



THE CLASS STRUGGLE

Devoted to International Socialism

Vol. III

MAY, 1919

No. 2

Articles by:

Lenin

Gorky

Mehring

Bukharin

Rappaport (Paris)

August Strindberg

Katayama

M. P. Price, etc.

Also

FACSIMILES OF SOVIET CIRCULARS

issued to Foreign Soldiers on Russian Soil

Price, 25 Cents

SOCIALIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY

243 55th STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y.

THE CLASS STRUGGLE

Vol. III

MAY, 1919

No. 2

CONTENTS

	Page
The First of May, 1919.—By L.....	129—131
Church and School in the Soviet Republic.—By N. Bukharin	131—139
What the Under-Class Answers to the Most Impressive Phrases of the Upper-Class.—By August Strindberg	139—144
The Truth About the Allied Intervention in Russia.—By Philips Price.....	145—154
Berne—A Post-Mortem Conference.—By Ludwig Lore	155—162
Russian Tale.—By Maxim Gorky.....	162—165
Japan and China.—By Sen Katayama.....	165—172
Can the Exploited and the Exploiter Be Equals.—By Nikolai Lenin	172—178
Socialism and the League of Nations.—By Maurice Sugar	178—187
The Logic of Insanity.—By Charles Rappaport.....	187—192
An Unusual Friendship.—By Franz Mehring.....	192—200
Bankruptcy or Revolution—Which?—By André A. Courland	200—208
Party Discussion	209—216
Manifesto and Program of the "Left Wing" Section, Greater New York.	
Editorials	217—236
Communism in Hungary.—The Left Wing.—Eugene V. Debs, a Revolutionist.—The Representative of a Free Working Class.—Mass Strikes.—Archangel, a Hopeful Sign.	
Documents	237—246
Maxim Gorky's Confession.—A Letter from Friedrich Adler.—The International of Youth.—Manifesto by the Soviet of Railway, Petrograd.—From the Commissariat of Labor to all Workers.—Facsimiles of Soviet Circulars issued to Foreign Soldiers on Russian Soil.....	247—255
The Mystery Solved	256

The Co-Operative Press



15 Spruce St., New York

THE CLASS STRUGGLE

Devoted to International Socialism

PUBLISHED BY

The Socialist Publication Society, 243 55th Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Issued Every Two Months—25¢ a Copy; \$1.50 a Year

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

VOL. III

MAY, 1919

No. 2

The First of May, 1919

Ever since the first day of May was adopted by the International Congress of Paris in 1889 as the International Socialist holiday it has been the milestone from which the class-conscious labor movement has looked backward over another year of activity to gage the work it had accomplished. On that day workingmen and children, in every civilized nation in the world lined up in impressive demonstrations to demand from a capitalist world greater political and industrial freedom and better conditions of livelihood. It was conceived particularly as an international demand for an 8-hour day, for social legislation, for equal suffrage for men and women, and as a protest against militarism and war. In most countries the first of May was celebrated as a workers' holiday. On this day the class-conscious workingmen and women asserted, if only for a day, their freedom from capitalist domination. And by this token it signified to them the great international brotherhood of the working-class, fighting for liberation from capitalist oppression.

Then came the war, and the first of May became a day of sorrow. May 1, 1915, was one of the most tragic days in the history of the International. Instead of brotherhood there was mass murder and hatred, in the place of anti-militaristic propaganda there were war-credits, in the place of better industrial conditions had come industrial slavery, political freedom had made way for political oppression. But events move swiftly in war times, and a year later the black despair of that first May Day had given place to a new, more hopeful spirit. The neutral countries once more celebrated their proletarian holiday with

something of the old hopefulness of spirit. In England there were impressive May Day demonstrations, and even in Germany, France and Austria the radical minorities arranged protest-demonstrations against the war that were disrupted by police and military forces. Karl Liebknecht delivered his famous address on the Potsdamer Platz. All over Europe hundreds of arrests attested to the fact that the international proletariat was alive, that the movement was recovering from the stunning blow it had received.

The first day of May, 1917, was a day of hope reborn. Only a few short weeks before the Czar had been driven from his throne. Russia, a new, free, glorious Russia was holding out its promise of peace to a war-weary world. With anxious eyes the world looked toward Germany and Austria for an answer, Revolution in the Central Powers seemed inevitable. There were reports of a general strike in Germany, of uprisings and mutinies. For us, here, not even the entry of the United States into the war could rob that first of May of its splendid promise.

A year later the romantic glamour that had surrounded the first period of the Russian revolution had disappeared. The war of the classes against each other had set in with a bitterness and an insistence such as the world had never seen before. Revolutionary Russia lay in the throes of Civil War. German troops were overrunning western Russia, cutting off the newly established Soviet government from its most fruitful source of supplies. Peace seemed further off than ever before. But the gloom that filled the hearts of the proletariat was no longer one of despair. Now they knew that even though peace might be years in coming, it would come, not at the expense of the working-class. Now they knew that every day of war was shaking at the very foundation of the capitalist class, that out of the wounds of the murdered proletariat was flowing the life-blood of world capitalism. Now they knew that peace, when it did come, would find a working-class, hoping, working, fighting, suffering and dying for the coming of a better day.

Another short year has passed. The world is aflame. Revolution is on the wing. From city to city, from nation to nation, from heart to heart it leaps, devastating and destroying, creating and achieving. And once more we are celebrating the first of May!

The old first of May! But with a new meaning. The working-class demands that loomed so big five years ago, have become a matter of course. The 8-hour day has become the standard of capitalist production; even conservative working-class organiza-

tions the world over are striving for the six-hour day, for the five-day week. Universal suffrage is on the eve of its realization in every capitalist country: for the revolutionary proletariat it has been superceded by new political ideals. But the world is still in arms, and each day threatens to bring new outbreaks, new wars. International armament under Capitalism has become a chimera, permanent peace an empty phrase, a dream that will not and cannot be fulfilled so long as Capitalism with its greed for territories, markets and spheres of influence continues to exist.

And yet the first of May looms big with promise. Arrayed against the harbingers of new wars that sit in Paris and in Washington, in London, aye and in Berlin, there will stand a working-class that understands, better than it ever understood before the meaning of proletarian brotherhood, a working-class that is ready, more desperately ready than ever before, to give that last full measure of devotion to a course that has become to them a tremendous, living reality.

Let it be a first of May worthy of the greatness of the year that has passed, worthy of the future that lies before us.

L.

Church and School in the Soviet Republic

By N. BUKHARIN

The working class and its party—the Communist-Bolshevik Party—aim not only at an economic liberation, but also at a spiritual liberation of the toiling masses. And the economic liberation itself will proceed all the more quickly, if the proletarians and day-laborers will throw out of their heads all the crazy ideas that the feudal landholders and the bourgeoisie and manufacturers have knocked into them. We have already seen how easy it was for the former governing classes to hedge in the workers on all sides with their newspapers, their magazines, handbills, their priests, as well as with their schools, which they had succeeded in transforming from an instrument of enlightenment into an instrument for obscuring the popular consciousness.

THE BELIEF IN GOD AND IN THE DEVIL IS A CONFUSION OF THE MIND OF THE WORKERS

One of the instruments for the obscuring of the consciousness of the people is the belief in God and the devil, in good and evil

spirits, angels, saints, etc., in short—*religion*. The masses of the people have become accustomed to believe in these things, and yet, if we approach these beliefs sensibly, and come to understand where religion comes from, and why religion receives such warm support from the bourgeois gentlemen, we shall clearly understand that the function of religion at present is to act as a poison with which the minds of the people have been and continue to be corrupted. And then we shall also understand why the Communist Party is so resolutely opposed to religion.

THE WORSHIP OF THE SOULS OF THE DEAD RICH WAS THE FOUNDATION OF RELIGION

Present-day science has pointed out that the most primitive form of religion was the worship of the souls of dead chieftains, and that this worship began at the moment that, in ancient human society, the elders of the tribe, old men more wealthy, experienced and wise than the rest of the tribe, already had secured power over the remaining members. At the very outset of human history, when men still were in the semi-ape stage, they were equal. The elders did not put in their appearance until later, and then began the subjugation of the other members. Then also the latter began to worship the former, and this worship of the souls of the dead rich is the foundation of religion; these "saints," these little gods were later transformed into a single threatening deity, who punishes and rewards, judges and regulates. Let us see why it was that this conception of things arose among men. The fact is that man always attempts to see things little known to him in the light of those with which he is well acquainted. He measures them with the yardstick of what he knows and understands. A scholar has recorded this example: a girl who had been brought up on an estate on which poultry-raising was extensively practised, was constantly occupied with eggs; eggs were constantly dancing before her eyes; and when she was confronted with the sky full of stars, she declared that eggs were scattered all over the sky. Any number of such examples might be given. Man observed that there were those who obeyed and those who issued commands; he was constantly confronted with this picture: the elder (later the prince), surrounded by his aides, was the wisest and most experienced, the strongest, the richest, and he issued the orders; and in accordance with his instructions the others acted: in short, they obeyed him. These relations were observable at all seasons and at all hours, and gave occasion to an interpretation of all occurrences as being due to similar causes. On earth, as it were, there are those who command and those who obey. Perhaps, people thought, the whole world is so constructed?

The world also has its master, a great powerful, threatening creature, on whom all depends, and who will severely punish all disobedience. Now this master over all the world is *God*. Thus the conception of God in Heaven arises at the moment when on the earth below, the formerly unified society is divided up into those who obey and those elders who lead and command the tribe.

THE WORD "GOD" IS DERIVED FROM THE WORD "RICH" *

It is an interesting fact that all the designations for God speak eloquently of this origin of religion. What does the word "Bog" mean? It is from the same root as "bogaty" (rich). God is he who is great and strong and *rich*. How else is God glorified? As the "Lord." What is a "Lord"? A "Lord" is a master and the opposite of "slave." In fact, in the prayers we say: "We are thy *slaves*." God is also glorified as "*the ruler of the heavens*." All the other appellations of God point in the same direction: "conqueror," "Dominus," etc. Precisely. A "Dominus" is a person who dominates, who rules over many others, who possesses a pretty good supply of wealth. What sort of thing, therefore, is God? God, so to speak, is a really rich, powerful master, a slaveholder, one who "rules the heavens," a judge—in a word, a precise counterfeit and copy of the earthly power of the elder, later of the prince. When the Jews were ruled by their princes, who punished and tormented them in every possible way, there arose the doctrine of a God that was evil and malignant. Such is the God of the Old Testament. He is a ferocious old man who inflicts cruel punishments on his subjects.

EVENTS ON EARTH ARE PARALLELED IN HEAVEN

Let us glance now at the God of the *Orthodox Church*. This conception was elaborated in Byzantium, which furnished the model for an autocratic régime. At the head of the state stood the autocratic monarch, surrounded by his ministers; then came the superior officeholders, further down a whole system of legalized grafters. And the Orthodox Faith is a close replica of this system. At the head was the "Lord of the Heavens." Around him his foremost saints (such as the Wonderworker Nicholas, the Mother of God—somewhat of the nature of an Empress, a woman of holy spirit), corresponding to the ministers; further down there follows a whole series of angels and saints, arranged in an order similar to that of the "chinovniks" in the autocratic

* In Russian this is the case. *Bog* (God) comes from the same root as "bogaty" (rich).

state. These are the so-called "officiating angels and arch-angels": the cherubim, the seraphim, the angels of the third and various other degrees. The very word "chin" (degree) reminds us of "chinovnik" (office-holder, bureaucrat), and both words are from the same root. These degrees ("chins") are represented in the ikons by having them dressed more richly the higher the rank, and by having a larger halo about their heads—that is, they had more decorations and "orders," exactly as on the sinful earth beneath. In the autocratic state, the chinovnik demands "obligatory palm-grease," otherwise there is nothing doing; similarly, the saint requires his candle, otherwise his wrath is incurred, and he will refuse to transmit any prayer to his highest superior, God. In the autocratic state there are special chinovniks who, for a consideration, will undertake the special function of petitioners. And, similarly, there are special saints who pray and "intercede in the behalf," particularly, of women. For instance, the mother of God, who is an "advocate" par excellence. And she does not do her work for nothing, to her must be built greater temples than to others; rice must be bought for her ikons, and the latter must be studded with more precious stones, etc., etc.

THE BELIEF IN GOD IS A BELIEF IN SLAVERY

In short, the belief in God is *an expression of the vile conditions on earth*, is the belief in *slavery*, which is present, as it were, not only on earth, but in the whole universe besides. It is of course clear that there is no truth in these things. And it is also clear that these fairy-tales are a hindrance in the path of human progress. Humanity will not advance until it has become accustomed to seek for a phenomenon its *natural* explanation.

But when, instead of explanations, faith is put in God or in the saints, or in the devils and woodsprites, there is no likelihood that any useful purpose will be attained. Let us take a few examples. There are some religious people who believe that when the thunder rolls, Elijah is riding in his chariot. They, therefore, whenever they hear the roll of thunder, take off their hats and cross themselves. And as a matter of fact, the very same *electrical energy*, which is responsible for the thunder, is very well known to science, and it is with its aid that we propel our tramways, which give us the power to carry anything we like. And while the old Elijah was of no use as a means of transportation, our modern electrical Elijah is indeed a charioteer of the first order. We should have no more been enabled ever to behold any tramways, than to see our own ears. In other words, depending on religion alone, we should have continued to wallow in *barbarism*. Another example. The war breaks out, men are de-

stroyed by the millions, oceans of blood are shed. An explanation is sought for this. Those who do not believe in God see the how, the why and the wherefore; they recognize that the war is the work of the Czars and Presidents, of the greater bourgeoisie and the landholders; they see that the war is waged in the interests of base and covetous aims. And therefore they say to the workers of all countries: "Take arms against your oppressors, cast down capital from its seat of power!" But with the religious man the case is entirely different. He reasons thus (and gasps like a little old man as he reasons): The Lord has punished us for our sins. "Oh, Holy Father, Lord of Heaven, rightly hast Thou chastised us sinful men!" And if he is very religious and orthodox in the bargain, he will set about emphatically eating one kind of food instead of another (which he calls fasting), and beating his head on the stone flags (which is known as "prostration"), and performing a host of other follies. Similar follies are practised by the religious Hebrew, the Mohammedan Tartar, the Chinese Buddhist, in a word, by all those who believe in God. From all of which it is evident that really religious people are not fit for any kind of fighting. Religion therefore not only causes the people to remain in a state of *barbarism*, but fits them also for the condition of *slavery*. The religious man is more readily inclined to accept everything without a murmur (since everything, of course, comes from God), and to submit to the powers that be, and to suffer in patience ("for everything will be requited a hundredfold up yonder"). It is therefore not surprising that the powers in control under capitalism should consider religion an extremely useful instrument for the deceiving of the people.

THE CHURCH WAS AN ORGANIZATION OF THE BOURGEOIS STATE

We have seen that the bourgeoisie is maintained not only by bayonets, but by the process of confusing *the minds* of its slaves. We have likewise seen, on the other hand, that the bourgeoisie poisons the consciousness of its subjects in an *organized* and *planful* manner. This purpose is served by a special organization, and this organization is the *Church*, the religious organization of the *State*. In almost all the capitalistic countries the Church is a state institution of the very same type as the police; the priest is a state official in the same sense as the hangman, the gendarme, the stool-pigeon. He receives a *state subsidy* for the venom which he circulates among the people. In fact, just there lies the great danger of the situation. If it were not for this unnatural, intrenched and powerful organization which is kept in countenance by the brigand state of the bourgeoisie, we should not stand for a single priest for a single moment. They would pass alive into immediate

insolvency. But the fact is that the bourgeois State wholeheartedly places all of its means at the disposition of its church hierarchy, which in turn with ardent zeal supports the bourgeois power. Under the Czar the Russian priests not only deceived the people, but they even made use of the confessional for spying out the very thoughts that were hostile to the government: they used their "mysteries" for purposes of *observation*. And the government not only supported them, but persecuted with jails, deportation and all other possible means all so-called, "defamers of the Orthodox Church."

WHY CHURCH AND STATE MUST BE SEPARATED

From the above the program of the Communists with regard to Church and State is clear. *We must fight the Church, not with force, but with conviction. The Church must be separated from the State.* This means, the priests may continue to exist—but let them be supported by those who wish to purchase their poison, or who have some other interest in their continued existence. Another poison of this type is opium. Those who have smoked it behold all sorts of lovely visions, are at once transported to Paradise. But the use of opium later results in a complete undermining of the health, and the user gradually becomes a complete idiot. It is similar with religion. There are persons who like to smoke opium. But it would be criminal for the State, at its expense, i. e., at the expense of the entire population, to maintain dens for the smoking of opium and to hire special persons to minister to the needs of the frequenters of these places. We must therefore proceed with the Church as follows (in fact, *we have already done it*): we must deprive the priests, hierarchs, metropolitans, patriarchs, abbots, and all the rest of the crowd, of all support from the government; let the true believers, if they like, feed them on sturgeon and salmon, of which the holy fathers are such devoted devourers.

RELIGION A PRIVATE MATTER

On the other hand, we must guarantee freedom of belief. There necessarily follows the rule: *Religion is a private affair.* This does not in any sense mean that we must cease our struggle against the Church by conviction. It simply means that the State must not support any church organization.

The program of the Bolshevik-Communists on this point is already *carried out* in Russia. The priests of all sects have been deprived of all state assistance. Of course they nearly burst with rage at this affront and roundly cursed the present power, that is, the power of the workers, and read all of the Communists out

of the Church. Think of this: under the Czar they knew very well the text: "There is no power but it descends from God," as well as the injunction: "Render obedience to all the powers that be." They had no objection to sprinkling the hangman with holy water. But why did they forget these texts as soon as the workers came into power? Or is it possible that the power of God is not extended also to Communists? What is the matter? The answer is very simple: The Soviet Government is the *first* government in Russia that hit the priests in *the pocket*. And this is the most sensitive spot a priest has. The priests are now in the camp of the "oppressed bourgeoisie." They are working below ground and above against the working class. But the times are bad, and the great masses of the workers no longer fall for the bait as they used to. That is the great educative accomplishment of the revolution. It liberates from *economic* slavery. But it also liberates from *spiritual* slavery.

THE SCHOOLS MUST BE AT THE DISPOSAL OF THE POOREST

There is another important question in connection with the spiritual enlightenment of the masses. This is the *school* question.

Under the domination of the bourgeoisie, the school served the cause of the rearing of the masses in the sense of an *obedience to the bourgeoisie*, rather than of real instruction. All the textbooks, all the teaching implements were permeated with the odor of slavery. Particularly the history textbooks: more lies than facts narrate the glorious deeds of the Czars and of other crowned rascals. And then: the priests played an important part in the schools. Everything worked in one direction: to prepare the child in such a manner as to make of him an obedient—not citizen, but *subject*, a slave, capable, if necessary, to kill his fellows if they should be so bold as to rise against the power of capital. The schools themselves were divided into classes, some for those of black blood, the rest for those of blue blood. The gymnasiums and universities were for those of blue blood. Here the offspring of the bourgeoisie were taught all the sciences in order that they might govern and subjugate those of black blood. For those of black blood there were the lower schools. Here the priests held more undisputed sway than elsewhere. The task of these schools, which imparted very little knowledge, but handed out an uncommon mass of priestly lies, was to prepare the people who were to suffer, to obey, and to subordinate themselves to those of blue blood without protest. Entrance into the middle schools, and more particularly to the higher institutions of learning (universities, engineering schools, and all similar institutions) was definitely out of the question for those of the plain people. In this

manner there was created a *monopoly of education*. The obtaining of a more or less decent education was possible only for the rich or for those supported by the rich. And the *intelligentsia* craftily exploited this situation in their own interest. And it is therefore plain why they were opposed to the workers in the November Revolution: they scented the danger to their privileges, their favored position, which would disappear if *all* should have instruction, if even those of black blood should have the opportunity to acquire knowledge.

INSTRUCTION SHOULD BE UNIVERSAL AND COMPULSORY

Before anything else, it is necessary to make education *universal* and *compulsory*. Under the new organization of life, on new foundations, it will be necessary for those young in years to become accustomed to useful labor. The pupils in the schools must therefore become accustomed to various kinds of productive work. The gates of the higher institutions must be open to all. The priests must be kicked out of all the schools; if they like, let them ply their task of misguiding the young in some other place: they shall not do so in the government schools; the schools shall be *worldly, of the world*, not of the priests. The organs of the local workers' authority shall have control over the schools, and shall not stint their energies in the matter of popular education, supplying to all the children and young men and young women all the knowledge which they need for a happy life.

At present in certain villages and provincial schools some of the more stupid teachers, with the aid of the *kulaks* (or, more correctly speaking, the *kulaks*, with the aid of these stupid teachers), are carrying on a campaign with the object of pointing out that the Bolsheviks want to destroy all learning, to abolish all education, etc., etc. But this is of course a manifest lie. The object of the Communist-Bolsheviks is quite different: they wish to free all learning from the control of capital; they wish to make all science accessible to the working masses, they wish to destroy the *monopoly* (the exclusive right) *of the wealthy in education*. That is the fact of the matter. And it is not surprising that the wealthy should be eager to retain every reed on which they lean. When every worker has command of the learning of an engineer, then the case of the capitalist and wealthy engineer becomes sad indeed: there will be many more like him, and he will have nothing in particular to boast of. Then no upsetting of the workers' plans, no sabotage on the part of the old retainers of capital will any longer be possible. That is what our respectable bourgeois friends are afraid of.

Culture for the wealthy, spiritual debasement for the poor—

that is the method of capitalism. Culture for all, spiritual deliverance from the yoke of capital—that is the watchword of the party of the working class, the Communist Party.

What the Under-Class Answers to the Most Impressive Phrases of the Upper-Class

By AUGUST STRINDBERG (1849-1912)

Society is an invention of the upper class to keep down the lower class.

It is the upper class which bestows authority, patents of nobility, social position; which devises the dictates of morality, the concepts of right conduct, the artificial conscience, which is drilled into the lower class from childhood, so that man living in society cannot without great difficulty distinguish the voice of his natural conscience from the false voices which the upper class may feel disposed to breed in us. The upper class controls all the books that are written, and itself writes all the books to defend its own acts, grants the necessary authority to them, and denies any authority to the books written by the lower class. Is it remarkable, therefore, that the upper class can "refute" everything, have an answer ready for everything? It needs simply to quote its own books, to clear up everything; the other side cannot quote its own books, because they have been declared not valid. Is it surprising that the lower class should so often be unable to make reply, when it has been taught from childhood only the stupid answers to all questions that the upper class has drilled into it?

But the time seems at last to have come, when the lower class no longer answers the catechetical answers taught by the upper class, but is beginning to examine the lies of the upper class. Of course it is impossible for them to have all their answers ready at once, for how could the lower class, which has only recently liberated its thoughts from blind following of authority, succeed in a short time in pulling down what it has taken the upper class a few thousand years to build up? I have here merely managed to gather together a little nosegay of the prettiest questions that I have for twenty years been noticing in the upper-class newspapers—and they can be read there just as well today—for they

continue blossoming undisturbed and multiplying from year to year, and if you pull them up by the roots, they always succeed in dropping a seed somewhere, before you throw them into the fire. So, please, look at my specimens! If others will harrow where I have plowed, the whole meadow will soon lie fallow!

PHRASE 1

You, lower-class man, are led only by egotistical motives in all you do, and you wish to overthrow authority merely in order to wield it yourself!

ANSWER 1

You are right, my friend, when you say I am led by egotistical motives, for we all are. But, my dear boy, there are two kinds of egotistical motives: those that are justified, and those that are not justified. The egotistical motives of the lower class are justified, for they ask for justice; the egotistical motives of the upper class are not justified, for they ask injustice. We are therefore in the right in asking that our "egotistical motives" be acted upon at the expense of your "egotistical motives."

As for our desire to overthrow authority merely in order to wield it ourselves, that seems true at once; for there are two kinds of authority: the authority of the upper class, which is a violation of justice, and the authority of the lower class, which is a violation of injustice. We therefore aim to deprive you of the power to violate justice, so that we may have the power to violate injustice! Is that plain? And do you now see that our egotistical aims are justified and that our striving for power is justified? (*Aside*) Now he's going to bring up Robespierre, but I'm ready for him!

PHRASE 2

Robespierre

ANSWER 2

Yes, Robespierre! I know! Robespierre was one of your pupils. For it is you who had given him his so-called training. Could he thrust all that behind him with a single sweep? And his mistakes he learned from you! But I will defend Robespierre. He did violence to injustice! Is that not so? (*Aside*) Now he will start about the way the Salvation Army was treated in Switzerland.

PHRASE 3

But the Salvation Army in *free* Switzerland

ANSWER 3

The Salvation Army violated the freedom Switzerland be-

stows on her citizens, for the Salvation Army disturbed the peace of home, street, and church! Therefore the Salvation Army was advised to obey the laws of the land or leave the country! Then the Salvation Army violated the laws of the land, and that gave Switzerland the right to meet violence with violence. Is that clear? (*Aside*) He will now talk about respecting the opinions of others.

PHRASE 4

But in this enlightened time we should all respect the opinions of others.

ANSWER 4

Yes, if the term "the opinions of others" will include the opinions of the lower class. I can therefore only admonish you to carry out your own principle and respect Socialism as the only sensible attempt to unveil all the tricks played by you when society was founded; I must admonish you—for you of the upper class should give us the advantage of your good example—to respect free thought—which will put reason into the structure of your Christianity; to respect the new morality, to respect all worthy strivings, such as peaceable union of nations, self-government of peoples; yes, I must admonish you particularly to respect all expressions of contempt for your contemptible conduct toward the lower class, for to despise contemptible opinions is equivalent to respecting worthy ones, and yet, you ask us to respect that which is contemptible! (*Aside*) Maybe he will start about "leveling down" now?

PHRASE 5

Your effort, which you call praiseworthy, consists simply in levelling down to your low position, everything that stands above you.

ANSWER 5

If a boy climbs one of the State's cherry trees, let us say in the Zoo, and sits on a branch, eating cherries, from which point of vantage he spits the pits on me standing under the tree—this boy, to be sure, occupies an elevated position as compared to mine down below;—but if it appear to me that he occupies this position of superiority unjustly, being his elder, I will pull him down from the tree and may give him a sound beating where he needs it most, and no sensible man will rebuke me for this chastisement! Do you get me?

PHRASE 6

That is not an answer to a question, but a poetic simile!

ANSWER 6

It is true that it is a simile, but I hardly expected that it would seem poetic! If it is, it must be your fault for having given me such a poetic bringing-up. But I am ready to try it again—in prose, this time. Your elevated point of view is merely your imagining; if it seems elevated, it is only because you have determined the point of view! But the fact that you fixed it does not necessarily make it elevated. Do you want me to investigate it? (*Aside*) He surely will not! He will rather talk about tearing down.

PHRASE 7

It is easy enough to tear down, but what will you put in its place?

ANSWER 7

It is not so easy, in the first place, to tear down the structures which it has taken you a few thousand unmolested years to build up. Do you know what they had to do in order to demolish the Linköping church tower? Why, they had to blast it with—hm!—dynamite! In the second place, I remember, of the precepts in the ancient "Building Law," a very remarkable one on demolitions (B. L., Chap. II, Sec. 2): "If a man build to another's harm, tear it down, after notifying him of it!" Well, if you will not do the tearing down, we'll have to see to it! And then, in the third place, there are systems of society so congested, that all they need is to tear them down so that the inhabitants shall "have light and air." In the fourth place, do not forget the great example in Russia, of how they proceeded with infected towns a few years ago!

PHRASE 8

You are not accurate; it was many years ago!

ANSWER 8

Forgive me, stern sir; what matters it whether it be few or many, if the fact be as indicated! And yet! It would almost seem as if facts were subsidiary in your eyes, and minor matters elevated into positions of importance! The fact remains that they burnt up the infected cities! (*Aside*) He can't answer that unless he makes use of his old reply: I deny the fact! Or the other: It's a lie! Or perhaps this one: That is irrelevant!

PHRASE 9

That is irrelevant! But if you want reforms, reform yourself first!

ANSWER 9

I have answered this Phrase exhaustively in the periodical, *Tiden* (The Times), No. 154, which appeared 1884,* and until you make an exhaustive reply to my answer, I shall not answer again. I shall merely point out that to be of value a reform must cover the entire population: otherwise it's no reform at all. Have you not a few more Phrases to give exercise to my ingenuity? Please phrase a little about morality!

PHRASE 10

You've said it! How is it that all reformers are so immoral, as soon as you put them under the magnifying glass? Eh? Answer that if you can!

ANSWER 10

This is caused by two circumstances at least. First, that they are put under the magnifying glass! Try it on yourselves; your blemishes will be just as large! For, (a) it is of the essence of human nature to have defects (be immoral); and, (b) the essence of the magnifying glass is that it magnifies. So the whole thing is based on the application of the magnifying glass. As the law forbids its application to the upper class, it is of course applied only to the lower class! Is that clear?

Second: It may be that in their judgment of the lower class the upper class make use of a different standard than in their own case.

Third: It is possible that morality is not so dreadfully moral, as it is an invention of the upper class, for their own immoral purposes, to keep down the lower class!—Perhaps it is now clear that the lower-class reformers are immoral because of the above, and not for any other reason?

Do you still wish to speak of Zola? Eh? But perhaps there is no need of that, now that he is not as pleasant toward the lower class as we had once hoped!

PHRASE 11

We needn't quarrel about such things at present; we must take the world as it is, for it will not change; and it is, after all, the best of all worlds.

* The article referred to is in the form of a playlet, "Autumn Slush" (Höstslask), which will be printed in the next number of *The Class Struggle*.

