

The Revolutionary Age

A Chronicle and Interpretation of Events in Europe

Vol. I, No. 2

Wednesday, November 20, 1918

Price, 2 Cents

The Trend Of Socialism in Europe

THE decision of the German government to put off the Constituent Assembly until February 2 suggests that the Scheidemann group are finding themselves in much the same predicament as was Kerensky, while the demand by the soldiers that the Assembly be held immediately parallels the action of the Bolsheviks before the November revolution.

German soldiers returning from the front are disposing of their arms and munitions to the civilians for a few marks and the fact that the left wing Socialists are the purchasers would point to the possibility of an armed demonstration along the lines of the Bolshevik precedent. The report that the present government is attempting to exclude the Russian delegates or ambassadors would tend to strengthen this belief as it is only when these propagandists are achieving success that such measures become necessary. The capture of the censorship by the Soldier's Councils is further evidence that the Soviet idea is spreading as this means that the councils will now control the agency of propaganda.

Such news as comes from Austria would indicate that all is not well with the bourgeoisie there; the failure of the last sitting of the Austrian Council of the Empire, the storming of the parliament building in Vienna by the Socialists, and the subsequent hoisting of the red flag together with the capture by the Socialists of the Neue Freie Presse would indicate that the people have no intention of allowing their will to be thwarted.

The Revolution in Germany has an ally in the Socialist Soviet Republic of Russia; and it is developing new allies among the proletariat of the other European nations.

In Switzerland, Holland, Sweden, Denmark and Spain strikes, riots and demonstrations are sweeping onward, symptomatic of a developing revolutionary struggle everywhere in Europe against Capitalism and Imperialism. Bolshevism in Austria seems to be sweeping onward almost as rapidly as in Germany.

While these governments of Europe are intriguing against the Soviet Republic, eager to crush Bolshevism in Russia, the European proletariat is accepting the revolutionary Socialist struggle against Imperialism.

In Switzerland strikes and riots are raging, while the Bolshevik Legation has been expelled. A general railway strike has been declared, strikers and troops have clashed in Zurich, and trade and industry is paralyzed. The Swiss revolutionary Socialists have acted as purveyors of information between the Socialists of the belligerent nations, and to the neutral world. They have particularly rendered service in spreading information about Soviet Russia. They are now turning to action.

Denmark is seething. Strikes and riots have broken out in Denmark. Independent Socialists in Sweden have issued a manifesto urging the formation of Workmen's and Soldiers' Councils in order to establish a Socialist Republic. General demobilization of the army and an eight-hour working day are demanded. The Socialist paper "Politiken" urges the convocation of a Constituent Assembly elected by general suffrage.

A demonstration against the crown and the dynasty was held Monday in Copenhagen.

The Social-Democratic Party of Holland, representing the revolutionary group, has issued a manifesto

in favor of a Soviet government, and pledging its solidarity with Bolshevik Russia. The Dutch government is apprehensive of oncoming Bolshevism. Intensive revolutionary propaganda is being carried on. The Social-Democratic Party, the party of Anton Pannekoek, Henriette Roland-Holst, Herman Gorter and J. Wynkoop is completely Bolshevik, and one year ago was designated by the Soviet Government as its agent to secure news from neutral and belligerent nations.

A few days ago, Wynkoop made a speech in the second chamber of the Dutch parliament demanding the abdication of the Queen. He urged that the troops under demobilization should refuse to surrender their arms and called on the workers to declare a general strike. Following the refusal of the Queen to abdicate a demonstration was staged in Amsterdam that resulted in an armed clash between the soldiers and the revolutionists in which several persons were killed and wounded. The street fighting lasted for several hours.

Wynkoop is the editor of the Socialist left wing daily The Tribune which is published in Amsterdam.

Apparently, the Russian, Austrian and German Revolution may develop into a general European revolution—a revolution against Capitalism and Imperialism.

In Italy, no recent news is at hand, but the Socialist Party there, the majority party, is completely Bolshevik. It opposed Italy's entry into war and acted against the government during the war. After the military disaster at Caporetto, the Socialist Party declared that, in spite of the invasion of Italian territory, it would not cease its propaganda against the war. In December 1917, the Socialist deputy in the parliament, Morgari, declared that the Socialists wanted peace,

not only on the Bolshevik terms, by Bolshevik methods. Some months ago, at a convention of the party, the extreme Bolshevik forces secured control.

The report that Turati, one of the Socialist centerists in the Italian parliament, had gone over to the government and was shortly to leave Italy on a governmental mission has been denied.

In France, the Socialist Party is becoming more and more radical. The reactionary Socialists, led by Albert Thomas and Marcel Cachin, have lost all influence. The party is now transforming itself, the Bolshevik forces represented by Loriot becoming more and more powerful. Last year there were serious revolutionary disturbances in France, in the army and in the cities.

The British proletariat is restive. The miners, led by Robert Smillie, have been aggressive all through the war. Shortly after the start of the great German offensive in March, Smillie, at a tremendous meeting bitterly denounced the war. In an article in the "Metropolitan" for August, Arthur Gleason declared that common unorganized labor—the overwhelming majority of the workers—had caught fire from Bolshevism and were out to wreck the existing social system.

The decision of the British Labor Party to withdraw from the government would support this contention. There are at present several labor men members of the coalition government but it is authoritatively stated that if they insist on remaining within the government ranks they will not be allowed to stand for re-election at the forthcoming general election as members of the British Labor Party. This decision of the Labor Party while not very radical in itself, may cause a breach through which may emerge more aggressive mass action.

The general election in Ireland is expected to practically end the career of the ill-fated Irish Party, and to introduce as a factor in Irish politics the Irish Labor Party. The laborites will contest four seats in the city of Dublin, and about fifteen other constituencies throughout the country. Jim Larkin, the general secretary of the Irish Transport and General Workers Union, who is at present in this country and is prohibited from landing in any part of the British Empire, has been nominated for the strongest seat in Dublin and is expected to carry the election in spite of his exile. All over the island strikes are in progress, the Teachers Union declaring a one day general strike in which 95% of the teachers joined as a demonstration of their power in case their demands were not complied with. The Irish Socialist and labor movement is in complete sympathy with the most forward elements of the English, Scotch and Welsh movements according to the Voice of Labor, the official organ of the Irish Transport and General Workers Union.

In Norway, the Socialist Party is now completely Bolshevik, the revolutionary Socialists having secured control at the party convention 8 months ago, their program being revolutionary mass action, organization of Soviets and proletarian dictatorship.

