relation to other countries; in time of war, on the other hand, class solidarity becomes the dominant feature of international affairs and the struggle against the workers of other countries dominates the proletarian view of foreign relations.

To the great historic appeal of the Communist Manifesto is added an important amendment and it reads now, according to this revision: "Workers of all lands unite!" and cut one another's throats in war!" To-day, "Down with Russians and French!" to-morrow, "We are brothers all!"

This convenient theory introduces an entirely novel revision of the non-interventionist interpretation of history. Proletarian tactics before the outbreak of war and after must be based on exactly opposite principles. This presupposes that social conditions, the bases of our tactics are fundamentally different in war from what they are in peace. According to the economic interpretation of history as Marx established it, all history is the history of the class struggles. Accord­ing to the new revision, we must add: except in times of war. Now human development has been periodi­cal­ly marked by wars. Therefore, according to this new theory, social development has gone on according to the following scheme: a period of class struggle marked by class solidarity and conflicts within the nations; then a period of national solidarity and international conflict; then a period of the subjugation of the foundations of society as they exist during peace change in time of war. And again, at the moment of the signing of a treaty of peace, they are restored. This is not, evidently, progress by means of successive "catastrophes"; it is rather progress by means of a series of sonatas. Society develops, we are to suppose, like an iceberg floating down a warm current; its lower portion is melted away, it turns over, and continues this process indefinitely.

Now all the known facts of human history run straight counter to this new theory. They show that there is a necessary and dialectic relation between the class struggle and the war. The class struggle develops into war and war develops into the class struggle; and thus their essential unity is proved. It was so in the medieval cities, in the wars of the Reforma­tion, in the Flemish wars of liberation, in the French Revolution, in the American Rebellion, in the Paris Commune, and in the Russian uprising in 1905. [And now in 1917, in Russia, again.]

Moreover, theoretically this new idea leaves one stone of the Marxian doctrine on another. If, as Marx supposed, neither war nor the class struggle falls from heaven, but both arise from deep social-economic causes, then they cannot disappear periodically unless their causes also go up in vapor. Now the proletarian class struggle is a necessary aspect of the wage system. But during the war the wage system does not tend to disappear. On the contrary, the aspects of it which give rise to the struggle of the class become especially prominent. Speculation, the founding of new companies to carry on war industries, military dictatorship.

If, then, the causes of the class struggle are multiplied, strengthened, during war how can their inevitable result be supposed to go out of existence? Conversely, wars are at the present time a result of the competition of various capitalist expansion. Now, these two forces are not operative only while the greatest advance of the proletariat is in peace as well as is precisely in time of peace that they influence our life in such a way as to make the outbreak of war inevitable. For war is, as Kautsky loves to quote from Clausewitz, "the continuation of politics by other means." And the imperialist phase of capitalist rule, through competitive building of armaments, has made peace illusory, for it has placed us regularly under military dictatorship and has thereby made war permanent.

Therefore our revised economic interpretation of history leads to a dilemma. Our new revisionists are between the devil and the sea. Either the class struggle persists in war as the chief life-condition of the proletariat and the declaration of class harmony by Socialist leaders is a crime against the working class; or carrying on the class struggle in time of peace is a crime against the "interests of the nation" and the "security of the fatherland." Either the International must remain a heap of ruins after the war or its restoration will take place on the basis of the class struggle from which it took its rise in the first place. It will not reappear between its actions in the past and the beginning of hostilities. Ready to do everybody's bidding, this theory assures us that the present practice of our party is in the most beautiful harmony with
The Communist Party of Germany

In No. 29 of the Moscow Pravda, Karl Radek, the Bolshevik envoy to Germany, gives interesting information about the disorganization of the German Social Democratic parties during the war and about the revolutionary elements which formed about the end of last year—the Spartacus party.

Radek points out that even before the war German Marxism divided into two groups: the so-called centre, led by Kautsky, Hilferding, Ebert, Haase and Ledebour; and the so-called left radicals, led by Kien, Rosa Luxemburg, Panneculet, Talheimer, Westmeier and Zetkin.

However, the line which divided the centre and the left of the German Social-Democracy before the war was not clear to the other sections of the International. Many were of the opinion that there really were no serious differences on principles between the centre and the left. Many comrades thought that the left are going too far in their attacks on the centre.

