

LENIN

Against Imperialist War



PROGRESS Publishers

Workers of All Countries, Unite!



W. H. Wood/Smith

LENIN

Against
Imperialist
War



Progress Publishers

Moscow

Compiled by *S. Manbekova* and *A. Khomenko*

В. И. Ленин

ПРОТИВ ИМПЕРИАЛИСТИЧЕСКОЙ ВОЙНЫ

На английском языке

*First printing 1966
Second printing 1974
Third printing 1978*

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Л $\frac{10102-352}{014(01)-78}$ 48-78

CONTENTS

FOREWORD	7
From THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST CONGRESS IN STUTTGART NOTES TO THE RESOLUTION OF THE STUTTGART CONGRESS ON "MILITARISM AND INTERNATIONAL CONFLICTS"	11 13
From THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST CONGRESS IN STUTTGART . .	14
ANTI-MILITARIST PROPAGANDA AND YOUNG SOCIALIST WORKERS' LEAGUES	17
From BELLICOSE MILITARISM AND THE ANTI-MILITARIST TACTICS OF SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY	21
BRITISH AND GERMAN WORKERS DEMONSTRATE FOR PEACE	31
EVENTS IN THE BALKANS AND IN PERSIA	35
MEETING OF THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST BUREAU	47
THE TASKS OF REVOLUTIONARY SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY IN THE EUROPEAN WAR	64
THE WAR AND RUSSIAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY	69
LECTURE ON "THE PROLETARIAT AND THE WAR" DELIVERED OCTOBER 1 (14), 1914. <i>Newspaper Report</i>	78
DRAFT DECLARATION OF THE C.C. R.S.D.L.P. TO THE LONDON CONFERENCE OF ENTENTE SOCIALISTS	85
From THE CONFERENCE OF THE R.S.D.L.P. GROUPS ABROAD	87
WHAT HAS BEEN REVEALED BY THE TRIAL OF THE RUSSIAN SOCIAL- DEMOCRATIC LABOUR DUMA GROUP	93
THE SLOGAN OF CIVIL WAR ILLUSTRATED	100
ON THE STRUGGLE AGAINST SOCIAL-CHAUVINISM	102
DRAFT RESOLUTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST WOMEN'S CONFERENCE	107
From THE COLLAPSE OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL	110
THE MAIN GERMAN OPPORTUNIST WORK ON THE WAR	121
From THE DEFEAT OF ONE'S OWN GOVERNMENT IN THE IMPERIALIST WAR	126
THE QUESTION OF PEACE	129
From SOCIALISM AND WAR	135
From LETTER TO A. G. SHLYAPNIKOV. <i>August 23, 1915</i>	156
APPEAL ON THE WAR	157
THE VOICE OF AN HONEST FRENCH SOCIALIST	161
THE FIRST STEP	170
REVOLUTIONARY MARXISTS AT THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST CONFERENCE, SEPTEMBER 5-8, 1915	177
OPPORTUNISM AND THE COLLAPSE OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL	182

SPEECH DELIVERED AT AN INTERNATIONAL MEETING IN BERNE, FEBRUARY 8, 1916	196
From LETTER TO G. Y. ZINOVIEV. <i>August 1916</i>	200
REPLY TO P. KIEVSKY (G. PYATAKOV)	202
From A CARICATURE OF MARXISM AND IMPERIALIST ECONOMISM	209
From LETTER TO INESSA ARMAND. <i>November 20, 1916</i>	215
From LETTER TO INESSA ARMAND. <i>November 30, 1916</i>	216
From DRAFT THESES, MARCH 4 (17)	218
LETTERS FROM AFAR. FOURTH LETTER. HOW TO ACHIEVE PEACE	219
From THE TASKS OF THE PROLETARIAT IN THE PRESENT REVOLUTION	226
APPEAL TO THE SOLDIERS OF ALL THE BELLIGERENT COUNTRIES	229
THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT'S NOTE	233
RESOLUTION OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE R.S.D.L.P. (BOLSHEVIKS) ADOPTED APRIL 21 (MAY 4), 1917	236
HONEST DEFENCISM REVEALS ITSELF	239
"DISGRACE" AS THE CAPITALISTS AND THE PROLETARIANS UNDERSTAND IT	242
RESOLUTION ON THE WAR ADOPTED AT THE 7TH (APRIL) ALL-RUSSIA CONFERENCE OF THE R.S.D.L.P.(B.)	244
RESOLUTION ON THE CURRENT SITUATION ADOPTED AT THE 7TH (APRIL) ALL-RUSSIA CONFERENCE OF THE R.S.D.L.P.(B.)	248
THE SIGNIFICANCE OF FRATERNISATION	252
WAR AND REVOLUTION. A LECTURE DELIVERED MAY 14 (27), 1917	255
THE HARM OF PHRASE-MONGERING	281
SPEECH ON THE WAR DELIVERED AT THE FIRST ALL-RUSSIA CONGRESS OF SOVIETS OF WORKERS' AND SOLDIERS' DEPUTIES, JUNE 9 (22), 1917	284
THE DIEHARDS OF JUNE 3 FAVOUR AN IMMEDIATE OFFENSIVE	299
AN ALLIANCE TO STOP THE REVOLUTION	302
IS THERE A WAY TO A JUST PEACE?	305
THE REVOLUTION, THE OFFENSIVE, AND OUR PARTY	307
TO WHAT STATE HAVE THE SOCIALIST-REVOLUTIONARIES AND THE MENSHEVIKS BROUGHT THE REVOLUTION?	310
From THE TASKS OF THE REVOLUTION	313
REPORT ON PEACE DELIVERED AT THE SECOND ALL-RUSSIA CONGRESS OF SOVIETS OF WORKERS' AND SOLDIERS' DEPUTIES, OCTOBER 26 (NOVEMBER 8), 1917	315
From THE SPEECHES ON WAR AND PEACE DELIVERED AT A MEETING OF THE C.C. OF THE R.S.D.L.P. (B.), JANUARY 11 (24), 1918	321
THE CHIEF TASK OF OUR DAY	324
PROPHETIC WORDS	330
From LETTER TO AMERICAN WORKERS	337
SPEECH IN POLYTECHNICAL MUSEUM, AUGUST 23, 1918	344
From THE REPLY TO QUESTIONS PUT BY KARL WIEGAND, BERLIN CORRESPONDENT OF UNIVERSAL SERVICE	350
From THE REPORT ON THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION AND THE FUNDAMENTAL TASKS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL DELIVERED AT THE SECOND CONGRESS OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL, JULY 19, 1920	351
THE HOME AND FOREIGN POLICY OF THE REPUBLIC	355
TO THE CLARTE GROUP	357
NOTES	358
NAME INDEX	378