According to a dispatch in the New York Times the trouble in Brussels was not entirely due to the presence of the German troops but had in it the purpose of securing certain reforms under the monarchy. A delegation of Belgian Socialists visited the king at Ghent and laid their demands before him.

Europe is seething, Europe is a-fire. Should the European governments attempt the desperate task of crushing the German Revolution, they may have their own proletariat to deal with!

To Our Readers.

The Revolutionary Age has been founded to interpret the great change that is at present taking place not only in Europe but throughout the entire world. Its interpretation will be strictly from the Socialist standpoint and is intended to offset the volume of misinformation at present being spread broadcast by the capitalist press. We will have among our contributors the best informed Socialist writers in America as well as men and women in close touch with the European Socialist movement.

Real success in a paper such as this depends however primarily upon the readers and we therefore place ourselves in your hands. If you are interested in having a journal such as this survive you must work for it.

To Socialist locals and branches we appeal for co-operation in bringing the paper before the attention of their members and urging that each member becomes a subscriber.

To individuals we appeal for help in securing subscribers and contributors. Distribute the paper in your shop, your club and your union.

The Revolutionary Age will be issued bi-weekly; Wednesday and Saturday. Order bundles from the Business Manager, 885 Washington Street, Boston, Mass.

Counter-Revolutionary Plots In Russia

(Translated from the Russian by Andre Tridon)

I

From the People's Commissaire for Foreign Affairs Tchitcherine to the Russian plenipotentiary in Berlin, —Moscow, September 2, 1918:

A plot was unearthed to-day which had been engineered by foreign diplomats led by the head of the English mission, Mr. Lockhart, the French Consul-General and some others. Their aim was, after bribing certain detachments of the Soviet's troops, to overthrow the Council of the People's Commissaires and to proclaim in Moscow a military dictatorship. This was a regular conspiracy relying for its success on forged documents and bribes. Among other documents brought to light there was a statement to the effect that if the revolt was successful, forged letters alleged to have passed between the Russian and German governments would be published, and also forged copies of treaties, whereby a sentiment would be created favorable to the declaration of a new war against Germany. The plotters took advantage of their diplomatic immunity and were protected by certificates personally signed by the head of the English Mission in Moscow, Lockhart. Several copies of the documents are already in the hands of the investigating committee. It has been proved that in the past fortnight one million two hundred thousand rubles had been distributed for the purpose of bribery by the English lieutenant Reilly, one of Lockhart's agents. An Englishman arrested in the plotters' secret meeting place and brought before the investigating committee was found to be the English diplomatic representative Lockhart. He was released as soon as his identity was established. Unsuccessful attempts to bribe certain corps commanders brought about the exposure of the plot. Investigations will be continued with all possible thoroughness.

II

"What the Plotters Were Planning to Do"—From the Moscow "Pravda," September 3, 1918.

Lockhart and an officer of the Soviet's troops met for the first time at a private house on August 4th. They discussed the feasibility of arranging an uprising against the Soviet authorities in Moscow about September 10th, at which time the English troops would be advancing in the Murman region. The date of September 10 was considered as very important owing to the fact that Lenin and Trotzky were to attend a meeting of the People's Commissaires on that day. It was also planned to seize the Imperial Bank, the Central Telephone Exchange and the Telegraph station. A military dictatorship was to be established and all meetings

prohibited pending the arrival of the English troops.

The Russian officer received from Lockhart the sum of 700,000 rubles to be spent in preparing the uprising. On August 22 another conference was held at which he received another 200,000 rubles and at which plans were elaborated for seizing all the papers in Lenin's and Trotzky's offices. On August 28 the Russian officer received another 200,000 rubles and it was agreed that he should go to Petrograd and enter into communications with the English military group and the White Guards.

The threads of the entire conspiracy converged in the British mission, the second in authority being the French Consul General Gresnard; then came General Lavergne, a French officer and several other French and English officers.

The negotiations between the Russian officer and the foreign plotters took place on August 29. The possibility of starting simultaneous movements in Nijny Novgorod and Tambov was discussed. Negotiations were carried on with the representatives of a number of allied powers with a view to paralyzing the resistance of the Soviet authorities to the Cheko-Slovaks and the Anglo-French forces, especially by bringing about an acute food shortage in Petrograd and Moscow. Plans were likewise laid for blowing up bridges and railroad tracks, for incendiary fires and the destruction of stores of food stuffs.

III

"The Arrests at the British Embassy"—from the "Pravda" of Moscow, September 3, 1918

The investigation commission holds 40 men, most of them Englishmen, who were arrested on August 31 in the British Embassy. Dzershinsky, chairman of the commission, had received important information on the relations existing between various counter-revolutionary organizations and the representatives of the British government.

Hiller, a member of the commission, was authorized to search in the British Embassy and to make arrests if necessary. Accompanied by Commissaire Polisenko and his assistants, Hiller arrived at the Embassy at five o'clock in the evening. They surrounded the building and gained access to the ground floor. But when they proceeded on their way to the floor above, shots were fired from there. Shenkman, one of the Commissaire's assistants fell with a wound in his chest. Lissen, a scout, was killed on the spot. Hiller with a detachment of scouts forced his way into the rooms on the second floor and arrested the men he found there, all of whom held up their hands. The fight went on in the corridor,

the scouts returned the fire, killing one of the men they had come to arrest. It was learned later that he was the naval attache Cromie, who had fired the first shot. Among the prisoners is Prince Shakhovskoy.

In the course of the search letters were found which contain damaging evidence against the British Embassy, and also a large number of weapons.

IV

An Editorial of the Moscow "Izvestia," the Official Organ of the Soviet, on Tchitcherine's Telegram to Joffe.

It was planned to seize the People's Commissaires at one of the Council's meetings at which important questions were to be discussed. The guards of the Kremlin were to receive bribes in consideration of which they would allow themselves to be also arrested. The members of the People's Council were to be sent to Archangel. At least such was the first plan. Soon afterward, Reilly expressed doubts about the advisability of sending Lenin to Archangel. Through his ability to make friends with simple people, Lenin might on the way to Archangel win the sympathy of his guards and prevail upon them to let him escape. Reilly declared it would be safer to shoot Lenin and Trotzky as soon as they were arrested.