But then the war broke out and "the majority of the German Social-Democracy openly deserted to German Imperialism, covering up the attack of German Imperialism by the slogan of national defense. Nine tenths of the parliamentary representatives of the so-called centre were among the traitors. A handful remained formally true to the old principles, but in reality they did not oppose Imperialism, defending those old foundations and forms of life, which the unity of the party, together with its principles with betrayal of Sociology is nothing else than treason. The German Social-Democracy failed, and with it failed the centre, whose political leader, deputy Haase, read on the 4th of August the famous declaration in the Reichstag about the defense of the fatherland. And the ideological leader of the centre, Kautsky, in his first message to the workers after this collapse of German Socialism found only words of justification for what had happened and urged unity.

"Precisely at this time it became clear that the work of the left radicals and their struggle against the decayed Kautskianism was not in vain, although before the war they could not convince the labor masses of the menace of Imperialism and of the necessity of revolutionary struggle. But they have created a group of the most mutilated from the moment of the most distressing disappointment clearly saw ahead of them the road of the struggle, understood the cause of the collapse and knew the way out of it. Already at the end of August, 1914, the Berlin left in its official organ as well as the Bremen and Hamburg groups had become active."

"Liebknecht's vote against war credits on November 21, 1914, was the first open call addressed to the masses. The workers hardly moved, and the centre party tried to suppress every movement, claiming that it was premature and pointing out the danger of a split. Liebknecht's action was taken by the centre as a slap directed at it. The centre tried to comprom­mise Liebknecht in the eyes of the masses, describing him as a selfish man who wants to be in the limelight. But the masses of workers understood the significance of the act of November 21 and began to close their ranks around Karl Liebknecht. The Bremen group came in on the Bremen Burger Zeitung not only as a militant policy with regard to current events, but interpreted the theoretical bankruptcy of the Interna­tional and other events, in spite of the opposition of the centre and the strict censorship. The small Liebknecht Kreis came on a persistent struggle for revolu­tionary Marxism."

"The German disorganized groups found a centre abroad in the London Tageszeitung which gets all the news of the German government. In May, 1915, Liebknecht's group managed to publish The International, whose appearance marked the end of the first period of the Communist Party of Germany."

"The Zimmerwald conference, however, shows that it was easier to plan correct theoretical tactics than to actually carry them out. The masses were awaken­ed, but did not yet act, and the centre were therefore, still dominant. The delegation of the "International" group at the Zimmerwald conference, in spite of their criticism of the centrists, at the final vote acted together with them."

"The arrest of Liebknecht, who was opposed to this indecisive policy, who demanded relentless separation from the centrists, from the centre, from the Bremen group, from the bulk of the Socialists, from the communists, from the Spartacus party, from the centre, from the offshoots of the centre, from the whole of the centre, from the centre, from the centre that Liebknecht, who, being opposed to a separation from the centrists, could not give a clear signal for a split in the centre party, for a separation from the centre party."

"But in spite of its tactical mistakes the group "Inter­national" in all open acts functioned as the most resolute factor. This group was at the head of the labor masses as soon as food rose, strikes and polit­i­cal demonstrations began. And during this struggle this group fell under the influence of the consistent propaganda of the Bremen Arbeitsblatt."

"Nevertheless, the desire not to break with the Indep­endentists still won in the group "International," although in the secret letters to its organizations the group speaks of the unity with the pacifist centrists as a temporary necessity, in view of the fact that the group existed illegally, while the centrists had some legal standing. The participation of the Spartacus group in the Independent party forced the radical elements of the centre around the Arbeitsblatt."

The conference of the Spartacus group which was held in the middle of October last decided to separate from the Independents and to unite all left Socialist organizations into a Communist party, the Spartacus party.

"The German Communists began their existence as a united party. They had a sufficient number of leaders comprehending theoretically the world situa­tion and they had a sufficient number of splendid and advanced workers who had become hardened in the illegal struggle of four years..."

"In the Communist party of Germany we salute an organization with which the Russian Communists are bound by common aims, common views and by the decision to help one another. From the ranks of this Communist party will in the future come the leaders of the German labor state."

The Left Wing in the American Socialist Party

By Nicholas I. Houwich

"United" in the social democratic parties, stand now arrayed against each other on opposite sides of the barricades, arms in hands,—one party defending the revolutionary going on, obtained by the proletariat and clearing, as it were, the road to further victories over world Imperialism; while the others function in the infamous and shameless role of the defenders of Imperialism and the bourgeoisie.