FOREWORD*

V. I. Lenin's articles and speeches collected between these covers date to shortly before or during the First World War. In them he examines its nature, causes and consequences, and the whole range of problems related to imperialist wars. But Lenin was more than a scholar analysing current events. He was also a political leader, the organiser and leader of the revolutionary working-class party, and a staunch fighter against imperialism and imperialist wars.

Long before the outbreak of the First World War, Lenin showed the predatory imperialist motives behind it, defining the tasks, tactics and slogans the international working-class movement must adopt in the event of war. At the international socialist congresses of 1907, 1910 and 1912, he and the Left-wing leaders of socialist parties of other countries secured the adoption of resolutions condemning war and instructing Socialists in all countries to use the economic and political crisis an eventual war would cause for overthrowing capitalism and furthering the socialist revolution.

The war began on August 1, 1914. Two mighty coalitions—France, Russia and Britain, on the one hand, and Germany, Austria-Hungary and Turkey, on the other—drove their peoples to slaughter in a brutal war that lasted several years and claimed millions of lives.

Spurning the resolutions of international socialist congresses, socialist leaders in most European countries betrayed

* English translation © Progress Publishers

their cause, fell in with their governments and sided with the war party. In their respective parliaments, the French and Belgian Socialists, and the German Social-Democrats, cast their votes for war credits. French Socialist Jules Guesde and Belgian Socialist Emile Vandervelde, and others, accepted ministerial posts in the bourgeois governments of their countries.

Lenin remained true to himself—an irreconcilable, determined and consistent opponent of the imperialist war. In all countries, he said, socialists must demonstrate the predatory imperialist character of the war and expose the lies, sophisms and hollow patriotic rhetoric of the dominant classes, the landowners and capitalists. The war, he showed, was being fought not "in defence of the fatherland", as the imperialist rulers told their peoples, but for a redivision of colonies, "spheres of influence" and "mandated territories", and for the colossal superprofits accruing from the fiendish exploitation of colonially dependent peoples. Tersely and pointedly, Lenin described it as a war between predators redividing their spoils.

He and his handful of Bolshevik comrades undertook the incredibly difficult and taxing work of uniting the socialists who had remained faithful to socialism and were fighting against the war. In September, 1915, at the Zimmerwald (Switzerland) international socialist conference Lenin united the revolutionary socialists in a Zimmerwald Left. In articles, books and speeches, he attacked Kautskyism, the centrist trend known by the name of its chief ideologue, the German Social-Democrat Karl Kautsky. Centrism, Lenin showed, was a disguised form of opportunism and chauvinism and therefore especially dangerous for the international socialist movement. While opposing the war in words, Kautsky and his followers in deeds supported their imperialist governments and the imperialist war.

On February 27 (March 12, New Style), a bourgeois-democratic revolution put an end to tsarism in Russia. But the Provisional Government which took power made clear its in-

tention to continue the imperialist war "until victory"; the Russian imperialist bourgeoisie wanted new markets and spheres of investment, and thirsted for new superprofits. Lenin tirelessly exposed the anti-people's policy of the Provisional Government and rallied the mass of the people to fight for ending the war.

The socialist revolution took place in Russia on October 25 (November 7), 1917. The Provisional Government was deposed. The Second All-Russia Congress of Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies proclaimed that state power had gone over to the Soviets. A worker-peasant government was formed under Lenin. On October 26 (November 8), the Second Congress of Soviets enacted the Decree on Peace, which called on the peoples and governments of the belligerent states to conclude an armistice and begin peace negotiations. The Entente scorned this proposal and continued the hostilities. The Soviet Republic withdrew from the war, and in March 1918 concluded peace with Germany and her allies.