During the night of August 31, members of the investigating commission entered the plotters' meeting place. Among the men who were arrested there was an Englishman who refused to give his name. Brought before the commission he declared that he was Lockhart. After Peters had verified the truth of that assertion he asked Lockhart to explain the attempt made to bribe the commander of the Soviet's troops. Lockhart denied categorically having ever had anything to do with that officer. When the exact dates on which he had met him were mentioned and other documents were produced, Lockhart declared excitedly that as a diplomatic representative he could not be subjected to any examination. It was then explained to him that the question had been put to him to enable him to prove that the Lockhart who had organized the plot and the English representative of the same name were two different persons.

The Fried brothers, one a major, the other a colonel, who were also arrested, were in the employ of the Soviet government. They had for some time been stealing documents and reports on conditions at the front and the movements of troops. Their reports were made in several copies and delivered to the English and French missions. An actress of the Art Theatre acted as go-between.

The Revolution—Russian and German

WHEN in March 1917 the Russians overthrow the Czar much ink was spilled by both the capitalist and Socialist press in proving that the Social Revolution was at last an accomplished fact; that it was not; that it would shortly be in operation and finally that Russia was not sufficiently developed capitalistically for the establishment of Socialism. Each side cited names and statistics to support its particular contention.

Since the outbreak of the Russian Revolution, however, events have moved swiftly. Despotism monarchy has been followed in quick succession by constitutional monarchy, bourgeois democracy, liberal-socialist coalition and revolutionary Socialism or Bolshevism. Some of these transitions have been accomplished so quickly that the outside world scarcely heard of the new government ere it had fallen. The proletariat in action moves apace and its march is ever forward.

The quick changes of government, nevertheless, were not directly accomplished by the workers but by the forces bent on retarding their progress. They were merely so many lines of retreat hurriedly established by the bourgeoisie and as hurriedly discarded until the final battle came which was to wrench control from the hands of the middle classes or establish them in power until such time as another revolutionary epoch swept them into the discard for ever.

The Kerensky regime was this last line of defense in Russia and its strength may be judged by the fact that it was overthrown by telephone and with the loss of less lives than it took to reform the corn laws in England. To suppose, how-

ever, that with the rise to power of the Soviets the bourgeoisie is finally disposed of in Russia would be a mistake of the first magnitude. Many a desperate struggle, national and international will yet be fought before the workers are finally triumphant, but events in Russia have already shown the tendencies of the times and the lines along which the struggle will develop.

Thus in viewing affairs in Austria and Germany the progress of the revolutionary movement may be gauged by comparison with Russia, taking into consideration, of course, the differences in the forces operating in the various countries. It must be particularly remembered that the Russian bourgeoisie were less fitted to hold the reins of government than the bourgeoisie of other countries on account of the fact that they had practically no place in the old Russian government and had little or no governmental experience to guide them. In Germany the middle class have in the past, taken a prominent part in the lesser governmental activities of the country and are familiar with the machinery of office and the right wing of the Socialist movement has also functioned in the government, particularly since the beginning of the war.

Already the Germans have arrived at the Kerensky stage and it is probable that the present government may remain in office for a protracted period; with minor changes in the personnel from time to time. The Scheidemann group are in power on the surface but indications are not lacking that the actual power is more and more being vested in the Soviets under the leadership of the group Internationale and

the Spartacus group. As in Russia the moderates are arranging for a Constitutional Assembly and are demanding that the Executive Committee of the Soviets cede their power to the Assembly, but at the same time it is admitted by the press that the government is in urgent need of the Soviets. How soon this admission will result into the now historic cry "All power to the Soviets" can only be a matter of conjecture. Certain it is that the German Soviets have a tremendous opportunity, having not only the example of the Bolsheviks to guide them, but having also their active co-operation in spreading propaganda, and if the present government would attempt anything so suicidal as the return of the Kaiser as a constitutional monarch it would appear that the time for the Soviets to take control is already at hand.

The actions of the Kaiser and the various places he will take up his abode will doubtless exceed the Czar's both by their peculiarity and their variety. The report that he is about to return to Germany is in all probability as true as the report in circulation some time ago that one of the Czar's daughters was on her way to America to take up a vaudeville engagement. There would appear to be a much greater danger in the continued presence of Hindenburg as the head of the German army than in any of the Kaiser's activities but Kerensky's experience with Korniloff will probably warn any government in Germany from allowing itself to become involved with Hindenburg.

One thing is certain from all the reports coming out of Germany: the proletariat is awakened after the sleep of ages and Russia is the guarantee that they will sleep no more.

COUNTER-REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISM

IT IS important, in considering developments in Germany, to emphasize that the fundamental struggle is between Socialism and Socialism, between two kinds or conceptions of Socialism, the moderate petty-bourgeois and the revolutionary proletarian. The Social-Democratic Party, the majority party of Scheidemann, Ebert & Co. is distinctly counter-revolutionary. The Executive Committee of the Social-Democratic Party, of which Ebert was a member, on October 17, issued a declaration against a revolution: "All this agitation is the work of confused, irresponsible persons, using Bolshevik revolutionary phrases, who are trying to rouse the workers to strikes and demonstrations against the Government that would have no sense nor object at present, makes it more difficult to bring about peace and to democratize Germany. . . . As the authorized representatives of the Social-Democratic Party have always declared, we wish to transform our political structure into a democracy and our economic life into Socialism by means of a peaceful change. We are on the road toward peace and democracy. All agitation for an attempted revolt runs counter to this road and serves the cause of the cause of the counter-revolution." (Our italics.) And this, just at the moment when the proletariat was on the verge of bursting forth in that elemental revolutionary

action that shattered the autocracy, and made a breach in the old order through which the proletariat could break through for action and the conquest of power! The language of this counter-revolutionary declaration was used in Russia against the Bolsheviks by moderate Socialism: it is characteristic and universal. This hesitation, this utter lack of audacity and revolutionary initiative, this horror of proletarian mass action, characterized the Social-Democratic Party before the war, characterized its majority during the war, and characterizes its policy to-day, when the German proletariat is accomplishing great things and Frederick Engels' prophecy of thirty years ago might come true—that out of the next general European war would emerge Socialism. Their theory has become life, and they contemptuously reject life itself.

WORK TO DO

A capitalist editorial writer's life is not a happy one these days. Events are moving so swiftly that he wishes to offend no one. He is in much the same position as the old lady who always bowed her head whenever His Satanic Majesty's name was mentioned in church and on being asked by the parson to account for such strange behavior replied:

"Well, civility costs nothing and one never knows what might happen."