ANSWER 11

Thank you, sir, thank you, for having brought up that phrase also, for it is perhaps the most important phrase of all. We needn't quarrel, said the cock in the horse's stall. No, all you want is to be left at peace, *beati possidentes*, lucky to have had first pick! It is quite natural, but not at all nice! I am ready to believe that this world is best for you; and that is why you throw us heaven as a consolation. By right, you should give us an occasional foretaste of your delectable heaven, so that we might lose our love for this best of all worlds, but, so long as you do not do that, we must believe that this world is a rather poor sort for us. Of course, we have meanwhile developed a faint hope that it may become better, for all of us, but we shall probably have to wait until you gentlemen have gone to heaven!

(*Aside*) I am surprised he has not yet said anything about envy!

* * *

PHRASE 550

You are merely envious, that's what's troubling you!

ANSWER 550

Envy is one of the nasty names the upper class gives to the sense of justice.

* * *

PHRASE 678

Brighten the corner where you are, etc.

ANSWER 678

If you have one to brighten, yes.

PHRASE 1290

Phrase-maker!

ANSWER 1290

Phrase-maker!

(Continuing *ad infinitum*.)

The Truth About the Allied Intervention in Russia

By PHILIPS PRICE,

Correspondent in Russia of the "Manchester Guardian."

One of the most deadly weapons wielded by the ruling classes of all countries is their power to censor the press; for thereby they are able to create under the pretext of military necessity an artificial public opinion with the object of hiding their fell designs. Never was this fact more clearly demonstrated than at the present moment; never was it more obvious that the governments of the Central Powers and the Allies, in order to suppress the workers' and peasants' revolution in Russia, must hide from their own people the truth about this revolution, must represent it to the proletariat of the West as the work of a gang of robbers. Just as a criminal or weak-minded man, after having committed some offense against public law, tries to shift the blame on to any person he finds handy, so the ruling classes of Europe, after butchering their people in a cruel four-years' war, now in terror before the judgment of humanity and the inner prickings of conscience, try to create for themselves pleasant illusions and find convenient scapegoats, on which to vent their wrath.

One cannot be surprised, of course, that the governments of England, France and Germany should, through their official agencies and their press censors, endeavor to blacken the work of the Russian Revolution. Living here in the besieged castle of the Russian Workers' and Peasants' Soviets, surrounded by the armed hosts of the European warlords, I am in a position to see more clearly than those outside this iron ring, the power possessed by the ruling classes, whose fell designs include the strangling of the youngest of the governments of the toiling masses. For this is what I have to face day after day. Telegrams to my newspaper are suppressed, or, if passed by the British censor, are decapitated, so that no sense is left in them, postal communication is severed, provocative rumors about what is happening here are spread in London and Paris, and my attempts to deny them are frustrated. All the technical apparatus of the capitalist states of Western Europe is set in motion against those whose duty it is to tell the truth about the Russian Revolution and to convey to the West the cry of the Russian people

for help. But let not the governments of England and France forget that "foul deeds will rise, though all the world o'erwhelm them to men's eyes." Those who suppress the truth create forces that bring the truth into the light of day, but by methods which they least expect.

Knowing therefore the love of freedom and the sense of justice of the British working man, I am in these few lines appealing to him to understand the facts that I have here set before him—facts which I have obtained after four years' residence in Russia. When he has read them he will be able to judge for himself whether the policy of the British government towards the Russian Revolution is a policy of which he approves.

I begin from the beginning. The Russian Revolution in March, 1917, was nothing less than the first practical step taken by the working classes of a European country to protest against the indefinite dragging on of the war for objects hidden in the Chancellories of secret European diplomacy. There is no better proof of this than in the fact that the first act of the first all-Russian Soviet conference in May, 1917, was an appeal to the workers of the world to lay down their arms and make peace with each other over the heads of their governments. The Russian workers and peasants were brought to this conviction by their intense sufferings during the previous two and a half years. The war in fact had brought their economically poorly developed country to ruin, the industries were at a standstill, famine was raging in the towns, and the villages were filled with maimed soldiers. Long before the March revolution one could see that the Russian army was no longer capable of the offensive, even if it had the inspiration to effect one, and meanwhile all the towns in the interior of Russia were, even in 1916, filled with deserters.

The next fact I wish to set forth is that the Governments of the Allies, by refusing to allow the Stockholm Conference to take place in the autumn of 1917, destroyed the belief of the Russian peasants and workers in the sincerity of the Allied cause, weakened the hands of those in Germany who were working for peace, played into the hands of the Prussian war party and made the calamitous Brest-Litovsk peace inevitable.

The "Bolshevik" revolution of October, 1917, was the second protest of the Russian workers and peasants against the continuation of a war which they had not the physical

strength to carry on, nor the moral justification to support. It seemed better for them to risk the dangers of making peace single-handed with the Prussian warlords than be ruined by being dragged along in a war for the objects which were disclosed in the secret treaties between the Allies. The October Revolution differed from that of March. For the first time in the history of the world a people realized that only by radically altering the whole form of human government was it possible to put down war. Declining all ideas of a compromise peace between the rulers of the countries at war (a solution which would only have led to another war) the workers and peasants of Russia dared to create a government, which, by putting an end to the political and economic power of landlords and financial syndicates, definitely rooted out that poison in human society which alone is the cause of war. For the Russian people under Czarism saw more clearly perhaps than the workers of England and Germany that the competition between the great banking and industrial trusts of London, Paris, Berlin and New York for spheres of influence, mining and railway concessions in undeveloped countries like their own, was the root cause of all modern wars and that, therefore, to put an end to war, the social and political system, which breeds the exploiting trust, must be once and for all overthrown.

From this it follows that the workers and peasants of Russia after the October Revolution were forced to undertake a task, which the weak Kerensky government (controlled, as it was, mainly by landlords and bankers) could not even attempt to solve, namely to take directly under its authority the principal means of production, distribution and exchange. For this reason the railways, waterways and mines were declared state property and the banks taken under government control. But Russia was bankrupt. Exhausted by the cruel war, through which Czarism had dragged her for three torturous years, her economic power was completely broken down. Food and the raw materials of industry in the country were reduced to a minimum and the land flooded with valueless paper money. To repay the bankers of London and Paris the war debts of Czarism, the Russian workers and peasants would have to export annually for many years to come in gold or raw materials a sum not less than one milliard roubles (30,000,000 pounds sterling) without obtaining any return. To bear this burden in addition to others, brought about by the ruin of the industries, the collapse of the railways and the famine, was impossible without reducing the people to

slavery. The Russian workers and peasants therefore could no longer admit the principle that they should pay tribute to foreign bankers for the doubtful honor of serving as their cannon fodder. So the repudiation of the debts of Czarism and the nationalization of all the natural resources of the Russian Republic, to serve the interests of the people, was the first and most essential of the principles of the October Revolution. But no sooner was this done than the governments of England and France began to plot for the overthrow of the Russian Soviet Government. In November, 1917, the French Government paid a large sum of money to the Ukrainian Rada in order that it should raise a rebellion against the workers' and peasants' government. On the Don, General Kaledin received arms and ammunition from the Allied military missions, in order that his Cossacks should join in the attack. But the peasants of the Ukraine and laboring Cossacks refused to be the tool of the Paris and London Stock Exchanges, threw off the yoke of the Rada and of General Kaledin and created their own revolutionary soviets in federal union with the Soviet Government of Great Russia. Then followed the tragicomedy of Kieff, when the Ukrainian Rada, which had been bought by Allied gold, finding itself threatened by its indignant revolutionary peasantry, sold itself to the German warlords and invited the armed forces of the Central Powers to protect its class interests.

Foiled in their attempts to use the Ukrainian Rada, the Allied governments began to spread rumors that the leaders of the Russian workers' and peasants' government were agents of Germany and had betrayed the working classes of England and France, because they had brought Russia out of the war. Against these slanders may be set the following facts. The necessity for Russia to obtain peace was dictated, firstly, by the impossibility of undertaking the work of social reconstruction at home, if a foreign war was draining the country of its material resources; and, secondly, by the desire of the workers and peasants of Russia to maintain a neutral position between the armed camps of Europe, and to show to the workers of other lands that they had no partiality to any of the warring governments. The best proof that the Soviet government was sincere in its desire to make peace not with the German government, but with the German people, was seen in the course of the Brest-Litovsk negotiations. The Soviet government not only showed no desire to bring the negotiations to a speedy conclusion, but did everything possible to cause them to drag on indefinitely, so as to expose

to the German people the rapacity and cynicism of the German government. By these tactics they were largely responsible for the great strike in Germany during January, 1918.

This was the first real protest of the German people against the war, and the policy of their government, and it was brought about by the tactics of the leaders of the Russian Revolution. Contrast with this the tactics of the Allied governments, who, in spite of their loud assertions that by armed forces alone can Prussian militarism be crushed, have after four years' battering away at the Western front at the cost of thousands of the noblest lives failed to call forth a single demonstration in Germany against the war. Trotzky succeeded in the Council Chambers of Brest-Litovsk in creating that spirit of rebellion among the German people, which all the heavy guns and armored tanks of Field-Marshal Haig had failed to create in the course of the whole campaign. But the strike in Germany failed and the German government was left free to crush the Russian Revolution. Why did the strike fail?

Because Hindenburg and the Prussian junkers were able to appeal to the more uneducated and less class-conscious among the German people and to say to them: "Don't withdraw your support from us, because, if you do, the Allied governments will ruin Germany and reduce you to slavery." They were able to point to the secret treaties, published by the Soviet government, which showed that the Allies had been fighting to annex Germany up to the left bank of the Rhine, and that their governments had not repudiated these treaties. They were able to point to the fact that, although the workers' and peasants' government of Russia had invited the Allies to take part in the Brest-Litovsk negotiations, had waited in fact a fortnight for them to make up their minds, the Allied governments had refused. Thus the Prussian warlords were able to tell their people that the Allies would not hear of peace and that therefore a strike at this time would be treachery to their country. It was only when the Soviet government saw that the Russian Revolution had been deserted by the Allied democracies and betrayed by the German proletariat, that they were compelled reluctantly to sign the cruel Brest-Litovsk peace. And the very fact that the Kaiser and his hirelings imposed such onerous conditions shows how much he feared the Russian workers' and peasants' revolution and how abominable is the slander that the Bolsheviks are the agents of the German government, since it was not the

Russian peasants and workers that deserted the Allies, but the Allies, yes, and I fear the working classes in the Allied countries, who deserted the Russian peasants and workers in the hour of their distress.

Now, what was the policy of the Soviet government of Russia after the Brest-Litovsk treaty? I submit that it was a policy which aimed at maintaining the strictest neutrality between the two great fighting camps. Yet the governments of Germany and the Allies did everything to make the maintenance of neutrality impossible, because they looked upon the Russian workers and peasants either as objects for economic exploitation or as cannon fodder to be used by them. The Soviet Government was forced to give up the Black Sea fleet to Germany (as a matter of fact a great part of the fleet was blown up to prevent its falling into German hands) and was forced to accept the principle of individual exchange of war prisoners, whereby hundreds of thousands of Russian workers and peasants were left to work in Germany in slavery under the Kaiser. And why had the ultimatums, which were showered upon the Soviet government from Berlin, to be accepted? They had to be accepted because the Russian army had been ruined. And why was it ruined? Because the Allies had tried, all through the spring and summer of 1917, to force the Russian workers and peasants to fight for the objects which were disclosed by the Bolsheviks in the secret treaties. Whenever the Russian people, either through the Soviet or through the more progressive members of the Provisional Government, asked the Allies to define their war aims, they were met by platitudes about liberty and justice. Meanwhile the peasants and workers were starving and had no prospect before them but endless war for the undefined aims of foreign governments. Was it likely that a 12-million army could be kept together under those conditions? Was it possible for the Bolshevik government, deserted by the Allies, to do anything else but sign the Brest-Litovsk peace and bow to every ultimatum which the tyrants in Berlin chose to send them? The Allied governments all through last winter acted as if they feared the Soviet Government of the Russian Workers and Peasants a great deal more than they feared the Imperialist Government of Germany.

But in spite of its isolation the Soviet Government, in the spring of this year, commenced a program of social reconstruction. In order to succeed in this sphere it was necessary to receive help from economically more advanced countries. The railways were in a state of collapse; technical appliances

were needed to repair the locomotives and waggons. The mines were flooded and broken down. Instructors and engineers were required to undertake the difficult task of restoring their working capacity. Agricultural machinery was required to help the peasant to till the soil, which, as a result of the war, had in large areas fallen out of cultivation. The Soviet Government asked the governments of Europe to help in this great task. To each of the countries of the great alliances an offer was made to treat with Russia, to supply her with those material and technical needs, in return for which the Soviet Government offered certain raw materials of export and certain railway and mining concessions. These concessions, of course, were to be kept under strict public control, so as to ensure that, while the foreign capitalists should have a fair return for their undertakings, the workers and peasants should not be subjected to the exploitation which they had experienced under Czarism. The offer was made to Germany and negotiations proceeded all summer in Berlin.

It was also made to the United States through the medium of one of the most sympathetic American representatives in Moscow, who personally took the proposals with him to America. But what was the attitude of the official diplomatic representatives of the Allies? They buried themselves in the provincial town of Vologda, refused to come to Moscow and one of their number last April made a cynical statement to the press that the governments of the Allies could not recognize a government, which was not either in fact or in law a representative of the "true" Russia. More than this; the Allied ambassadors became in Vologda the centre of every counter-revolutionary intrigue in the country and when the Soviet Government, seeing what was going on, courteously requested them to come to Moscow, the seat of the government, to which they were supposed to be accredited, otherwise it could not be held responsible for their safety, they left the territories of the Republic on the ground that they had been insulted!! The Soviet Government insisted on putting them under control if they remained in Vologda, in order to prevent counter-revolutionary elements in the country from getting at them. To what extent this action was justified may be seen from the following facts. On the basis of documents discovered on the premises of the Czechoslovak National Council in Moscow in July, the fact was established that at the end of February this year an agreement was reached between certain British and French mili-

tary agents in Russia and the Czecho-Slovak National Council. This Council had taken under its control the Czecho-Slovak prisoners and deserters from the Austrian army and had formed them into a separate legion to fight against Austria. This had already been done under Czarism, and after Brest-Litovsk the question was raised of sending them to the French front. To this the Soviet Government agreed. But it appears that the British and French governments had other work for the Czecho-Slovak soldiers to perform and were by no means anxious that they should go to France. For between March and May, 1918, the French Consul in Moscow paid to two persons on the Czecho-Slovak National Council the sum of nine million roubles and the British Consul in Moscow paid eighty-five thousand pounds to the same people. Directly after these payments the Czecho-Slovak forces, which were scattered all along the Siberian and Eastern railways, rose in rebellion, occupied most of the important strategic posts in East Russia, thus cutting off Central and Northern Russia from the corn producing districts, and condemning the workers and peasants of Muscovy to famine and the industries to destruction. The legend circulated in Western Europe that the Soviet Government was preparing to hand the Czecho-Slovaks to the Austrian government is false, for the former had only too readily accepted the proposal the Czecho-Slovaks had themselves made, before the interference by the Allied Governments, that they should be sent to France.

But even after the seizure of the Siberian railway and the opening of the road to Vladivostok, the commanders of the Czecho-Slovaks not only made no attempt to move their troops out of Russia but began to advance west towards Moscow, clearly showing they were carrying out the pre-arranged plan, for which they had received these payments.

At every town where they arrived they united with counter-revolutionary forces, organized by the local landlords and bosses, and began to break up the Soviets, shoot the leading revolutionary leaders and reestablish a military dictatorship of the propertied classes. Up to this time every counter-revolutionary rebellion which had been raised against the Soviet Government had been suppressed by the Red army, thus showing that the Soviet government had sufficient authority and support among the masses to put it down. It was only when hired bands of foreign imperialists raised rebellion and supported the local counter-revolutionary forces, which had been defeated in a square fight, that the

position of the Soviet Government began to be in danger. Thus the Allied Governments in East Russia, like the German government in the Ukraine, endeavored by financing counter-revolution and anarchy to make the work of social reconstruction and the feeding of the starving people impossible for the Soviet Government.

The governments of England and France, in order to recoup themselves for the losses of the London and Paris bankers, incurred by the Russian Revolution, are now trying to overthrow the Soviet government and reestablish a government with the aid of armed hirelings, which will impose again the milliard tribute of the loans of Czarism upon the backs of the Russian workers and peasants. They are also trying to force the Russian people to fight in the war against Germany, against their will, to use them as cannon fodder, although one of the main motives of the workers' and peasants' revolution was to free themselves from the war, which was ruining them and condemning them to starvation. To impose fresh tribute upon the Russian people, to force them to fight against their will, to still further increase their misery, indescribable as it is at present, that is the task, which the British government asks the British soldier to perform, when he fights on the Murman; that is the object for which the British munition worker is toiling, when he makes shells, which are to be fired upon his Russian comrades.

As one who has lived for four years in Russia, who has seen the sufferings of her people and their heroic efforts to free themselves, I categorically assert that the anarchy and famine now raging in Russia is the deliberate work of the imperialist governments of Europe, and in this respect the governments of the Allies and of Germany behave like vultures of the same brood. For what Germany has done in the Ukraine, the Allied governments have done in Siberia and the territories east of the Volga.

And yet the British workingman is told that in Russia there is chaos and anarchy and that the British government, out of sympathy for the Russian people, is sending expeditions to help them, and to bring a rule of law and order. Where is the law which finances rebellion against a government of the workers and poorest peasantry, in order to force it to pay an intolerable tribute and reduce it to industrial slavery? Where is the order which brings war to a land that is already exhausted by the three years' slaughter of the

European Imperial butchers? The Soviet Government of Russia asked peace and the governments of England and France are trying to give it a sword: it asked for help in its work of social reconstruction and it has been given the serpent of anarchy. It is just because the workers and peasants of Russia are trying to establish a new order in their country that the governments of Europe are trembling and are trying by their treacherous attacks on Russia to destroy this new order and in its place to establish the old. For, if the Soviet Government succeeds, it will for ever put an end to exploitation by social parasites and will sweep away the profiteers that fatten out of war.

The "financial capital" of London and Paris is trying to save the "real" Russia but it is really forging for it new chains. By a Judas kiss it is trying to hide the shekels of silver, for which it has sold the Russian people. But let the workers of England know the truth about this great crime; let them say to the British government: "Hands off; let none dare to touch the Russian Revolution, the noblest product of these four years of blood and tears."

I know how firm in the memory of British workingmen is the tradition of freedom with which they have for generations been associated. When the ruling classes of England acted as suppressors of movements for freedom in America, when they interfered to bolster up privilege and reaction on the continent of Europe, the British workers raised their voices in protest. At the end of the eighteenth century the landlords of England declined to treat with the ambassadors of the free French republic and declared war upon a people who had cast off a feudal tyranny. Today the banking oligarchies in London try to strangle by isolation and spread of famine the great movement of freedom that has sprung up in Eastern Europe. They will not succeed now, just as they did not succeed then, and the conquests of the Russian Revolution will endure, as did the conquests of the French Revolution last century. But to bring this about, the workers of England must know the truth, and, knowing it, must dare to act.

Moscow, August 1918.

Berne—A Post-mortem Conference

By LUDWIG LORE

If the world at large and the Socialist movement in particular still needed proof of the fact that the second International is dead, it was given at Berne, Switzerland, in the two weeks of February, when an International Conference of what remains of the proud Socialist International of former days, was first able to convene since the beginning of the war. How much better would it not have been to let the dead body rest, to bury decently an epoch of the Socialist movement that has done its work and should long ago have given place to one more fit to cope with the problems of a new age! As it is, the desperate efforts of the social-patriots and super-opportunists who arranged that sorrowful post-mortem, who tried to galvanize its corpse, served but to turn a tragedy into grim comedy, at the expense, albeit, of the international working class movement.

The program that was presented to the Congress when it convened showed how statesmanly the erstwhile leaders of the world-proletariat have become, how well they have learned to avoid those subjects that most urgently demand discussions, how completely they have subordinated working-class problems and working-class interests to their newly acquired sense of bourgeois-nationalistic responsibility. More than five years have passed since the representatives of the Socialist movement met to discuss their common aims and problems. And in these five years a new world was born. Thrones that seemed built upon rocks have been overturned. Armies that seemed invincible have been vanquished. Institutions that seemed built for eternity have been thrown on the scrap-heap. Day after day the human race has accomplished the impossible. Nations have gone under—new nations have arisen. The human race has gone through a period of unspeakable suffering, has shown itself capable of incredible sacrifices. New values have taken the place of old. The whole world is looking at life with new eyes, from a hitherto unknown point of view. These Socialist gentlemen alone have learned nothing, have forgotten nothing. They are prepared to go calmly on where they left off five years ago, thinking the same stereotyped sets of thoughts, using the same worn-out methods, with the same narrowminded ideals and aspirations. In Russia, in Germany, in Austria, and in Hungary the Socialist movement has overthrown

the established order and has taken the power out of the hands of the capitalist class. In every civilized nation revolution is hanging by a hair over the heads of a trembling capitalist class. And these gentlemen come together, placidly, with the dignity that becomes ministers and diplomats, to discuss "A League of Nations," "the regulation of territorial questions," "international labor legislation." Further they did not dare go. For these careful gentlemen felt, and perhaps not without good and sufficient cause, that a serious discussion of the fundamental questions that are agitating the world would bring about the hopeless collapse of the whole carefully erected edifice.

The purpose and aims of the entire Congress were very accurately characterized by Lorient (France) in his declaration to the International Conference:

"You have come together not for the purpose of finding a Socialist solution for the tragic problems that have followed in the wake of this greatest of all capitalist crimes, but for the purpose of finding some sort of justification for the governmental, nationalistic, chauvinistic neo-war-Socialism that flourished upon the ruins of the Socialist movement after the outbreak of the war.

"You are here, not in order to give expression to your determination to fulfill your Socialist ideals, but in order to document the agreement of the International with the policies of Wilson, the representative of American multi-millionaires.

"You have met, finally, and above all, to condemn the tremendous struggle for freedom that is spreading out from Russia all over Western Europe

"The history of Socialism will not be written in your Congress. It is being written, page by page, day by day, by the proletariat itself, and today the elite of this, the class-conscious, revolutionary proletariat, no longer stands behind you!"

The conference itself was characterized by certain departures from the method of procedure usually adopted at former International Congresses. Though unimportant in themselves they serve to accentuate the spirit in which it was conceived. Newspapers of all shades and political affiliations had been so liberally deluged with reporters' cards that there were, in the convention hall, far more "gentlemen of the press" than there were actual delegates. On the other hand, the transactions were closed to the general public, "to avoid undesirable ovations." This did not prevent, however, the admission of ladies and gentlemen of the

"better class," while comrades, who are familiar figures in the international movement, were refused permission to enter the Conference Hall. The credentials of the so-called delegates were not passed upon by the body itself but by a commission, which, likewise, was not elected, but had been appointed for this purpose. Delegates were admitted against the protest of a part of the conference that objected to the admission of men, as in the instance of Frank Bohn from America, who had been sent by their respective governments, while the actually elected and accredited delegates from these countries were prevented, by the same governments, from attending the Conference.

In other respects also the Conference differed from Party Congresses of former years. The Socialist Party of Belgium refused to send delegates to meet the representatives of the German Social Democracy, until the latter have formally repudiated the crimes committed by the German militarist autocracy during the war. The Socialists of Switzerland, Italy, Serbia, Rumania, Norway, Denmark, and the Left Wing Socialists of Sweden had refused to participate in a conference controlled by social-patriots. Important questions were not decided according to the invariable method pursued at all International Socialist Congresses—by recorded votes—but by the very questionable and uncontrollable showing of hands. In fact the entire Conference, its order of business, the nomination of committees and commissions, the list of speakers and the presentation of resolutions, were all so completely in the hands of the engineers of the Conference, that one could not but receive the impression that these gentlemen favor democracy only when it can be used as a weapon against revolutionary Socialist methods.

At the insistence of Thomas, the arch-nationalist of the French Socialist movement, the question of responsibility for the war was taken up as the first order of business, and occupied the evening of the first and the entire second day of the session. As was to be expected, the German majority Socialists presented a resolution which, in spite of an evident desire to placate the French and Belgian Socialists, whitewashed not only their own actions, but indirectly even those of the former German government, and attributed the war to the general imperialistic development of the last decades. They did, however, promise to investigate the immediate occurrences that were responsible for its outbreak, and to publish, as soon as possible, all documents that may serve to shed some light upon this question. The committee-made resolution that was finally adopted, with very obvious reluctance on the part of the French majority Socialists, evaded the issue by accepting,

with a few courteous generalities, the statement of the German majority group, and leaving it to future Congresses to render a decision. The words with which Wels, the spokesman of the German majority Socialists, closed the discussion were significant: "The German majority Socialists are silent, and we hope that our French comrades will understand our silence."

Since it was the avowed purpose of the Conference to bring pressure to bear upon the Peace Congress in Paris, the question of a "League of Nations" was accorded a lion's share, both of time and rhetoric. Speaker after speaker emphasized the necessity of exerting a strong influence upon the negotiations in Paris, without, however, in any case being anything but delightfully vague as to the means by which this much to be desired end was to be accomplished. Indeed it must be admitted that the powers that be who were making history in Paris, while the Berne Conference was consuming valuable time with optimistic speeches, seemed to have little or no regard for the intentions and desires of these powerful representatives of the international working class. By the strange irony of circumstance, the revolutionary uprisings of the German and the Hungarian proletariat, the threatening attitude of English and French labor, the rumbling in Southern Europe, in the Balkans and in Italy, and surely the Soviet Government of Russia, seemed to interest the great rulers of the world more keenly, seemed more forcibly able to influence their actions and decisions, than all the words and all the resolutions that were sent over the wires from the "Socialist" International Conference at Berne.

On the whole, the persons who participated in the Convention were far more interesting than the resolutions that were finally adopted. "In the eyes and in the whole deportment of most of the delegates," writes a Swiss comrade, "one saw the desperate desire to create an impression, the real bourgeois arrogance, the emptiness of soul and spirit that characterizes the political aspirant. One felt depressed in this sickening atmosphere of hypocrisy, of phrases and demagoguery. One longed for a breath of fresh, revolutionary air, of healthy fanaticism, and enthusiasm for Socialist ideals, for true freedom. One was forcibly struck by the contrast between the few revolutionaries who were present and the great majority of opportunists, who seemed to feel called upon to prove their individual fitness to occupy ministerial seats in their respective governments."

In comparison with the social-patriots of France and Germany, the British delegation, while no-one could accuse them of an overabundance of radical sentiment, appeared in an extremely

sympathetic light. There was in their speeches and in their attitude nothing of the intense nationalism, that placed the French and German majority delegations, and those that came from some of the smaller nations and national groups, so completely beyond the pale of serious consideration. They evidenced a clear desire to render impartial judgment. Their words and actions were free from jingoism, their speeches gave some indication at least, of a wholesome idealism and faith in the power of the working-class. While they did not go so far as to indorse the actions of the Russian revolutionary government, and, in the main agreed with the prevailing sentiment that "democracy" must not be subordinated to Socialism, they were obviously unwilling to render snap judgment upon the Russian comrades, based only on the strength of the lies and slanders that have thus far been the sole source of information about Russian conditions.

Of the delegates to the convention, Kurt Eisner was one of the few who showed a willingness to learn from the past and to meet the issues that face the world squarely and courageously. During the discussion of the responsibility for the war, while the French and German government Socialists were vying with each other in mutual recriminations, when Kautsky warned the Conference to forget past grievances in order to be prepared to meet the menaces that threatened the international Socialist movement, from counter-revolution on the one hand and Bolshevism on the other, when even Friederich Adler tried to bring about a peaceful understanding by explaining that the German and Austrian workers had striven to defend their country against the menace of Russian robbery and greed, just as the French had protected their nation against the ravages of German attack, Eisner unflinchingly shouldered the burden of responsibility. He condemned the attempts of the majority Socialists to hide behind exploded legends.

"Are you revolutionists or not," he demanded. "If so you must punish the old system . . . The minutes of the caucus session of the Socialist Reichstag group of August, 1914, should be published. Wels and the others have lost their memories.

"They helped to throw Germany into an abyss. They did not have the courage to vote against Brest-Litovsk. It is worse to carry the war into another country than to bear it one-self. We suffered unspeakably under the hunger-blockade, but we have no right to protest, for Germany provoked the blockade by her disregard of every principle of international justice."

Later when the question of prisoners of war was under discussion, and the German majority delegates were bitter in their denunciation of the Allied governments for refusing to liberate German prisoners of war, thus provoking the French delegates to equally bitter recrimination against the Germans for their alleged inhuman treatment of Allied prisoners, Eisner again showed the same freedom from nationalist prejudice:

"Have we the right to protest? I say no. It is too late! Shall we protest against involuntary servitude, who countenanced the forcible employment of 10,000, aye 100,000 human beings, worse than in the middle-ages? Have we forgotten that young girls were dragged out of France and Belgium to work for their captors? Have we forgotten how French industry was destroyed, how their bridges, their factories, their railroads have been devastated? We have no right to protest. To alleviate the lot of these prisoners must be our first consideration. . . . It is the duty of Germany to help rebuild in France and Belgium, willingly, as a penance."

As we look back over the International Socialist movement of the last two decades, it would seem as if its entire development was one of stubborn and tenacious resistance to the inevitable day of reckoning that has now come upon it. We spoke of the coming world war, yet feared to look its consequences in the face; at Basel we staged an impressive and heart-stirring demonstration of proletarian internationalism—and steadfastly refused to decide upon that most important of all questions, the attitude of the Socialist movement in the various countries in case of war. We wrote books and delivered speeches filled with high-sounding phrases of the overthrow of Capitalism—and unconsciously shrank from forming in our own minds and in the minds of our hearers a definite concept of the course that such action would involve. We used the phrase "expropriation of the expropriator"—and our horror over the methods that have been employed by the Russian revolutionists to put this idea into active operation shows how thoughtlessly these words were actually used. The history of the international Socialist movement of recent years has, in fact, been one of consistent procrastination and self-deception.