Lenin's Decree on Peace set forth the principle of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, which has been the cornerstone of Soviet foreign policy ever since. The efforts of the Soviet Government at different stages in the development of the world's first socialist country to secure world peace, prevent new wars, and build inter-state relations on the foundation of peaceful coexistence, are well known.

The concluding phase of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe held in Helsinki in July-August 1975, which was attended by the heads of 33 European states, the United States and Canada, has shaped fresh opportunities for consolidating peace and international security—the central task of our time.

"The main thing now," said L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in his report to the 25th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, "is to translate all the principles and understandings reached in Helsinki into practical deeds. That is exactly what the So-

viet Union is doing and will continue to do. Recently, we made certain proposals for expanding all-European co-operation in a number of important spheres. We shall continue to apply our efforts in this direction, and expect the same approach from all the other participants in the European Conference."*

* *Documents and Resolutions. XXVth Congress of the CPSU, Moscow, 1976, p. 23.*

From THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST CONGRESS
IN STUTT GART¹

We pass now to the last, and perhaps the most important, resolution of the Congress—that on anti-militarism. The notorious Hervé, who has made such a noise in France and Europe, advocated a semi-anarchist view by naïvely suggesting that every war be “answered” by a strike and an uprising. He did not understand, on the one hand, that war is a necessary product of capitalism, and that the proletariat cannot renounce participation in revolutionary wars, for such wars are possible, and have indeed occurred in capitalist societies. He did not understand, on the other hand, that the possibility of “answering” a war depends on the nature of the crisis created by that war. The choice of the means of struggle depends on these conditions; moreover, the struggle must consist (and here we have the third misconception, or shallow thinking of Hervéism) not simply in replacing war by peace, but in replacing capitalism by socialism. The essential thing is not merely to prevent war, but to utilise the crisis created by war in order to hasten the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. However, underlying all these semi-anarchist absurdities of Hervéism there was one sound and practical purpose: to spur the socialist movement so that it will not be restricted to parliamentary methods of struggle alone, so that the masses will realise the need for revolutionary action in connection with the crises which war inevitably involves, so that, lastly, a more lively understanding of international labour solidarity and of the falsity of bourgeois patriotism will be spread among the masses.

Bebel's resolution (moved by the Germans and coinciding in all essentials with Guesde's resolution) had one shortcoming—it failed to indicate the active tasks of the proletariat. This made it possible to read Bebel's orthodox propositions through opportunist spectacles, and Vollmar was quick to turn this possibility into a reality.

That is why Rosa Luxemburg and the Russian Social-Democratic delegates moved their amendments to Bebel's resolution. These amendments (1) stated that militarism is the chief weapon of class oppression; (2) pointed out the need for propaganda among the youth; (3) stressed that Social-Democrats should not only try to prevent war from breaking out or to secure the speediest termination of wars that have already begun, but should utilise the crisis created by the war to hasten the overthrow of the bourgeoisie.

The subcommission (elected by the Anti-Militarism Commission) incorporated all these amendments in Bebel's resolution. In addition, Jaurès made this happy suggestion: instead of enumerating the methods of struggle (strikes, uprisings) the resolution should cite historical examples of proletarian action against war, from the demonstrations in Europe to the revolution in Russia. The result of all this re-drafting was a resolution which, it is true, is unduly long, but is rich in thought and precisely formulates the tasks of the proletariat. It combines the stringency of orthodox—i.e., the only scientific Marxist analysis with recommendations for the most resolute and revolutionary action by the workers' parties. This resolution cannot be interpreted *à la* Vollmar, nor can it be fitted into the narrow framework of naïve Hervéism.

Written at the end of August
and beginning of September
1907

Collected Works, Vol. 13,
pp. 79-81

NOTES TO THE RESOLUTION OF THE STUTTGART CONGRESS ON "MILITARISM AND INTERNATIONAL CONFLICTS"

Accordingly, the Congress considers it to be the duty of the working class and especially of its representatives in the parliaments, in view of the class character of bourgeois society, to use every means to struggle against and to deny appropriations for the aggressive policy of states, *and to act in such a way as to educate working-class youth in the spirit of socialism and an awareness of the brotherhood of nations.**

* * *

* The Russian amendment also had this provision: "in such a way that the ruling classes would not dare to use it (youth) as an instrument to consolidate their class domination against the fighting proletariat". These words were deleted by the commission not because anyone disagreed with them in principle, but because they were regarded by the Germans as being illegal and capable of providing a pretext for the dissolution of German Social-Democratic organisations. This abridgement did not alter the essential meaning of the corresponding passage of the resolution.

* * *

In the event of a danger of war, the working class and its parliamentary representatives in the countries concerned must, relying on the support of the International Bureau, do everything they can to prevent a declaration of war, by every *means* which they consider reasonable, *and the choice of which depends on the degree of aggravation of the class struggle and the general political situation.**

* * *

* The Russian amendment said that these means (to prevent war) are changed and *intensified* (*sich ändern und steigern*) depending on the aggravation of the class struggle, etc. The commission deleted "intensified", leaving only "changed".