The papers who a short time ago covetly approved of the lynching of Frank Little, and openly lauded the Bisbee deportations and similar outrages against the American workers are now urging that employers take their employees to their expansive bosoms, explain all their troubles, thank God that they are not as the other bosses and finally whisper in the ear of the already overcome worker a word against Bolshevism.

Mr. Creel's bureau for distributing useful information among uninformed Europeans and Americans is urged to continue its good work.

"Their (the Bolsheviks) propaganda is international in character" says one of these editorials.

Their appeal is to the people who are dissatisfied. There are millions of such people in every big nation. Our own country is not free from them. . . .

"We are not fighting against men with guns and gas. We are fighting against ideas. We can overcome those ideas only by sending better ideas against them. There is work, therefore, for Mr. Creel's Bureau. . . ."

Those who remember what Mr. Creel's bureau did about the Sisson documents will agree that there is work for Mr. Creel's bureau to do—right inside the bureau, with a broom.

The Revolutionary Age

A Chronicle and Interpretation of Events in Europe.

LOUIS C. FRAINA Editor

EADMONN MACALPINE Associate Editor

Contributing Editors

SCOTT NEARING

LUDWIG LORE

JOHN REED

SEN KATAYAMA

N. I. HOURWICH

G. WEINSTEIN

ISSUED EVERY WEDNESDAY AND SATURDAY

885 Washington St., Boston, Mass.

Wednesday, November 20, 1918

STARVING THE REVOLUTION!

IN A note to the Swiss Minister, acting for the German Government, Secretary of State Lansing on November 13, in answer to Chancellor Ebert's appeal for food-stuffs, declared that the American government "is ready to send food-stuffs into Germany without delay."

This is well; the fearful misery must be assuaged. But the note adds that President Wilson will "take up the matter immediately with the Allied Governments, provided he can be assured that public order is being and will continue to be maintained in Germany and that an equitable distribution of food can be clearly guaranteed."

Why the provision about "order" being maintained, and what is meant by "order"? Does it mean that if the German Revolution continues on its course relentlessly and to the complete overthrow of Capitalism, that this might be interpreted as "disorder" and the attempt be made to starve the Revolution into submission? This interpretation is being made: is it the conception of the government?

A Revolution necessarily means a certain amount of disorder, since it implies a complete change of society and arouses violent antagonisms. Every revolution—the American Revolution, the French Revolution, the Russian Revolution, and now the German Revolution—is characterized by disorder, a disorder out of which arises the order of a new society and a new life.

Shall the control of the food of the world be used to crush the German Revolution, which is now the hope of the world? We do not know if this is precisely the meaning of Secretary Lansing's words, but our fears are aroused by the systematic press campaign in favor of intervention in Germany should the revolution definitely develop into a Socialist Revolution. The Revolution is the test of the American pledge of "self-determination of peoples." Self-determination is for Socialist nations as well as Capitalist nations.

Moreover, at this time, we must remember that for one year the Allies have been starving the Russian people as a means of starving out the Russian Revolution and destroying the Soviet Government. Their policy has been based on the assumption that if the Russian people starved enough they might make a counter-revolution and annihilate the Soviet Government.

For one year Soviet Russia has been cut off from the world, blockaded and completely isolated. Communications, intellectual and commercial, have been broken. While Germany prevented egress by way of the Black Sea and Constantinople, the Allied soldiers and fleets prevented egress by way of Archangel and Vladivostok. Russia could not communicate with the world; Russia could not secure food or agricultural machinery from other nations, for which it was willing to pay in gold or raw materials, and which were indispensable in the great task of reconstruction. The Russian people have been starving and suffering and dying, but they have refused to run against their Revolution! All the sympathy they have received have been screeds in the newspapers describing terrible hunger in Russia and blaming the Bolsheviks! But this isolation and blockade of Russia is largely responsible for the scarcity of food.

In addition to this blockade, there was the Czecho-Slovak adventure. The Czecho-Slovaks were to become the centre of a counter-revolution; all they accomplished was to cause more misery and starvation in Russia, to demoralize the railways and the food supply system, with terrible consequences to the Russian people.

The blockade of Russia must immediately cease. The Soviet government must be allowed to purchase food. And there shall be no starving of the German Revolution!

TWO STRUGGLES

GERMANY is in the throes of a revolutionary convulsion—that is the one definite impression conveyed by the meagre and often contradictory news of events. Revolution and counter-revolution are struggling for supremacy. One must tread his way through the uncertain reports of events by means of Socialist theory, and the social and Socialist alignment of forces in Germany.

The correspondents are quite clearly hypnotized by the activity of the provisional governments, three or four of which have been organized since the Revolution marched on to action. Organizing provisional governments seems to be the favorite industry of the bourgeois liberals and the petty bourgeois Socialists in Germany, as in Russia. These provisional governments are apparently organized by cliques, the Reichstag having disappeared; what power they possess is due to the fact that things have not come to a head, and their only real power is the power of appeal to a people being revolutionized by events.

The news of the "All-Socialist" Provisional Government recently was greeted enthusiastically by the radical and gloomily by the conservative. But this government was Socialist only in name; it included the utterly reactionary Ebert, Scheidemann & Co., together with Haase, Ledebour and Dittman of the Independent Socialists, and the "Spartacus" revolutionary Socialist Barth, who for some reason accepted the portfolio of "social policy." Barth's status in the government was and still is uncertain. The "All-Socialist" government arose out of some obscure impulse of compromise, and was clearly a temporary shift. But the status of this government itself is still more uncertain, since the news of the appointment of the government's "department heads," including Dr. Dernburg and other unflinching representatives of the bourgeoisie. Is this an expression of a definite counter-revolutionary trend, or is it simply the stupidity and treason of Scheidemann & Co.? Socialists of revolutionary persuasion will not assume responsibility for such a government, all the more since the titular head of the government, "Socialist" Chancellor Ebert, is using the threat of "anarchy" to discourage the revolutionary masses. The revolutionary Socialist can only fight this government.

But these provisional governments represent the appearance of reality, and not reality itself. The actual destiny of the revolution is being decided by *election of the masses*, by the movement and tendency represented by Karl Liebknecht, Otto Ruhle, Rose Luxemburg and Franz Mehring. But scarcely any news is transmitted of these real events being made by the masses, of the tendency and movement of the revolutionary proletariat,—precisely as in Russia, during the period of Lvov, Kerensky & Co., scarcely any news came of the *action of the masses*, of the movement and tendency represented by Lenin and Trotsky, until they conquered power.