And, precisely the fact, that in the two countries where the revolution is in action, where the proletariat has dealt an especially strong blow at the domination of the bourgeoisie,—the split between the "left" and the "right" phalanxes of the at the one time united Socialists has an open effect. This fact is deeply significant. This fact destroys the fetish that a "united" Socialist Party was the all important necessity and on the contrary proves that such an "unlawful union" of elements fundamentally different in an "united" party is the chief weakness of the Socialist movement and is a continual burden on the revolutionary wing of the party. The split in the Socialist parties of Russia and Germany, did not weaken, but on the contrary, strengthened the left wing and made it capable of revolutionary actions.

The same applies to the other Socialist parties.

The war has dealt the first mighty blow at the structure of the Second International. Now before the social builders and architects of the future lies the hard, but nevertheless inevitable, task of completing the process of destruction and building up the ruins the firmer and more stable structure of the Third International.

The same task lies before the American Socialist Party, and as the first step towards the realization of this task I heartily greet the creation within its ranks— the bearer of the revolutionary message—the left wing of the party.

The timely creation of this wing and its successful growth will be the guarantee that at the proper moment the party will be enabled to reach the accomplishment of the task imposed upon it by history and will be tied hand and foot firmly to the forces of opportunism or the collaboration of elements which are no longer Socialist.
THE international Socialist and working class movements the world over have in the course of the war split into three groups. Whoever under the name of war against imperialism analyzed them closely and still deserts the fight for real active internationalism, is a weakening and a fraud.

1.—Social-patriots, that is, Socialists in words and opportunists, of compromise with the social-patriots. These people swear by dodges to get out of the difficulty. Its center is for union and actual internationalism. These people speak by all that is holy that they are Marxists, that they are internationalists, that they are for peace, for exerting pressure upon the government, for presenting all sorts of demands that show the desire of the nation for peace, for being out on Potsdam and wanting without annexations and they want peace with the social-patriots. The center is for union and against any sort of sich. The center is the heaven of petty bourgeoisie, of imperialist opportunism, of compromise with the social-patriots. The fact is that the center is not convinced of the necessity of a revolution against the government of its own country: it does not preach that kind of revolution; it does not wage an incessant fight for the revolution, and it resists to the lowest, super-Marxian dodgers, to bourgeois patriotism.

The social patriots are the enemies of our class, they are bourgeois in the midst of the labor movement. They represent layers of the working class which have been practically bought by the bourgeoisie through better wages, positions of honor, etc., and which help its bourgeoisie to exploit and oppress smaller and weaker nations, and take part in the division of capitalistic spoils.

The members of the center group are routine workers, eaten up by the gaugeness of legality, corrupted by the parliamentary comedy, bureaucrats accustomed to nice sincerities and steady jobs. Histo-rically and economically, they do not represent any special stratum of society; they only represent the transition from the old fashioned labor movement as it was from 1872 to 1914, which rendered inestimable services to the proletariat through its slow, continuous systematic work of organization in a large, very large field, to the new movement which was objectively necessary at the time of the first world-wide war of Imperialism, and which has inaugurated the social-revolutionary era.

The main leader and representative of the center is the very askew figure of the Second International (from 1899 to 1914), who has been responsible for the complete downfall of Marxism, who has shown an unheard-of lack of principles and the most pitiful hesitancy and betrayed the cause since August, 1914.

Among the centrists are Kautsky, Haase, Ledebour, and the so-called center party in the Reichstag; in France, Louget, Pressman and the so-called minor-party; in England, Philip Snowden, Ramsay MacDonald and other leaders of the Independent Labor Party, and a part of the British Socialist Party; Morris Hill-Louis and many others in the United States; Tarut, Treves, Modigliani and others in Italy, Robert Grimm and others in Switzerland; Victor Adler & Co. in Austria; the Mensheviks, Axelrod, Martov, Cheidze, Tseitlin and others in Russia.

It goes without saying that some individual members of those groups go uncomprehendingly from social-patriotism and want to fight our enemies. Every Marxist knows, however, that classes retain their character regardless of the free migration of people from one group to another, in spite of all the efforts which are made to blend class or harmonize tendencies.