Written in the second half
of August 1907

Collected Works, Vol. 41,
pp. 200-01

From THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST CONGRESS IN STUTT GART

The last day of the Congress was devoted to the question of militarism in which everyone took the greatest interest. The notorious Hervé tried to defend a very untenable position. He was unable to link up war with the capitalist regime in general, and anti-militarist agitation with the entire work of socialism. Hervé's plan of "answering" any war by a strike or an uprising betrayed a complete failure to understand that the employment of one or other means of struggle depends on the objective conditions of the particular crisis, economic or political, precipitated by the war, and not on any previous decision that revolutionaries may have made.

But although Hervé did reveal frivolity, superficiality, and infatuation with rhetorical phrases, it would be extremely short-sighted to counter him merely by a dogmatic statement of the general truths of socialism. Vollmar in particular fell into this error (from which Bebel and Guesde were not entirely free). With the extraordinary conceit of a man infatuated with stereotyped parliamentarism, he attacked Hervé without noticing that his own narrow-mindedness and thick-skinned opportunism *make* one admit the living spark in Hervéism, *despite* the theoretically absurd and nonsensical way in which Hervé himself presents the question. It does happen sometimes that at a new turning-point of a movement, theoretical absurdities conceal some practical truth. And it was this aspect of the question, the appeal not to prize only parliamentary methods of struggle,

the appeal to act in accordance with the new conditions of a future war and future crises, that was stressed by the revolutionary Social-Democrats, especially by Rosa Luxemburg in her speech. Together with the Russian Social-Democratic delegates (Lenin and Martov—who here spoke in full harmony) Rosa Luxemburg proposed amendments to Bebel's resolution, and these amendments emphasised the need for agitation among the youth, the necessity of taking advantage of the crisis created by war for the purpose of hastening the downfall of the bourgeoisie, the necessity of bearing in mind the inevitable change of methods and means of struggle as the class struggle sharpens and the political situation alters. In the end Bebel's dogmatically one-sided, dead resolution, which was open to a Vollmarian interpretation, became transformed into an altogether different resolution. All the theoretical truths were repeated in it for the benefit of the Hervéists, who are capable of letting anti-militarism make them forget socialism. But these truths serve as an introduction not to a justification of parliamentary cretinism, not to the sanction of peaceful methods alone, not to the worship of the present relatively peaceful and quiet situation, but to the acceptance of all methods of struggle, to the appraisal of the experience of the revolution in Russia, to the development of the active, creative side of the movement.

This most outstanding, most important feature of the Congress resolution on anti-militarism has been very aptly caught in Zetkin's journal, to which we have already referred more than once.

"Here too," Zetkin says of the anti-militarist resolution, "the revolutionary energy (*Tatkraft*) and courageous faith of the working class in its fighting capacity won in the end, winning, on the one hand, over the pessimistic gospel of impotence and the hidebound tendency to stick to old, exclusively parliamentary methods of struggle, and, on the other hand, over the banal anti-militarist sport of the French semi-anarchists of the Hervé type. The resolution, which was

finally carried unanimously both by the Commission and by nearly 900 delegates of all countries, expresses in vigorous terms the gigantic upswing of the revolutionary labour movement since the last International Congress; the resolution puts forward as a principle that proletarian tactics should be flexible, capable of developing, and *sharpening* (*Zuspitzung*) in proportion as conditions ripen for that purpose."

Hervéism has been rejected, but rejected not in favour of opportunism, not from the point of view of dogmatism and passivity. The vital urge towards more and more resolute and new methods of struggle is fully recognised by the international proletariat and linked up with the intensification of all the economic contradictions, with all the conditions of the crises engendered by capitalism.

Not the empty Hervéist threat, but the clear realisation that the social revolution is inevitable, the firm determination to fight to the end, the readiness to adopt the most revolutionary methods of struggle—that is the significance of the resolution of the International Socialist Congress in Stuttgart on the question of militarism.

The army of the proletariat is gaining strength in all countries. Its class-consciousness, unity, and determination are growing by leaps and bounds. And capitalism is effectively ensuring more frequent crises, which this army will take advantage of to destroy capitalism.

Written in September 1907

Collected Works, Vol. 13,
pp. 91-93

ANTI-MILITARIST PROPAGANDA AND YOUNG SOCIALIST WORKERS' LEAGUES

It will be recalled that the International Socialist Congress in Stuttgart discussed the question of militarism and in connection with it the question of anti-militarist propaganda. The resolution adopted on the point says, among other things, that the Congress regards it as a duty of the working classes to "help to have working class youth brought up in a spirit of international brotherhood and socialism and imbued with class consciousness". The Congress regards this as an earnest of the army ceasing to be a blind instrument in the hands of the ruling classes, which they use as they see fit and which they can direct against the people at any time.