A revolution is made by the *action of the masses*. It is this elemental mass action, breaking loose against the opposition of the moderates and the government, that casts aside fears and hesitation, topples over the imposing enginery of authority, mobilizing the revolutionary energy and initiative of the people for the assault against the old order and the conquest of power. This tendency characterizes all revolutions. Another characteristic is that the immediate revolutionary task accomplished, bourgeois representatives and the old radical moderate opposition come into power and act against the revolutionary masses,—precisely as the "Socialist" Chancellor Ebert is now doing by discouraging the onward march of the revolution through cajolery and threats of "anarchy" and disaster should new revolutionary action develop. But this new revolutionary action is absolutely indispensable to accomplish the real task of the Revolution. *The struggle of the masses now becomes a struggle against their own moderate representatives.* These representatives try to disperse the masses, to discourage any new revolutionary action, to limit the revolution within the deadening bounds of the parliamentary bourgeois state as a purely political revolution and to prevent this political revolution from developing definitely into a social and economic revolution.

This alignment characterizes not only the proletarian revolution in Russia and Germany, but in lesser force characterized previous revolutions, the bourgeois democratic revolution.

The French Revolution, historically and in accomplishments a bourgeois revolution, was made by the dynamic mass action of the people: the bourgeoisie acted only under the impulse of the revolutionary energy and initiative of the masses. But the middle class came into power, through the National Assembly and the Constituent Assembly,—representing a purely political tendency, desiring no fundamental change in government, much less in society, temporizing with the monarchy and against a democratic republic. It was the action of the masses that compelled drastic political changes, that annihilated the monarchy; and the struggle between the masses and the middle class liberals was bitter, intense, fundamental. But there was another and more determining phase of this great struggle: the masses instinctively and

aggressively aimed to broaden and deepen the revolution, a powerful communist movement developing in favor of a social and economic revolution. This fundamental tendency aroused the violent and murderous opposition of the bourgeois class. The masses through the much-maligned Terror (which was the savior of the bourgeois democratic phase of the Revolution, even) conquered temporarily; but they could not retain power, being dispersed by the counter-revolution and crushed by Napoleon.

These two struggles were apparent, in a minor expression, during the abortive 1848 Revolution in Germany and the successful 1848 Revolution in Paris.

In a Socialist expression, these two struggles determined the destiny of the Russian Revolution, which developed definitely into a proletarian revolution initiating the reconstruction of society on a communist Socialist basis,—against the moderate, political and democratic tendency of the bourgeois liberals and the moderate petty bourgeois "Socialists."

These two struggles, these two irreconcilable conceptions of the Revolution, are for the moment engaged in a desperate grapple in Germany. The issue is clear, but the strength of the struggling forces is still obscure.

The political tendency, represented by the bourgeois liberals and the moderate Socialists, particularly by Scheidemann, Ebert & Co., aims to reconstruct the government, to transform the old autocracy into a democratic parliamentary republic. The old regime of Kaiserism has been shattered by the revolutionary action of the masses; this has created an opportunity for organizing a democratic republic, and this is the task of the "Provisional Government" and the moderate Socialists generally. But this democratic republic would be a bourgeois republic, with Capitalism retaining industrial and consequently political supremacy. It might be a "radical" republic, it might even continue for an indefinite period a republic graced—or disgraced by the Socialist camouflage of Scheidemann, Ebert & Co., but it would still be a bourgeois republic, still the republic of the capitalist and the financier, of the sweater of labor.

The moderate Socialists, in Germany and in Russia, justify this attitude by declaring that conquest of political democracy is necessary before the definite struggle for Socialism may begin. But you had bourgeois democracy under the Russian Ebert, Kerensky; you have bourgeois democracy under the German, Kerensky, Ebert: the struggle may begin for the fundamental industrial democracy of Socialism, particularly as the revolutionary action against autocracy has created a breach in the old order through which the Socialist proletariat may emerge for revolutionary action and the conquest of power. Bourgeois democracy is a fetter upon the action of the revolutionary proletariat; it is not, under the conditions of Imperialism, any phase of the Socialist struggle. The slogans of democracy—of bourgeois democracy—are counter-revolutionary, in Germany as in Russia. The moderate Socialist policy in Germany abandons and betrays the great hopes aroused by the proletarian revolution in Germany.

The democratic republic is accomplished in Germany; therefore, on with the revolutionary struggle against Capitalism and for Socialism!—this is the general policy of the revolutionary Socialist, of the economic and social tendency of the proletarian masses. This tendency, instinctively in action during the French Revolution, the conqueror in Russia, is now in Germany mobilizing the masses for the revolutionary struggle against Capitalism and Imperialism. The Revolution must become definitely a proletarian revolution: upon that depends the destiny of Socialism in Europe. This revolutionary tendency struggles for a dictatorship of the proletariat, for a new state of the organized producers, for the expropriation of capital,—and once in power, this tendency would accomplish its Socialist task much more easily and swiftly, immediately proceed further in the direction of actual Socialism, than in Russia, because of the superiority of industrial and technological development. The policy of revolutionary Socialism builds upon the accomplishments of Russia, seeks to conserve and extend the conquest of the Russian revolutionary proletariat.

Every real revolution sets the masses in motion, loosens their energy and initiative. The masses must not only act initially, they must continue to act, to develop from instruments of revolutionary action into the masters of revolutionary government—of their own government. The Revolution must broaden and deepen itself in the action and the consciousness of the masses; the "provisional government," the policy of the moderate Socialists, deaden this necessary revolutionary action and consciousness, while the policy of the revolutionary Socialists in Germany broadens and vitalizes this action and consciousness. The expression of the revolutionary masses, in Germany as in Russia, are the Councils of Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates. These exist in Germany; but the two struggles are proceeding within the Councils as in society at large. In the Councils, as in the government, the moderates at first control, the proletarian revolutionary tendency is still unclear; but clarity develops under the pressure of events and revolutionary propaganda. How far the Revolution has actually penetrated the masses, fundamentally and dynamically,—upon this depends the course of events in Germany. The Councils must be revolutionized.

The two tendencies, the two struggles, are there, actively counter-revolutionary and actively revolutionary. The one would establish a democratic republic, with Capitalism in authority and the threat of a restoration of autocracy; the other would annihilate Capitalism, start the process of introducing Socialism, and in that way climax the magnificent achievements of the proletarian revolution in Russia.

The Revolutionary Age

A Chronicle and Interpretation of Events in Europe.