What was unforgiveable short-sightedness before the war, however, becomes a crime in the face of the tragedy that the world has undergone. The Socialist leader who, in the midst of this ruin and devastation, face to face with nationalist hatred in the very heart of the International, still pins the future of the

working-class to a "League of Nations" controlled by Imperialism for openly imperialistic aims, who can aspire no higher than to the international regulation of labor legislation by capitalist powers at a time when Imperialism is trembling at the sound of revolution in every country of the world, is, consciously or unconsciously, betraying the spirit of the movement that looks to him for guidance.

Whatever one may think of the course of action that has been adopted by the Bolshevik rulers of Russia, there can be but one opinion as to the serious nature of the problem their activity presents. Russia is the first state to come under Socialist rule, the first state to attempt the full realization of the Socialist program of industrial socialization. This being the case, it seems that an international Socialist conference would under all circumstances regard the problems that have been created by this new social experiment as of vital and consuming interest, and would make them the center of discussion. When one considers that nation after nation is shaking off the yoke of capitalist domination, that the coming months may see the rule of the proletariat established in every industrially developed country of Europe, does it not seem as if some united course of activity, some method of binding together these proletarian nations for united resistance against the common capitalist foe should have been decided upon, or at least seriously discussed? Actually, however, the Berne Conference took exactly the opposite course. In the original order of business laid before the conference, there was nothing that even indicated the existence of such problems. Only upon a motion of Thomas was it brought up for discussion, and then in a form that circumvented the necessity of taking a definite position. Ostensibly the discussion was limited, or rather broadened so as to cover the entire question of "Socialism vs. Democracy." As a matter of fact, the speakers, from Karl Kautsky, who maintained that the Bolsheviks had accomplished nothing but the creation of a large army, to Axelrod, the violent Russian anti-Bolshevik Socialist, refrained, with notable unanimity, from discussing the question in its theoretical aspects. It was evident that the whole discussion had put the conference into an extremely uncomfortable position necessitating, as it did, some open statement of its position. But this is exactly what the gentlemen of the Right and the Center were not prepared to do. Not that they have hesitated in the past to speak their opinions openly where the Soviet government is concerned. But recent events in Europe, the spread of revolutionary sentiment, as well as the strong likelihood that the Allied powers will, sooner or later, come to some sort of a working agreement with the Russian govern-

ment have convinced them of the foolhardiness of committing themselves to an anti-Bolshevik declaration before a proletariat that is looking more and more to the Russian republic for inspiration. This accounts for the minimum of time allotted to the discussion of this extremely important question. It accounts too, for the ambiguous wording of the question as it came up for discussion to be sent to Russia. It explains also, why the Conference refrained from coming to a vote on the question. It was the cowardly climax of a cowardly convention.

The one definite result that the Conference accomplished was the very thing it had striven most desperately to prevent. It proved to the Socialist movement of the whole world that the parting of ways had been reached. The best efforts of sentimental idealists like Friedrich Adler and others who attended the Conference not because they were in sympathy with the majority but because they hoped that it would be possible, now that the war is over, once more to bring together the various elements of the movement in some kind of understanding were in vain. There can be no cohesion between social patriots and revolutionists. There can be no understanding between those who have done the work of the counter-revolution in Russia, and its revolutionists; there can be no harmony between the Spartacides and the people who represent the Ebert government. It is for the Socialist movement in every country to decide whether it will stand with those who have compromised, and are continuing to compromise the Socialist movement in the interests of the bourgeoisie, or whether it will lend its undivided support and allegiance to the struggling revolutionary movement of the working-class.

Russian Tale

By MAXIM GORKYI

In a certain Czar's reign, in a certain state, there lived common everyday Jews—for pogrom purposes, slander purposes, and other requirements of the state.

The procedure was as follows: Whenever the indigenous population began to display symptoms of dissatisfaction with their condition, then, from the observation towers of order, the well-born uttered the call, resounding with hope:

"People, approach the seats of power!"

The people approach, and the words of charm begin:

"What is the matter?"

"Your Highness—we have nothing to chew."

"But you still have teeth?"

"Yes—some—"

"There you are at it again!—Always managing to conceal something from the authorities!"

And if the high-born find that the agitation is due to the presence of teeth, they resort at once to the painless method of removing all those that remain, and if they find that harmonious relations have not by this method been restored, they seductively obtain their information:

"What is it you want?"

"A bit of land would—"

Some, in the savagery of their misconception of the needs of the state, go even further and asseverate:

"We should like some reforms, for instance, that our teeth, ribs, and internal organs might be considered, in a manner of speaking, to be our own, and should not be interfered with by others!"

And then the little officials begin talking to them seriously:

"See here, boys! Why these vain dreams? *Man does not live by bread alone*—it is written, and it is also written: *One man beaten is worth two men not beaten.*"

"And would they agree?"

"Who?"

"The unbeaten ones?"

"Heavens! Of course! Three years ago, after Ascension, the English came to us and asked: Look here, please, why don't you take your whole people and carry them to Siberia, and put us in their place; we shall pay you well and promptly, and we shall start in drinking vodka, twenty buckets a year for each man, and anyway No, we answered them, what for! We are satisfied with our people; they are peaceful, obedient. We know how to get along with them. You see, boys, wouldn't it be better, instead of getting excited over nothing, to go and beat up the Jews? What are they good for, anyway?"

The native population thinks and thinks and can find no other solution to the question than that proposed by the authorities, and decides:

"Well, come on, friends, let's first cross ourselves"

They turn half a hundred houses inside out, beat to death a few of the Hebrew nation, and, having tired of their labors, feel no further desire for reforms, and—order has triumphed! . . .

In addition to the well-born officials, the native population, and the Jews, there existed in this same state, for the turning aside of discontent and the appeasing of passions, also some good people, who, after each pogrom, having gathered in their full strength, sixteen men, issued to the world their written protest:

"Although the Jews are also Russian subjects, we are nevertheless convinced that it is ill-advised to wipe them out altogether, and therefore express in this document—from every point of view, our dissatisfaction with the immoderate destruction of living people. (Signed) Humanistov, Hairsplitter, Ivasov, Lip-biter, Lout, Shrieker, Three-eared Ossip, Grokhalo, Queen Anne's Fan, Cyril Methodieff, Logorrhea, Kapitolina Kolym-skaya, Drinknobeer, Lt. Col., retired, Attorney Nary Busybody, Pritulikhin, Grisha Futurity (seven years old)."

And so it was after each pogrom, except that Grisha's age changed, and that Kolimskaya signed for Nary, after his unexpected disappearance from the town of the same name.

From time to time from the provinces came answers to these protests:

"I sympathize and join with you," telegraphed Razdergayeff from the Backwoods; Zatorkanny of Myamlin also joined in; and from Okoruv, "Samogryzov, etc." sent their approval, but everyone knew that the "etc.," had been carefully added to swell the apparent force of the threat, for there was no "etc." in that place outside of Samogryzov.

When the Jews read the protest they wept still more, but once upon a time, one of them, a very cunning man, proposed the following:

"You know what we'll do? Don't you? Well, just before the next pogrom, we'll hide all the paper, and all the pens, and all the ink, and then we'll see what these sixteen creatures, with their Grisha, will do!"

The people were agreeable—no sooner said than done: they bought up all the paper and all the pens, and hid them, and all the ink they poured into the Black Sea, and they sat and waited.

They were not obliged to wait very long: the word was handed out, the pogrom was put through, the Jews lay in the hospitals, and the humanitarians rushed to Petrograd and looked for paper and pens, but there was no paper, there were no pens, except in

the bureaus of the well-born bureaucrats, and none could be gotten from there!

"What?!" they were told, "we know what you want these things for! No! you can get along without them!"

Shrieker begged:

"How can we get along without them?"

"Well, we've read enough of your protests, find some way yourselves!"

Grisha (who has now attained the age of forty-three) cried:

"I bish to dodge a plotest!" and he began to weep.

What should they write on? Queen Anne's Fan darkly suggested:

"On the brick walls along the streets!"

But there are no brick walls in old St. Petersburg, only wrought-iron fences. So they went out to the suburbs, and found an old stone wall, and as Humanistov had just finished executing the first character in chalk, a policeman appeared as if from the clouds and began addressing him seriously:

"What do you call this? We lecture little children when they write things in this way, and you seem to be respectable, intelligent people! Oh dear, oh dear, oh dear!"

Of course, he did not understand them, thinking that they were literary men of the type who have written 1001 articles, but they became embarrassed and decided to go straight home.

So one pogrom remained unprotested, and the humanitarians remained without their satisfaction.

Persons acquainted with racial psychology rightly assert that the Jews are a cunning people!

Japan and China

By SEN KATAYAMA

The discussions and speculations that have accompanied the recent difficulties between Japan and China in the world of old-fashioned diplomacy are characterized by a remarkable superficiality and lack of understanding of true conditions. Nor will any substantial or permanent settlement be reached in the near future.

China is a large country with an enormous population. Modern China is governed by a comparatively small class of the population, by the educated men of the nation, altogether about five million in number, comprising approximately one and one-quarter per cent of the entire population. The vast majority of the Chinese people are poor and ignorant, and are mercilessly exploited by this small ruling class that dominates not only the political, but also the industrial, the commercial and the social world. Chinese education culminates in a great, very difficult competitive civil service examination, with particular emphasis on classical subjects. Chinese officials have been, from immemorial times, picked by these competitive examinations, the educated class thus furnishing not only the political rulers, but its military officials as well. By this same system Chinese tradition condemned the masses to a life of complete political ignorance and indifference. By the same token the Chinaman has become an intense individualist, and indifferent as he is to ordinary political problems, he will bitterly resent and direct any tangible interference with his personal life and comfort. Where this is attempted the persons immediately concerned will frequently take recourse to a sort of individualistic collectivism, that has more than once proven to be an effective weapon against governmental encroachment. In this connection we recall the experience of the officials of a certain Manchurian town who were responsible for the levying of a business tax upon local merchants. The latter organized a boycott against their inconvenient officials and their families that was so complete that even the water-carriers refused to supply them with the necessary drinking water. So thoroughly was this boycott carried out that the officials were forced to relent, and the tax was revoked. Nor is this an isolated case. In spite of their individualism, the Chinese, especially the traders and business men, have an exceptionally strongly developed collectivist sense and show a marked spirit of co-operation when it comes to pursuing some point of mutual advantage. In their dealings with foreign traders they have been able to outwit the shrewdest Yankees and John Bulls. It is practically impossible for a foreign merchant to deal directly with Chinese business men. All business at the Chinese treaty ports is conducted through the medium of compradors, brokers who form a solid combination that has successfully kept up the prices of goods intended for exportation, while forcing down prices of goods that are brought into the country. In this respect the Chinese merchant has more effectively resisted the exploitation of foreign merchant capital than his Japanese neighbor.

As a people the Chinese are contented and adopt themselves easily to the most adverse conditions. As a matter of age-long tradition they are slow to adopt new ideas and methods. Chinese education is based upon an intense worship and adoration of the past, and this inordinate pride in the glorious past of the Chinese nation has made the whole nation more or less impervious to the teachings of a more modern world. Then, too, the average Chinaman has little or no intercourse with the world outside. Foreigners in China are found only in the treaty ports. And even here they rarely come into contact with the people. The Chinese language is enormously complicated and difficult to learn. There are very few foreigners who can understand the Chinese tongue and master the language. And even after he has learned the language, the foreigner is usually limited to a single province, for in the various parts of China the people speak in dialects that are so radically different from each other, as to form an impossible barrier for communication even among Chinamen themselves.

In spite of their slow, dull, plodding natures, the Chinese are shrewd, acute business men, and this strongly developed sense of business acumen will prove China's greatest asset in the coming struggle for national recognition. We have mentioned before the strongly communistic sense of the Chinese people. This is due, to a degree, to the ancient examples of collectivism that still persist in Chinese life. The villages are still conducted upon a sort of communist system of families. The trades are strongly dominated by guilds whose ancient regulations are still strictly adhered to, rude and crude though some of them may be. The severest punishments are meted out to those who infringe upon guild regulations. Thus, for instance, in some guilds it is a practice that every member bite the man who has committed a breach of regulations. For the aggressiveness of the Chinese business man we can hardly find a better example than the astonishing growth of the Chop Suey houses right here in the city of New York. Ten years ago these Chinese eating places were practically confined to the Chinese colonies, in New York as elsewhere. Today they are a prominent institution in American restaurant life, and many thousands are being fed daily in this city in eating houses that bear witness to the business efficiency of the Chinese people.

Although China is probably the richest country in the world, its people are exceedingly poor. All classes of China, the well-to-do as well as the poor, are extremely economical. But when once

the Chinese have realized the value of their national resources, they will become a powerful influence among nations.

Most nearly related to the Chinese are the Japanese. Racially these two nationalities have so much in common that either can be easily assimilated by the other. The Japanese who comes to China rapidly becomes absorbed into Chinese life, in spite of the fact that the Japanese are intensely nationalistic. The educated Chinaman learns the Japanese spoken and printed language readily. The Japanese word symbols are an adaptation of the older Chinese, and nouns and verbs still have a largely identical meaning. In the same way, the educated Japanese can master the Chinese language within a few months. It is mostly a matter of pronunciation.

Historically Japan owes everything to China, although there have been a number of bitter disputes between the two nations. Japan has copied the Chinese language and written symbols, just as most European countries have built up their tongues on the Latin. With their peculiar genius for adopting the characteristics of all nations and weaving them into its national life, Japanese culture, politics, literature and even religion to-day are an interesting conglomeration of the oriental and occidental, of all nationalities and all races, all happily adapted to the needs and demands of Japanese conditions. This characteristic applies to all classes of the Japanese people, to the ruling as well as to the lower classes. This tendency to adopt foreign methods and ideas can be distinctly traced in Japanese political life. Up to the Franco-Prussian war France was the teacher and leader of Japanese rulers. They followed the lead of France in all important matters, adopted its laws and administrative forms, copied its army and navy organization. But after the victory of Prussia over France, the intensely practical sympathies of the Japanese ruling class took up the new allegiance, and from this time on Prussian methods and Prussian ideas dominated Japan's political life. The educated youth of Japan were sent to German schools, there to assimilate German practices and German ideas.

The government and its bureaucratic institutions bear every earmark of Germanic inspiration. The prominent political leaders on the other hand are unmistakably English in their political ideology, while French republican ideas find expression in the small handful of radical politicians who have survived.

Japanese literature, too, plainly shows the marked influence of the various nations of Europe at various times. English, Italian, French and German and Russian ideas all have left their mark upon the literary and political life of the Japanese people.

Among the common people of Japan, on the other hand, there has always been a pronounced sympathy for American institutions. There exists, too, a firm bond of sympathy between the people of Russia and of Japan. This existed even before the days of the Russian revolution, and arises even more from an underlying similarity of life conception and an affinity of thought and feeling between the peoples of the two nations. The strain of orientalism that is the natural outcome of Russian peasant life and that runs through all Russian literature strikes an answering chord in the psychology of the people of Japan.

This popular sympathy in Japan toward the Russian people on the one hand and the Chinese on the other was in no way lessened by the fact that Japan, within the last decade, was engaged in war with both of these nations. In both wars Japan was victorious, but both wars were fought in accord with old-fashioned ideas of international justice, and the peace that followed left no sting in the hearts of the vanquished, no overbearing attitude of triumph with the victor. Japan lost whatever she may have gained through her military victory over China at the hands of Germany, Russia and Austria, while the Russian-Japanese war was so palpably waged in the interests of the ruling classes of both countries that it failed, at any time, to awaken a responsive chord in the populace. In Russia the attitude of the masses from the outset was one of open opposition. The Japanese, it is true, followed blindly the dictates of their rulers. But there, too, there was a conspicuous lack of hatred or inimical feeling against the Russian foe. In this war, too, the beaten Russian people were the ultimate victors, for the coming of peace in 1905 brought on the first revolution and thus prepared the people for their ultimate emancipation.

The defeat of their autocratic government and its loss of influence increased the potential force of the people, winning for them not only direct reforms, but awakening in their minds and hearts hopes for a better and freer future.

In spite of their military victory, the Japanese were, in the end, the real losers, for the years that followed brought them a heavy burden of militarism and reactionary exploitation at the hands of an imperialistic government and a reactionary capitalist class as reward for their achievement. For the Chinese people, too, the Chinese-Japanese war was an eye-opener. It shocked them into a realization of the progress that the once so heartily despised Japanese had made at the expense of the sleeping Chinese giant. It put an end to the ancient prejudices of the Chinese against all things Japanese. They no longer called their neighbors

"Japonlic" (the eastern devil). Furthermore, it loosened the stranglehold that Germany held upon China. Hitherto the Chinese had felt that their army, drilled and commanded by German experts, was invincible. The ease with which the Japanese forces advanced once and for all discredited German domination. Thus the Japanese-Chinese war, far from creating hostile sentiments, actually knit the peoples of the two nations more closely together than ever before. So complete was the understanding that had sprung up between the two nationalities that Japanese students and revolutionists took an active part in the Chinese revolution. The uprisings that swept over the country were openly fostered by Japanese, many of the Chinese leaders of the revolution had been, at one time or another, in Japan and stood under the protection of Japanese sympathizers. The second Chinese revolution was, to all intents and purposes, a fight between German and Japanese war machines; the Army of the South was practically fitted out by Japanese revolutionists. Japanese fought side by side with their Chinese brethren, while Germany controlled and supplied the army of the Peking government. This state of affairs persists down to the present day. There may be strong differences between the Japanese and Chinese governments—between the two nations there exists only brotherliness and understanding. No doubt the existing difficulties will persist for some time to come. The Japanese rulers are aggressive and relentless in the pursuit of their imperialistic aims. The Chinese government, on the other hand, must place its reliance on diplomatic strategy, since China lacks a strong army and navy that might eventually back up its demands. It is not altogether improbable that Japanese imperialism may for a time establish a political and military domination over the Chinese nation, provided European and American capital does not interfere in its own interests. This is, indeed, more than likely, for the Chinese government would welcome foreign interference in order to sidestep a crushing defeat by Japan, and would reward such assistance with valuable concessions. To us this latter possibility seems, after all, the more dangerous of the two, for Japanese domination, at best, would be but temporary.

It is very likely that a crushing defeat at the hands of Japan would arouse the people of China to their own self-defense; but even if the Japanese should succeed in dominating China for any length of time, they would be eliminated by a process of absorption into the stronger and more virile Chinese race. The Japanese, probably because of the very adaptability that is the foundation of their present power, are racially weak, while the Chinese are, in the same sense, the strongest nation on earth. The history

of China is one of a chain of such assimilations. Time and again foreign races have invaded and conquered China, only to disappear completely as a separate entity, rapidly losing their characteristic peculiarities as they merged their existence with that of their Chinese subjects. Not even the warlike Manchurians have been able to retain their dominant natural and social characteristics. They are lost, to-day, in the mighty race of the Chinese people. It is a recognized fact that nowhere in Europe has it been possible to break down the strong barriers with which the Jewish race has surrounded its people and preserved its characteristics. But not even this proverbially virile race has been strong enough to retain its individuality in China. Jewish emigrants who settled in China in large communities have, within a few generations, lost every Jewish characteristic and become almost wholly Chinaized. The present function between the governing classes of Japan and China may continue to exist for some years to come, and the people of both nations will, in consequence, suffer increased imperialistic and militaristic oppression. But their domination will be short-lived.

China, so much seems fairly certain in the light of most recent developments, will never become a full-fledged capitalist state. Like the Russian neighbor, the coming revolution in China will establish a socialist-communist republic, earlier perhaps than this can be accomplished in the more capitalistically developed Japan. As we have tried to show at the beginning of this article, China is inherently a democratic country, or more correctly, the Chinese are more open to democratic and revolutionary ideas because individualism is more strongly developed in the masses. This individualistic spirit makes the average Chinaman a more fruitful soil for Bolshevik propaganda than the native of militaristic and well-policed Japan. The long, unprotected border line between Siberia and China has, in fact, already been utilized by the Russian revolutionary movement, and Chinese peasants are rapidly assimilating the communist ideas of their Bolshevik neighbors. Moreover, the Chinese are a characteristically economic people, and the ideals taught by the Bolsheviks have for them a strong appeal for this reason. And when once China has emerged from its present indifference into a state of proletarian self-determination it will be the great dominant power of the Far East. Eventually even Japan will have to submit to the rule of the Asiatic majority.

And so, with the coming of the Socialist revolution in the East, Asia will at last enter upon an era of peace and progress. The peoples of Russia, China and Japan will live together peace-

ably in a new Socialist world. The wars of the past have shown that their peoples are not enemies, but friends. Already the Soviets of Russia are extending the hand of fraternity to their Chinese and Japanese brethren. The coming of Socialism will make their spiritual union a reality!

New York, March 11, 1919.

Can the Exploited and the Exploiter Be Equals?

A CHAPTER FROM LENIN'S NEW BOOK "THE PROLETARIAN REVOLUTION AND THE BETRAYER KAUTSKY"

"The exploiters have always been only a small minority of the population." (Page 14 of Kautsky's book "The Dictatorship of the Proletariat.")

This is an undeniable fact. What conclusion must be drawn from this fact? It is possible to arrive at the Marxian, Socialist, conclusion; in this case the relation of the exploited to the exploiters must be taken as the basis. It is possible to arrive at the liberal, bourgeois-democratic conclusion; then the relation of the majority to the minority must be taken as the basis.

If the Marxian conclusion is to be drawn, there can be but one logical process of reasoning: the exploiters form the state, and a democracy in such a state must function absolutely as the weapon of the rule of this, the exploiting class, subjecting the exploited to its rule. Therefore a democratic state, as long as there are exploiters who dominate the majority composed of exploited, will become a democracy for the exploiters.

By the same process a state of the exploited must completely differ from such a state, it must be a democracy for the exploited and express itself as *oppression of the exploiters*; but the oppression of a class means that this class is not equal, that it is put outside of "democracy."

If the liberal-bourgeois conclusion is drawn, then it must be said: the majority decides, the minority obeys. The disobedient will be punished. Then there can be no question as to the class character of the state generally, or especially of the "pure democratic" state; it is out of the question, because majority is majority. A

pound of meat is a pound of meat—the well-known standpoint of Shakespeare's Shylock.

* * *

"Why should proletarian rule take on a form which is incompatible with democracy?" (Kautsky, Page 21). This question is followed by an explanation that the proletariat has on its side the majority, a very detailed and wordy explanation with numerous quotations from the works of Marx and election figures from the Paris Commune. The conclusion: "A system which is so strongly based on the masses has not the least cause to use force against democracy. It cannot always avoid the use of force in those cases when force is trying to overpower democracy. Force can be answered only by force. But a system which knows that the masses are behind it, will use force only to *defend* democracy, but not to *destroy* it. It would be suicidal to endeavor to abolish its most reliable basis—the general suffrage, the deep source of strong moral authority." (Page 22.)

You see: the relation of exploited to exploiters has completely disappeared from Kautsky's reasoning. There is left only the majority in general, the minority in general, democracy in general, that "pure democracy" which is so dear to Kautsky.

Notice that this is said when *discussing the Paris Commune*! Let us quote what Marx and Engels say when *discussing the Commune*.

Marx: "If the workers supplant the bourgeois dictatorship by their own revolutionary dictatorship . . . in order to crush the resistance of the bourgeoisie . . . the workers are giving to the state a revolutionary form . . ."

Engels: "The party which wins in the revolution will be compelled to sustain its power with the fear which is created among the reactionaries by its weapons. If the Paris Commune had not used the authority of the armed people against the bourgeoisie, could it have held itself in power more than a day? Are we not on the contrary right when we charge them with having made too little use of this authority?"

Engels says further: "Because the state is only a transitory institution which is to be used in the struggle, in the revolution forcibly to crush the opponents, therefore to speak of a free people's state is pure absurdity: as long as the proletariat yet needs the state, it needs it for the cause of freedom, and to crush its opponents, but when it is possible to speak of freedom, then the state, as such, will cease to exist" . . .

Kautsky is as far from Marx and Engels as earth is from heaven, as the liberal bourgeois from the proletarian revolutionist. The pure democracy and simple "democracy" of which Kautsky speaks, is only another way of expressing the conception "free people's state," i. e. pure absurdity. Kautsky, with the wisdom of a book-worm or the innocence of a 10-year-old girl, asks: Why should dictatorship be necessary, if there is the majority? But once more we will allow Marx and Engels to explain:

"Dictatorship is necessary to crush the resistance of the bourgeoisie.

"It is necessary for the purpose of frightening.

"It is necessary in order that the proletariat may forcibly crush its opponents."

Kautsky does not understand these explanations. Being enamoured with the "pure" democracy, without perceiving its bourgeois character, he "consistently" takes the standpoint that the majority, because it is a majority, does not need to "crush" the "opposition" of the minority, there is no need "forcibly to crush" it—that it is necessary to crush the *incidental* attempts to overthrow democracy. Adhering to this conception of "pure" democracy, Kautsky *unexpectedly* commits that same little error which is always made by all bourgeois democrats; namely that he thinks that the formal equality, altogether false and feigned under Capitalism, is a reality! A small thing!

The exploiter and the exploited cannot be equal. This fact, much as Kautsky dislikes it, forms the most essential substance of Socialism.

Another fact is essential: there cannot be real equality before it is absolutely impossible for one class to oppress another class.

It is possible to overpower the exploiters with one blow by a successful revolt in the interior or by a mutiny among the troops. But, with possibly very rare and special exceptions, the exploiting class cannot be annihilated at once. It is not possible to confiscate immediately the property of all landowners and capitalists in a great country. Further, confiscation alone, being a juridical or political measure, by no means solves the question, because it is necessary in reality to *oust* the landowners and capitalists, to put others in their places, to substitute workers in the administration of factories and estates. There cannot be equality between the exploiters on one side—exploiters who for generations have robbed their great part of the property of common education, the prerequisites and customs of a rich life—and the

exploited on the other, while the great mass of the exploited are still, even in the most progressive and most democratic bourgeois republics, miserably maltreated, unlearned, crude, scattered without selfreliance. The exploiters will hold for a long time after the revolution many real, great advantages: they have in their possession money; money cannot be immediately abolished; they own moveable property, often of great value, they have relations, organization and administrative experience, they know all kinds of administrative "secrets," customs, methods, means, possibilities, they own education, are in close relations with the technically highest personnel, which lives and thinks as bourgeoisie, they have more experience in war, and this is by no means unimportant.

If the exploiters are crushed only in one country—and that is, of course, the usual course of events, because a simultaneous revolution in many countries will be a rare exception—they will, nevertheless, remain more powerful than the exploited, because the international relations of the exploiters are very extensive. The fact that a part of the exploited, less developed element of the middle peasantry, artisans, etc., will go and is apt to go over to the side of the exploiters, has been a common observation during revolutions. This was the case also during the Commune. Among the Versailles troops there were also proletarians, a fact the learned Kautsky has "forgotten."

Such being the case, it is an absurdity to assume that, in a revolution that is, to any degree, determined and thoroughgoing in character, the relation between majority and minority can be a decisive factor. History has proven beyond a doubt that in every revolution worthy of the name, the new ruling class must reckon with the long continued, selfish, furious opposition of the deposed class, who for years to come, have very real advantages as compared with those of the new ruling class. Only a prejudiced liberal, or a ridiculously mawkish Kautsky, can for a moment imagine that the exploiting class will respect the decision of the exploited majority, before they have tested their superiority in a last, furious struggle.

The passing from Capitalism to Communism forms a whole historical period. While this period continues, the exploiters will not cease to hope that the former conditions will be restored, and this *hope* finds concrete expression in *attempts* to restore former conditions. After the first serious defeat, the defeated exploiters, who certainly did not anticipate defeat, will not believe, will not *dare* believe such a possibility, will throw themselves with tenfold strength, in a fury of hatred and rage, into the struggle to restore their lost "paradise," to defend their families who once enjoyed

the sweetest fruits of existence, but who now are doomed by the "mob" to destruction and poverty or to "common" work. . . . Behind the exploiters stand also the great mass of the petit-bourgeoisie, who as years of historical experience in every country have shown, waver and vacillate panic-stricken, frightened at the difficulties of the revolution, when the proletariat meets the first defeat or partial defeat. They become nervous and run in terror from one camp to another . . . as did our Mensheviks and social-revolutionists

To prattle of majorities and minorities, of pure democracy, of the needlessness of dictatorship, of the equality of exploiters and exploited at this time, when a furious war has put into question the existence of privileges that have existed for hundreds and thousands of years—what narrow-mindedness, what conservatism it indicates!

Tens of years of a relatively "peaceful" period of Capitalism, from 1871 to 1914, have drawn to the Socialist parties, which were sinking into opportunism, whole Augean stables of conservatism, narrow-mindedness, betrayal

The reader has undoubtedly noticed that Kautsky, in the quotation taken from his book concerning general suffrage, refers to it as the deep source of strong moral authority; that on the other hand Engels, speaking of the same Paris Commune and discussing the same question of dictatorship, speaks of the authority of an armed people, when it must choose between the authority of a bourgeois and of a revolutionist

It is necessary to point out that the question of depriving the exploiting class of its suffrage rights is a *purely Russian* question, not one that is vitally necessary to a dictatorship of the proletariat. If Kautsky, to be sincere, had entitled his book "Against the Bolsheviks," then this title would have answered the substance of his book, and then Kautsky would have had the right to speak as he did about the suffrage. But Kautsky wished above all to appear as a "theoretician." He entitled his book *generally*: "The Dictatorship of the Proletariat." He discusses the Soviets and refers to Russia as a separate problem only in the second part of his book, beginning from the sixth chapter. The first part from which I have taken the quotation, treats of *democracy and dictatorship in general*. But when he begins to speak about suffrage, he specifically attacks the Bolsheviks, and sets aside completely his theoretical position. Discussed in the light of a theory, as the relation that exists between democracy and dictatorship in gen-

eral, without application to any one particular nation, the subject becomes not "suffrage or no suffrage" but concerns itself solely with the possibility of preserving democracy, for the *rich and the exploiters*, during that historical period in which the exploiters are being crushed and their state is being supplanted by the state of the exploited.