It is very hard, sometimes almost impossible, to conduct propaganda among soldiers on active service. Life in the barracks, strict supervision and rare leave make contact with the outer world extremely difficult; military discipline and the absurd spit and polish cow the soldier. Army commanders do everything they can to knock the "nonsense" out of the "brutes", to purge them of every unconventional thought and every human emotion and to instil in them a sense of blind obedience and an unthinking wild hatred for "internal" and "external" enemies. . . . It is much harder to make an approach to the lone, ignorant and cowed soldier who is isolated from his fellow-men and whose head has been stuffed with the wildest views on every possible subject, than to draft-age young men living with their families and friends and closely bound up with them by common interest.

Everywhere anti-militarist propaganda among young workers has yielded excellent results. That is of tremendous importance. The worker who goes into the army a class-conscious Social-Democrat is a poor support for the powers that be.

There are young socialist workers' leagues in all European countries. In some, for instance, Belgium, Austria and Sweden, these leagues are large-scale organisations carrying on responsible party work. Of course, the main aim of the youth leagues is self-education and the working out of a distinct and integrated socialist outlook. But the youth leagues also carry on practical work. They struggle for an improvement in the condition of apprentices and try to protect them from unlimited exploitation by their employers. The young socialist workers' leagues devote even more time and attention to anti-militarist propaganda.

For that purpose, they try to establish close ties with young soldiers. This is done in the following way. Before the young worker has joined the army, he is a member of a league and pays membership dues. When he becomes a soldier, the league continues to maintain constant contacts with him, regularly sending him small cash aids ("soldier's sous" as they call them in France), which, however small, are of substantial importance to the soldier. For his part, he undertakes to provide the league with regular information about everything that goes on in his barracks and to write about his impressions. Thus, even after he joins the army, the soldier does not break off his ties with the organisation of which he was a member.

An effort is always made to drive the soldier as far away from home as possible for his service. This is done with the intention of preventing the soldier from being tied with the local population by any interest, and to make him feel alien to it. It is then easier to make him carry out orders: to shoot at a crowd. Young workers' leagues try to bridge this alienation between the soldier and the local population. Youth leagues are connected with each other. When he arrives in a new town, the soldier, a former member of a youth league

at home, is met by the local league as a welcome visitor, and he is at once brought into the circle of local interests and helped in every possible way. He ceases to be a new-comer and a stranger. He is also aware that if any misfortune befalls him he will receive help and support. This awareness adds to his courage, he gains assurance in his behaviour in the barracks, and is bolder in standing up for his rights and his human dignity.

Their close ties with young soldiers enable the youth leagues to carry on extensive anti-militarist propaganda among the soldiers. This is done mainly with the aid of anti-militarist literature, which the youth leagues publish and circulate in great quantities, especially in France, Belgium and also in Switzerland, Sweden, etc. This literature is highly diverse: postcards with anti-militarist pictures, anti-militarist army songs (many of these songs are very popular among the soldiers), "soldier's catechism" (in France it was circulated in more than 100,000 copies), all sorts of pamphlets, leaflets, appeals; weekly, fortnightly and monthly newspapers and magazines for soldiers, some of them illustrated. *Barracks*, *Recruit*, *Young Soldier*, *Pju pju* (a pet name for the young recruit), and *Forward* are very widely circulated. For example, in Belgium the newspapers *Recruit* and *Barracks* have a printing of 60,000 copies each. Especially many magazines are published at the time of the draft. Special issues of soldiers' newspapers are mailed to the homes of all recruits. Anti-militarist literature is delivered to soldiers in the barracks and handed out to them in the streets; soldiers find it in coffee-houses and pubs, and everywhere else they go.

Recruits receive special attention. They are given a ceremonial send-off. During the recruitment, processions are staged in the towns. In Austria, for instance, recruits walk through the town dressed in mourning and to the strains of funeral marches. In front of them rolls a decorated red carriage. All the walls are plastered with red posters which say in large letters: "You will not shoot at the people!" Evening

parties with ardent anti-militarist speeches are held in honour of the recruits. In short, everything is done to awaken the recruit's consciousness, to ensure him against the evil influence of the ideas and emotions which will be instilled into him in the barracks by fair means and foul.

The work of the socialist youth is not in vain. In Belgium, there are almost 15 soldiers' unions in the army, which are mostly affiliated with the Social-Democratic Labour Party and are closely allied with each other. In some regiments, two-thirds of the soldiers are organised. In France, the anti-militarist mood has become massive. During the strikes at Dunkirchen, Creusot, Loguivi, Monso-le-Min the soldiers ordered against the strikers declared their solidarity with the workers. . . .

As time goes on, there are more and more Social-Democrats in the army and the troops become increasingly less reliable. When the bourgeoisie has to confront the organised working class, whom will the army back? The young socialist workers are working with all the enthusiasm and energy of the young to have the army side with the people.

Vperyod No. 16,
October 8, 1907

Collected Works, Vol. 41,
pp. 204-07

From BELLICOSE MILITARISM AND THE ANTI-MILITARIST TACTICS OF SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY

I

The diplomats are in a flurry. There is a shower of "Notes", "Reports", "Statements"; ministers whisper behind the backs of the crowned puppets who, champagne-glasses in hand, are "working for peace". But their "subjects" know perfectly well that when crows flock together there must be a smell of carrion about. And the Conservative Earl Cromer informed the British Parliament that we were living in times when national (?) interests were involved, and passions were excited, and there was a risk, and more than a risk, that a collision would take place, however pacific (!) the intentions of rulers may be.