3.—The third, truly internationalist, is most accurately represented by the so-called "Zimmerwald Left." It is characterized by its complete schism from the social-patriots and the centrists. It has been waging relentless war against Imperialists, for the Gobierno men and its own imperialistic bourgeoisie. Its motto is: "Our worst enemy is at home." It has fought ruthlessly the nice and respectable social-patriots' sophistry, for those people who are social patriots in words are bourgeois pacsists in deeds: bourgeois pacifists dream of an everlasting peace which shall not be preceded by the overthrow of capitalist domination. They have been employing every form of sophistry to demonstrate the impossibility, the inopportunities of keeping up the proletarian class struggle or of starting a proletarian Social Revolution in connection with the present war.

The members of this group in Germany are known as the Spartacists or International Group, to which Karl Liebknecht belongs. Karl Liebknecht is the best known representative of that tendency and of the new real, proletarian international.

Karl Liebknecht called upon the workingmen and soldiers of Germany to turn their guns upon their own government. Karl Liebknecht did that openly from the tribune of parliament, the Reichstag. Then he went over to the bourgeois camp. He betrayed his class or harmonized tendencies, to the workers, to the toiling masses, to the world, for it was his greatest task to turn the workers, to the world, for it was his greatest task to turn the workers, and all his comrades were murdered at the very moment that the war was about to sweep all over the European continent.

Karl Liebknecht attacked mercilessly in his speeches and his writings not only the Plehervaks and the Pot- rozels of Germany (Scheidemann, Legien, David, etc.), but also the centrists of Germany, the German Chiesides and Tseretelle, men like Kautsky, Haase, Ledebour and others.

Karl Liebknecht and his friend, Ceto Ruhm, side among 110 Socialists deputies in the Reichstag, disregarded the party discipline, destroyed the harmonious union with the centrists and the chauvinists, and fought everybody. Liebknecht alone really represents Socialism, the proletarian cause, the proletarian revolution. The rest of the German Social Democracy, to quote the apt words of Rosa Luxembourg, also a member and leader of the Spartacist Group, is "a stinking carrion."
Tchitcherine's Report to the Fifth Soviet Congress, July, 1918

Translated from the De Nieuwe Tijd, the Dutch left wing Socialist magazine, by B. Auerhaam.

II

The relations of Russia to the states of Central Europe were determined by the peace treaty of Brest-Litovsk, and the principal part of our policy in relation to Germany was to execute this treaty.

The Imperial Germans, after undecisive agreements and the imperfection of the treaty of Brest encouraged the exponent of the annexationist policy to develop this policy still further, with regard to Russia.

The treaty of Brest is not distinct as to the boundaries of the territory occupied by Germany, and it is impossible to determine the moment of the ending of the treaty all further progress should cease. The treaty leaves the situation of territories occupied by Germany an open question. The territory of the Ukraine is described, and the question of the extension of the territory occupied by Germany was even stated as a question of the occupation of the territory occupied by Germany.

The simplest method was to accept a fictitious right of self-determination in the regions occupied by Germany. In fact, we had already received a report concerning the "self-determination" of Dvinsk (on the railroad from Warsaw to Petrograd and from Riga to Moscow, Warsaw in Poland and Riga in Courland being under German control) who desired to become German. We also heard from the delegation in the White Russian regions (the governments of Grodno, Vilna, Vitebsk, Smolensk, Mogilef and Minsk—the region between Warsaw to a short distance from Moscow) that they wished to withdraw from the sovereignty of Russia.

Section 7 of the treaty of Brest provides that a special commission determine the boundaries of those regions that withdrew from Russia. When this commission convened at Pskow (between Dvinsk and Petrograd) it was empowered, by the consent of both governments, to determine definitely the boundaries of the territories occupied by Germany. However, after the approval of this commission, their work was interrupted, and has not been continued since.

The following proposition was submitted by the Germans: that the basis for the right of self-determination in the regions occupied by Germany, should be the declaration of the people of the occupied regions as to their desire to be annexed to Germany. Every landowner or landlord, whose land was him parcel of the German-Russian occupation, should have the privilege of deciding to which side (Germany or our side) his property should belong in the future.

The solution of this question of principle was referred to Berlin, where the Political Commission (a mixed commission of Soviet representatives and Germans) will be occupied with it.