Only in this way can the question be treated as an abstract theory.

We know the example of the Commune, we know what the founders of Marxism have said in respect to it and on the basis of it. On the basis of this material I have studied the question of democracy and dictatorship in my book "The State and Revolution," which was written before the October revolution. *I did not mention in a single word* the question of the limitations of suffrage. But here it must be said that the question of a limitation of suffrage is particularly a national question, but not one that involves the question of proletarian dictatorship. It is necessary to study the question of the limitation of suffrage when one studies the *particular prerequisites* of the Russian revolution, the *particular method* of its development. But it would be a mistake to state beforehand that all, or most of the future proletarian revolutions in Europe absolutely will give a limited suffrage to the bourgeoisie. It may so happen. After the war and after the experience of the Russian revolution, it is probable that this will happen. But *it is not necessary* for the enforcement of proletarian dictatorship, it is not an *absolute* distinguishing mark of the logical conception of such a dictatorship, it is not a *necessary* prerequisite for the historical and class conception of the dictatorship.

The conception that underlies it and the absolute prerequisite of this dictatorship is the *forcible* crushing of the exploiters as a class, and therefore the *disregarding* of "pure democracy," i. e. equality and freedom, in regard to that *class*.

From this point of view alone can this question be theoretically set forth. And Kautsky, by failing to discuss the question from this angle, has shown that he opposes the Bolsheviks, not as a theoretician, but as an opportunist and a bourgeois.

In what country, and under what peculiar national conditions of this or that Capitalism, this or that limitation shall be used, exclusively or generally, whether or not democracy is violated when the exploiters are in question—that is a question of national traits, peculiar to this or that Capitalism, to this or that revolution.

Theoretically the matter resolves itself into the question: is the dictatorship of the proletariat possible *without violating democracy*, as far as the class of exploiters is concerned?

Kautsky has expressly omitted this, theoretically the only important and essential question. Kautsky has set forth all kinds of quotations from the works of Marx and Engels, *but not those* which refer to the case in question and to which I referred.

Kautsky has discussed the things that suit him, using as premises those facts which can be accepted without qualification by liberals and bourgeois democrats, because they do not transcend the sphere of their thinking. But he has wholly disregarded the main subject, the fundamental fact that the proletariat cannot win *without crushing* the *opposition* of the bourgeoisie, without *forcibly overpowering its opponents*. And where there is "forcible crushing," there is not "freedom," there *also cannot be democracy*.

Socialism and the League of Nations

By MAURICE SUGAR

Foreword

Since the following article was written there have come to my attention certain newspaper editorial comments which are of great significance, in the light of the conclusions which I have expressed. On January 5, 1919, the New York Times, in a leading editorial insisting upon the necessity for the existence of a league of nations, says:

"Even Clemenceau would not care for the balance of power without the support of the United States, more than ever necessary now that the world faces a new threat more insidious, equally immoral, and perhaps more powerful, or at least more dangerous than Germany itself, where the Bolshevik idea was born, appropriately enough. The balance of power is powerless against the enemy within the gates of every nation."

On January 6, 1919, the New York World states editorially:

"Without a League of Nations, two-thirds of Europe will be Balkanized by the logic of events, with the black menace of Bolshevism hanging over everything and everybody."

House of Correction,
Detroit, Michigan.
February first, 1919.

For centuries it has been customary to consider "nationality" as the primary distinguishing feature between larger groups of

people. Explanation of group characteristics and practices is yet made by their ascription to some particular "people" or country, usually upon the assumption that such characteristics and practices are inherent. It is altogether natural that this facile method of solving the mysteries of social phenomena should be accentuated during a time of war, since it is at such a time that fervid nationalistic appeals play upon and exaggerate this view; a predisposition for which is already implanted in the people by the teachings of a grossly distorted educational system. And this view is all the more readily accepted because of the indisputable fact that "nationality" does very often furnish a rough means of classification of many apparent differences; sight being lost of the facts that these differences are relatively minor ones, and that the comprehensive characteristic "nationality" itself is a derivative one, its rise being traceable to the play of certain social and economic forces, which by no means cease to exist upon the crystallization of a nationality, but which continue to work within the nationality by them brought forth.

The practice of treating nations as separate, distinct and fundamental entities is one to which even a great number of "radical" thinkers adhere. And, in the realm of international relations, we constantly find progressive minds contrasting one country with, or comparing it to another, and noting what they contend to be basic differences or similarities. To say that one capitalist country is democratic and that another is autocratic is to ascribe a fixed political character to each of these countries as a unit. There is disclosed no recognition of the fact that some of the elements of governmental administration of each of the countries may be of a democratic nature or tendency, and some of an autocratic nature or tendency; a greater or less proportion of one of these elements giving a democratic or autocratic appearance to the whole.

Many, known as radicals, who display enthusiasm for the formation of a league of nations, conceive of such a league as the clasping together of the hands of so many individuals. These countries are democratic, they say. They will join hands, and jointly they will "insure peace," or "enforce peace," or "greatly mitigate the danger of war," such declarations being accompanied by arguments which show that the reference to countries as distinct entities is not one invoked merely because of the expediency of this method of expression, but, generally, because the league, in their minds, is to partake of the characters of the countries forming it.

To point out that capitalist nations are not essentially cohesive

units is not by any means to promulgate a new doctrine. Marx and others of his day pointed it out so often and so clearly in expounding the theory of the class struggle, that all subsequent pointing has been more or less reiteration, although illuminated by new illustrations. But great crises in human affairs produce great crises in human minds and human breasts. And the war, a great crisis in international relations, produced a great crisis in minds devoted to the furtherance of international unity, and in breasts harboring a passion for universal brotherhood. Men who before the war were unequivocal adherents to the view that within each nation there are two stupendous economic forces, diametrically opposed, and battling with each other for supremacy, were virtually overcome by the vision of an international amalgamation, such as the one espoused by President Wilson. Indeed, the very word "international" in this connection had an alluring sound. It was the word that had always been associated with the Socialist conception of world union. And the application of radical terminology to other than radical programs is a most successfully deceptive device. Then there were those, quite enthusiastic over the idea of a league of nations, who yet adhered to the doctrine of the class struggle, urging the one as a step in the evolution of nationalism into internationalism, and espousing the other as a progressive force operating within the league. These, however, as a general rule were guilty of flagrant neglect in their agitation of the latter, in the belief, not always admitted, that the former was the most potent propaganda for the time.

The doctrine of the class struggle which, before the war, was consciously advanced by a relatively small proportion of the people of the world—though vaguely felt by a much larger proportion—seemed obliterated by the entry into the war of all the hitherto contending elements. The failure of the Socialists to prevent the war was commonly mistaken for the breakdown of their principles and philosophy. Were not both the bourgeoisie and the proletariat united in the defense of their respective countries? In the great common cause, classes had disappeared. The class struggle had ceased.

As if classes are created by virtue of a desire that they exist! The belief that there are classes may be dissipated for a time, or rather, there may prevail for a time the belief that classes are dissipated, but the existence of classes is a fact, which, though befogged by the clouds of overwhelming passion, remains to await a renewed recognition upon the rising of the mist.

The mist rose before the war was over. The revolution in Russia, particularly the shift of authority which put supreme

power in the Soviet, was a monumental shock to the placidity of those who, as soon as the war had started, had complacently dismissed the "menace" of uneasy labor. Nor was it an undisturbing factor in the mental poise of those who had firmly placed the propaganda value of the class struggle subordinate to the "pressing need" and "immediate practicability" of a league of nations. Here was not a pressing need. Here was a pressing actuality! Here was not an immediate practicability. Here was an immediate practice! Back came the class struggle to a position of supreme importance. It is difficult to talk of its disappearance at a time when it stands a naked revelation to the whole world.

And then, as if this first outbreak had been a signal, evidences of the conflict began to appear everywhere. Bulgaria, Austria-Hungary and Germany showed violent symptoms. Striking signs appeared in Switzerland, Holland, Spain, Portugal, the Scandinavian countries; in Argentina and other South American countries. France was being viewed by the bourgeoisie with no little apprehension. In England the class issues came to the fore with a rapidity that belied the reputed stolidity of the English worker. Australian workers are on the verge of the organization of the "One Big Union." A Canadian official publicly expresses his belief that Canada has recently been dangerously near an "uprising." Even the United States shows some feeble, though not inconspicuous signs. The talk of a "labor party," and the recession of the belief in the "identity of interest" between capital and labor is of significance in this regard. The whole world is awakening; and to appreciate the underlying significance of it all, one need but to survey the plans for "reconstruction" which are under process of formulation by the governments of the world. Such plans present practically nothing but attempted solutions of the "problems" which have been propelled into focus by the ever increasing sharpness of class antagonisms.

Never before in history have the expressions of this class struggle been so glaringly apparent; and to-day the denial of this tenet of the Socialist philosophy becomes not merely the profession of a theoretical opposition to an academic formula, but the betrayal of an actual blindness to an overpowering reality.

It is hardly a step from the recognition of the clash of the economic elements in a single country to a recognition of the identity of interest of each of those elements with that of a corresponding element in each of the other countries. The recognition of this latter proposition is altogether as irresistible as of the former. Patent evidence exists in the similarity of demands

made by the working classes of all countries, as well as the similarity of palliative measures offered by the capitalist classes as a means of pacification.

More striking proof is presented in the attitude of hostility taken by the ruling classes of all countries towards the proletarian republic of Russia. Most "respectable" and "patriotic" representatives of the Russian bourgeoisie are frantically appealing to the bourgeoisie of all countries including those of the "enemy" to aid them in their terrified resistance to this new and awful menace of an aroused proletariat. And these appeals cannot be said to strike unresponsive chords. Moral support is tendered from all quarters with most affectionate sincerity. Material aid is given by every means available. And if military support shall be wanting, it will be only because of the fear on the part of the anxious sympathizers that its tender will hasten the day of their own necessity for succor.

Consciousness of the international identity of interest of the workers is rapidly growing. Even during the war conferences were held by representatives of the workers of countries allied in the conflict, and attempted to be held by representatives of the workers of all the belligerent nations. This international class consciousness is the explanation of the pronounced and determined protest by the workers of many of the "allied" nations against intervention in Russia. And the development of this consciousness will be the factor that will induce the ultimate collapse of the League of Nations, lately characterized by President Wilson as "the final enterprise of humanity."

The Russian social revolution, in its inception, took on the aspect of an overthrow of established political institutions. So with the beginning of the social revolution in Germany. This was because—as has been pointed out by the science of Socialism since the middle of the last century—the forms and functions of the political institutions of a country have their roots in its economic structure. The economic struggle between classes finds its reflection in political conflict; and the class which is in economic supremacy is the class which dominates political administration. Says the Communist Manifesto: "The ruling ideas of each age have ever been the ideas of its ruling class." It is the ruling class, therefore, which gives to the political system its functions and forms. And with the disappearance of its economic supremacy vanish the political forms which were the outgrowths. Russia is the clearest present-day illustration of this historical law. In countries, therefore, where the bourgeoisie is the prevailing class, the political institutions function in its inter-

est. And it is a corollary that the acquisition of a class consciousness by the workers is followed by his energetic attack upon the prevailing political institutions. With the development of the international class consciousness comes the attack upon prevailing international political institutions.

The League of Nations is an international political institution. Its affairs will of necessity be administered by agents of the bourgeoisie of all countries. It will be the main office of the world's exploiters. The first interest of those who will comprise its constituency remains as it was, the preservation of their class supremacy. Pressure may compel their abandonment of points of vantage but the final dominance of the class will never be bartered. There is nothing to exchange for it. It must be wrested, if it is to be acquired. This class position, heretofore predominantly nationalistic, is not to disappear upon the formation of the League of Nations. On the contrary, the League will in reality be the instrument for the facilitation of international exploitation. Capitalistic institutions have attained such gigantic proportions as to require international administration. And, as against the exploited class, the identity of economic interest of the exploiters—in spite of what competitive tendencies may be operating within the limits of this common interest—compels the establishment of some mutual instrument of common protection. The enemies of the workers are welding a new sword.

The growth of the class consciousness of the workers of the world will most naturally develop the objects to be attacked by the League. The international spread of solidarity throughout the ranks of the proletariat generates an international spread of apprehension throughout the ranks of the bourgeoisie. The arrest of the spread of this solidarity must be a principal endeavor of the League of Nations. While there does appear to be a growing conviction among the more "progressive" representatives of the bourgeoisie that social unrest is not a germ disease, yet it is altogether possible that one of the methods of attacking this "evil" will be to "strangle it at the source." This follows from the stupidity of the mind that contemplates social unrest as capable of being caused only by contagion. It is as if one were to pour water on a bon-fire, all the while unaware that a volcano is about to erupt under his feet. Yet there is no denying the potency of the example of actual socialist success, in the furtherance of revolutionary propaganda. And in the pursuance of a policy based upon an erroneous assumption, the League of Nations may impede Socialist progress in no little degree. Posing as the guardian of the welfare of the world, the League may stand

ready to beat upon the head any one who shall attempt to rise to question its designs, protest its acts, or challenge its authority.

The principal one of consequence that will so question, protest and challenge, is the rising worker. It is his head then, at which the blow is to be aimed. He must, therefore, use the head to provide means for its own protection.

The practical position to be taken by the workers of a country in which they have attained political ascendancy resolves itself at the outset into the question of whether or not a Socialist republic should join the League of Nations. Of course the refusal of the League to include a Socialist country in its ranks will likely eliminate the practical necessity for rendering an answer. The failure of the dominant members of the League to "recognize" a Socialist government would necessarily be followed by such exclusion. Assuming a welcome on the part of the League, however, the answer to the question does not, it seems to me, involve a question of principle. It is rather a question of expediency, a question of international Socialist tactics. It is entirely conceivable that conditions may prevail which would justify the entry of a Socialist government into the League of Nations. Was not the Socialist government of Russia justified in entering into the Brest-Litovsk treaty with a capitalist Germany? The significant point is that such entry could only be from considerations of preservation of the gains of the revolution; the activities of the Socialists being directed towards the undermining of the League by the overthrow of its bourgeois constituencies in the capitalist countries.

But, facing the facts as they exist at the present time, a Socialist government must look to some agency other than the League of Nations, for the execution of its international policies.

The alternative to the League of Nations is a federation of the Proletariats of the world. This would be the common agency of Socialist countries just as the League of Nations will be of capitalist ones. It would be the instrument through which the "workers of the world unite" to defend their gains and organize for further encroachment upon capitalist control of the world. And its functions, at its inception, would necessarily be of a character different from those it would assume after the revolutionary process had placed the workers in control of the greater nations.

May we speculate?

At the outset it would be incumbent upon such a federation

to hasten the process of socialization within the countries in which the workers had gained control. It must work to establish the new order so firmly that differences of policy within a country shall be confined to differences, affecting administration within the limits of the new society, and not differences as to the desirability of the maintenance of that society. It is vital that the social processes should be speeded in order to completely foredoom any attempt at counter-revolution. This would only be doing internationally what Premier Lenin has insisted must be done to preserve the revolution in Russia.

Likewise means must be provided for a unified defense against attacks which may be made upon it by capitalist countries, which attacks will not unlikely find their outlet through the League of Nations. Such unity of defense is indispensable since the "causes" of all Socialist countries are identical; and because of the unified power of the foe, the strongest of the Socialist nations will be as much in need of the aid of the weakest as the latter will be of the help of the former.

Following the firm establishment of the new order in the countries of the federation, and of provision for the means of unified defense, and indeed, simultaneous with these while they remain matters of prime importance, tremendous effort must be made to assist the Socialist movements throughout the world, not merely as a stimulating expression of comradeship, but as a method of forestalling attacks upon Socialist governments by capitalist ones. The Socialist movement at home is the most vital factor in discouraging attacks upon the Socialist movement abroad.

Means innumerable will be advised and employed to carry out these objects. In establishing the new order beyond the possibility of overthrow, concern must be directed to the problem of the production and distribution of wealth both within the countries and between them. The shifting of industrial management and the transfer of land ownership to the working class must be accomplished with the greatest possible speed, consistent with stability. There must also be established trade relations which will result in the total disappearance of lines of economic demarcation; and there must be developed a unity of economic administration.

In providing for a unified defense the federation will be compelled to consider, as one of its means, the erection and maintenance of a military force. The particular course of such plans would, to a great extent, depend upon the military aspect

assumed by the League of Nations. A decision of the League to abolish armaments would undoubtedly be welcomed, and suit gladly followed. And it seems no less clear that a decision on the part of the League to maintain a military force would be met with corresponding determination on the part of the federation, forced to such a program as a defensive measure.

Assistance to the Socialist movements throughout the world may be provided by the furnishing of financial aid, and the supplying of most persuasive material for propaganda—as well as most persuasive propagandists. First-hand enlightenment is appetizing. The worker is stimulated by the knowledge that other workers, facing the same problems, have actually arrived at a solution, particularly when he discovers that that solution is one which is flattering to his own intelligence, and laudatory of his own powers. Further, knowledge garnered from the experience of countries that have gone through, or are going through the transitional stages of the social change will be of inestimable value to revolutionary elements in countries approaching these stages. This knowledge must be collated and distributed where its want is felt.

It is only natural that with the growth of power of such a federation will come the decline of power of the League of Nations. It will be as the flow of power from one to the other, the League being disintegrated by the loss of its units, which of necessity will attach to the federation. It will be practically impossible for the League to curb this tendency, as its efforts would have to be directed not only against the lost member, but at the federation with which the member will have identified itself, and which, by the acquisition of this new strength will have become greater in its power of resistance. The life-blood of the League will be drained away, to throb in the veins of a newly vitalized body, thrilling in the passion of resistless conquest.

In countries under bourgeois control it is idle of the workers to oppose the formation of the League of Nations. Such negative propaganda can be of no avail, since it leaves the choice between the League, with its seductive ideological accouterments, and the old system with its ideology shattered beyond repair by the tragedy of the war. A more important reason for declining to oppose the formation of the League is that such opposition would without doubt fall into the category of dissipated energy. Opposition is useless. Some such league is an inevitable consequence of the accelerated development of international capitalism. All activity should start from this assumption, and proceed in harmonious contemplation of the next evolutionary development.

The worker must be provided with the explanation of the rise and function of the League of Nations, together with an explanation of the forces affecting its disintegration. Emphasis must be laid upon the next step in the evolution of internationalism—the accomplishment of a federation of the proletariats of the world. Here is an ideal, a positive one, and one that will ultimately fire him, since it is a prefiguration of an approaching social phenomenon. It is something for him to grasp and to materialize. Persistent and illustrative presentation of all the phases of the class struggle must be made. And, with this tragical wail and its incidents, with the revolutionary uprisings and their fascinating touches of the dramatic, with the establishment of workers' republics and their absorbing activities, never was there greater abundance of material for refreshing illustration. Between the application of the theory of the class struggle to the problems of the workers' immediate environment, and to those of his relationship to the workers of other countries is not even a step—it is a gradation.

The Logic of Insanity

By CHARLES RAPPOPORT, Paris

I have just returned from Berne, where I have watched, with mingled feelings, the vain attempts of our International Opportunists to galvanize the corpse of the second "nationalist" International and to restore to it the spirit that brought about the socialist catastrophe of August 4, 1914. I should, I suppose, give a record of the impressions I received there, but events of such far-reaching significance, of so much vaster scope are attracting our immediate attention.

The insane madmen who loosed this tempest upon the earth, still continue to rule the world, leading it recklessly onward, along the path that leads to an abyss and bloody chaos. Twenty million men, the flower of the world's vigorous youth, have been sacrificed in vain. Forty billion dollars in property have been uselessly destroyed, for the general education of our honorable rulers. The misery that awaits thousands of households, the dreadful epidemics that continue to be a constant menace to every one of us, the terrific rise in the cost of living, all of these questions so vital to the peoples of all nations, are of no significance to our blind and war-mad nationalists. They shout for

annexations of territory and peoples, they demand mines and natural resources for capitalist exploitation. They have no thought of the future. Like primitive savages they live only for the present. After us the Deluge! A deluge of blood and tears.

And yet this nationalist insanity too, has its logic, a logic that is irrefutable so long as one considers it from the premises furnished by these four years of horrible slaughter. For, after all is said and done, Germany and her allies did attack innocent and unarmed peoples. And, in the logic of war and the capitalist class, the defeated violator of defenseless nations must be made to atone for his wrong-doings. Shall the victims pay the price of Germany's wrong-doing? Shall not the incendiary pay for the damage the fire has wrought? And since the havoc exceeds even the wildest flights of imagination, shall not the price of his atonement be equally bitter?

It is natural that the "majority" socialists, having made the historical philosophy of the capitalist class their own during the war, should be somewhat embarrassed now that the time has come when they must draw the practical conclusions of their process of reasoning during the war. The guilty must pay, and the guilty are to be found only on one side

It is by no means a new problem that the world is being called upon to face. Bismarck and his band, in 1870, reasoned not a whit differently. According to the author of the Ems despatch France alone bore the responsibility of the war, was the aggressor. And though, after the battle of Sedan, the French envoy, General de Wimpfen, showed the implacable victor that it would be a political blunder to continue to aggravate the French nationalist sentiment, although Bismarck was warned of the frightful consequence for the future, the iron soldier, drunk with the wine of victory, answered with the irrefutable logic of madness, "No war indemnity, no matter how huge the sum may be, can compensate us for our enormous sacrifices. We must protect Germany on the South, the most vulnerable point exposed to French attack. We must put an end forever to the pressure that France has exercised, for two centuries in the past, upon German peoples, at the expense of the whole German nation Baden, Wuertemberg and the other southern states must no longer live in fear and terror of Strassburg."

In place of "the southern states" place the phrase "Paris is too near the border" and you will find that we have adopted the same process of reasoning, in favor of the opposite side. But with far greater consequences.

"During the last one hundred and fifty years," reasoned the blood and iron Chancellor, "France has waged more than a dozen wars against south-western Germany. The attempt has been made to acquire certain guarantees against such attacks, but whatever these states obtained was a snare and a delusion The real danger lies in the incurable arrogance, in the tireless ambition of the French character (just as to-day our annexationists speak of the "German character"). We must protect ourselves against this peril, not by attempting to placate French susceptibilities, but by insuring ourselves of an adequate *border-line*. France, in its ceaseless attacks upon our western border, has again and again penetrated southern Germany with relatively small forces, before help could possibly be sent from the North. These invasions have been repeated, time and again, under Louis XIV., under the Republic and the first Empire, and the German states have constantly been forced to pit their strength against that of France."

Bismarck knew that the "annexation of a slice of territory would be bitterly resented by the French." But the Great Statesman, intoxicated by victory, formally declared this consideration to be of "little importance".

Not that Bismarck failed to foresee the campaign for revenge. But he stilled his anxiety with logic, and this same insane logic, in all its dangerous plausibility, is being echoed and re-echoed to-day by our block-headed press. "An enemy who can never be made into a friend must be fought to the bitter finish. Only the complete surrender of the eastern fortresses of France can guarantee our safety."

One almost feels that Bismarck must have been a constant reader of to-day's *le Matin*. And since the strangling of a vanquished nation must always be accomplished in the light of pacifism and idealism, the reasoning beast of prey adds: "Everyone who is desirous of international disarmament must desire that the neighbors of France act in this light, for France alone endangers the peace of Europe." (See les Memoirs, by Maurice Busch, of 1898.)

History repeats itself,, atrociously and stupidly. However, there are some variations. In face of the unlimited demands of the Prussian super-militarists, who, together with Count Waldersee, the same, we believe who in 1900 commanded the Allied troops as well as the French in the Chinese Expedition, demanded the eternal destruction of the "Paris Babel." The Statesman, more clear-sighted, after all, than the pride-maddened Junkers, here

showed stiff resistance and somewhat reduced the "bill" that France was condemned to pay.

Have we a Bismarck? It seems doubtful. But there is no doubt that the military caste everywhere reasons in the same way, is madly charging down the same incline of victory.

And there is yet another difference. A few days ago our friend, Jean Longuet, brilliantly introduced, at *l'Ecole Socialiste*, his very interesting book on the "Politique extérieure du Marxisme." He pictured the heroic resistance of the first International to the annexationist appetites of a victorious Germany. The Berne conference did not even consider the possibility of such opposition, except perhaps in a few generalities that had neither force nor color.

Where are our Bebels and our Liebknechts?

They are dead, assassinated. And the living failed to speak there where their words might have had real historical significance. And so the blind are leading the lame toward the final cataclysm, in an atmosphere overcharged with electricity.

Poor France! Poor Humanity!

* * *

Headed for Stockholm (via Russia), we arrived at Berne. The allied governments, in their wisdom, why, normal human intelligence fails to comprehend, have at last, after four years of war, condescended to allow us to cross the borders into a neutral state. French and German Socialists have shaken hands—and the world did not totter!

It has been my privilege to be present at all International Congresses, without exception since the second International was founded at Paris in 1889, on the occasion of the first centennial anniversary of the French Revolution. But never have I witnessed a Congress so dull, so poor in thought and so devoid of revolutionary or even of idealistic sentiment than this. A hundred delegates, flanked by at least 200 more or less authentic journalists, were gathered together there in a bare hall. There was no Socialist insignia, no bit of red cloth, not even the traditional bust of Karl Marx or the famous rallying cry "Workers of all countries, unite" without which there has never been an International Congress. Truly, it seemed more like a meeting of old veterans, or of agricultural comitias

But even more important was the complete absence of frank and fearless expression, the lack of a single popular breath. The

few courageous minority members, and even ex-majority members felt themselves completely submerged by a marsh of stagnation, of auguries and sub-auguries, of hallway diplomats, of old and future ministers, and Socialist ministers actually in office.

After four years of the most terrific struggle that the world has ever seen, after four social revolutions (in Russia, Germany, Austria and Hungary, one had hoped for something better. But they did not dare to broach the most important subject, the question of the responsibility of the different Socialist sections for the assassination of the International. French ex-majority and German majority Socialists generously declared a general amnesty and together formed a solid counter-revolutionary and anti-bolshevik bloc. The reconciliation was made at the expense of Lenin.

Instead of forcing the responsible capitalist regime to face the responsibility of its millions of dead, instead of charging the guilty with their foul murder, they prepared themselves to chastise the Bolsheviks.

This struggle, at long distance, against a social revolution, in the midst of its revolutionary period, by a body whose very existence was based upon the principle of the overthrow of the capitalist system, was so comic that even the authors of that gloomy enterprise backed down before the ungrateful task.

All of the most important decisions were put off. It was, in truth a Congress of postponements. It would have been far wiser had the Congress adjourned until a more favorable time when the proletariat, which is now busy with other things, would have an opportunity to make its presence felt. Only once was there at least a semblance of international solidarity. It was the question of the German prisoners. But even here the French ex-majority Socialists found a way out of the difficulty by leaving the initiative, with generous impartiality, to the German minority member, Kurt Eisner, who, in the face of our social patriots, branded the military reactionaries of his own countries, as we were all wont to do in the good old days before the war. Renaudel did not fail to step on the tender corns of the others with the heavy clumsiness that characterizes this shrewd native of Normandy. But nobody whispered a word about our own prisoners, of those Socialists in all countries that are being held by their own bourgeois ruling classes.

Not one problem of Socialist politics, or, for that matter, of world politics, found serious discussion. True, the Bolshevik problem was broached. But even here the discussion centered

rather on the relations between Socialism and democracy. The subject, furthermore, was put on an absolutely unacceptable basis: dictatorship or democracy. As if every Socialist who knows the ABC of Socialist philosophy did not know that there is no such thing as bourgeois democracy under capitalism. For us the choice lies not between dictatorship and democracy but between capitalist dictatorship and Socialist dictatorship, between a dictatorship for and of the people, and a dictatorship against the people.

In France we have, at this moment, a dictatorship of the past. We proclaim to the world that we will put in place of the dictatorship of the deputies of a dead age, the dictatorship of the oppressed masses.

An Unusual Friendship

By FRANZ MEHRING

The victory of Marx's career was not only due to the man's enormous power. According to all human probability, he would have succumbed sooner or later, if he had not found in Engels a friend, of whose self-sacrificing fidelity we have had no accurate picture until the publication of the correspondence of the two men.

No other such spectacle is afforded in all recorded history. Couples of friends, of historical importance, are found throughout history, and German history has its examples also. Frequently their life-work is so closely interwoven that it is difficult to decide which accomplishment belongs to each one of them. But always there has been a persistent remnant of individual obstinacy or stubbornness, or perhaps only an instinctive reluctance to surrender one's own personality, which, in the words of the poet, "is the highest blessing of the children of men." After all, Luther saw in Melancton only a chicken-livered scholar, while Melancton regarded Luther as a coarse peasant. And in the correspondence of Goethe and Schiller, any one with sound senses can discern the secret lack of attunement between the great Privy Councillor and the small

Court Councillor. There is no trace of this ultimate human weakness in the friendship of Marx and Engels: the more their thoughts and labors became interwoven, the more each one of them remained a full man, complete in himself.

Their exteriors were quite different. Engels, a blond Teuton of tall stature, of English manners, as an observer once said of him, always well-dressed, with a bearing that was rigid with the training not only of the barracks, but also of the counting-house. With six clerks, he said, he would organize a branch of the administration a thousand times more simple and efficient than with sixty Government Councillors, who cannot even write legibly and get your books all balled up, so that the Devil himself can make nothing of them. A member of the Manchester Stock Exchange, perfectly respectable in the business dealings and the amusements of the English bourgeoisie, its fox-hunts and its Christmas parties, he was yet a tireless mental worker and fighter, who, in a little house on the outskirts of the city, held his treasure concealed, his little Irish girl, in whose arms he would refresh himself whenever he tired of the human turmoil in the world without.