Plenty of inflammable material has accumulated in recent times, and it is steadily growing. The revolution in Persia threatens to upset all the barriers or "spheres of influence" set up there by the European powers. The constitutional movement in Turkey threatens to snatch that private estate from the claws of the preying wolves of European capitalism; and looming large and threatening are old "questions" which have now become acute—those of Macedonia, Central Asia, the Far East, etc.

But with the present network of open and secret treaties, agreements, etc., it is sufficient for some "power" to get the slightest of flicks for "the spark to burst into flame".

And the more menacingly the governments rattle their sabres one against the other, the more ruthlessly do they crush the anti-militarist movement at home. The persecu-

tions of anti-militarists are growing extensively and intensively. The "Radical-Socialist" Ministry of Clemenceau-Briand acts no less violently than the Junker-Conservative Ministry of Bülow. The dissolution of the "youth organisations" throughout Germany, following the introduction of the new law on unions and assemblies, which prohibits persons under the age of 20 from attending political meetings, has made anti-militarist agitation in Germany extremely difficult.

As a result, the dispute about the anti-militarist tactics of the socialists, which had died down since the Stuttgart Congress, is being revived again in the Party press.

At first sight it is a strange thing. When the question is so obviously important, when militarism is so patently and starkly harmful for the proletariat, it would be difficult to find another question on which such hesitation and confusion reign among the Western socialists as in the arguments on anti-militarist tactics.

The fundamental premises for a correct solution of this problem were long ago established quite firmly, and do not arouse any dispute. Modern militarism is the result of capitalism. In both its forms it is the "vital expression" of capitalism—as a military force used by the capitalist states in their external conflicts ("*Militarismus nach aussen*", as the Germans say) and as a weapon in the hands of the ruling classes for suppressing every kind of movement, economic and political, of the proletariat ("*Militarismus nach innen*"). A number of International Congresses (Paris 1889, Brussels 1891, Zurich 1893 and finally Stuttgart 1907) provided a perfect expression of this view in their resolutions.² The Stuttgart resolution establishes this link between militarism and capitalism most circumstantially, although in keeping with the agenda ("International Conflicts") the Stuttgart Congress was more concerned with that aspect of militarism which the Germans call "external" ("*Militarismus nach aussen*"). Here is the relevant passage in this resolution: "Wars between capitalist states are usually the result of their competition

on the world market, since each state strives not only to assure itself of a sphere of export, but also to conquer new regions, and the principal part in this is played by the enslavement of other peoples and countries. These wars then arise from the continuous armaments produced by militarism, which is the principal implement of class domination of the bourgeoisie and of the political subjugation of the working class.

"A favourable soil for wars are nationalist prejudices, which are systematically cultivated in the civilised countries in the interests of the ruling classes, with the object of diverting the proletarian masses from their own class objectives and making them forget the duty of international class solidarity.

"Thus wars are rooted in the very essence of capitalism; they will end only when the capitalist system ceases to exist, or when the immensity of human and financial sacrifice caused by the development of military technique, and the indignation which armaments arouse in the people, lead to the elimination of the system.

"The working class, which is the principal supplier of soldiers, and which bears the brunt of the material sacrifices, is in particular the natural enemy of wars, because wars contradict the aim it pursues, namely, the creation of an economic system founded on socialist principles, which in practice will give effect to the solidarity of peoples..."

II

Thus the principle which connects militarism and capitalism is firmly established among socialists, and on this point there are no differences. But the recognition of this link does not of itself concretely determine the anti-militarist *tactics* of the socialists; it does not solve the practical problem of how to fight the burden of militarism and how to prevent wars. And it is in the answers to these questions that a considerable divergence of views is to be found among socialists.

At the Stuttgart Congress these differences were very marked.

At one pole are German Social-Democrats like Vollmar. Since militarism is the offspring of capitalism, they argue, since wars are a necessary concomitant of capitalist development, there is no need for any special anti-militarist activity. That exactly is what Vollmar declared at the Essen Party Congress. On the question of how Social-Democrats should behave if war is declared, the majority of the German Social-Democrats, headed by Bebel and Vollmar, hold rigidly to the view that the Social-Democrats must defend their country against aggression, and that they are bound to take part in a "defensive" war. This proposition led Vollmar at Stuttgart to declare that "all our love for humanity cannot prevent us being good Germans", while the Social-Democratic deputy Noske proclaimed in the Reichstag that, in the event of war against Germany, "the Social-Democrats will not lag behind the bourgeois parties and will shoulder their rifles". From this Noske had to make only one more step to declare that "we want Germany to be armed as much as possible".

At the other pole is the small group of supporters of Hervé. The proletariat has no fatherland, they argue. Hence all wars are in the interests of the capitalists. Hence the proletariat must combat every war. The proletariat must meet every declaration of war with a military strike and an uprising. This must be the main purpose of anti-militarist propaganda. At Stuttgart Hervé therefore proposed the following draft resolution: "The Congress calls for *every declaration of war, whencesoever it may come*, being met with a military strike and an uprising."