The position of the occupied regions is not as yet clear. The Germans, who in the first months after the occupation of Poland, expected that the railroad employees would retain their former wages, and enjoy all advantages as to the division of the necessities of life, and that malicious agitators would be spreading rumors among the employees that all those who continued their work under German occupation would lose their employment, their pension, and all their savings when later the new occupied territories were restored to Russia. Therefore, the German government requested us to send a public notice to the occupied districts containing the information that such rumors were baseless and that the German government recommended that the railroad employees continue with their work. However, we found upon inquiry that the work of the railroad employees were reduced fifty per cent, and that these employees and all other officers were subjected to all kinds of harassing measures, so that they did not enjoy any advantage in regard to the necessities of life.

We informed the German government that we could not take any part in the responsibility of the administration of the occupied district as long as the German government insisted upon depriving all Soviet citizens and continuing to destroy the truces of the Soviet government. The question of the internal administration of the occupied regions had also to be referred to the Political Commission.

The military advance of the Germans after the treaty of Brest-Litovsk occurred in two directions: in Finland and in the Ukraine. After the Russian revolts, the German government proposed as a basis for an agreement with Finland: the return of the town of Ipo. upon the condition that this place and the district Ravoli (on the railroad, exactly N. W. of Petrograd) in the vicinity of Bjerwost should not be enforced by the Russians, and upon the condition that we abandon the western part of the Murman regions, which the Germans and Finns had invaded, and Finland. Our acceptance of this as a basis for an agreement led to the discontinuation of the critical situation of May. However, notwithstanding this, on the 15th of June, there was delivered to our representative Woszofski in Stockholm a declaration from the land owners of Esthonia and Courland concerning the independence of these provinces.

After that, the meetings of the landowners and barons were held in Esthonia and Courland, and in Riga, the capital of Latvia. On April 28th, or May 1st, the inhabitants of Esthonia, on March 28th, decided on the conclusion of the congresses. These congresses were held in Riga and Reval on April 9-10, and they accepted the declaration as to the separation from Russia. On the 19th of May, our representative Joffe received notice to that effect through the office of the German Minister of Foreign Affairs.

In this note of May 28th, addressed to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Joffe called attention to the fact that the action taken in Riga and Reval was in reality but the expression of the demands of the people of Courland and Esthonia that only by a real and general unhaunted expression of the will of the people, under the condition of the independence of the army of occupation, could the basis of self determination and separation be decided.

The Russian Government was but lately confronted with the question of the division of the territory of the latter part of April and the beginning of May, containing pressing inquiries as to their exact intentions in relation to Fort Ipo, resulted in the conclusion of negotiations.

(Note: Fort Ipo is one of those forts which threaten Petrograd.

Despite the negotiations, the Finnish troops demanded the immediate surrender of Fort Ipo, and the fortress was destroyed by the retreating Russian troops, the German government proposed as a basis for an agreement with Finland: the return of the town of Ipo. upon the condition that this place and the district Ravoli (on the railroad, exactly N. W. of Petrograd) in the vicinity of Bjerwost should not be enforced by the Russians, and upon the condition that we abandon the western part of the Murman regions, which the Germans and Finns had invaded, and Finland. Our acceptance of this as a basis for an agreement led to the discontinuation of the critical situation of May. However, notwithstanding this, on the 15th of June, there was delivered to our representative Woszofski in Stockholm a declaration from the land owners of Esthonia and Courland concerning the independence of these provinces. After that, the meetings of the landowners and barons were held in Esthonia and Courland, and in Riga, the capital of Latvia. On April 28th, or May 1st, the inhabitants of Esthonia, on March 28th, decided on the conclusion of the congresses. These congresses were held in Riga and Reval on April 9-10, and they accepted the declaration as to the separation from Russia. On the 19th of May, our representative Joffe received notice to that effect through the office of the German Minister of Foreign Affairs.

In this note of May 28th, addressed to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Joffe called attention to the fact that the action taken in Riga and Reval was in reality but the expression of the demands of the people of Courland and Esthonia that only by a real and general unhaunted expression of the will of the people, under the condition of the independence of the army of occupation, could the basis of self determination and separation be decided.