Marx, on the other hand, short, thick-set, with flashing eyes and a lion's mane of ebon hue, betraying his Semitic origin; of careless exterior, a father, whose family cares alone would be sufficient to keep him away from the social life of the great city; so intensely devoted to consuming intellectual labor that he has hardly the time to gulp down a hasty dinner and uses up his bodily strength to all hours of the night; a tireless thinker, to whom thought is a supreme pleasure; in this respect a genuine successor of Kant, of Fichte, and particularly, of Hegel, whose sentence he loved to repeat: "Even the most criminal thought of a scoundrel is more sublime and more magnificent than the miracles of the celestial sphere," but differing from them in that his thoughts inexorably drive him to action, he was unpractical in small matters, but very practical in large matters; far too helpless to arrange a petty household, but incomparably capable in the business of re-

cruiting and leading an army that was to revolutionize the world.

If it is true that "the style is the man," we must also note their differences as writers. Each in his way was a master of language, a linguistic genius, with a mastery of many foreign languages and even of individual dialects. In this field, Engels was even more remarkable than Marx, but whenever writing in his mother-tongue, even in his letters, and of course in his writings, he exercises a most austere care to keep the language free from all foreign admixture of word and phrase, without falling, however, into the vagaries of the patriotic linguistic purists. He wrote with ease and lucidity, always in a style so pellucid, that you looked right down to the bottom of the current of his animated speech.

Marx' style was at once more careless and more difficult. In his youthful letters there is still apparent, as in those of Heine, a condition of struggle with the language, and in the letters of his later years, particularly after his settlement in England, he began to make use of a picturesque jargon of German, English and French, all mixed up. In his published writings, also, there is an over liberal use of foreign words, and there is no lack of Gallicisms and Anglicisms, yet he is so distinctly a master of the German language that he cannot be translated without serious loss. Once when Engels had read a chapter by Marx in a French translation, even after Marx had revised the translation, it seemed to Engels that all the vigor and sap and life had disappeared. Goethe once wrote to Frau von Stein: "In metaphors I am ready to stand comparison with the proverbs of Sancho Panza." Marx could easily bear comparison with the greatest of the world's adepts in figures of speech, with Lessing, Goethe, Hegel, so full of life and vigor is his language.

He had fully absorbed Lessing's statement that a perfect representation requires a fusion of image and conception, as closely joined as man and woman, and the university pedants have gotten square with him for this, from Father Wilhelm

Roscher down to the youngest fledgeling of a Privatdozent, by accusing him of being incapable of making himself understood except in an extremely vague way, "patched up with a liberal use of figurative language." Marx never exhausted the questions which he attacked beyond the point of enabling the reader to begin a fruitful train of thought; his speech is like the dancing of the waves over the purple depths of the sea.

Engels always saw in Marx a superior spirit; he never wished to play anything but second fiddle by his side. Yet he never was a mere interpreter and assistant, but always a collaborator of independent activity, a kindred spirit, though not of equal size. In the early days of their friendship, Engels played, in one important field, rather the role of a giver than of a receiver, and twenty years later Marx wrote to him: "You know that all ideas come to me too late, and that, in the second place, I always follow in your tracks." With his somewhat light equipment, Engels was able to move about more freely, and even though his glance was sharp enough to distinguish the decisive features of a question or of a situation, it did not penetrate far enough to review at once all the conditions and corollaries with which even the scantiest decision is often burdened. For a man of action this defect is even an advantage and Marx never made a political decision without first calling upon Engels for advice, and Engels was usually able to hit the nail on the head.

Accordingly the advice which Marx asked from Engels was not as satisfactory in questions of theory as in questions of politics. In theory Marx usually was the better of the two. And he was absolutely inattentive to such advice as Engels would often give him, in order to impel him to terminate his labors on his great scientific masterpiece. "Be a little less severe on yourself in the matter of your own productions; they are far too good for the public. The main thing is to have it finished and to get it out; the defects that you still see the asses will never discover." It was a characteristic bit of Engels advice, and it was just as characteristic of Marx to ignore it.

It is clear from the above that Engels was better fitted for a journalistic career than Marx; "a real walking encyclopedia,"—so Marx once described him to a mutual friend, "capable of work at any hour of the day or night, drunk or sober, swift with his pen and alert as the devil." It seems that both, after the cessation of the *Neue Rheinische Revue*, in the autumn of 1850, had still in mind the issuing of another journal in common, to be printed in London; at least, in December, 1853, Marx wrote to Engels: "If we—you and I—had started our business as English correspondents in time, you would not now be condemned to office-work in Manchester, nor I to my debts." Engels' choice of a position of clerk in his father's firm, in preference to the prospects of this "business" was probably due to his consideration for the hopeless situation of Marx, and to a hope of better times in the future, and certainly not with the object of devoting himself permanently to the "damned business." In the spring of 1854, Engels again considered the desirability of returning to London for literary work, but this was the last time; it must have been about this time that he made up his mind to assume the cursed burden for good, not merely in order to be of assistance to his friend, but in order thus to preserve the party's best mental asset. Only with this motivation could Engels make the great sacrifice, and Marx accept it: both the offer and the acceptance required a great spirit.

And before Engels became a partner in the firm some years later, he cannot exactly be said to have trod a path of roses, but from the first day of his stay at Manchester he aided Marx and never ceased aiding him. An unending stream of one-pound, five-pound, ten-pound, later even hundred-pound notes began to flow toward London. Engels never lost his patience, even though it was often sorely tried by Marx and his wife, who had no over-great supply of domestic wisdom. He amount of a note and appeared unpleasantly surprised to learn of it when the note fell due. Slight also was his concern when, on the occasion of another general clean-up of the domestic economy, Mrs. Marx, through misplaced considerateness, con-

cealed a large item and began paying it off by stinting with her household money, thus starting the old trouble over again, with the best of all intentions; on this occasion Engels allowed his friend the rather pharisaical amusement of bewailing the "idiocy of women," who manifestly are "in constant need of guardianship," and contented himself with the gentle admonition: See it doesn't happen again.

But Engels did not alone slave away for his friend in office and exchange all day long, but he also gave to him most of his evening leisure hours, in fact, a great part of the night. Although the original reason for this added labor was the necessity of preparing an English version of Marx's articles for the *New York Tribune*, until Marx should be able to use the language well enough for literary purposes, the laborious co-operation continued for many years after the original reason had been overcome.

But all this seems a slight sacrifice as compared with the greatest service Engels rendered his friend, namely, his renunciation of his independent accomplishments as a thinker and investigator, which, in view of his incomparable energy and his rich talents would have produced valuable results. A correct notion of this sacrifice can also be obtained from the correspondence of the two men, even if we note only the studies in linguistic and military science, which were carried on by Engels partly owing to an "old predilection" and partly with a view to the practical needs of the struggle for proletarian emancipation. For, much as he hated all "autodidacticism,"—"it's all damn nonsense," he contemptuously said—and thorough as were his methods of scientific work, he was yet as little a mere closet-scholar as Marx, and every new piece of knowledge was doubly precious in his eyes, if it might aid at once in lightening the chains of the proletariat.

He therefore undertook the study of the Slavic languages because of the "consideration" that in the next great clash of national interests, "at least one of us" should be acquainted with the language, history, literature, social institutions of

those nations with whom there was some likelihood of immediate conflict. Oriental troubles led him to the oriental languages; he steered clear of Arabic with its four thousand roots, but "Persian is a veritable child's play of a language"; he would be through with it in three weeks. Then came the turn of the Germanic languages: "I am now buried in Ulfilas: I simply had to get rid of this damned Gothic: I have been so long carrying it on in a rather desultory manner. I am surprised to find that I know much more than I expected. I need one more book, and then I'll be absolutely done with it in two weeks. And then for Old Norse and Old Saxon, with which I have long been on terms of half-acquaintance. As yet I have absolutely no paraphernalia, not even a lexicon: nothing but the Gothic text and old Grimm, but the old fellow is really a brick." In the sixties, when the Schleswig-Holstein question came up, Engels undertook "some Frisian-English-Jutian-Scandinavian philology and archaeology," and when the Irish question blazed up, "some Celto-Irish," and so on. In the General Council of the International his comprehensive linguistic accomplishments were of great value to him; "Engels can stammer in twenty languages," was said of him, because in moments of excitement he displayed a slight lisp.

Another epithet of his was that of the "General," which he earned by his still more assiduous devotion to the military sciences. Here also he was satisfying an "old predilection" at the same time that he was preparing for the practical needs of the revolutionary policy. Engels was counting on "the enormous importance with the *partie militaire* would attain in the next commotion." The experiences with the officers who had joined the revolution in the years of rebellion had not been very satisfactory, and Engels declared that "the military rabble has an incredibly dirty caste spirit. They hate each other worse than poison, envy each other like schoolboys at the slightest mark of distinction, but they show a united front against all civilians." Engels wanted to arrive at a point at which his theoretical remarks might have some weight and might not merely expose his ignorance.

He had hardly gotten established in Manchester, when he began to "plug up military science." He began with the "simplest and most rudimentary things, such as are asked in an ensign's or lieutenant's examination, and are therefore assumed by all authors as already known." He studied everything about army administration, down to the most technical details: Elementary Tactics, Vauban's system of fortification, and all other systems, including the modern system of detached forts, bridge construction and fieldworks, fighting tools, down to the varying construction of carriages for field-guns, the ravitaillement of hospitals, and other matters; finally he passed on to the general history of war, in which connection he paid particular attention to the English authority Napier, the French Jomini, and the German Clausewitz.

Far removed from any shallow attacks on the moral folly of warfare, Engels sought rather to recognize its historic justification, by which effort he more than once aroused the violent rage of declamatory democracy. Byron once poured the phials of his scorching rage over the two generals who, at the Battle of Waterloo, in the character of champions of feudal Europe, inflicted a deathblow on the heir of the Revolution; it was an interesting accident that made Engels, in his letters to Marx, outline historic portraits both of Wellington and Blücher, which in their small compass, are so complete and so distinct, that they hardly need to be altered in a single respect to make them fully acceptable to the present state of advancement of military science.

In a third field, too, in which Engels also labored much and with pleasure, namely, in that of the natural sciences, he was not to have the opportunity, during the decades in which he accepted the bondage of commerce in order to afford free rein to the scientific investigations of another man—to put the finishing touches to his own Labors.

And this was really a tragic lot. But Engels never wailed about it, for sentimentality was as foreign to his nature as to his friend's. He always held it to be the great good fortune

of his life, to have stood by Marx's side for forty years, even at the price of being completely overshadowed by Marx's gigantic form. Nor did he consider it to be a belated form of satisfaction, to be permitted, after the death of his friend, to be the first man of the international workers' movement, to play the first violin, as it were, undisputed, in this movement; on the contrary, he considered this to be an honor that was too great for his merits.

As each of the two men was completely absorbed in the common cause, and each made an equally great sacrifice to it, although not an identical sacrifice, without any disagreeable reservation of objection or of boast, their friendship became an alliance which has no parallel in human history.

Bankruptcy or Revolution . . . Which?

By ANDRE A. COURLAND

Beginning with a mass manifestation on March 16, in spite of the prohibition of the government of Georges Clemenceau, under the guise of a demonstration in favor of the long-forgotten 14 principles of Woodrow Wilson, the workers of Paris seem to be decided to take matters into their own hands, fully resolved to put to a test the revolutionary consciousness of the French proletariat. The occasion will arise out of a three-day's debate on the financial situation of France to take place at the Chamber of Deputies, on March 13, 14, 15.

The yearly budget for France will be four times greater than the one of the year prior to the war, with a deficit of somewhere between \$4,250,000 and \$4,500,000 that must be met. Yet the Minister of Finance Klotz, the puppet of the big interests of France, particularly of the Rothschilds, is said to have made the statement, only a few days ago, that France has become richer since the war. Later the Minister of Finance denied this fact in a reply to the Chamber of Deputies in his opening speech in the long deferred debate on the French financial situation. "From the fiscal point of view more resources have been created, but it would be absurd to say that any country with departments in such a condition as the invaded regions of France had become

richer." According to the same statement of M. Klotz *it would be relatively easy to meet the 168,000,000 Francs (\$34,000,000) of war expenditures, with a deficit of over \$21,000,000 for 1919, by an increase in direct taxes, an income tax, receipts from liquidating war stocks and a revision of the law governing the transportation of troops over French railroads by charging the allies for the transportation, as the French are charged.* "Concerning a proposition to tax capital, M. Klotz, spokesman of the financiers, said: *"The French capitalist taxpayer will not be called on to pay 1c. of additional taxes until Germany's indemnity figures to France are settled upon and guaranteed.* But even should Germany pay completely for damages and the restoration of the devastated provinces, it would not be sufficient to balance future budgets after 1919."

The atmosphere of the Chamber of Deputies was during this debate fully suited to the occasion, crowded as it was with army officers of all ranks, who had gained admittance by virtue of personal privilege, the usual custom in French *democratic* institutions. As was to be expected, these heroic defenders of plutocratic-democracy loudly expressed their sentiments of approval at this part of the Ministers' speech, and fairly hissed Victor Dalbiez (bourgeois-radical) when he shouted, "Long live Caillaux!", referring to the former Minister of Finance and French Premier who is being held under arrest, charged with having had dealings with Germany. In concluding his address, M. Klotz mentioned a future *"Financial League of Nations, the plans of which have been discussed and will be given out shortly"* as the only means whereby France may hope to balance her budgets in the future."

When one studies the symptoms that are leading to revolutionary upheavals in the various countries, it will usually be found that the economic and financial condition of the country is of vital significance in the analysis. This is one of the reasons that prompt us to approach this question from its capitalist angle, in order to impress upon the minds of our readers some realities that are rarely mentioned in the bourgeois press.

Only one liberal-bourgeois editor found it imperative to acquaint his radical readers, in a somewhat hazy way, with the true conditions actually prevailing in France, Oswald Garrison Villard writing in the Nation of March 15, under the title "France in a Hurry", indicates some of the reasons why the French ruling classes are so very anxious to see the "peace" pourparlers come to an early end. He deals with the question of the false interpretation of the dissatisfaction of the French toiling masses

and the very evident rebellious mood of the class-conscious workers, launching an alarming warning to the powers that be to take cognizance of the fact that France is resting on a volcano far more dangerous than even Italy or England.

Some time ago, Louis Sellier, socialist alderman of Paris but not yet a "Bolshevist", wrote an editorial in *le Populaire*, dealing with the financial position of France, under the head: "Capitalism dying of the war". After a long exposé, largely in conformity with the very recent official statements, he went on to say:—"But when our militant workingmen, interested as they may be in the economic realities, grasp the real significance of these figures, of which we have cited only the most suggestive, when their minds once realize the fact that the entire income of France, before the war, was slightly above \$6,000,000, what conclusion will they reach?"

No conceivable rate of production, no matter how prolific, can hope to cover the public debt of nearly four and a half billion dollars, and at the same time feed the mouths of over 37 million souls. There, we think, is a clear demonstration of the material impossibility, mathematically proven, of performing such a task. . . .

"Private capitalism, already unbearable before the world-drama began, will take on the hideous form of an enormous monster, inflated tenfold in proportions and appetites.

"There are other considerations, on which we will dwell in the near future, militating in favor of and urgently preparing, the liberating event which will secure for the working class the full returns of their productive efforts."

CONDEMNED TO DEATH

Only a few weeks ago, on February 22 to be exact, there occurred another significant incident that shows the frenzied state of mind actually prevailing among the French rulers. The third Court Martial, still disposing of cases dealing with labor disturbances that occurred during 1917-1918, ceremoniously tried our comrades Henri Guilbeaux and Hartmann, dangerous syndicalist agitators, and after three minutes of deliberation condemned both to death. In view of the significance of their trial, the charges made against them are interesting enough to warrant attention. In his 65 page report of the case, Captain Thibaut, public prosecutor, makes the following accusations:

Henry Guilbeaux was born at Verviers (Belgium), in 1884. He speaks French perfectly and before the war was a regular contributor, between 1909-1914 to the following newspapers: *La Guerre Sociale*, *la Bataille Syndicaliste*, and *le Libertaire*. Besides he acted as foreign correspondent to a number of German newspapers, among them the *Berliner Tageblatt* and the *Vossische Gazette*, during the same period. At that time he was already considered a dangerous agitator and notorious anarchist. He traveled extensively and paid frequent visits to Germany. In 1913 he published an anthology of German lyrics for which Emil Verhaeren, the great Belgian poet, wrote the foreword.

At the beginning of the war, Guilbeaux was discharged from military duty. His discharge was later renewed before the revision council in 1915. He then went to Switzerland, reaching Geneva penniless. Soon afterwards he became associate editor of "*la Guerre Mondiale*" (World War); later he went into the employ of the International Red Cross in Geneva, earning 250 francs (about \$50.00) per month.

In his charges Captain Thibaut accuses this paper of being openly pro-German, insisting that the German authorities, after March 1916, showed a keen interest in its publication, and implying that its editor (Guilbeaux), having no personal resources, must have been in the pay of the German government. He affirms that the testimony of Louis Dumur and Marcel Provence proves him to be a German agent.

He further declares his intention of proving that Guilbeaux was under suspicion by the French secret service even before the outbreak of the war, but fails to show why the police did not refuse to give a man whom it considered notoriously German before the war, a passport to Switzerland in 1915.

A mass meeting in favor of Romain Rolland at which Guilbeaux spoke, also enters into the testimony and the Zimmerwald Conference is likewise mentioned. The accusation notes that, in 1916 the *Demain* changed its character from a literary organ to one of intense political propaganda, that it then ceased to appear until the first of May, 1917, when it resumed its propaganda work. In the mind of the prosecutor there was no doubt as to its anti-French character, for among its editors there were men like Romain Rolland, Lenin, Trotzky, Zinoviev and Radek. Furthermore Guilbeaux is charged with being in frequent communication with Maximalists residing in Switzerland, alleged fugitives from French justice.

The remainder of the report is an attack upon the Bolsheviks.

It is hardly necessary to repeat the charges it contains against our Russian comrades. We are all familiar with them.

Hartmann, according to the terms of the indictment, is a strange individual with a mysterious past. He is described as a French Alsatian, born in 1855, who adopted French citizenship in 1874. It appears that he tried, and successfully, to make a fortune; that he laid claim to the title of Doctor, and that, in spite of his fortune, he was held in an English detention camp in 1915. Then follow various hearsay stories: that Hartmann is suspected of being the author of a leaflet entitled "*The General and his Lieutenant*", purporting to tell the story of his relations with Gustav Hervé before the war; that the latter, during his imprisonment from 1911-1912, on account of his desperate anti-militaristic campaign, received a mysterious monthly contribution of 1,000 francs; that the mysterious donor was no other than Hartmann. It is further related that upon his release in England Hartmann crossed French territory on his way to Geneva in November 1916, that there he made the acquaintance of Guilbeaux, that he gave financial support to *la Nouvelle Internationale*, that he created *la Reconciliation* and finally that he sponsored *Paris—Geneva*, with material help from Rosenberg, Jellnech and Moulheu. The indictment also shows that Lenin, Trotzky and Zinoviev are German agents, that Trotzky, through the intermediary comrade, Sonia, received the sum of 315,000 marks; that Guilbeaux is a Bolshevik, having helped most of the Maximalists to escape to Switzerland. Of course, there is the story of a sealed train car, dashing through space to unfortunate Russia.

Here Guilbeaux once more figures in the indictment. The French diplomatic attaché at Berne reports that Guilbeaux blames France for his precarious financial condition, that he tried to return to Paris, with recommendations from Longuet and Merrheim; that he tried to go to Petrograd, using the names of Trotzky and Lenin as recommendations.

Had he but used the names of Gustav Hervé or Professor Milionhoff!

Then follow the sensational revelations:—that a meeting of conspirators was held on the night of August 6-7, 1917, attended by Guilbeaux, Hartmann, Jean Debrit, Chapiron, the old anarchist Fromenten, and two Bolshevik representatives, to perfect arrangements for the overthrow of the French Republic. At this conspirators' meeting the following points are alleged to have been decided upon:—the seizure of the telephone and telegraph centrals; the prohibition of all newspapers except those of the

extreme left wing; sabotage on all bourgeois and capitalist printing plants.

Before resting the case the government introduced a letter written by Guilbeaux to the reporting magistrate in May, 1918: "I refuse to appear before any bourgeois court of justice, of which Courts Martial are the most hideous and vilest expression."

The charges against Guilbeaux and Hartmann are summed up by the prosecution in the one word "Treason".

Before the court retired the government Commissar felt obliged to clear Leon Jouhaux, the general secretary of the C. G. T., of all suspicion, by saying:—"Our fellow citizen Jouhaux was a patriot. This fact alone was sufficient to make him the object of Guilbeaux' attacks."

Guilbeaux and Hartmann were found guilty and were condemned to be shot at sunrise!

But unfortunately these comrades were not above playing a despicable trick upon the French government. Not only did they absent themselves from court, with the entirely insufficient excuse that as Russian Bolsheviks they were quite satisfied with their new fatherland; they further deplored the fact that pressing business on behalf of the Soviet government in Moscow made it impossible for them to return to France to be shot.

The following is a translation of one of the documents in the hands of the Clemenceau government that was published a week after the trial. It throws some light upon the preparations that are under way to insure the success of coming events in France.

GUILBEAUX ON THE SITUATION IN FRANCE

"The latest information reaching me from France, before and after the launching of the allied offensive of last July, clearly confirms the fact that a secessionist movement is taking shape in the bosom of the C. G. T. and especially in the Federal Committee.

"The situation is very promising and will permit us to intensify our revolutionary program in France, particularly in Paris, Lyon, Saint-Etienne and Bourges where the militant syndicalists will answer our call.

"*La Plebe* has come into being, cleverly edited by our friend Desprès, and there is no reason to believe that the origin of the funds necessary for its weekly publication should be suspected, since our comrade-publisher is known to be in comfortable finan-

cial circumstances. The paper will probably appear twice a week, beginning with next month, and it will do good work.

"We have done all that is necessary to insure its distribution amongst the workers in the urban and industrial centers.

"To this effect, we have adopted the methods used by our Russian Bolshevik comrades for the preparation of the revolutionary movement in Petrograd, in November 1917, and I feel quite sure that in the very near future the criminal French government will be called to account for its actions by the proletariat.

"Comrade Péricat has sent me a copy of the program of the Congress to be held at Saint-Etienne under the auspices of the Committee of Syndicalist Defense. He has received the funds necessary for the conference and he heartily thanks the Russian comrades of the International Bureau for their fraternal support.

"Meerheim, of the Federation of metal workers, is hesitating, not willing to follow Péricat, but if our movement gives promise of success he will eventually rally to our cause. Bourderon has given us his tacit support, as did Henri Fabre, of the *Journal du Peuple*, who is sure of his paper's stamina.

"So far, the situation looks favorable in all its aspects and revolves around the workers' centers, reaching the toilers on whom we depend exclusively. The politicians of the socialist party, and most of the parliamentary-socialist group will, in the end, be forced to follow the movement which we will have started.

"The above mentioned program is as follows:

"1st—Secession movement to begin in the Confederal Committee of the Party and from there to spread to the General Confederation of Labor. The secretary of the Confederation, Leon Jouhaux, sees his authority swiftly dwindling away in favor of Merrheim, secretary of the Federation of Metal Workers. Because of his official position the latter still maintains a certain reserve towards the Committee of Syndicalist Defense and towards its secretary, Raimont Péricat, but I have the positive assurance that we will have his support as soon as our revolutionary action takes definite form.

"I have received from the German social-democratic delegate information regarding the movement which is being prepared at Essen and at Cologne, but from the content of his long letter there would seem to be great difficulties in the practical organization of the movement during the German offensive in France.

"The International Bureau would have to use all its authority and its secret propagandists in order to lay out the simplest plan of a general strike in the German industrial centers of metal works.

"The announcement of such a movement, forwarded into France as rapidly as possible, would help us immensely and will precipitate the coming events.

"2nd—Intense agitation among the French workers and promote strikes that our propaganda will intensify into clear revolutionary understanding. The following deputies have tentatively pledged their support:—Brizon, Alexandre Blanc and Raffin-Dugens. Support of several socialist, revolutionary and Zimmerwaldian newspapers, such as *La Vague*, *le Journal du Peuple*, *le Droit du Peuple*, etc.

"We have men worthy of our full confidence, and comrades devoted wholeheartedly to the cause in the unions everywhere and *Bourses du Travail* (Labor Exchanges) of Paris, Lyon, Saint-Etienne, Bourges and Grenoble, are ready to take part in our action at the first signal. All other necessary measures are being taken such as the organizing of transport workers, mine workers and metal workers, in order that, when the Committee of Syndicates issues its orders for a General Strike, work should cease instantly.

"We have dependable agents in the Parisian telegraphic centrals who will insure the transmission of the General Strike orders, and will inform the cities of the interior of the course taken by the revolutionary events in Paris.

"On the whole the situation promises the full success of our revolutionary action and, from an international point of view, the events actually in the way of preparation will have incalculable consequences if, as we sincerely hope, our German and Austrian comrades firmly support us in our class struggle, in our faithful execution of the immortal principles of Zimmerwald.

"I will keep you in touch with events, the funds necessary for propaganda may still be addressed to that formerly indicated, using the same means of communication, in order to thwart the efforts of the numerous agents of the Clemenceau government, of whom we have a large number here.

"Do not send anything to my place, comrades of the International Bureau of Bolshevik propaganda, for I am under constant surveillance. It would be preferable to arrange special appointments in cases of urgent and secret communications.

"Thanks to the International Bureau for the services it has rendered in the transmission of my correspondence to the *Pravda* and *Isvestia*.. As a measure of prudence, I will transmit to you all information concerning France and typewritten reports by numbered copies."

A. GUILBEAUX.

In conclusion, another instance of the actual state of mind of the French Proletariat:

A few weeks ago, the interfederal executive board of the railroad workers' federation decided to test the solidarity of the workers, and ordered one of its secretaries, Midol, to decide on a method for demonstrating the readiness of the working class to strike at any given moment. Some four weeks ago, Midol, in agreement with the central committee, called a general strike on the P. L. F., lasting one minute on the roads, fifteen minutes in the depots, and an hour in all the station-buffets, so important in the European transport system. The response was a revelation. It must not be forgotten that in France, since the outbreak of the war, the entire rail system has been militarized, and that every employee is, by the same token, a soldier. Refusal to conform to the military regulations implies heavy punishment and not infrequently death sentences by court-martial. Yet the tie-up was absolute. Midol, together with twenty others, was arrested and taken to Dijon in a motor car. Train-engineers who refused to operate the engines for this purpose, after a three days' confinement were condemned to one year of prison and immediately reprieved. This little incident almost precipitated the long expected event.

Party Discussion

Manifesto and Program of the "Left Wing" Section Socialist Party, Local Greater New York*

The members of the Socialist Party are entitled to an explanation for the issuance of this pamphlet by the Left Wing Section.

We are a very active and growing section of the Socialist Party who are attempting to reach the rank and file with our urgent message over the heads of the powers that be, who, through inertia or a lack of vision, cannot see the necessity for a critical analysis of the party's policies and tactics.

The official Socialist Party press is in the main closed to us; therefore, we cannot adequately present our side of the case.

In the various discussions that arise wherever party members or delegates assemble, both sides grow too heated for calm, dispassionate judgment.

Therefore, we have decided to issue our Manifesto and Program in pamphlet form, so that the rank and file may read and judge our case on its merits.

Comrades—and this is addressed to members of the party—the situation is such that a careful study of our position is absolutely imperative.

MANIFESTO

Prior to August, 1914, the nations of the world lived on a volcano. Violent eruptions from time to time gave warning of the cataclysm to come, but the diplomats and statesmen managed to localize the outbreaks, and the masses, slightly aroused, sank back into their accustomed lethargy with doubts and misgivings, and the subterranean fires continued to smoulder.

Many trusted blindly—some in their statesmen, some in the cohesive power of Christianity, their common religion, and some in the growing strength of the international Socialist movement. Had not the German Social-Democracy exchanged dramatic telegrams with the French Socialist Party, each pledging itself not to fight in case their governments declared war on each other! A general strike of workers led by these determined Socialists would quickly bring the governments to their senses!

So the workers reasoned, until the thunder-clap of Serajevo and Austria's ultimatum to Serbia. Then, suddenly, the storm broke. Mobilization everywhere. Everywhere declarations of war. In three or four days Europe was in arms.

The present structure of society—Capitalism—with its preten-

* This Manifesto and Program was adopted by a mass convention held in New York and has since been endorsed by States, Locals and Branches.

sions to democracy on the one hand, and its commercial rivalries, armament rings and standing armies on the other, all based on the exploitation of the working class and the division of the loot, was cast into the furnace of war. Two things only could issue forth; either international capitalist control, through a League of Nations, or Social Revolution and the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. Both of these forces are today contending for world power.

The Social Democracies of Europe, unable or unwilling to meet the crisis, were themselves hurled into the conflagration to be tempered or consumed by it.

THE COLLAPSE OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL

Great demonstrations were held in every European country by Socialists protesting against their governments' declarations of war, and mobilizations for war. And we know that these demonstrations were rendered impotent by the complete surrender of the Socialist parliamentary leaders and the official Socialist press, with their "justifications" of "defensive wars" and the safeguarding of "democracy."

Why the sudden change of front? Why did the Socialist leaders in the parliaments of the belligerents vote the war credits? Why did not Moderate Socialism carry out the policy of the Basle Manifesto, namely: the converting of an imperialistic war into a civil war—into a proletarian revolution? Why did it either openly favor the war or adopt a policy of petty-bourgeois pacifism?

THE DEVELOPMENT OR MODERATE "SOCIALISM"

In the latter part of the nineteenth century, the Social-Democracies of Europe set out to "legislate Capitalism out of office." The class struggle was to be won in the capitalist legislatures. Step by step concessions were to be wrested from the state; the working class and the Socialist parties were to be strengthened by means of "constructive" reform and social legislation; each concession would act as a rung in the ladder of Social Revolution, upon which the workers could climb step by step, until finally, some bright sunny morning, the peoples would awaken to find the Cooperative Commonwealth functioning without disorder, confusion or hitch on the ruins of the capitalist state.