Such are the two "extreme" positions on this question in the ranks of the Western socialists. "Like the sun in a drop of water", there are reflected in them the two diseases which still cause harm to the activity of the socialist proletariat in the West—opportunist tendencies on the one hand and anarchist phrase-mongering on the other.

First of all, a few remarks about patriotism. That "working men have no country" was really said in the *Communist Manifesto*. That the attitude of Vollmar, Noske and Co. strikes at this basic principle of *international* socialism is also true. But it does not follow from this that Hervé and his followers are right in asserting that it is of no concern to the proletariat in what country it lives—in monarchical Germany, republican France or despotic Turkey. The fatherland, i.e., the given political, cultural and social environment, is a most powerful factor in the class struggle of the proletariat; and if Vollmar is wrong when he lays down some kind of "truly German" attitude of the proletariat to "the fatherland", Hervé is just as wrong when he takes up an unforgivably uncritical attitude on such an important factor in the struggle of the proletariat for emancipation. The proletariat cannot be indifferent to the political, social and cultural conditions of its struggle; consequently it cannot be indifferent to the destinies of its country. But the destinies of the country interest it only *to the extent* that they affect its class struggle, and not in virtue of some bourgeois "patriotism", quite indecent on the lips of a Social-Democrat.

More complicated is the other question, namely, the attitude to militarism and war. At the very first glance it is obvious that Hervé is unforgivably confusing these two questions and forgetting the causal connection between war and capitalism. By adopting Hervé's tactics, the proletariat would condemn itself to fruitless activity: it would use up all its fighting preparedness (the reference is to insurrection) in the struggle against the effect (war) and allow the cause (capitalism) to remain.

The anarchist mode of thought is displayed in full measure here. Blind faith in the miracle-working power of all direct action*; the wrenching of this "direct action" out of its general social and political context, without the slightest analysis of the latter: in short the "arbitrarily mechanical inter-

* These words are in French in the original: *action directé*.—Ed.

pretation of social phenomena" (as Karl Liebknecht put it) is obvious.

Hervé's plan is "very simple": on the day war is declared the socialist soldiers desert, while the reservists declare a strike and stay in their homes. But "the strike of the reservists is not passive resistance: the working class would soon go over to open resistance, to insurrection, and the latter would have all the greater chance of ending in triumph because the army on active service would be at the frontiers" (G. Hervé, *Leur Patrie*).

Such is this "effective, direct and practical plan"; and Hervé, confident in its success, proposes that a military strike and insurrection should be the reply to every declaration of war.

It will be clear from this that the question here is not whether the proletariat is able, when it finds such a course desirable, to reply with a strike and insurrection to a declaration of war. The point at issue is whether the proletariat should be bound by an obligation to reply by an insurrection to every war. To decide the question in the latter sense means to take away from the proletariat the choice of the moment for a decisive battle, and to hand it over to its enemies. It is not the proletariat which chooses the moment of struggle in accordance with its own interests, when its general socialist consciousness stands at a high level, when its organisation is strong, when the occasion is appropriate, etc. No, the bourgeois governments would be able to provoke it to an insurrection even when the conditions for it were unfavourable, for example, by declaring a war specially calculated to arouse patriotic and chauvinist feelings among wide sections of the population and thus isolate the insurgent proletariat. It should be borne in mind, moreover, that the bourgeoisie which, from monarchist Germany to republican France and democratic Switzerland, persecutes anti-militarist activity with such ruthlessness in peace-time, would descend with the utmost fury on any attempt at a military strike in the event of war, when war-time laws,

declarations of martial law, courts martial, etc., are in force.

Kautsky was right when he said of Hervé's idea: "The idea of a military strike sprang from 'good' motives, it is noble and full of heroism, but it is heroic folly."

The proletariat, if it finds it expedient and suitable, may reply with a military strike to a declaration of war. It may, among other means of achieving a social revolution, also have recourse to a military strike. But to commit itself to this "tactical recipe" is not in the interests of the proletariat.

And that precisely was the reply given to this debatable question by the Stuttgart International Congress.

III

But if the views of the Hervéists are "heroic folly" the attitude of Vollmar, Noske and those who think like them on the "Right wing" is opportunist cowardice. Since militarism is the offspring of capitalism, and will fall with it—they argued at Stuttgart and still more at Essen—no special anti-militarist agitation is needed: it should not exist. But a radical solution of the labour question and the women's question, for example—was the reply given them at Stuttgart—is also impossible while the capitalist system exists; in spite of that, we fight for labour legislation, for extending the civil rights of women, etc. Special anti-militarist propaganda must be carried on all the more energetically because cases of interference in the struggle between labour and capital on the part of the military forces are becoming more frequent; and because the importance of militarism not only in the present struggle of the proletariat, but also in the future, at the time of the social revolution, is becoming more and more obvious.