LOUIS C. FRAINA Editor

EADMONN MACALPINE Associate Editor

Contributing Editors

SCOTT NEARING

LUDWIG LORE

JOHN REED

SEN KATAYAMA

N. I. HOURWICH

G. WEINSTEIN

ISSUED EVERY WEDNESDAY AND SATURDAY

885 Washington St., Boston, Mass.

Wednesday, November 20, 1918

STARVING THE REVOLUTION!

IN A note to the Swiss Minister, acting for the German Government, Secretary of State Lansing on November 13, in answer to Chancellor Ebert's appeal for food-stuffs, declared that the American government "is ready to send food-stuffs into Germany without delay."

This is well; the fearful misery must be assuaged. But the note adds that President Wilson will "take up the matter immediately with the Allied Governments, *provided he can be assured that public order is being and will continue to be maintained in Germany* and that an equitable distribution of food can be clearly guaranteed."

Why the provision about "order" being maintained, and what is meant by "order"? Does it mean that if the German Revolution continues on its course relentlessly and to the complete overthrow of Capitalism, that this might be interpreted as "disorder" and the attempt be made to starve the Revolution into submission? This interpretation is being made: is it the conception of the government?

A Revolution necessarily means a certain amount of disorder, since it implies a complete change of society and arouses violent antagonisms. Every revolution—the American Revolution, the French Revolution, the Russian Revolution, and now the German Revolution—is characterized by disorder, a disorder out of which arises the order of a new society and a new life.

Shall the control of the food of the world be used to crush the German Revolution, which is now the hope of the world? We do not know if this is precisely the meaning of Secretary Lansing's words, but our fears are aroused by the systematic press campaign in favor of intervention in Germany should the revolution definitely develop into a Socialist Revolution. The Revolution is the test of the American pledge of "self-determination of peoples." Self-determination is for Socialist nations as well as Capitalist nations.

Moreover, at this time, we must remember that for one year the Allies have been starving the Russian people as a means of starving out the Russian Revolution and destroying the Soviet Government. Their policy has been based on the assumption that if the Russian people starved enough they might make a counter-revolution and annihilate the Soviet Government.

For one year Soviet Russia has been cut off from the world, blockaded and completely isolated. Communications, intellectual and commercial, have been broken. While Germany prevented egress by way of the Black Sea and Constantinople, the Allied soldiers and fleets prevented egress by way of Archangel and Vladivostok. Russia could not communicate with the world; Russia could not secure food or agricultural machinery from other nations, for which it was willing to pay in gold or raw materials, and which were indispensable in the great task of reconstruction. The Russian people have been starving and suffering and dying, *but they have refused* to run against their Revolution! All the sympathy they have received have been screeds in the newspapers describing terrible hunger in Russia and blaming the Bolsheviks! But this isolation and blockade of Russia is largely responsible for the scarcity of food.

In addition to this blockade, there was the Czecho-Slovak adventure. The Czecho-Slovaks were to become the centre of a counter-revolution; all they accomplished was to cause more misery and starvation in Russia, to demoralize the railways and the food supply system, with terrible consequences to the Russian people.

The blockade of Russia must immediately cease. The Soviet government must be allowed to purchase food. And there shall be no starving of the German Revolution!

TWO STRUGGLES

GERMANY is in the throes of a revolutionary convulsion—that is the one definite impression conveyed by the meagre and often contradictory news of events. Revolution and counter-revolution are struggling for supremacy. One must tread his way through the uncertain reports of events by means of Socialist theory, and the social and Socialist alignment of forces in Germany.

The correspondents are quite clearly hypnotized by the activity of the provisional governments, three or four of which have been organized since the Revolution marched on to action. Organizing provisional governments seems to be the favorite industry of the bourgeois liberals and the petty bourgeois Socialists in Germany, as in Russia. These provisional governments are apparently organized by cliques, the Reichstag having disappeared; what power they possess is due to the fact that things have not come to a head, and their only real power is the power of appeal to a people being revolutionized by events.

The news of the "All-Socialist" Provisional Government recently was greeted enthusiastically by the radical and gloomily by the conservative. But this government was Socialist only in name; it included the utterly reactionary Ebert, Scheidemann & Co., together with Haase, Ledebour and Dittman of the Independent Socialists, and the "Spartacus" revolutionary Socialist Barth, who for some reason accepted the portfolio of "social policy." Barth's status in the government was and still is uncertain. The "All-Socialist" government arose out of some obscure impulse of compromise, and was clearly a temporary shift. But the status of this government itself is still more uncertain, since the news of the appointment of the government's "department heads," including Dr. Dernburg and other unflinching representatives of the bourgeoisie. Is this an expression of a definite counter-revolutionary trend, or is it simply the stupidity and treason of Scheidemann & Co.? Socialists of revolutionary persuasion will not assume responsibility for such a government, all the more since the titular head of the government, "Socialist" Chancellor Ebert, is using the threat of "anarchy" to discourage the revolutionary masses. The revolutionary Socialist can only fight this government.

But these provisional governments represent the appearance of reality, and not reality itself. The actual destiny of the revolution is being decided by *election of the masses*, by the movement and tendency represented by Karl Liebknecht, Otto Ruhle, Rose Luxemburg and Franz Mehring. But scarcely any news is transmitted of these real events being made by the masses, of the tendency and movement of the revolutionary proletariat,—precisely as in Russia, during the period of Lvov, Kerensky & Co., scarcely any news came of the *action of the masses*, of the movement and tendency represented by Lenin and Trotsky, until they conquered power.

A revolution is made by *the action of the masses*. It is this elemental mass action, breaking loose against the opposition of the moderates and the government, that casts aside fears and hesitation, topples over the imposing enginery of authority, mobilizing the revolutionary energy and initiative of the people for the assault against the old order and the conquest of power. This tendency characterizes all revolutions. Another characteristic is that the immediate revolutionary task accomplished, bourgeois representatives and the old radical moderate opposition come into power and *act against the revolutionary masses*,—precisely as the "Socialist" Chancellor Ebert is now doing by discouraging the onward march of the revolution through cajolery and threats of "anarchy" and disaster should new revolutionary action develop. But this new revolutionary action is absolutely indispensable to accomplish the real task of the Revolution. *The struggle of the masses now becomes a struggle against their own moderate representatives*. These representatives try to disperse the masses, to discourage any new revolutionary action, to limit the revolution within the deadening bounds of the parliamentary bourgeois state as a purely political revolution and to prevent this political revolution from developing definitely into a social and economic revolution.

This alignment characterizes not only the proletarian revolution in Russia and Germany, but in lesser force characterized previous revolutions, the bourgeois democratic revolution.