And what happened? When a few legislative seats had been secured, the thunderous denunciations of the Socialist legislators suddenly ceased. No more were the parliaments used as platforms from which the challenge of revolutionary Socialism was flung to all the corners of Europe. Another era had set in, the era of "constructive" social reform legislation. Dominant Moderate Socialism accepted the bourgeois state as the basis of its action and **strengthened** that state. All power to shape the policies and tactics of the Socialist parties was entrusted to the parliamentary leaders. And these lost sight of Socialism's original purpose; their goal became "constructive reforms" and cabinet portfolios—the "cooperation of classes," the policy of openly or tacitly declaring that the coming of Socialism was a concern "of all the classes," instead of emphasizing the Marxian policy that the construction of the Socialist system is the task of the revolutionary proletariat alone. "Moderate Socialism" accepted the bourgeois state as the leaders, was now ready to share responsibility with the bourgeoisie in the control of the capitalist

state, even to the extent of **defending the bourgeoisie against the working class**—as in the first Briand Ministry in France, when the official party press was opened to a defense of the shooting of striking railway workers at the order of the Socialist-Bourgeois Coalition Cabinet.

"SAUSAGE SOCIALISM"

This situation was brought about by mixing the democratic cant of the eighteenth century with scientific Socialism. The result was what Rosa Luxemburg called "sausage Socialism." The "Moderates" emphasized petty-bourgeois social reformism in order to attract tradesmen, shop-keepers and members of the professions, and, of course, the latter flocked to the Socialist movement in great numbers, seeking relief from the constant grinding between corporate capital and awakening labor.

The Socialist organizations actively competed for votes, on the basis of social reforms, with the bourgeois-liberal political parties. And so they catered to the ignorance and prejudices of the workers,

Dominant "moderate Socialism" forgot the teachings of the founders of scientific Socialism, forgot its function as a proletarian movement—"the most resolute and advanced section of the working-class parties"—and permitted the bourgeois and self-seeking trade union elements to shape its policies and tactics. This was the condition in which the Social-Democracies of Europe found themselves at the outbreak of war in 1914. Demoralized and confused by the cross-currents within their own parties, vacillating and compromising with the bourgeois state, they fell a prey to social-patriotism and nationalism.

SPARTACIDES AND BOLSHEVIKI

But revolutionary Socialism was not destined to lie inert for long. In Germany, Karl Liebknecht, Franz Mehring, Rosa Luxemburg and Otto Ruhle organized the Spartacus Group. But their voices were drowned in the roar of cannon and the shrieks of the dying and maimed.

Russia, however, was to be the first battle-ground where "moderate" and revolutionary Socialism should come to grips for the mastery of the state. The breakdown of the corrupt, bureaucratic Czarist régime opened the flood-gates of Revolution.

Three main contending parties attempted to ride into power on the revolutionary tide; the Cadets, the "moderate Socialists" (Mensheviks and Social Revolutionists), and the revolutionary Socialists—the Bolsheviks. The Cadets were first to be swept into power; but they tried to stem the still-rising flood with a few abstract political ideals, and were soon carried away. The soldiers, workers, and peasants could no longer be fooled by phrases. The Mensheviks and Social Revolutionaries succeeded the Cadets. And now came the crucial test: would they, in accord with Marxian teachings, make themselves the ruling class and sweep away the old conditions of production, and thus prepare the way for the Cooperative Commonwealth? Or would they tinker with the old machinery and try to foist it on the masses as something just as good?

They did the latter and proved for all time that "moderate Socialism" cannot be trusted.

"Moderate Socialism" was not prepared to seize the power for

the workers during a revolution. "Moderate Socialism" had a rigid formula—"constructive social reform legislation within the capitalist state" and to that formula it clung. It believed that bourgeois democracy could be used as a means of constructing the Socialist system; therefore, it must wait until the people, through a Constituent Assembly, should vote Socialism into existence. And in the meantime, it held that there must be established a Government of Coalition with the enemy, the bourgeoisie. As if, with all the means of controlling public opinion in the hands of the bourgeoisie, a Constituent Assembly could or would ever vote the Socialists into power!

Revolutionary Socialists hold, with the founders of scientific Socialism, that there are two dominant classes in society—the bourgeoisie and the proletariat; that between these two classes a struggle must go on, until the working class, through the seizure of the instruments of production and distribution, the abolition of the capitalist state, and the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat, creates a Socialist system. Revolutionary Socialists do not believe that they can be voted into power. They struggle for the conquest of power by the revolutionary proletariat. Then comes the transition period from Capitalism to Socialism, of which Marx speaks in his "Critique of the Gotha Program" when he says: "Between the capitalistic society and the communistic, lies the period of the revolutionary transformation of the one into the other. This corresponds to a political transition period, in which the state cannot be anything else but the dictatorship of the proletariat."

Marx and Engels clearly explain the function of the Socialist movement. It is the "moderate Socialists" through intellectual gymnastics, evasions, misquotations and the tearing of sentences and phrases from their context, who make Marx and Engels sponsors for their perverted version of Socialism.

PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SOCIALISM

At the present moment, the Socialist Party of America is agitated by several cross-currents, some local in their character, and some a reflex of cleavages within the European Socialist movements. Many see in this internal dissension merely an unimportant difference of opinion, or at most, dissatisfaction with the control of the party, and the desire to replace those who have misused it with better men.

We, however, maintain that there is a fundamental distinction in views concerning party policies and tactics. And we believe that this difference is so vast that from our standpoint a radical change in party policies and tactics is necessary.

This essential task is being shirked by our party leaders and officials generally.

Already there is formidable industrial unrest, a seething ferment of discontent, evidenced by inarticulate rumblings which presage striking occurrences. The transformation of industry from a war to a peace basis has thoroughly disorganized the economic structure. Thousands upon thousands of workers are being thrown out of work. Demobilized sailors and soldiers find themselves a drug upon the labor market, unless they act as scabs and strike-breakers. Skilled mechanics, fighting desperately to maintain their war-wage and their industrial status, are forced to strike. Women, who during the war have been welcomed into industries hitherto closed to them, are

struggling to keep their jobs. And to cap the climax, the capitalists, through their Chambers of Commerce and their Merchants and Manufacturers' Associations, have resolved to take advantage of the situation to break down even the inadequate organizations labor has built up through generations of painful struggle.

The temper of the workers and soldiers, after the sacrifices they have made in the war, is such that they will not endure the reactionary labor conditions so openly advocated by the master class. A series of labor struggles is bound to follow—indeed, is beginning now. Shall the Socialist Party continue to feed the workers with social reform legislation at this critical period? Shall it approach the whole question from the standpoint of votes and the election of representatives to the legislatures? Shall it emphasize the consumers' point of view, when Socialist principles teach that the worker is robbed at the point of production? Shall it talk about the Cost of Living and Taxation when it should be explaining how the worker is robbed at his job?

There are many signs of the awakening of labor. Strikes are developing which verge on revolutionary action; the trade unions are organizing a Labor Party, in an effort to conserve what they have won and wrest new concessions from the master class. The organization of the Labor Party is an immature expression of a new spirit in the Labor movement; but a Labor Party is not the instrument for the emancipation of the working class; its policy would be in general what is now the official policy of the Socialist Party—reforming Capitalism on the basis of the bourgeois state. Laborism is as much a danger to the revolutionary proletariat as "moderate" Socialism; neither is an instrument for the conquest of power.

CAPITALIST IMPERIALISM

Imperialism is the final stage of Capitalism, in which the accumulated capital or surplus of a nation is too great to be reinvested in the home market. The increased productivity of the working class, due to improved machinery and efficiency methods, and the mere subsistence wage which permits the worker to buy back only a small portion of what he produces, causes an ever-increasing accumulation of commodities, which in turn become capital and must be invested in further production. When Capitalism has reached the stage in which it imports raw materials from undeveloped countries and exports them again in the shape of manufactured products, it has reached its highest development.

This process is universal. Foreign markets, spheres of influence and protectorates, under the intensive development of capitalist industry and finance in turn become highly developed. They, too, seek for markets. National capitalist control, to save itself from ruin, breaks its national bonds and emerges full-grown as a capitalist League of Nations, with international armies and navies to maintain its supremacy.

The United States no longer holds itself aloof, isolated and provincial. It is reaching out for new markets, new zones of influence, new protectorates.

The capitalist class of America is using organized labor for its imperialistic purposes. We may soon expect the capitalist class, in true Bismarckian fashion, to grant factory laws, old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, sick benefits, and the whole litter of bour-

geois reforms, so that the workers may be kept fit to produce the greatest profits at the greatest speed.

DANGERS TO AMERICAN SOCIALISM

There is danger that the Socialist Party of America might make use of these purely bourgeois reforms to attract the workers' votes, by claiming that they are victories for Socialism, and that they have been won by Socialist political action; when, as a matter of fact, the object of these master class measures is to prevent the growing class-consciousness of the worker, and to divert them from their revolutionary aim. By agitating for these reforms, therefore, the Socialist Party would be playing into the hands of the American imperialists.

On the basis of the class struggle, then, the Socialist Party of America must re-organize itself, must prepare to come to grips with the master class during the difficult period of capitalist re-adjustment now going on. This it can do only by teaching the working class the truth about present-day conditions; it must preach revolutionary industrial unionism, and urge all the workers to organize into industrial unions, the only form of labor organization which can cope with the power of great modern aggregations of capital. It must carry on its political campaigns, not merely as a means of electing officials to political office, as in the past, but as a year-round educational campaign to arouse the workers to class-conscious economic and political action, and to keep alive the burning ideal of revolution in the hearts of the people.

POLITICAL ACTION

We assert with Marx that "the class struggle is essentially a political struggle," and we can only accept his own oft-repeated interpretation of that phrase. The class struggle, whether it manifests itself on the industrial field or in the direct struggle for governmental control, is essentially a struggle for the capture and destruction of the capitalist state. This is a political act. In this broader view of the term "political," Marx includes revolutionary industrial action. In other words, the objective of Socialist industrial action is "political," in the sense that it aims to undermine the bourgeois state, which "is nothing less than a machine for the oppression of one class by another and that no less so in a democratic republic than under a monarchy."

Political action is also and more generally used to refer to participation in election campaigns for the immediate purpose of winning legislative seats. In this sense, too, we urge the use of political action as a revolutionary weapon.

But both in the nature and the purpose of this form of political action, revolutionary Socialism and "moderate Socialism" are completely at odds.

Political action, revolutionary and emphasizing the implacable character of the class struggle, is a valuable means of propaganda. It must at all times struggle to arouse the revolutionary mass action of the proletariat—its use is both agitational and obstructive. It must on all issues wage war upon Capitalism and the state. Revolutionary Socialism uses the forum of parliament for agitation; but it does not intend to and cannot use the bourgeois state as a means of introducing Socialism; this bourgeois state must be destroyed by the mass

action of the revolutionary proletariat. The proletarian dictatorship in the form of a Soviet state is the immediate objective of the class struggle.

Marx declared that "the working class cannot simply lay hold of the ready-made state machinery and wield it for its own purposes." This machinery must be destroyed. But "moderate Socialism" makes the state the center of its action.

The attitude towards the state divides the Anarchist (anarcho-syndicalist), the "moderate Socialist" and the revolutionary Socialist. Eager to abolish the state (which is the ultimate purpose of revolutionary Socialism), the Anarchist and Anarcho-Syndicalist fail to realize that a state is necessary in the transition period from Capitalism to Socialism; the "moderate Socialist" proposes to use the bourgeois state with its fraudulent democracy, its illusory theory of "unity of all the classes," its standing army, police and bureaucracy oppressing and baffling the masses; the revolutionary Socialist maintains that the bourgeois state must be completely destroyed, and proposes the organization of a new state—the state of the organized producers—of the Federated Soviets—on the basis of which alone can Socialism be introduced.

Industrial Unionism, the organization of the proletariat in accordance with the integration of industry and for the overthrow of Capitalism, is a necessary phase of revolutionary Socialist agitation. Potentially, industrial unionism constructs the basis and develops the ideology of the industrial state of Socialism; but industrial unionism alone cannot perform the revolutionary act of seizure of the power of the state, since under the conditions of Capitalism it is impossible to organize the whole working class, or an overwhelming majority, into industrial unions.

It is the task of a revolutionary Socialist party to direct the struggles of the proletariat and provide a program for the culminating crisis. Its propaganda must be so directed that when this crisis comes, the workers will be prepared to accept a program of the following character:

- (a) **The organization of Workmen's Councils;** recognition of, and propaganda for, these mass organizations of the working class as instruments in the immediate struggle, as the form of expression of the class struggle, and as the instruments for the seizure of the power of the state and the basis of the new proletarian state of the organized producers and the dictatorship of the proletariat.
- (b) **Workmen's control of industry,** to be exercised by the industrial organizations (industrial unions or Soviets) of the workers and the industrial vote, as against government ownership or state control of industry.
- (c) **Repudiation of all national debts**—with provisions to safeguard small investors.
- (d) **Expropriation of the banks**—a preliminary measure for the complete expropriation of capital.
- (e) **Expropriation of the railways, and the large (trust) organizations of capital**—no compensation to be paid, as "buying-out" the capitalists would insure a continuance of the exploitation of the workers; provision, however, to be

made during the transition period for the protection of small owners of stock.

(f) **The socialization of foreign trade.**

These are not the "immediate demands" comprised in the social reform planks now in the platform of our party; they are not a compromise with the capitalist state, but imply a revolutionary struggle against that state and against capitalism, the conquest of power by the proletariat through revolutionary mass action. They imply the new Soviet state of the organized producers, the dictatorship of the proletariat; they are preliminary revolutionary measures for the expropriation of capital and the introduction of communist Socialism.

PROGRAM

1. We stand for a uniform declaration of principles in all party platforms both local and national and the abolition of all social reform planks now contained in them.

2. The party must teach, propagate and agitate exclusively for the overthrow of Capitalism, and the establishment of Socialism through a Proletarian Dictatorship.

3. The Socialist candidates elected to office shall adhere strictly to the above provisions.

4. Realizing that a political party cannot reorganize and reconstruct the industrial organizations of the working class, and that that is the task of the economic organizations themselves, we demand that the party assist this process of reorganization by a propaganda for revolutionary industrial unionism as part of its general activities. We believe it is the mission of the Socialist movement to encourage and assist the proletariat to adopt newer and more effective forms of organization and to stir it into newer and more revolutionary modes of action.

5. We demand that the official party press be party owned and controlled.

6. We demand that officially recognized educational institutions be party owned and controlled.

7. We demand that the party discard its obsolete literature and publish new literature in keeping with the policies and tactics above mentioned.

8. We demand that the National Executive Committee call an immediate emergency national convention for the purpose of formulating party policies and tactics to meet the present crisis.

9. We demand that the Socialist Party repudiate the Berne Congress or any other conference engineered by "moderate Socialists" and social patriots.

10. We demand that the Socialist Party shall elect delegates to the International Congress proposed by the Communist Party of Russia (Bolsheviki); that our party shall participate only in a new International with which are affiliated the Communist Party of Russia (Bolsheviki), the Communist Labor Party of Germany (Spartacus), and all other Left Wing parties and groups.

EDITORIALS

Communism in Hungary

The second revolution in Hungary, which overthrew the coalition ministry under Karolyi and substituted for the futile efforts of a bourgeois-social-patriotic government a dictatorship of the proletariat, created a profound stir all over the world. While the European and the American capitalist press immediately interpreted it as a "nationalistic revolution," it cannot be denied that the Peace Conference at Paris received the news of the overthrow of the Hungarian Republic with dismay. For this new proletarian government gave an entirely new direction and impetus to their negotiations, and their attitude toward Bolshevik Russia was to a large degree determined by this astounding turn of events.

The first Hungarian revolution created little attention. It was completely overshadowed by the events that were transpiring in Germany, where the overthrow of the Imperial government was making history, not only for Germany but for the entire civilized world. Like all revolutions in modern times, the reasons that culminated in this outbreak were various and diverse in character. The people of Hungary had suffered untold hardships during the war. The oppression and exploitation to which the Magyars of Hungary had been subjected at the hands of their Austrian rulers in times of peace were increased a hundredfold when war, with its rule by the power of arms, swept over Europe. Hunger and suffering stalked throughout the land. And for the people of Hungary there was no patriotism, no love of fatherland to alleviate the hardships they were forced to undergo, and to blind them to their sufferings. Hatred of Germany and of the German-Austrian rulers, who were responsible for the misery that engulfed them, was the sentiment that dominated the first revolution in Hungary.

It was only natural, therefore, that the new government, under Karolyi, should be distinctly pro-Ally in its sympathies. As in Germany and in Russia, the power of government was first placed into the hands of a coalition ministry, a combination of socialist and bourgeois elements, under the nominal domination of labor. Count Karolyi, the head of the new

republic, was a liberal democrat of the finest type, honest in his intentions. But just as the Kerensky government in Russia was doomed to failure, and just as surely as the Scheidemann-Ebert regime in Berlin will finally succumb to the insistence of the proletarian demands of the German people, so the Hungarian republic, with its democratic ideals was doomed to destruction. From the beginning, the young republic was involved in a mire of difficulties. There were nationalistic prejudices, especially on the part of the propertied classes, which were a constant source of irritation. The returning soldiers made insistent demands, demands that were recognized in principle, but whose fulfilment was out of the question for a government that respected the property rights and interests of the wealthy classes. A system of agrarian reform that satisfied no-one was promised, but the government did not have the courage to approach its realization. Unemployment insurance measures were instituted, but succeeded only in arousing the dissatisfaction of the returning troops, because they were insufficient to satisfy the demands the latter felt justified in making. "Make the rich pay" was the note that dominated the demonstrations held all over the country. Strikes became more and more frequent. The working-people in the industrial centers were strongly socialistic, and demanded that the interests of the working-class alone henceforward control the forces of industry. They demanded wages that the capitalists could not afford to pay without serious curtailment of what they considered their legitimate profit. The result was a threatening standstill in the machinery of production, that increased the number of unemployed on the one hand and decreased the supply of products on the other. The urban population of Hungary has always been strongly organized, and belongs to the radical element in the labor movement. Thus, dissatisfaction in the country was rife as well. The brief history of the Hungarian republic was one of constant uprisings.

In this respect Hungary differs in no way from the other revolutionary countries of Europe. What happened in Hungary is happening in Germany at the present time, and is a repetition of the experiences that the Kerensky regime in Russia was forced to undergo. It is proof, if proof is still needed, of the impossibility of restoring order and normal industrial conditions in any country, under a system based upon the co-operation of the political representatives of both the capitalist and the working class. The least that a working-class government can give will discourage capitalist pro-

duction sufficiently to create a definite and threatening problem of unemployment. There exists, under such a form of government, the constant danger of a counter-revolution, because its methods must inevitably leave in existence a dangerous, because extremely dissatisfied, capitalist class. On the other hand, the demands of the working-class, who, under what they consider a Socialist form of government, refuse to take into account interests and needs of capitalist production, leave only one possible solution—complete socialization of industry. Workingmen who will willingly submit to hardship and sacrifice, when this sacrifice is demanded by the interests of their class, will and must refuse to do so in order to help build up the industries of the nation for the profit of their owners.

Preparations for the election to the National Assembly were under way. While there was no strong organized opposition to this Assembly, such as was carried on in Germany by the Spartacus movement during December and January, the working-class as a whole looked upon these elections with open skepticism. Although the majority-Socialist had finally decided to officially participate in the election, it was only after a long and serious discussion, a strong element in the party being in favor of such an election only if the absolute majority of the Social Democracy in the Assembly could be guaranteed at the outset. In the meantime Communist agitation was arousing the country. There were uprisings everywhere. Insignificant incidents often led to open rioting. In Kiskunfélyhaza, a small town near Szegedin, an altercation between a merchant and a would-be purchaser over the price of a piece of cloth led to the plundering of the merchant's shop by the crowd that had collected. Police and guards who were sent to restore order were disarmed. The assembled masses set up a machine gun in front of the plundered establishment and began to fire. The merchant was killed. The riot persisted through the entire night and was only quelled the next day by the arrival of a detachment of sailors who placed the town under military law.

On the same day, February 19, a Communist demonstration in Budapest, in which about 4000 persons participated, went from place to place through the city, holding protest demonstrations and finally assembled before the home of the Hungarian Socialist organ, the Nepszava. Fifty policemen had been sent by the authorities to meet the oncoming demonstrators. The latter assembled before the newspaper building with hoots and cat-calls, until the police began to disperse the

crowd. A shot from a neighboring house called forth an answering volley from the crowd. Hand-grenades were thrown and several persons were more or less seriously wounded.

As a result of these and similar uprisings 56 Communist leaders, among them Bela Kun, Bela Vago and Dr. Eugene Lasslo, were arrested on March 5th by the coalition government.

* * *

The inter-political situation in Hungary had undoubtedly reached a critical period. Nor was the international situation, in so far as it affected the affairs of the Hungarian republic, more promising. Under the terms of the armistice between Austria-Hungary and the Allied nations, a large part of what had been Hungarian territory was occupied by Allied troops. This occupation was rendered particularly irksome to the national instincts of the Hungarian people, because these troops came from the smaller nations who had always constituted a menace to the Hungarian frontier. Its most fruitful stretches of land were given over to the Tchechians in the North, to Rumania on the West, to Servia on the South. There were frequent clashes between the population and the occupying forces, that kept alive a bitter spirit of resentment. About the middle of March, Admiral Trowbridge ordered the Hungarian government, without previous negotiations, to deliver all navigation rights upon the Danube into the hands of the Tchecho-Slav Republic. This cut off Hungary from one of its most important industrial resources, in spite of the fact that the Tchechian racial population extends nowhere nearly as far as the arbitrary borderline established by this order. A few days later the Entente officially capped the climax by sending the famous note that gave to Rumania an important portion of Hungary, making the military lines established by the armistice permanent. The coalition government was placed before an impossible alternative. To submit, meant open revolution in Hungary. To refuse, meant war with the Allies. And neither Karolyi nor his cabinet were prepared to undertake this step. There was but one way out of the situation. Count Karolyi resigned with his cabinet and turned over the political control of the nation to the Workmen's and Soldiers' Council, "to insure the rule of the proletariat and as a protest against the Imperialism of the Entente." Karolyi resigned, as the words of his proclamation plainly show, because conditions at home, as well as the state of foreign affairs, had reached a crisis that he and his government could no longer hope to control.

Since the establishment of the control of the Workmen's and Soldiers' Council on March 22, events have moved with startling rapidity. The new government, a coalition of all wings of the Socialist movement, has undertaken the immediate socialization of Hungarian industrial resources, as the only means of stabilizing industrial conditions and preserving the country from complete collapse. According to a proclamation to the whole world:

"... the Social Democratic Party and the Communist Parties of Hungary have united into a single party and have created a dictatorship of the proletariat without the loss of a single drop of blood. For the present, the powers of government lie in the hands of a Council of People's Commissaries, until such time as the National Congress of Workmen's and Sailors' Councils shall decide upon the ultimate form of a Soviet government. The Hungarian proletariat has unanimously united its forces under the flag of the dictatorship of the proletariat and of the world revolution. It will take up the struggle against the Imperialism of the capitalist governments, hand in hand with the Soviet government of Russia and with the proletariat of the entire world, who have recognized that in the open revolution of the united workers, soldiers and peasants lies the only possibility of crushing the forces of international Imperialism and of realizing our Socialist ideals.

"The Hungarian proletarian revolution arose out of two causes: the one was the determination of all poor peasants, proletarians and soldiers no longer to bear the oppressive yoke of Capitalism; the other cause was the Imperialism of the Entente, which threatened to deprive the people of Hungary of all supplies, of its raw materials, and of the very possibility of existence by dividing up its territory among the neighboring nations.

"The ultimatum of the Entente demanding the immediate cession of one-half of the nation to the Rumanian oligarchy was answered by the Hungarian people with the establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat. The Tchecho-Slav and Rumanian conquerors hope to defeat the revolution of the Hungarian proletariat by force of arms. We appeal to the Tchecho-Slav and to the Rumanian soldiers to refuse to obey, to mutiny and to turn their weapons against their own oppressors, that they may not become the hangmen of their brothers, the workers and soldiers of

Hungary. We call upon the Tchecho-Slovak peasants and workers to shake off the yoke of their oppressors.

"Although we are determined to defend our republic against all attacks, we hereby declare our firm desire to make peace as soon as it is possible to do so with the assurance that its conditions will secure to the working-class of Hungary the possibility of a livelihood, a peace that will enable us to live in accord and in harmony with the peoples of the earth, and above all, with our nearest neighbors."

The determination expressed in this proclamation, to unite the forces of the Hungarian republic with those of Soviet Russia were put into immediate practice. On the 22nd of March the Hungarian Soviet Republic was directly connected with the Russian capital, and the following interesting exchange of messages ensued:

"The Hungarian Soviet Republic requests Comrade Lenin to come to the wire."

After 20 minutes the following answer came from Moscow:

"Lenin at the apparatus. Will you connect me with Comrade Bela Kun."

The following reply was sent from the Budapest station: "Bela Kun is at present unavoidably detained in the Commissariat. Representing him at the wire is Ernest Por, member of the Central Committee of the Communist Party. The Hungarian proletariat, which last night assumed the dictatorship in the Hungarian nation, sends greetings to you as the leader of the international proletariat. Through you we send to the Russian people the expression of our revolutionary solidarity and our greetings to the Russian proletariat. . . . Comrade Bela Kun has been appointed People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs. The Hungarian Soviet Republic requests a defensive and offensive alliance with the Russian Soviet Government. With weapons in hand, we will defy all enemies of the proletariat. We request immediate information as to the military situation."

At 9 P. M. the following reply came from Moscow:

"Here Lenin. Submit my heartfelt greetings to the proletarian government of the Hungarian Soviet Republic, and particularly to Comrade Bela Kun. I have just submitted your message to the Congress of the Communist Party of Russia. It was received with unbounded enthusiasm. We will report to you the decisions of the Moscow Congress of the

third Communist International as rapidly as possible, as well as the report concerning the military situation. It is absolutely necessary to maintain permanent wireless connections between Budapest and Moscow. Communist greetings. Lenin."

The following message which was received by the office of the Swiss Social Democratic Party on the 29th of March shows how wholeheartedly the new Hungarian government has entered upon its chosen course:

"As soon as we gained the power necessary to put our program into action, we proceeded without waiting a moment. Already we have felled the impregnable walls of the capitalist fortress, blow upon blow. -The fetters of wage-slavery are torn into a thousand shreds; and at the same time we have begun the creation of a new world. Industrial life is taking its normal course, indeed it is already functioning more smoothly than before. Only the parasites have been abolished, their life of idleness is at an end. What the country possesses of mental and physical energy has been put to work. Production and transportation are entirely in our hands. All supplies have been confiscated and will be in part equitably distributed, and partly used as material, with which we will build up the Communist organization of production. All those legal fetters that were invented by Capitalism for the oppression of proletarian existence have been swept away. Air, light, cleanliness, at one time the exclusive privilege of the children of the bourgeoisie, have been placed within the reach of the children of the proletariat. Theaters, hitherto exclusively the possession of the wealthy class, are being encouraged to devote themselves, more than ever before, to the propagation of a higher art, and have been opened to the proletariat. The Press, that mighty weapon of Capitalism, has been pressed into the service of the movement for a better future. Joyously, great masses of the proletariat are crowding into the Red Guards, ready to defend their liberation from capitalist slavery with their hearts' blood. Heads up, brothers! The Götterdämmerung of capitalist society has come. The hour has struck for the expropriation of the expropriators of the world."

"Bela Kun, People's Commissary."

* * *

Sparse as are the reports that reach us from the new revolutionary government, they all indicate that the above sweeping statements are based upon actual fact. In Budapest the revolu-

tionary government has appointed a commissariat for housing problems, which has gone at once to work not only to formulate, but to put into immediate practice a thorough-going system of housing reform. According to the conditions laid out by this commission no single individual shall for the present have the right to occupy more than one room with the necessary appurtenances. All larger domiciles have been investigated and assigned. Rents have been ordered reduced, particularly for the cheaper houses, where the reduction has aggregated approximately 20 per cent. The socialization of the financial institutes of the country is already well under way. The right to draw upon bank deposits has been materially restricted. The suffrage has been extended to all men and women over 18 years of age who are doing socially useful work, or who are employed in home work that furthers the labor of those who are employed in socially useful occupations. All persons who insist upon living without labor are excluded from participation in political affairs.

The Hungarian socialist republic has been fortunate in that it has been able to profit by the lessons that the Russian revolution learned only after long and often bitter experiences. Where our Russian comrades were forced to grope blindly, step by step, to find their way out of the maze of capitalist mismanagement that surrounded them on every side, their Hungarian followers are working, with eyes that can see and weigh the consequences of each act, along a well defined course of action. One of the most interesting signs of the new spirit that pervades the Hungarian revolution is the union of the two wings of the social democracy, a union not only for the purpose of conducting the affairs of state, but an actual merging of identity of the two organizations. According to socialist press reports "the Communist Party has ceased to exist and will henceforward be known, together with the old 'majority' Party, under the name of 'Socialist Party.'" In Russia the revolution was seriously hampered by the counter-revolutionary opposition of the Mensheviks and Social Revolutionists of the Right. Only now, when the determined resistance of the entire Russian nation to the invasion of Allied forces has made further support of intervention a suicidal policy to pursue, after two years of persistent effort have shown that the social revolution in Russia has come to stay, only now it appears that these elements are prepared to support the Bolshevik regime. The course of the Hungarian revolution will be the easier for this lesson, because the men and women of the reactionary wing of the Hungarian socialist movement were, if anything, more conservative than the Russian Mensheviks, and yet they were immediately ready to join the forces of the Communist movement, once it was pushed into power.