The Russian Government was but lately confronted with the question of the division of the territory of the latter part of April and the beginning of May, containing pressing inquiries as to their exact intentions in relation to Fort Ipo, resulted in the conclusion of negotiations.
of the independent Soviet Republic of Ukraine. After the German troops had occupied all points belonging to the industrial region of North Caucasus (in the direction of Moscow and even occupied the southern part of the Russian governments of Tversk and Woronesj)." The question of determining a line of demarcation on the Ukrainian front, which would determine the limits of the German advance, was quite acute. We knew that Germany first demanded the occupation of some districts, but later only the occupation of the Waloei district, with the important strategic railroad junction of Woronesj. The German government cherished the urgent wish that the negotiations at Tversk (halfway between Moscow and Kiev), where our delegations rapidly departed. The peace delegation of the Ukraine came to Woronesj to negotiate the demarcation, but the constant hostilities made it impossible for the delegates to meet. At this time, the Kief Rada was displaced by the government of Skoropadski, and Germany insisted that the negotiations be transferred to Kief, here they commenced on May 22nd. The first question to be acted upon was the question of an armistice. The most important question, however, was the determination of a line of demarcation. We had repeatedly in the past made the question of determination of the boundaries of the Ukraine a topic for discussion, as we considered this matter as most important, having to reckon with far reaching consequences in case of an unfavorable solution. On March 30, we received a telegram from the German assistant secretary Busche, in answer to our queries, explaining that the circumference of the Ukraine was temporarily determined upon, nine governments being added to the Ukraine. When the negotiations concerning an armistice started, the Ukrainians demanded much more. They demanded that the line of demarcation be extended further to the North and to the East, so that they occupy eight more districts. They wanted especially the government of Woronesj, making fourteen districts, with a population of three million, to be given them. The extreme moment in the negotiations occurred simultaneously with the beginning of the work of the joint commission in Berlin, with the critical moment upon the Black Sea, when Germany demanded that the Russian fleet from Novorossiisk to Sebastopol. The Germans did not limit their military forces to the nine governments added to the Ukraine on March 30th, but occupied Taganrog and Rostof, on the Don (both of the Sea of Azov). Their fleet was stationed at Batarsk (opposite Rostof) upon the Black Sea. The decision would be reached by a vote of the nine governments. The German government also informed us of the contents of a manifesto of a government of the Union of Mountain Tribes of North Caucasus, with the proclamation of their independence, while in reality, North Caucasus was in the hands of the adherents of Soviet Russia, who rejected the proposition. The independent Georgians permitted Germany to transport their troops onto the Black Sea, which opened the way to Baku, on the Caspian Sea, for Germany. The Turkish troops were, as we know, in the Armenian regions, in the beginning of July, 1918, where a strong Armenian movement was operating against them. The question of the Caucasus was placed upon the order of the day of the Political Commission convened at Berlin (German and Soviet representatives). The question of economic relations between Germany and Russia was determined by our obligations, caused by necessity of the liquidation of losses through Carlistic war measures and through the social legislation of the Cau­ casus in revolution in regard to German property in Russia, and on the other side by the necessity for the creation of mutual economic relations in both countries. The treaty of Brest-Litovsk obligated us to pay indemnity for the losses of German citizens during the war through the liquidation of their undertakings, or through the cessation of payments of dividends and pensions. The execution of these obligations demanded from us the creation of a department that should investigate the German claims. This department is now in existence as the Liquidation Depart­ ment of the Peoples Commissariat of Trade and Indus­ tries, and functions with success. If, therefore, the settlement of such obligations, caused by the Carlistic war measures, occurs less rapidly than we wish, which gives the German government occasion for constant complaints, then this is not caused by the partial defects of our department alone (these defects are new eliminated), but by the fact that the Russian bourgeoisie strives to take advantage of our obligations to the Central Powers, and en­ dures by all kinds of fictitious contracts to make de­ mands upon us. The question of payments of inter­ est on old loans, dividends, etc. cannot be separated from the question of the occupation of the Black Sea, which is dependent upon our decisions. The occupation can only be arranged by social legislation, and, likewise cannot be separated from our duty to support our prisoners of war in Germany. Our social legislation endeavors to unite the principal sources of the economic life of the country and place them in the hands of the Workers' and Peas­ ants' Soviet. Many of these sources are in the hands of foreign subjects. If we nationalize these branches of industry, then we are compelled to com­ pensate the former owners. The German workers and local Soviets do not always understand that the interests of the State of Workers and Peasants does not demand the indiscriminate confiscation of every­ thing. The occupation of such industries as are necessary for us from the standpoint of the general economic plans of the state. The indiscriminate nationalization of all possible kinds of moving picture houses and apothecaries, the requisition of foreign property without plan, without a direct necessity, caused the State of Workers and Peasants to pay damages which run into hundreds of millions. To Be Continued
Prospects of the Proletarian Dictatorship