The French Revolution, historically and in accomplishments a bourgeois revolution, was made by the dynamic mass action of the people: the bourgeoisie acted only under the impulse of the revolutionary energy and initiative of the masses. But the middle class came into power, through the National Assembly and the Constituent Assembly,—representing a purely political tendency, desiring no fundamental change in government, much less in society, temporizing with the monarchy and against a democratic republic. It was the action of the masses that compelled drastic political changes, that annihilated the monarchy; and the struggle between the masses and the middle class liberals was bitter, intense, fundamental. But there was another and more determining phase of this great struggle: the masses instinctively and

aggressively aimed to broaden and deepen the revolution, a powerful communist movement developing in favor of a social and economic revolution. This fundamental tendency aroused the violent and murderous opposition of the bourgeois class. The masses through the much-maligned Terror (which was the savior of the bourgeois democratic phase of the Revolution, even) conquered temporarily; but they could not retain power, being dispersed by the counter-revolution and crushed by Napoleon.

These two struggles were apparent, in a minor expression, during the abortive 1848 Revolution in Germany and the successful 1848 Revolution in Paris.

In a Socialist expression, these two struggles determined the destiny of the Russian Revolution, which developed definitely into a proletarian revolution initiating the reconstruction of society on a communist Socialist basis,—against the moderate, political and democratic tendency of the bourgeois liberals and the moderate petty bourgeois "Socialists."

These two struggles, these two irreconcilable conceptions of the Revolution, are for the moment engaged in a desperate grapple in Germany. The issue is clear, but the strength of the struggling forces is still obscure.

The political tendency, represented by the bourgeois liberals and the moderate Socialists, particularly by Scheidemann, Ebert & Co., aims to reconstruct the government, to transform the old autocracy into a democratic parliamentary republic. The old regime of Kaiserism has been shattered by the revolutionary action of the masses; this has created an opportunity for organizing a democratic republic, and this is the task of the "Provisional Government" and the moderate Socialists generally. But this democratic republic would be a *bourgeois* republic, with Capitalism retaining industrial and consequently political supremacy. It might be a "radical" republic, it might even continue for an indefinite period a republic graced—or *disgraced* by the Socialist camouflage of Scheidemann, Ebert & Co., but it would still be a bourgeois republic, still the republic of the capitalist and the financier, of the sweater of labor.

The moderate Socialists, in Germany and in Russia, justify this attitude by declaring that conquest of political democracy is necessary before the definite struggle for Socialism may begin. But you had bourgeois democracy under the Russian Ebert, Kerensky; you have bourgeois democracy under the German, Kerensky, Ebert: the struggle may begin for the fundamental industrial democracy of Socialism, particularly as the revolutionary action against autocracy has created a breach in the old order through which the Socialist proletariat may emerge for revolutionary action and the conquest of power. Bourgeois democracy is a fetter upon the action of the revolutionary proletariat; it is not, under the conditions of Imperialism, any phase of the Socialist struggle. The slogans of democracy—of *bourgeois* democracy—are counter-revolutionary, in Germany as in Russia. The moderate Socialist policy in Germany abandons and betrays the great hopes aroused by the proletarian revolution in Germany.

The democratic republic is accomplished in Germany; therefore, on with the revolutionary struggle against Capitalism and for Socialism!—this is the general policy of the revolutionary Socialist, of the economic and social tendency of the proletarian masses. This tendency, instinctively in action during the French Revolution, the conqueror in Russia, is now in Germany mobilizing the masses for the revolutionary struggle against Capitalism and Imperialism. The Revolution must become definitely a proletarian revolution: upon that depends the destiny of Socialism in Europe. This revolutionary tendency struggles for a dictatorship of the proletariat, for a new state of the organized producers, for the expropriation of capital,—and once in power, this tendency would accomplish its Socialist task much more easily and swiftly, immediately proceed further in the direction of actual Socialism, than in Russia, because of the superiority of industrial and technological development. The policy of revolutionary Socialism builds upon the accomplishments of Russia, seeks to conserve and extend the conquest of the Russian revolutionary proletariat.

Every real revolution sets the masses in motion, loosens their energy and initiative. The masses must not only act initially, they must continue to act, to develop from instruments of revolutionary action into the masters of revolutionary government—of *their own government*. The Revolution must broaden and deepen itself in the action and the consciousness of the masses; the "provisional government," the policy of the moderate Socialists, deaden this necessary revolutionary action and consciousness, while the policy of the revolutionary Socialists in Germany broadens and vitalizes this action and consciousness. The expression of the revolutionary masses, in Germany as in Russia, are the Councils of Workmen's and Soldiers' Delegates. These exist in Germany; but the two struggles are proceeding within the Councils as in society at large. In the Councils, as in the government, the moderates at first control, the proletarian revolutionary tendency is still unclear; but clarity develops under the pressure of events and revolutionary propaganda. How far the Revolution has actually penetrated the masses, fundamentally and dynamically,—upon this depends the course of events in Germany. The Councils must be revolutionized.

The two tendencies, the two struggles, are there, actively counter-revolutionary and actively revolutionary. The one would establish a democratic republic, with Capitalism in authority and the threat of a restoration of autocracy; the other would annihilate Capitalism, start the process of introducing Socialism, and in that way climax the magnificent achievements of the proletarian revolution in Russia.

Why Soviet Russia Made Peace

By N. Lenin

This article, published here for the first time in the United States, either in Russian or English, consists of Lenin's "theses" urging the acceptance of the Brest Litovsk treaty.

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

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

3. This resistance takes the form chiefly of passive manifestations, not of a military force: of sabotage, bribery of variants, bribery of agents of the bourgeoisie, who permeate the ranks of the socialists in order to compromise their cause, etc., etc. This resistance is so obstinate and assumes such varying forms, that the conflict must go on for some months, since the victory of Socialism is not possible until all the encumbrances have been removed.

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

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

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

7. The negotiation of the Brest Litovsk Treaty has now (January 7, 1918) shown that the military party has gained the upper hand in the German Government, and that this party has its own way with the governments of the other countries in the Quadruple Alliance. The military party already has actually sent an ultimatum to Russia, the official form of which we may expect in a few days. This ultimatum means: either the continuation of the war or the conclusion of a peace by annexation, i. e., the Germans will retain all the districts occupied by them, while we must give up the districts occupied by Russian troops, and an indemnity will be imposed upon us (under the guise of a compensation for the maintenance of prisoners) of nearly three milliards, to be paid in a few years.