But not only the proletariat has learned. The bourgeoisie, too, has profited by the example of their fallen Russian brethren, and have, up to the present time, refrained from all counter-revolutionary demonstrations. According to the reports that reach us from Hungary they are leaving the inhospitable confines of the new proletarian republic as fast as possible, and to all appearances, the proletariat is more than willing to see them go. It is possible, therefore, that Hungary will prove the truth of Lenin's contentions, when he says that the Red Terror, that has aroused such a storm of indignation against the Russian Bolsheviks, is by no means an inseparable accompaniment of the dictatorship of the proletariat. There has been no Red Terror in Hungary, because there was no White Terror; because the Socialist movement, in its entirety, stands behind the Communist program of socialization, because the Hungarian bourgeoisie does not dare to engage in counter-revolutionary propaganda in the face of a united proletarian opposition; because, finally, the Allied nations and the smaller nations, whose capitalist rulers may desire to foment counter-revolutionary activity by means of armed invasion, will do so only at the risk of carrying the conflagration into their own lines.

As we go to press, the cable brings the news of a victory of the "Reds" in Vienna. With each new victory of the proletarian movement of the world, the "dictatorship of the proletariat" loses some of its terror. The proletarian revolution, i. e. Bolshevism, has ceased to function as bugaboo, as a horrible example in the interests of a capitalist world. It has become the hope and the highest achievement of the revolutionary proletariat.

L.

The Left Wing

The most vital fact in the Socialist Party at this moment is the development of a left wing. It is not yet definite and organized; but the process is accelerating. There is a passionate activity in the party, a developing revolutionary consciousness, a desire to reconstruct the party in accord with the new concepts of proletarian purposes and action expressed by the proletarian revolutions in Russia and in Germany, which promises to bring real results.

It is, of course, impossible to estimate accurately the strength of these sentiments. Local Boston is completely left; Locals Seattle, Cleveland, Rochester, N. Y., Philadelphia, etc., are either completely left or turning to the left. In the Greater

New York locals, which are dominated either by the "right" or by the "center," a mass movement of the membership has produced the organization of a Left-Wing Section, the Manifesto and Program of which have already been adopted by a number of locals of the party. There is a real revolt against the bureaucracy of the party, against the reactionary N. E. C., against a policy that is not uncompromisingly revolutionary in the Bolshevik and Spartacan sense.

The forces which are producing this left movement are not of recent origin. There has always been a struggle in the party between the moderates and the revolutionists, between the right and the left. This struggle has been powerfully accelerated by the war and by the actual coming of the proletarian revolution. The great fact of the war and of the proletarian revolution in Russia and in Hungary has been the miserable, counter-revolutionary policy of petty bourgeois, moderate Socialism. *And this moderate Socialism has been officially dominant in the Socialist Party.*

But, the critic may ask, did not the Socialist Party, unlike moderate Socialism in Europe, oppose the war? It did; but, officially at least, it was an opposition based upon petty bourgeois pacifism and not upon revolutionary Socialism. Moderate Socialism comprises not only the extreme right—Ebert, Scheidemann, Thomas, etc.—but equally the center—the Independents and the tendency they represent. The Independents, captained by Hugo Haase and Karl Kautsky, opposed the war after they had previously accepted it, but it was an opposition of petty bourgeois pacifism; and the fact that the Independents are not united with the Spartacans, that they do not uncompromisingly accept the revolutionary policy, proves that they are not real revolutionary Socialists. Now the official policy of our party on the war—in spite of the activity of the membership—was petty bourgeois and pacifist. The officials and bureaucracy of the party baffled the will of the membership; they refused through the N. E. C. to accept the Bolshevik proposal for an armistice on all belligerent fronts; they were silent on the Bolshevik until the upsurge of the revolutionary sentiments of the membership compelled them to speak, and then they spoke the language of evasion and bourgeois liberalism.

After the armistice, the most important need of the party was to hold an emergency national convention. But the N. E. C. refused to act. For three months, while great events were happening and the world was shaking under the attack

of the proletarian revolution, the N. E. C. was silent and inert, the party was unable to meet and formulate a policy. This was treason to the Russian and German proletariat, to revolutionary Socialism. And when the N. E. C. met in January, it refused to call a convention and issued nothing of a vital character on the international situation.

The N. E. C. avoided committing itself on the revolutionary events. But it did commit itself on the question of the International by *aligning the party officially with the Congress of the Great Betrayal at Berne*, with the gang of social-patriots, with the Eberts and Scheidemanns, the Hendersons and Longuets. The N. E. C. selected, illegally and in flagrant violation of the party constitution, three delegates to represent the party at Berne. This was again treason to international revolutionary Socialism, a shot in the back to the Bolshevik and Spartacans fighting and dying then in the great struggle against Capitalism and Imperialism, against moderate, petty bourgeois Socialism.

And again the N. E. C. refused to call an emergency national convention, to the tune of "those who ask for a convention are Anarchists and party disrupters." . . .

But the demand for a convention developed insistently, and in spite of the sabotage of the N. E. C. and National Secretary Germer, it is now before the membership in a referendum: but five, and more, precious months will have been wasted. The party membership vigorously repudiated participation in the Berne yellow congress, local after local of the party doing this officially. And now the N. E. C., through "International Delegate" James Oneal, explains that it was a mistake to believe that the N. E. C. meant participation in the Berne Congress, that Oneal is going over to secure "information"! This is subterfuge. We have enough information to know that the Berne Congress is counter-revolutionary, and that the Bolshevik-Spartacan International alone is worthy of the revolutionary Socialist.

All these events are a challenge to the militant Socialist. In an epoch in which Capitalism is verging on collapse, in which the proletarian revolution has conquered in Russia, is preparing to conquer in Germany, is developing its action everywhere for the conquest of power, our party is without a definite revolutionary policy, our party bureaucracy is sabotaging revolutionary Socialism. There must be a clear division, an uncompromising policy. To realize this is the task of the developing left wing in the Socialist Party.

The revolutionary Socialist who would promote its policy must align himself with the left wing, must carry on the war against moderate Socialism in the party. To dodge on this issue is to play the "center," and to betray revolutionary Socialism. The time for hesitation and evasion has passed; the time for definite action has come, to conquer the party for the party, for revolutionary Socialism.

The left wing has not, as yet, formulated a definite declaration of principles acceptable to the whole "left" of the party. There is still division of opinion, disagreement on certain points. We are still, largely, at the stage of discussion, although the tendency is clear; but out of this must come a common policy and program, a policy and program absolutely necessary if the left wing is to conquer.

In this organization and formulation of the left wing one thing should be emphasized: it must be an *extreme* "left," and not a "center" movement. It is not sufficient to wage war upon the "right," we must wage equally uncompromising war upon the "center," upon the masters of words and the poltroons in action. There must be no swamp in our "left" movement, but a clear formulation and acceptance of the theory and practice of revolutionary Socialism. The division must be clear: revolutionary Socialism against all others. We shall not accomplish our purposes if we compromise with the "center"; there are comrades who think they are "left," but who are actually "center." These comrades must be taught to discriminate; and if they don't, they must be excluded from the movement of the left wing. The mass of the "center" must be split away from its leaders by a merciless criticism of these leaders, by an emphasis of the policy and practice of the extreme "left." We don't want an "Independent Socialist" movement in our party. The policy adopted by the Communist Party of Russia (Bolshevik) of inviting only the groups of the extreme "left" to their proposed International Communist Congress must be our policy.

The party is developing a revolutionary consciousness; but it needs clarification and organization. This work is being accomplished rapidly; it must be accelerated. Shortly, within six months, we shall have two Internationals claiming to represent Socialism—the red International and the yellow—the Berne and the Bolshevik. The Socialist Party must accept the red International. But that, again, implies the revolutionary reconstruction of the party's program and policy. To shirk this task is to betray the cause of Socialism. To hesitate is to

compromise; to compromise is to betray revolutionary Socialism. On with the war against moderate Socialism in our party! Turn to the "left"! F.

Eugene V. Debs, a Revolutionist

On more than one occasion, the socialist movement of this country has paid dearly for its readiness to raise upon a pedestal men and women who possessed the gift and the ability to become its leaders. This has been particularly true where these newcomers in the socialist movement had established for themselves enviable reputations as radicals and reformers in bourgeois circles. Their coming was hailed as a great achievement, their opinions were received with a degree of attention and accorded a degree of importance entirely out of keeping with their experience in the working-class movement or their deserts. Men like Benson, Russell and others became leaders in the socialist movement, not on account of their services in the interests of the working class, but for the notoriety that attached itself to their names and to the prestige that their membership gave to the party in certain circles. And so it happened, that when the great crisis came, when the Socialist Party was forced to undergo an acid bath that separated the true metal from the alloy, that these elements in our movement failed. They were tried—and found wanting.

But our movement has leaders too that were made of sterner stuff—leaders that can take their place beside the best the international socialist movement has produced. And foremost among them all stands Eugene V. Debs. No matter how great the crisis—and the socialist movement has gone through more than one critical period—Debs always rang true. He came into the movement at a time when to be a socialist meant to be a social outcast. He came to us, not as a Messiah sent from above, to liberate the toiling masses from economic and political slavery, but as a workman who had learned, in the bitter school of a capitalist jail, that the only hope of the workman in the unequal fight against the organized capitalist class lies in the merging of his identity with that of the class-conscious proletariat. He became one of us to learn, not to teach, to serve, not to lead, to give the best that was within him, without stint and without hope of gratitude. For more than two decades he has served the Party, whenever it called him, in whatever position the movement saw fit to place him, always ready to carry his share of the burden, heavy and

large though it was because of his great capacities. But wherever he stood, and in whatever capacity he served the movement, it was always as a revolutionist, as one who knows that to be a socialist means to be a rebel and a fighter, that achievement for the working-class means sacrifice. And because this is so, Debs was and is one of the men most feared, and withal most respected by the American ruling class.

Already our bourgeoisie is beginning to feel no small degree of discomfort over the victory it won over the revolutionary working-class movement when it passed a ten year sentence upon Debs. Hitherto, because of the comparative obscurity of its victims, they were able to lend color to the fiction that the men and women of the radical and socialist movements who had been sentenced to prison, had indeed endangered the interests of the nation with their propaganda. But Debs has been too long before the American public. No power on earth can make the American workingman believe that he was prepared to act dishonorably, that he would act against the interests of the American proletariat. The conviction of Debs has shown the organized campaign of frightfulness was directed, not against the enemies of the nation, but against the enemies of its exploiters.

Once more the Spargos and the Russells, the Slobodins and the gentlemen from the "Appeal to Reason," nee "New Appeal," stand ready to serve the ruling class, the more willingly since by so doing they hope to rehabilitate their badly damaged standing in the socialist movement. They have sent out appeal after appeal to Washington and to Paris, pleading for clemency for this splendid upright man, they whose denunciations and slanders about the socialist movement and its aims are to no small degree responsible for the hatred and intolerance that prompted this campaign against the socialist movement. Nor have their appeals failed to accomplish their purpose: there have been suggestions, transparently obvious, that a sufficiently repentant Debs might reasonably hope for a pardon.

But Debs is made of sterner stuff. And neither the pleas of those who will accept government missions today and make overtures to the socialist movement tomorrow, nor the fear of ten years behind prison bars will swerve him from the path he has chosen. As Debs goes to Moundville jail he gives his comrades a message that sends a quiver of pride through their veins:

"I shall refuse to accept a pardon unless that same pardon is extended to every man and every woman in prison under the espionage law. They must let them all out—I. W. W. and all—or I won't come out. I want no special dispensation in my case."

With these splendid words Debs has set us a standard that we must uphold and carry out. To accept less, to ask for less, were an insult to the man whose courage and whose cheerful readiness to endure the fullest measure of sacrifice with his comrades has struck an answering chord in the heart of every thinking man and woman in the United States. All over the country, in sunshine and in storm, socialist meetings are being attended as they were never attended before. The socialist movement stands face to face with an opportunity that holds out the greatest promise for the future of our movement if we are big enough to grasp it. Shall we be smaller, less brave than our Eugene Debs? Shall we be afraid to demand where he has spoken. Will we, too, be ready to give all, that we may win all?
L.

The Representative of a Free Working Class

We have often wondered how much of the newspaper notoriety that has fallen to the lot of Leon Trotsky in this country is attributable to his colorful and vivid personality, to the fact that he, in appearance and in character, was such a grateful object for the efforts of unscrupulous caricaturists. If such is the case, then we fear that the ambassador for New Russia, Engineer L. C. A. K. Martens, will be of little interest to the gentlemen who are paid for the fabrication of public opinion according to the needs of the American capitalist class. For one can hardly imagine a person who less resembles the popular conception of what a Bolshevik should look like than this scholarly, unassuming Russian who has just been introduced to the American public as the official representative of the Soviet Republic.

Comrade Martens is a well-known figure among Russian Socialists. He was born, in 1874, in Bachmut, Southern Russia, received his elementary education in Kursk, and his degree as Machine-Engineer in the University of Petrograd. While a student he became interested in the revolutionary Socialist movement, and became allied with a group of revolutionists, among whom Lenin was one of the most active members. Shortly after his matriculation he was imprisoned for revolutionary propaganda, and spent three years in the prisons of the Czar. Later he was banished, and carried on his activity in the various countries of Europe. About three years ago he came to this country. Here

he was employed as the American representative of the great Demidow Steels Works of Russia. He combines therefore a knowledge of business affairs with an impeccable record as a Socialist and revolutionist, a combination that will make him an ideal representative of Revolutionary Russia during the trying and difficult time of international economic reconstruction that lies before us. In the American movement, too, Comrade Martens has won, during his brief stay in this country, many friends and admirers among those who made his acquaintance. He was well known here in Russian circles and has been associated for some time with the Socialist Publication Society, the publishers of the "Class Struggle." Unless indications are more than deceptive, Comrade Martens will be successful in the work that he has undertaken. Already the representatives of a number of large and prominent American establishments have made overtures to him. For, in spite of their hatred for the social ideal that the Russian government represents, they realize that Russia is an exceedingly wealthy nation, rich in resources that have, up to the present, been little more than superficially touched. It is true, they would have preferred to enter upon business relations with a government that would show a little more "business understanding" and sympathy with the needs and views of international capital—but then, beggars can't be choosers. And American capital has discovered to its grief that the kind of "negotiations" that were used in the past, hold out little promise of success.

But, after all, the most important work to be done by the Russian embassy in this country will be the inauguration of an active campaign against the whole complicated system of slander and lies that has been created against the Soviets. Or, perhaps, it would be more in keeping with the facts to say, continue, for Comrade Santeri Nuorteva, who will in the future act as the Director of the Bureau of Information of the Embassy, has already for more than a year done valuable and splendid work in this direction.

The class-conscious workingmen and women have given to Comrade Martens, as the representative of the Russian proletarian revolution, a greeting, the memory of which will live in our minds as one of the most inspiring incidents of these inspiring times. To them Comrade Martens is not only the spokesman of the revolutionary proletariat movement of Russia. As the highest aim of the Russian revolution has been the world-revolution, so they see in Comrade Martens the spokesman, the ambassador of the working class of the world.

L.

Mass Strikes

In considering the period of strikes into which the American proletariat—and the proletariat of other nations—has emerged, it is important to remember that the coming of the war occurred during a time of great industrial disturbances. Strikes of great magnitude had shaken Capitalism to its basis—class antagonisms on the industrial field were being sharpened while they were officially being modified in politics; new strikes were developing; everywhere there was potential action against Capitalism. Then war was declared; and the strikes ceased, proletarian energy being directed into the channels of war instead of the class struggle.

But the war, while breaking short this phase of industrial unrest, introduced a new phase—more conscious and definitely revolutionary. The miserable collapse of bourgeois society; the agony of the war; the victorious proletarian revolution in Russia and the developing proletarian revolution in Germany—all these have loosed the initiative and energy of the proletariat. The epoch of strikes into which we have merged is, on the one hand, a consequence of the revolutionary stimuli of Russia and of Germany; and, on the other, of the problems of economic reconstruction which press down upon Capitalism.

In the United States, there is no program of "reconstruction." The Capitalist Class, accustomed to a docile proletariat, are not worrying much about the problem; and, moreover, their unprecedented prosperity during the war has developed a fatalistic attitude among them. President Wilson, shortly before his departure for France in December, "put up" the problems of reconstruction to Congress; but Congress did absolutely nothing, was bankrupt and impotent. Soldiers are being demobilized who cannot get jobs; workers are being thrown out of jobs; the employers are trying to lower wages to pre-war standards—and all this is producing protest and strikes.

Outstanding among the recent strikes are the strikes in Seattle and Butte. In Seattle, the strike was forced upon the conservative union officials by an upsurge of the spirit of action in the workers; it developed into a general strike—the first of its kind in recent American labor history; it developed revolutionary sentiments, in the proposals of the strike committee to assume municipal functions while the general strike was on. The strike was crushed by the betrayal of the conservative union officials and by the display of military force by the municipal government.

The Butte strike was equally important and dynamic; it was directed by an actual Soldiers' and Workmen's Council; it showed the I. W. W. to be a real industrial force; and again it was the conservative craft unions that broke the strike. In these two strikes there was manifest that primitive initial mass-action which, when developing into the final revolutionary form, becomes the dynamic method of the proletariat for the conquest of power.

The strikes are not over. There is still a mass-strike in the textile mills of Lawrence, Mass. Strikes are breaking out all over the country, are multiplying. This is the peculiar characteristic of the period into which we have emerged; it is the attitude of the Socialist toward these strikes that will hasten or retard the coming of Socialism. Out of these strikes the Socialist must develop larger action, must marshal and direct the proletariat for the conquest of power; and our parliamentary action must be a means of serving the industrial proletariat in action, of developing mass-action.

Out of these strikes, moreover, the Socialist must try to develop the *political strike*. The political strike is a strike in which the proletariat uses its industrial might to accomplish political purposes, to bring pressure to bear upon the bourgeois state. It is out of the political strike that develops the final mass-action; and the political strike is a supreme form of political action.

There is, at this moment, an opportunity for a political strike of the first magnitude. Union after union has declared in favor of a strike to demand the release of Tom Mooney; some unions have gone further and insisted that this strike should include *all* political prisoners. But the movement is being sabotaged by the bureaucracy of the American Federation of Labor; and even by men active in the Mooney defense. They decided to call a general strike on July 4—a legal holiday, a day on which it is absurd to speak of a general strike; and, moreover, they decided that it should be a strike for Mooney *alone*, and not include other of labor's prisoners. Moreover, this "general strike" itself is being sabotaged by the union conservatives; it is now in a sort of cataleptic state.

In this emergency, the whole forces of the Socialist Party should be concentrated on propaganda for a great mass-demonstration on July 4, and for a general *political* strike on July 5, to demand the release of *all* class war prisoners. Large sections of American labor are prepared for such a strike, but they are being baffled by the bureaucracy, by reactionary union officials. It is the task of the Socialist to engage in this struggle, to concentrate

on this fundamental issue. Our comrades are languishing in prisons; amnesty cannot reach them, and we don't want amnesty for them. *We want them released by the industrial might of the proletariat, by class conscious action.* If this political strike materializes, it will blazon a new trail in American labor history; it will set a precedent for the future; it will mean real class action by the proletariat, an appreciation of the political character of its struggle.

The political strike is new to American labor. But it is indispensable. It must come. It is the function of the left-wing Socialist to develop an intense propaganda in favor of this method of struggle, to develop out of the strikes of the proletariat the concept and the action of the political mass-strike. F.

Archangel, A Hopeful Sign

From Archangel there comes a bit of news that is full of promise for the future. According to an official statement from Washington a company of soldiers who were ordered, after a period of leave, to return to the front, not only refused to comply with the commands of their superiors and insisted upon release of their imprisoned leader, but demanded an immediate statement from Washington as to the intentions of the government regarding Russian occupation.

The capitalist press at first showed an evident desire to belittle the significance of this occurrence. It was made to appear as if the movement were confined to a single company whose natural reluctance to return to the front after a period of comparative freedom and safety, together with the conflicting reports as to the intentions of the Allied army-leaders, had led them to take this step. But the fact that the officers of the "refractory" company were forced to accede to every demand, the fact that the company, when it did finally pack its supplies, were sent to an army post, but insisted on their refusal to go to the front, the fact that the authorities at Washington not only did give the desired assurance that American troops would be withdrawn on the first of June but admitted that the mutiny at Archangel has assumed dangerous proportions and threatens to spread out over the entire American Expeditionary force—all of these things prove that the occurrence is by no means as incidental as we were at first led to imagine.

It would seem as if the much ridiculed methods employed by the Russian Red Guard at the various fronts have, after all, not been without a marked effect upon the Allied forces. When we consider that the British forces are in grave danger and that French troops have refused to continue fighting in Odessa, we must admit that the Bolshevik ammunition of speeches in No-Man's Land and leaflets dropped from aeroplanes, though perhaps not as deadly, are certainly more effective than the high-powered guns of the invaders. Evidently not even the hard heads of our American dough-boys are able to resist the "insidious" propaganda that proved the undoing of the German government after its "glorious" victory over the Russian Soviet government.

The offensive of the Russian Army has been, wherever possible, one of education instead of cannon and bullets. Tons upon tons of leaflets were, by the most devious ways, distributed among the enemy soldiers, always emphasizing the class character of the war against Russia, always appealing to the working-class sympathies of the men who were carrying arms against a working-class government. Instead of interning prisoners of war and arousing their resentment against their captors by harsh treatment and suffering, they took them, in large companies, into the Russian cities, to show them conditions as they really were. These men were given the choice of remaining in Russia or returning to their own armies. Some preferred to remain with their captors. Indeed there are numerous instances where German and Austrian prisoners of war fought and died for the fatherland of their adoption. Those who returned became ardent defenders of the new regime, and constituted an effective antidote against the lies and calumnies that had been spread about the Bolshevik regime.

That the American soldier, with his proverbial stupidity on all political subjects, and his lack of sympathy for all so-called "foreign" ideas, should be capable of responding to the appeal of Russian revolutionary propaganda, seems to us to justify great hopes for the future of the revolutionary movement in this country. It again proves that the appeal of revolutionary ideas and methods is more potent than the world-wide campaign of capitalist lies and counter-revolutionary agitation.

L.

Documents

Maxim Gorky's Confession

The war has ended. German Imperialism has been conquered and must suffer a severe penalty for its lust for plunder. The German proletariat, tortured by war and wasted by hunger, will pay dearly for the war because it submitted to the policy of its ruling class. The victors, who a short time ago, proclaimed to the whole world that they were destroying millions of men for the victory of justice and the happiness of all peoples, have now forced the conquered German people to accept the terms of an armistice which is ten times harder than the Brest-Litovsk peace and which threatens the Germans with inescapable hunger. From day to day the cynicism of the inhuman policy of the imperialists becomes clearer and threatens more and more openly the peoples of Europe with new wars and fresh bloodshed. President Wilson, who yesterday was the eloquent champion of the freedom of peoples and the rights of democracy, is equipping a powerful army for the "Restoration of Order," in Revolutionary Russia, where the people have already realized their lawful right to take the power into their own hands and are striving with all their might to lay the foundation for a new political order. I will not deny that this constructive work has been preceded by an often unnecessary destruction. But I, more than anyone else, am justified and in a position to explain, that the cultural metamorphosis which is going on under particularly difficult circumstances, and which calls for heroic exertions of strength, is now gradually taking on a form and a compass which has up to the present, been unknown in human history. This is not an exaggeration. But a short time ago an opponent of the Soviet government and still in many respects not in agreement with it, I can yet say, that in the future the historian, when judging the work which the Russian workers have accomplished in one year, will be able to feel nothing but admiration for the immensity of the present cultural activity. I will not undertake to enumerate examples. I only want to say, that to every one, this process, which for the first time allows the Russian people a share in the rudiments of the world's culture, is a thing of the heart; everyone who is striving for a renovation of the world can only and should only rejoice at the rapidity, the strength, and the zeal with which the Russian people is struggling to build for itself a new cultural life. It is true, that in this work in Russia, which has a world significance, great mistakes and unnecessary cruelties have been committed. What significance however, have these mistakes in comparison with the shameful crime of the war which was called forth by English and German imperialists? This damnable war evoked a fever in the hearts of all the European peoples and killed the already somewhat weak conceptions of men as to the value of life and respect for the worker. Is it because of the slight transgressions of the Russian Revolution against humanity, is it because of the lack of highmindedness on the part of the Russian workmen towards their conquered class enemies, that the imperialists of Europe and America are taking the field against Revolutionary Russia? No, the case is not so beautiful or

so idealistic as the papers of Europe, France, America and Japan represent it. The matter is much simpler. The imperialists of the three continents fear the operation of the new influences which may hinder the fortifying of political conditions and institutions that can strengthen their power over the wills of the people. Conditions, in consequence of which a small minority disposes of the wills and lives of the majority, that minority which evoked the senseless, bloody battles. One would think that all sensible and honorable men must see clearly the hypocrisy and the stupidity of the foundations of the capitalist system. It seems as if this were the time to convince all honorable and thoughtful men that capitalism has lost its constructive force and is a relic of the past, is a hindrance to the development of world culture, that it calls forth enmity between individuals, families, classes and nations and that the beautiful dream of the great brotherhood of nations cannot be accomplished as long as the irreconcilable struggle between labor and capital still survives. I do not deny the services of capital to the working portion of humanity, out of the flesh and blood of which it created the bases for a transition into a new, perfect and just order of society by means of Socialism. But now that the damnable war has disclosed the complete shabbiness, inhumanity and cynicism of the old system, now, its death sentence has been pronounced. We, Russians, a people without traditions and on that account bolder, more rebellious and less bound by the prejudices of the past, we have been the first to tread the path which leads to the destruction of the outworn conditions of capitalist society, and we are convinced that we have a claim on the help and sympathy of the proletariat of the entire world, and also of those, who, even before the war, criticised sharply the present conditions of society.

If this criticism was honest, then all honorable men in Europe and America must recognize our right to shape our destiny in the manner we think necessary. If any of the intellectual workers take a true interest in the solving of the great social problem, they must protest against those who strive for the reestablishment of the old regime, who wish to destroy the Russian Revolution by the shedding of Russian blood, to subject Russia to their rule in order later to exploit it as they exploited Turkey and other countries, and as they are now preparing to exploit Germany. This is the true wish of the imperialists. This is their sacred task. The leader of the campaign against Russia is Woodrow Wilson. The torch of the Russian Revolution which throws its light over the entire world, is held firmly by the hand of Lenin. The proletariat and the intellectuals will choose which one represents their interests most nearly, the representative of the outworn, life-destroying minority rule, or the leader and teacher of new social ideals and emotions, who is the embodiment of the beautiful ideals of the workers—of freedom of labor among all peoples. At different periods, almost every race has regarded itself as the Messiah who is called on to save the world. It is apparent that history has now assigned this great task to the Russian people, starving and tortured by the servitude of three centuries and exhausted by the war.

Existing under the menace of conquest by the robbers, this, they proclaim to the workers and to honorable men in all the world: Follow us to a new life, for the creation of which we are working.

without sparing ourselves or anything or anyone else. For this we are working, erring and suffering with the eager hope for success, leaving to the just decision of history all our acts; follow us in our struggle against the old order, in the work for a new form of life, for the freedom and beauty of life.

A Letter from Friedrich Adler to Huysmans

The following letter was sent by Friedrich Adler to Camille Huysmans:

Vienna, January 23, 1919.

Dear Comrade Huysmans:

The Swiss Parliament has found it advisable to refuse to recognize as valid the visé which was granted me by the Swiss Embassy in Vienna, after it had been sanctioned by the Swiss foreign police at Berne, in order to prevent my journey to Switzerland. I feel that I can safely leave the proper characterization of this proceeding to my Swiss party comrades. The incident, however, is not only a symptom of present conditions in Switzerland, but also a sign showing the nature of the Socialist conference which you have called at Berne.

As it has been made impossible for me to take part in this conference, to which I have been elected a delegate by the Executive Committee of the Social-Democratic party of German Austria, the consequence will be that the left wing of the German Austrian Social Democracy will not be represented there at all. As however, it was understood that I was to take part in the conference, it will perhaps not be superfluous, in order to prevent any misunderstanding, to state briefly, what point of view I would have represented in this convention.

Our attitude towards the conference called to meet in Berne is anything but a hopeful one. However, we consider the policy of absenting ourselves to be a mistake. Just as we enter into bourgeois parliaments in order to represent the proletarian point of view, so also we feel it our duty to defend the position of the Revolutionary International Social Democracy in this assemblage of representatives of the working class. But we are under no illusions as to the difficulties which we have to cope with in this task.

We do not rejoice that now at last an international conference has been convoked, on the contrary, we feel, principally, bitter shame that fully four years have passed without a single discussion in the bureau of the International being possible. As regards the only duty which the Stuttgart Conference assigned to it, the taking of immediate steps in case of war to end that war, the International has absolutely failed to function.

We have advocated from the beginning of the war the standpoint "that the first decisive defeat of this war was the one suffered by the International." And we explained again and again, "Proletarians who wish to conquer each other, cannot unite for international purposes." The tragic conflict in which the working class

finds itself involved, does not consist in the fact that proletarians must fight each other, but it begins only when they want to conquer each other. And as this will-to-victory is present in the majorities of the Socialist Party of all countries, all hopes for the revival of the International Socialist Bureau are absolutely vain.

We have tirelessly and resolutely opposed the will-to-victory of the Socialists of Germany and Austria, but never did we fool ourselves into thinking that the real Internationalists on the other side of the trenches would not have the same difficult task, for we knew that the workers of the countries of the Entente were likewise infected with the poison of this will-to-victory. We were constantly demanding that the Socialists of all countries should recognize their historic duty.