By Richard Hansen

The recent white guard victory in Berlin is a Pyrrhic victory. One more like it and they are lost. All the causes of the Revolution continue at hand. The support and the struggle which the moderate Socialists are becoming loud about—of course, of organizing for the final act of seizing power—for the complete and irreversible destruction of the German bourgeoisie, to keep the working men of the town at a safe distance from the meeting hall of the Imperial Constituent Assembly! The dangers of prompt dissolution as it took place in a great city like Petrograd to which it could happen in Berlin or Hamburg—are greatly diminished.

The Bolsheviks are so much pleased with the Weimar affair, that they even dream of choosing for their spokesman the well known Junker Herr Naumann in place of the millions of men.

The Moscow Conference. So they are now in Germany, preparing for a real Constituent Assembly of the bourgeoisie.

It is interest to note, that the Assembly is going to meet in Weimar—a small city of about 30,000 inhabitants. The German bourgeoisie is not going to take chances. The place must be safe enough. Women in widows' weeds, who were sitting sadly about the chances of world revolution? "nothing can come out of the camp; even the automobile companies in Germany, of which Karl Liebknecht was the president, are rising against it, as well as liberal and counter-revolutionists. Their silent lips are calling all the revolution of the world upon their peoples, the international class is still not convinced that this War is the war for the complete and irrevocable destruction of the capitalist state, for the setting up of Proletarian Dictatorship—the only possible way of solving the great question of this decisive period of human history—transition from Capitalism to Socialism—as it was pointed out by Karl Marx and Engels after the French Revolution of 1838-31 and the Paris Commune of 1871, and as it has been accomplished in practice on a very large scale in Russia with such a glorious success.

The tragic end of Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg was destined to bring the Proletarian Revolution instead of interfering with it, as the counter-revolutionists apparently expected. They were to be two—most bitter, most conspicuous of a multitude army. Their silent lips are calling all the German and all of the country to rise up and to make an end of the capitalist regime of blood and starvation. This eloquent and solemn call is irresistible. Their uncompromising spirit, the consistency of their words and deeds will remain as a bright inheritance to the world, as well as to the future generations of Social Democracy.

Karl Liebknecht's Words

When I was in Berlin in December, 1915, I went to visit Karl Liebknecht. He had an office in a district Social Democratic headquarters in the poorer section of the city—a tenement, I remember, which looked very like Washington Street in Boston. It was a large, bare room, the walls hung with pictures of Bebel and the elder Liebknecht, and memorials of historic events in the great history of the German Social Democracy.

Liebknecht sat at a table in the middle of the room, the lower half of his face faintly illuminated by a green-shaded lamp. He wore a semi-military coat buttoned up to the neck. There were dark circles under his eyes, and the very slightly ironical look about him. His hand moved nervously with a paper-cutter as he talked; his eyes never left mine. His face was dark and full—almost round—with a slight beard.

The door to the inner hall had been left open. It was empty, except for two or three forlorn-looking women and widows' wees, who were sitting sad and motionless on chairs along the wall, waiting for some official of the branch on business connected with death-benefits.


I had not seen the statement which Liebknecht had sent out to Holland, and which was even then being published all over the world, especially by the Allied capitalist press—then calling him "the bravest of the brave." So it was more or less natural that I should ask him whether his attitude of extreme hostility to the War and the Government was still the same.

"There is no other attitude for a Social Democrat to take," he said, with a faint smile of amusement. "As each problem of capitalist aggression arises, it must be met full and squarely. In spite of the pro­ digious influence brought to bear in all countries of the world upon their peoples, the international working-class is rising against it. The capitalist state, for the setting up of Proletarian Dictatorship—the only possible way of solving the great question of this decisive period of human history—transition from Capitalism to Socialism—as it was pointed out by Karl Marx and Engels after the French Revolution of 1838-31 and the Paris Commune of 1871, and as it has been accomplished in practice on a very large scale in Russia with such a glorious success.

The army of Spartacists have grown since these brutal murders took place. They have taken possession of Bremen and Cuxhaven (naval base on North Sea). They are reported to be dangerously strong and active in Berlin and Hamburg.

The world is moving on with an amazing velocity—on toward Bolshevism, toward Proletarian Dictatorship.