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

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

This reasoning is all wrong. Workingmen who lose a strike and are compelled to accept conditions favorable to the capitalists and unfavorable to themselves, do not betray Socialism. Only those betray the interests of the proletariat, who betray Socialism, who accept inadmissible conditions.

Those who call the war with Germany a righteous and defensive war are the true betrayers of Socialism, because they are in reality supporting French and English Imperialism and concealing the secret treaties from the people. These, on the other hand, who conceal nothing from the people and make no secret treaties with the capitalists,—they are by no means betraying Socialism when they conclude a peace which is disadvantageous for a weak people and advantageous for the capitalists of one group, at a moment when there is no possibility of continuing to wage war.

10. In the second place, we are reproached with becoming, through the conclusion of a socialistic peace, agents of the German Government against our will, since we are giving to it the possibility of withdrawing troops from our front and are liberating millions of their prisoners of war. But this argument also proves nothing, since a revolutionary war against Germany would make us agents of the Anglo-French Imperialism. The English promised outright to Kry-

lenko, the commander of our army, one hundred roubles a month for each soldier if we should continue to wage war. And even if we should not accept a penny from the Entente, we should yet, as far as the outcome is concerned, have become their agents in holding a portion of the German troops at the front.

On this point: We can free ourselves as little in one case as in the other, entirely from the imperialistic shackles, for that is impossible without the annihilation of world-imperialism. It therefore follows that after the victory of Socialism in one country, these questions must not be decided from the standpoint of a preference for one capitalism, but from that of developing and strengthening under the most favorable conditions the social revolution that has already begun.

In short, our policy must be based, not on a choice between two imperialisms, but on the possibility of strengthening the Socialist revolution, or at least, on the necessity of enabling it to offer resistance until the other countries join the revolutionary movement.

11. It is maintained that the German Socialist minority has asked us to not to yield to German Imperialism. But we do not consider this a good interpretation. We have always fought our own Imperialism, but the overthrow of the Imperialism of one country by means of an alliance with the Imperialism of another is a line of action that we reject both on reasons of principle and because we consider it inadmissible. This argument, therefore, is really only a repetition of the former one. If the international Socialists of Germany should ask us to postpone the conclusion of peace for a time, and should guarantee us the outbreak of the revolution in Germany by a fixed time, we might eventually take the matter under consideration. But the German international Socialists not only do not say this to us, but they actually are saying, formally, "Offer as much resistance as you can, but decide on this point in agreement with the interests of the Russian Revolution, for it is impossible at present to make any definite promises with regard to the German Revolution."

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

And now it is our duty to prepare the revolutionary war. We are keeping this promise, just as we have kept all promises that circumstances have permitted us to keep: we have published the secret treaties, we have offered a righteous peace to all nations, we have drawn out the peace conferences in order to give all the peoples an opportunity to join us. But the question of the present possibility of waging a revolutionary war can be decided only from the standpoint of its material possibility, and from the standpoint of the Russian Revolution that has already begun.

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

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

15. Furthermore, there is no doubt that the majority of the peasants in our army would now be in favor of a peace by annexations by the Germans and not a revolutionary war, while the organization of a revolutionary army and the forming of a Red Guard have hardly been begun.

It would be a serious business to wage war against the will of the majority of our soldiers, now that the entire army is demoralized; and it will be many months before a truly proletarian army, socialistic through and through, can be formed.

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

17. The question of revolutionary war therefore stands as follows: if revolution should break out in Germany within the next three or four months, the revolutionary war tactic, for immediate action would not be fatal to our Russian Revolution.

If the German Revolution does not take place in a few months, the continuation of the war would have the consequence that still greater defeats would force Russia to accept a still more onerous peace; and peace would not be concluded by a Socialist, but by a mixed government, for example, by a coalition between the adherents of Chernov and of the bourgeois party or something of the sort, for the peasant army, sick and tired of the war would overthrow the Socialist government in a few weeks.

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

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

20. By a separate peace we free ourselves, in so far as present conditions will permit, from the two imperialist coalitions; by taking advantage of their warfare and their mutual enmity preventing them from uniting against us, we shall utilize the time so gained, in order to strengthen the Socialist Republic in Russia.

The reorganization of Russia, based on the dictatorship of the proletariat, the nationalization of banks and of big industry, the exchange of the products of the cities with the cooperatives of small peasants in the country, is economically quite feasible, provided we have a few months to devote energetically to the job. Such an organization will make Socialism unconquerable in Russia, and will provide a permanent basis for the formation of a powerful red army of peasants and workers.

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

But we cannot at present attack this object. In reality we should now fight for Livland and Kurland. No Marxist, no Socialist of any kind, can deny, without contradicting the basic principles of Socialism, that the interests of Socialism transcend the right of self-determination of a nation. Our republic has done and continues to do all in its power to obtain for Finland and for the Ukraine the right to determine their own lot. But, granting that the existence of the Socialist Republic is threatened by the violation of the right of Poland, Lithuania, and Finland to determine their own fate, it is nevertheless self-evident that the interests of the Socialist Republic transcend all other considerations. We are not enthusiastic about the peace based on the liberation of Poland, make German Imperialism stronger as opposed to England, Belgium, Serbia, etc. The peace based on the liberation of Poland, Lithuania, and Kurland would be a patriotic peace from the standpoint of Russia, but it would none the less be a peace with the German annexationists and Imperialists.

The Kaiser, by fleeing like a coward, escapes the fate of the Czar. But German Capitalism will not escape the fate of Capitalism in Russia.

LONDON, November 14.—Throughout Germany the struggle between the moderate and radical Socialists is going on. The Scheidemann Socialists are unequivocally opposed to stirring up class hatred and civil war. But as in Russia under Kerensky the newly-formed Councils of Soldiers, Workmen and Peasants, constituted after the fashion of the Bolshevik Soviets, are now beginning to clamor for complete authority. All power to the Soviets!—in Germany as in Russia.

Recently, A. Joffe, the Bolshevik Ambassador in Berlin, was expelled from Germany because he was the centre of a revolutionary propaganda against Kaiserism. According to the press, the Bolsheviks are pro-Kaiser; but apparently, this particular Bolshevik was too pro-Kaiser to suit the Kaiser! But now, Kaiserism having collapsed, comrade Joffe is back in Berlin representing the Soviet Republic.

The Council of Workmen and Soldiers in Berlin has sent its fraternal greetings to the Russian Soviets. International proletarian solidarity is becoming a fact!