We drew attention to this vital problem of international action during the war, not in order to recriminate, not because we believe that the time has come to sit in judgment on the guilty ones, but because we are convinced that so long as the socialists of all countries have not become conscious of their sins during the war, the "Reorganization of the International," will only be the revival of a phantom. The great problem which the working class of the world has before it, is whether international solidarity can really become the deepest foundation of its action.

The deliberations after the decision which is now being taken in Berne will not impress anyone. And, just at this time, we remember with gratitude the Zimmerwald conferences which brought about unanimous agreement on the principle of "peace without annexations and indemnities," and which were the only conferences at which, during war, the duties of international solidarity were fulfilled.

The task which confronts the international proletariat is so enormous that it cannot permit itself, merely for the sake of petty tactical advantages, to control from its bourgeois enemies the truth of our defeat in this war.

Not until we have profited to the utmost by the lessons of the war, can we hope to be equal to our task.

With social-democratic greetings,

Friedrich Adler.

The International of Youth

By N. LENIN, in *Sbornik Sotsial-Demokrata*, No. 2, December, 1916.

Under this title there has been appearing, in Switzerland, in the German language, since September 1, 1915, "a militant propagandist organ of the International Young People's Socialist League." Already six numbers of this paper have appeared, which are decidedly worthy of consideration and are, therefore, strongly recommended to all members of our party who have opportunities for contact with the foreign social-democratic parties and with the young people's organizations.

The majority of the official social-democratic parties of Europe now occupy a position of the most disgraceful and base social-chauvinism and opportunism. Such parties are: the German, French, the Fabians and the "Labor Party" of England, the Swedish, Dutch (Troelstra's party), Danish, Austrian, etc. In the Swiss party, aside from the secession (for the great good of the party) of the worst opportunists into a non-partisan "Grütli League," there still remain within the social-democratic party proper, a great number of opportunist, social-chauvinist, Kautskian leaders, who have a *tremendous* influence on the actions of the party.

In view of this state of affairs throughout Europe, the Young People's Socialist League is presented with a gigantic, very grateful, but also very difficult, task: the task of fighting *for* revolutionary internationalism, *for* real socialism, *against* the prevailing opportunism, which has gone over to the imperialistic bourgeoisie. In the "International of Youth" is printed a series of fine articles in defense of revolutionary internationalism, and the whole paper is permeated with a splendid spirit of hatred for the "defenders" of socialism, "defenders of their fatherland," in the present war, a fiery ambition to purge the international workers' movement of the chauvinism and opportunism that are consuming it.

Of course, there is *now* no theoretical clearness and firmness in this organ of youth, and never will or can be, for the simple reason that this is the paper of searching, ebullient, stormy youth.

But toward the absence of theoretical clearness *in such* people we must take an entirely different stand from that which we assume toward the theoretical chowder in the heads, and the absence of revolutionary consistency in the hearts, of our "Organization Committee Men," "Social-revolutionists," Tolstoyans, Anarchists, Pan-Russian Kautskians ("Center"), etc. It is one thing for grown up men to confuse the minds of the proletariat, and yet to consider themselves the leaders and teachers of others: against them we must wage *relentless* warfare. It is quite another thing with these Young People's organizations, which openly declare that they are still learning, that it is their function to prepare workers for the Socialist Party. Such persons we must help in every possible way, we must approach their errors with all possible patience, attempting to rectify them gradually, and preferably by *conviction*, never by opposition. It often happens that those of the old, outlived generation *do not understand* how to approach, suitably, their youthful comrades, who necessarily must arrive at Socialism *differently*, not by *that* path, *not through the same forms*, or *under the same circumstances*, as their fathers. Among other things, therefore, we must insist on keeping the Young People's League independent *in organization*, and *not only* because the opportunists are afraid of this independence, but because of the very nature of the case. For without a complete independence of the young *it will be impossible* to make good Socialists out of them, or to prepare them for the task of *advancing* Socialism.

Let us have complete independence of the Young People's League; but let us also have complete independence to criticise them! They do not want to be flattered.

Among the errors of this fine periodical we have just named, are, principally, the following three:

1. On the disarmament question, the incorrect position we have criticised in a special article. There is reason to believe that this error was called forth by the desire (very good in itself) to emphasize the necessity of fighting for "a complete abolition of militarism" (a good point), forgetting, however, the part to be played by civil wars in the socialistic revolution.

2. As to the question of the difference between socialists and anarchists in their relation to the government, Comrade Nota-Bene's article (No. 6) makes a serious mistake (also in a number of other questions, as for instance, in the *motivation* of our right against the cry to "defend the home country"). The author wants to give a "clear conception of government in general" (by the side of the predatory imperialist government). He quotes a number of declarations by Marx and Engels. He finally arrives, among other things, at the following two conclusions: a) "It is absolutely erroneous to find the difference between socialists and anarchists in the fact that the former are in favor of, and the latter against, government. The actual difference lies in the fact that the revolutionary social-democracy wishes to create a new, social (because centralized) system of production, i. e., technically more advanced, while the decentralized anarchistic production would amount to a step back, to the old technology, to the old form of enterprise." This is not correct. The author puts the question as to the difference between the relation of the socialists and anarchists *to the government*, but he answers *not this* question, but *another*, giving the difference in their attitude toward the economic foundation of the future society. And do not forget that this is a very important and necessary question. For all this, the *chief* difference between the relations of the anarchists and socialists toward the government should not have been overlooked. Socialists are willing to utilize the present government and its institutions in the struggle for the liberation of the working class, and also insist on the necessity of so using the government in the creation of a suitable transition form from capitalism to socialism. This transition form, also *governmental*, is the dictatorship of the proletariat.

The anarchists wish to "abolish" the government, "disrupt" it (German *Sprengen*), as Comrade Nota-Bene observes at one point, erroneously ascribing this view to socialists. The socialists (the author has unfortunately cited chiefly quotations from Engels that are not always appropriate) are for a dying out, a "gradual disuse" of government *after* the expropriation of the bourgeoisie.

b) "For the social-democracy, which is, or at least ought to be, the

awakener of the masses, it is now more than ever necessary to emphasize its hostility to the principle of government. . . . The present war has shown how deeply rooted governmentalism is in the minds of the workers." Thus writes Comrade Nota-Bene. To "emphasize" "hostility to the principle" of "government," one must really have a "clear" idea of it, and that is just what the author lacks. The phrase about the "rooted governmentalism" is quite confusing, unMarxian, and unsocialistic. It is not "governmentalism" that must be met with a denial of governmentalism, but it is the policy of opportunism (an opportunist, reformist, bourgeois relation to the government) that must be met with a revolutionary social-democratic policy (a revolutionary social-democratic attitude toward the bourgeois government, and the utilization of the government against the bourgeoisie for the overthrow of the latter). That is a very different story. We shall return to this very important question at some future date.

3. In the "declaration of principles of the International Young People's Socialist League," printed in No. 6 as a "proposal by the secretary," there are a number of inaccuracies, and, worst of all, the *main thing* is missing: a clear statement of our three principal tendencies (social-chauvinism, the "center," the right), now fighting for the domination of the Socialism of the whole world.

I repeat: such errors must be refuted and cleared up. And we must make every effort to approach and keep in contact with the Young People's organizations, helping them in every way, but we must exercise *understanding* in doing so.

Manifesto issued on December 19, 1917, By the Soviet of Railway, Petrograd District, to the Railroad Employees of all the Russian Railway Systems

Comrades!

The general confusion into which the country was plunged by the government of the landholders and capitalists, which for eight months has been operating without the slightest accounting or control, has been particularly manifest in the railways, which constitute one of the most important functions of the national economic life.

Even without this, the transportation system, after being dislocated by the war, had fallen into complete disorganization because of the criminal carelessness, ignorance, and lack of preparation on the part of the higher officials of the railroads, of the guardians, who, although they were entrusted with the guidance of the hundreds of thousands of white slaves constituting the lower ranks of the serv-

ice, were interested only in keeping their own jobs safe, completely forgetting the hopeless situation of the lower employees.

Thus the railroads of our country were gradually enveloped in an increasing state of disorder, the possibility of through traffic and transportation over the roads was reduced to a minimum, the rolling stock was in bad repair, the number of "sick" cars and locomotives was increasing day by day, the lack of traction material is becoming seriously felt; there is a constant increase in the difficulties experienced at traffic centers and transfer points; the normal flow of "empties" to the important points from which provisions are constantly moving to the capitals and to the army, was being constantly interrupted; the most important centers, Moscow and Petrograd, were congested; there, at other times, an insufficiency of rolling stock was felt when thousands of cars that were being held up at transfer points were preventing the proper operation of the roads.

It is not possible to give a detailed picture here of the whole mess, but it is necessary to point out that if, in this vast confusion, it is still possible for a citizen of Russia to move about somewhat in his own country, this possibility must be ascribed to the slavish devotion alone, the almost intolerable exertions of the lower ranks of railway employees—workmen, foremen, clerks, especially the men working out on the line.

The consciousness of our duty to the country and to the revolution impels us, the lower employees of the railroads, to stand by our posts under conditions that are intolerably severe, in spite of the fact that the coalition ministry of agreement (Kerensky Cabinet), in a number of proclamations, criminally betraying the interests of the toiling masses for the advantage of capital, completely forgot the railway slaves, fed them on promises and used only the most merciless measures in dealing with the disobedient.

Ministers changed, the wording of their promises changed, but the poverty of the poor railway employees increased.

The hopes of the railway men to have the aid of their own Trade Organization have not been realized.

This organization, the All-Russian Railway Organization, the so-called "Vikzhel" (*Vserossiskiy Zhelyeznodorozhnyy Soyuz*), from the very beginning of its existence, assumed the impress of the policy of coalition and compromise which was characteristic of the Kerensky Government.

Being elected at a removal of two, three and even four degrees from the original voter, "Vikzhel," consisting of persons cut off from the great masses of the railway workers, has not reflected, and does

not reflect the will and the hopes of these masses, and has never fought for their demands.

On the contrary, all this time, especially at the moment when there were bitter conflicts between the broad masses of the workers with the landholders and capitalists, this organization stood openly by the side of those who fought, with a policy of union with the landholders and capitalists, against the workers and the peasants.

This fight against the workers and peasants came out with particular clearness in November, at the time of the successful uprising of the workers and soldiers.

Comrades! There are still many struggles ahead, the workers and peasants will still have many conflicts with the landholders and capitalists, the Kaledins, Kornilovs, and Kerenskys; all workers, all toilers, should unite in one faithful family around their Peasants' and Workers' Government, born in the Second All-Russian Congress of Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Delegates.

Comrades! All for one and one for all! Only by our united strength and not by the wretched policy of agreement pursued by the "Vikzhel," can we improve our lot. Only by supporting the outspoken policy of the Council of People's Commissaires can we prevent the sabotage and the opposition now being practised by our superior officials, those managers and servants of the roads who were formerly the *chinovniks* and employees of the Czarist Government, in their fight against the success of our Workers' and Peasants' Government.

This criminal sabotage must be stopped!

Comrades, support the Council of People's Commissaires!

From the People's Commissariat of Labor to all Workers

Comrades:

Hard and difficult times are ahead of us for the industries of our country which were mobilized without any system during three and a half years of the war and were conducted for the sole purpose of war-profiteering, are now losing a considerable part of their contracts. The slowdown of war industries is taking place at the moment of the greatest struggle between two classes, two worlds—the world of capitalist exploitation and oppression, and the world of fraternal cooperation of all the oppressed. The political struggle between capital and labor throughout the whole country is being accompanied by a threatening economic disorganization. The organ-

izers of the capitalist production—the owners of plants, factory owners, bankers with all their clique of lackey partisans (officials, engineers and others) fed on the crumbs of the profiteers attempt to utilize the coming crisis so that the deadly grip of hunger and disorganization will tighten the noose on the necks of the working class and thus crush the revolution.

Every worker, soldier, peasant,—all the sons of the revolution must at this crucial hour unite and consciously use their capabilities, strong hands and mighty shoulders to preserve our economic system from that disorganization. Enterprises released from war orders and labor organizations must adapt themselves to the production of the vital necessities for national consumption. Everyone must now remember that he works not for accumulating profits for capitalists but for the benefit of all the toilers; that the workers and peasants are becoming the real masters of our country and all must regard the factories, plants, other enterprises and forms of work with such unselfish considerations as befits the Socialist state of society.

The slowdown of war orders, the horrible disorganization which results in the cessation of work at the plants would bring grief to the worker's heart, and the spectre of hunger and the fear of oncoming unemployment hovers over the heads of the large toiling masses. This fear inherited from our enslaved fathers keeps our vigorous thoughts in capitalist captivity, dwarfs our great aspirations for the emancipation of the whole mankind from the yoke of exploitation, and overcomes them with fears for the morrow.

Only when the control shall rest in the hands of labor organizations, central as well as local, and energetically and actively applied, not hesitating even to use most drastic measures against capitalists, should the latter deliberately neglect the duties imposed on them;—only when the control shall be put in close and direct contact with the general regulation and organization of production, in individual enterprises, as well as in a whole branch of an industry—only then will it accomplish its aims and justify the expectations held out for it.

Control should be precisely understood as a **transitory step** towards an organization of the whole economic structure of the country on a social basis, as the immediate and necessary step in that direction, made by the masses themselves, and parallel with the work done in the central organs of the national economy.

Petrograd, July, 1918

FACSIMILES OF SOVIET CIRCULARS

issued to Foreign Soldiers on Russian Soil

RUSSIAN SOCIALIST FEDERAL SOVIET REPUBLIC.

Why have you come to Ukraine?

To British and American soldiers.

Fellow workmen!

Why have you come to Ukraine? Do you not know that the war is over? An armistice is declared on the Western front, and preparations are being made for the peace conference. Yet instead of arrangements being made for you to return home, to those dear ones, who with keen longing will be expecting you, you have been brought here to start a new war in Russia.

What have you got to fight for now?

When the allied governments invaded Russia from the North, in Mourmansk, and Archangel, and the East from Vladivostok, they publicly made a solemn declaration that they had no hostile intentions against the Russian people. They said, they had come in fact to help us to get out of the clutches of German Imperialism. President Wilson gave as an additional reason that he desired to protect the Czecho-Slovaks, who he alleged were in danger of being betrayed to the Germans.

These were merely hypocritical pretexts. Russia was not in the grip of the Kaiser. Russia did not want the kind of assistance of the Allies. The Czecho-Slovaks were in no danger of betrayal. They were at perfect liberty to leave Russia unharmed, but they were bribed by the Allies to take up arms against the Russian Republic, and were until we had defeated them, a source of danger to us.

But what excuse is there now for this fresh landing in the Ukraine, openly directed against Russia? It may be that you have been kept in ignorance of the tremendous events that have taken place during the last month, although that is hardly possible. We tell you then, that there have been revolutions in Bulgaria, Austria-Hungary and Germany.

Prussianism has been overthrown by the German workers and soldiers. Kaiser Wilhelm has fled to Holland. The Crown Prince has been shot. There is a new Government in Berlin controlled by a Workers' and Soldiers' Council.

On the west front fighting has ceased and the German, French, and British soldiers are fraternizing.

In Austria-Hungary too the old order has been overthrown by the workers. The Emperor Karl has abdicated. Hungary has broken away from Austria, and the Czecho-Slovaks, as well as the other nations hitherto under the dominion of the Hapsburgs have established their independence.

What pretext have the Allied governments now for invading Russia from the South? The menace of Prussian militarism no longer exists thanks to the German Revolution. We have offered to the Czecho-Slovaks all facilities to return to their own country, to join their liberated countrymen. There is no excuse at all for your landing in the Ukraine. If there was ever the slightest doubt as to the intentions of the Allied Governments, there can be none now. The purpose of the Allied invasion of Russia is to crush the Socialist Republic, and re-establish the reign of capitalism and landlordism. You surely cannot be unaware of the tremendous change that has taken place in Russia. We have abolished capitalism and landlordism. The land belongs to the whole people. So, too, do the factories, mines, railways and all the means of wealth production. All these things are under the direct control of workers and peasants. We are constructing a new society in which the fruits of labour will go to those who work. But the financiers of Wall Street and the City have greedy eyes for our vast storehouse of wealth. They want to control the rich coal basin of the Don, the oil wells of Baku, the cotton fields of Turkestan and minerals of the Caucasus, the great timber forests of the North, and the vast corn lands of the South. They want to convert the million of workers and peasant of Russia into wage slaves to grind out profits for them.

- 2 -

Fellow workingmen, this is the purpose for which you have been brought here. You have not come to fight Prussian Militarism, that is finished. You have not come to fight for liberty. You have come to overthrow the first real Workers Republic. There is another important fact which you should know. In this attack on Soviet Russia from the South, your government will be co-operating with the present government of the Ukraine. Last year we had a Soviet Republic in the Ukraine. But the present head of the government, Skoropadsky, with the assistance of the Kaiser suppressed the Soviet Republic, and since then has maintained an iron rule over the Ukraine people with the aid of German bayonets.

The German soldiers have now refused any longer to be the policemen for the Ukrainian-German capitalists and landlords, and are going home to their now free country.

Skoropadsky, has now turned to the Allied Governments and they, not in the least troubled by the fact that he has been actually co-operating with the Kaiser, have come to an arrangement with him, to keep the Ukrainian people down, and to sacrifice you in the interests of international capitalism. If you were told that your landing will be welcomed by the people, do not believe it. During the whole period of the German occupation the Ukrainian people have been in a state of rebellion. The German Commanding General was assassinated. Numbers of other acts of violence, and strikes showed the hostility of the people to the present regime, not merely because it was German, but because it was capitalist. At any moment we expect our comrades in the Ukraine to overthrow Skoropadsky and to re-establish the Soviet Republic.

Now you have come to the assistance of the South Russian landlords and capitalists. Comrades, are you going to do the dirty work that the German soldiers refused to do any longer?

The supreme motive which animates the capitalist governments of the Allies for invading Russia is to suppress this stronghold of the revolutionary socialist movement. They fear above everything else that the working people in their own countries will overthrow them and take the power into their own hands. They hope, by crushing the Russian revolution, to take the heart out of the tremendous movement for working class emancipation that is spreading everywhere. And how rapidly it is spreading. The soldiers, who only yesterday were slaughtering each other on the Western front are now mingling as brothers. Will it be long before the voice of revolution is heard in France, England, America and Italy?

Comrades, if the workers of England or America made a revolution would you suppress it? You would not. You would side with your own class. We also are workers, we belong to the same class as you do. Will you then, fight against us?

Comrades, we are living to-day at the beginning of a new period in the history of mankind. This is the last struggle between Capital and Labour. If you continue your present job, you will be siding with the gang of imperialists, who during four years have sacrificed ten millions of the flower of manhood, have mutilated thirty millions more, have caused unutterable misery and devastation, and who, if allowed to remain in power will reduce us workers, to a worse slavery than has ever been known.

Comrades, don't do it. You have arms in your hands. Your officers are powerless against you. Raise the red flag of workingclass freedom. Join with us, and with the revolutionary workers of Germany and Austria to make the world free for Labour.

Down with capitalism! Long live the Social Revolution!

Signed: N. Lenin.
President of the Council of Peoples'
Commissaries.

C. Chicherin.
Peoples' Commissary for Foreign Affairs.

Quit Fighting, British Soldiers And Join Your Russian Comrades!

English prisoner from Archangel front writes to his brother Scots.

Is it right for working people of one country to kill working people of another?

The Allied troops, invading Russia, have so often been told that if they are taken prisoner they will be tortured and killed by the bolsheviks, that it is interesting to see what in fact happens when an English soldier falls into the hands of the Russian workmen and peasants' army. Here is the letter of a private of the Royal Scots taken prisoner last month near Archangel:

Cutlas.

Monday, Oct 14-th 1918

To the men of the Royal Scots.

I wonder if you all know the kind of men you are fighting. I do. You are fighting an army of working men and there are no officers amongst them. Everybody is the same. They ask, why do we fight them. Well, that is more than I can say; in fact I don't know why we have come to fight them, and another thing that counts is, they do not want to fight us. They are not fighting their own class, the working class, but the capitalists of Russia and all countries. Since I have been a prisoner I have been treated as one of themselves, and given me plenty to eat and drink. I have also seen one of our men that lies in hospital wounded. He tells me he has been well treated and looked after and as a friend, a working man, and not as a soldier.

Now I ask you this question; is it right, that the working class of one country should come and fight the working class of another country? We are not at war with Russia, and the Russians are not at war with us, but with the capitalists of all the countries, the people whom we work for and keep in plenty, while we, the working class, merely exist. If the working class knew why they are fighting and for who, they would refuse to fight any longer. Think things over and ask yourselves, is it worth while killing each other to please other people, who care not what happens, as long as their pockets are being filled at our expense. From what I have seen the Russians are a good people and they are fighting for a good cause, a cause that every country in the world should follow.

Private Lapham 10-th Royal Scots.

- 2 -

Now isn't it clear that English and American soldiers are being fooled when they believe that a mob of robbers and criminals have seized power in Russia and are murdering right and left. Here is an example of a Scotch soldier taken prisoner in square fight. He says himself he did not know what sort of people he was fighting, till he was in their hands. He had probably been told by his officers and by some rag like the "Daily Mail" that the most terrible things would happen to him, if he fell in the hands of the bloodthirsty bolsheviks. Of course he was told that, because the rich people who rule England must hide from English workmen the truth about the Russian people and their revolution. But what happens in fact when an English soldier gets into the hands of the Red army? The Russian soldier, who is a working man or peasant like the English soldier, looks upon him at once like a comrade and sees that his interests lie not in killing his prisoner but in treating him as a fellow worker, who has the same hard life of toil as he has. But the Russian workman and peasant is trying to improve his lot. He has turned out his criminal government and put an end to the rich parasites that have lived so long at his expense,—landlords, warprofiteers, bankers, industrial bosses. He is making a new world here now, where only those people rule, who labour by muscle and brain. Therefore every workingman and peasant from any country in the world, no matter what language he speaks is welcome to him and will find a home in Russia. He wants to make Russia the refuge of all those who are oppressed under the cruel régime of capitalism and wage-slavery. He has abolished that régime in his country and invites fellow workers of other lands to come and see what he has done and then go home and do the same.

For this reason a special order has been issued by the commander of the Red army on the Archangel and Murman fronts to all soldiers of the Red army to treat all prisoners with the utmost kindness and consideration, to provide for their material wants and to send them down to the bases, where they will be welcome as fellow workers. The commander of every battalion is now responsible for the safety of prisoners taken. If any prisoner is shot, then he answers for it with his life before the military revolutionary tribunal of the republic.

To the British Soldiers.

Comrades!

Great events are taking place. We have just been celebrating the anniversary of the great Russian proletarian Revolution. This revolution has overthrown the government of the landlords and capitalists. It has brought to the working class of Russia not only political but also economic liberty. The big landlords have been driven off the land, the land has become the common property of the people and those who toil are utilising it for the good of the people. The capitalists have been deprived of the factories, works and mines; these are now being controlled by the workers themselves.

By the February Revolution the Russian people liberated themselves of the tsar's autocracy with its evils; a capitalist government was established. The Russian middle class tried to introduce a system of government similar to yours, a system the main object of which is the exploitation of the working class and its subjugation to a few trusts magnates. The capitalist governments have not only unmercifully exploited the people but have been and are using them as gun-fodder for almost five years.

The Russian working class however did not fight through its revolution in order to continue the murderous fratricidal war, or to maintain such a system of slavery as you have in Great Britain. The Russian working class has overthrown the capitalist government and established an entirely new system of government by the working class. Soviets (Councils) of Workers Soldiers and Peasants Deputies have been established which have complete political power and are managing the industries of the country for the welfare of the working people. In each village, town or district such Soviets are at work. These are united in one central body which is being elected every the months at the all-Russian Congress of the Soviets. The People's Commissaries such as the people's commissary for foreign affairs, for home affairs, for war and so forth are appointed by this central body and are directly responsible to the working people. Instead of lawyers and selfseeking professional politicians the workers and peasants are themselves managing their affairs. We communists are acting in accordance with the principle: «The emancipation of the working class is the task of the workers themselves».

The fact that the Russian working class is striving for its economic and political liberty induced the British capitalists to use all means in order to prevent us from establishing Socialism. The British, French and American capitalists know pretty well that as soon as the truth about the Russian workers revolution becomes evident to the proletarians of their respective countries these will follow our example and liberate themselves of wageslavery. Therefore they supported our counterrevolutionary capitalists, landlords and generals against the Soviets of the working people. Now

not being satisfied with the streams of blood that are flowing everywhere—in the west, in the east, in the south they send you, British workers, to fight against us, the Russian workingmen. They wish to enslave us in order to keep you in slavery, yet you allow yourselves to be used as tools for this vile purpose.

Your capitalists and officers have been telling you that you are fighting against Prussian militarism. Prussian militarism has already been destroyed by the Prussian people themselves. Influenced by the Russian Revolution, the German working class has risen and has overthrown the regime of the bloody kaiser. He is in prison; his government is disperse. Soviets are being formed everywhere; the soldiers have joined hands with the working class; the German sailors at Kiel and elsewhere have shot their officers and taken possession of the navy. Berlin is in the hands of the revolutionary soldiers and workers. Severe fighting is taking place all over Germany; a great Socialist Revolution has commenced. Similar events are taking place in Austria and Hungary. The Emperor Karl has escaped and Vienna and Budapest are in the hands of the Soviets of workers and soldiers. At the western front the German soldiers have arrested the peace delegation of the old government and are negotiating directly with the French and British soldiers.

At this time you are called upon by your capitalist government to play the part of international gendarmes. You are called upon to assist the Russian and German capitalists and landlords to enslave those peoples. In the meantime the British, French and American capitalists are strengthening the shackles of slavery and are forging chains for yourselves. In Great Britain liberty of the press, the liberty of the subject, the rights of the Trade Unions have been completely abolished, the country is misgoverned by a gang of adventurers and profiteers who for the sake of a few millions of profit do not mind killing millions of British and other working men. The flower of the manhood of the nation is being crippled. Industries which produced necessities of life for the people have been destroyed, famine and misery are reigning everywhere. The armament ring which dictates its policy through the Northcliffe press is ruling supreme.

Hundreds of thousands of British working men are protesting against this unbearable state of affairs; they demand peace and liberty. Hundreds of the best men of the nation, such as John Maclean are in prison.

At this time you serve as tools of your exploiters. British Soldiers! Is it not time for you to face the truth, and to decline to serve as the gendarmes of international capitalism?

Demand your immediate withdrawal from the soil of the Russian Federative Soviet Republic!

Return home and join those workers who are fighting for the liberation of the working class.

Peter Petroff

Berlin, October 31 st 1918.

To the workers and soldiers of the entente!

Friends, Comrades, Brothers!

In the midst of the earthquake of the world war, of the chaotic collapse of the tzaristic imperialist society the Russian proletariat, in spite of misunderstanding, hatred and slander, has established its rule—the Socialist Republic of Workers, Soldiers and Peasants. It is the titanic beginning of the Socialist construction of the world, the work which constitutes now the historic task of the international proletariat. The Russian revolution has tremendously stimulated the revolutionizing process of the world's proletariat. Bulgaria and Austria-Hungary are already drawn into the struggle. The German revolution, too, is awakening. Still, tremendous difficulties are arising on the way to victory of the German proletariat. The bulk of the people of Germany are with us. The power of the most bitter enemies of the working class is breaking down. Still they are striving by means of lies and deception to chain the masses to their chaotic and to put off the hour of the emancipation of the people of Germany.

And just as the imperialism of the Entente powers was strengthened by the robberies and murders perpetrated by German imperialism in Russia, so have the German rulers made use of the assault of the Entente powers upon Socialist Russia for the maintenance of their power in Germany.

Have you seen how a few weeks ago Kaiser Wilhelm II, who after the overthrow of Tzarism is the representative of the most infamous reaction, made use of the intervention of the Entente powers against proletarian Russia to arouse anew the war spirit of the masses of workers?

We cannot allow that such welcome opportunities for demagoguery be placed into the hands of our contemptible enemies—the most abominable enemy of the world proletariat. It cannot be that the proletariat of the Entente powers should allow such a thing to happen. Of course we know that you have already raised your voice against the machinations of your governments. But the danger is constantly growing. The united front of the world imperialism against the proletariat is becoming a reality in the case of the campaign against the Russian Soviet Republic.

It is to fight to prevent this that I am appealing to you!

The world proletariat cannot allow the hearth of the Socialist Revolution to be put out if it does not want to see its own hopes and power vanish. The downfall of the Russian Soviet Republic would mean the defeat of the world proletariat.

Friends, Comrades, Brothers! Raise your arms against your masters!

Long live Russia of the Workers, Peasants and Soldiers!

Long live the revolution of the French, British, Italian and American proletariat!

Long live the emancipation of workingmen of all countries from the hell of war, exploitation and slavery!

Karl Leibknecht.

THE MYSTERY SOLVED

The Question is often asked "How do these Socialist publications get their support?"

This seems to be the "Mystery" of the day. We will let you in on the secret. The answer will be obvious as soon as you have properly filled out and mailed the subscription blank at the bottom of this page.

The "Class Struggle" is in a field of Socialist literature that is bringing out many kinds of thought, but we believe that this magazine fills a place that no other Socialist publication covers. You are pleased with each issue. This is no idle boast. Our readers tell us this daily, and we are talking to you personally as a reader of "The Class Struggle." YOU can help us do more effective work by reaching a large circle of readers if you will interest one or more persons to subscribe. May we not expect you to do this as your contribution to keep the aims and objects of Revolutionary International Socialism, clearly presented by those who are part of the Movement, before those who wish to keep informed? YOUR ANSWER will be made by using the contribution blank.

SOCIALIST PUBLICATION SOCIETY

243 55th Street, Brooklyn, N. Y.

COMRADES:—Enclosed find \$1.50 for One Year's Subscription to "The Class Struggle," to be sent to the following address:

Name

Street and Number.....

City or Town.....

State

Send All Money by Postal or Express Money Order, or by Check.