Special anti-militarist propaganda has behind it not only the evidence of principle but also extensive historical experience. Belgium is ahead of other countries in this respect. The Belgian Labour Party, apart from its general propa-

ganda of anti-militarist ideas, has organised groups of socialist youth under the title of Jeunes Gardes (Young Guards). Groups in one and the same area constitute an Area Federation, and all the Area Federations in turn form a National Federation, headed by a "Chief Council". The newspapers of the "Young Guards" (*La jeunesse-c'est l'avenir, De Caserne, De Loteling,** etc.) circulate in tens of thousands of copies! The strongest is the Walloon Federation, which has 62 local groups with 10,000 members; in all there are at present 121 local groups of the "Young Guards".

In addition to agitation in print, there is intensive verbal agitation. In January and September (the months of the call-up) public meetings and processions are held in the main towns of Belgium. Outside the town halls, in the open air, socialist speakers explain to the recruits the meaning of militarism. The Chief Council of the "Young Guards" has a Complaints Committee, the duty of which is to gather information about all acts of injustice committed in the barracks. This information, under the heading "From the Army", is daily published in *Le Peuple*, the central organ of the party. Anti-militarist propaganda does not halt at the threshold of the barracks, and socialist soldiers form propaganda groups within the army. At the present time there are about 15 such groups ("soldiers' unions").

Following the Belgian model, with varying intensity and forms of organisation, anti-militarist propaganda goes on in France,** Switzerland, Austria and other countries.

Thus specially anti-militarist activity is not only specially necessary but practically expedient and fruitful. Therefore, since Vollmar opposed it, pointing out the impossible police

* *Youth Is the Future, the Barracks, the Recruit.*—Ed.

** An interesting feature among the French is the practice known as "The Soldier's Half-penny". Every week the worker pays one sou to the secretary of his union. The money collected in this way is sent to the soldiers "as a reminder that, even in soldier's clothes, they belong to the exploited class, and that in no circumstances should they forget this".

conditions prevailing in Germany and the danger of it leading to party organisations being broken up, the question reduced itself to the factual analysis of conditions in this particular country. But this was a question of fact and not of principle. Though here, too, there was justice in Jaurès's remark that the German Social-Democrats, who in their youth, in the difficult years of the Anti-Socialist Laws, stood up against the iron hand of Prince Bismarck, could now, with their incomparably greater numbers and strength, not fear persecution at the hands of their present rulers. But Vollmar is all the more wrong when he tries to fall back on the argument that special anti-militarist propaganda is inexpedient in principle.

No less opportunistic is the conviction of Vollmar and those who think like him that the Social-Democrats are bound to take part in a defensive war. Kautsky's brilliant criticism made hay of these views. Kautsky pointed out that it was often quite impossible to make out—especially at times of patriotic excitement—whether a particular war had been brought about with defensive or aggressive aims (the example Kautsky gave was: was Japan attacking or defending herself at the beginning of the Russo-Japanese War?). Social-Democrats would be entangled in a net of diplomatic negotiations if they took into their heads to determine their attitude to a war by this criterion. Social-Democrats may find themselves even in a position to demand offensive wars. In 1848 (it would not hurt the Hervéists to remember this too) Marx and Engels thought a war of Germany against Russia to be necessary. Later they strove to influence public opinion in Britain in favour of a war with Russia. Kautsky, by the way, puts forward the following hypothetical example: "Assuming," he says, "that the revolutionary movement in Russia is victorious, and the effects of this victory, in France, lead to power passing into the hands of the proletariat; let us assume on the other hand, that a coalition of European monarchs is formed against the new Russia. Would international Social-Democracy begin protesting if the French

Republic then came to the aid of Russia?" (K. Kautsky, *Our Views on Patriotism and War.*)

It is obvious that on this question (just as in discussing "patriotism") it is not the defensive or offensive character of the war, but the interests of the class struggle of the proletariat, or—to put it better—the interests of the international movement of the proletariat—that represent the sole criterion for considering and deciding the attitude of the Social-Democrats to any particular event in international relations.

Proletary No. 33,
July 23 (August 5), 1908

Collected Works, Vol. 15,
pp. 191-99

BRITISH AND GERMAN WORKERS DEMONSTRATE FOR PEACE³

As is well known, in Britain and Germany a chauvinist campaign has long been conducted by the bourgeois press, especially the gutter press, in which these countries are incited against each other. Competition in the world market between British and German capitalists is becoming more and more bitter. Britain's former supremacy and her undivided ascendancy in the world market, have become a thing of the past. Germany is one of the capitalist countries that are developing particularly rapidly, and her manufactures are seeking markets abroad on an ever-growing scale. The struggle for colonies and the conflict of commercial interests have in capitalist society become one of the main causes of war. It is therefore not surprising that the capitalists of both countries consider war between Britain and Germany inevitable, and the military men on both sides deem it quite desirable. The British jingoes want to undermine the strength of a dangerous rival by smashing Germany's sea power while it is still immeasurably weaker than Britain's. The German Junkers and generals, headed by that Bourbon, Wilhelm II, are spoiling for a fight with Britain, hoping to be able to use their numerical superiority in land forces, and hoping that the clamour of military victories will stifle the growing discontent of the working masses and prevent the aggravation of the class struggle in Germany.

The British and German workers decided to come out publicly against the growing war danger. For a long time

the labour press in both countries had been waging an unremitting struggle against chauvinism and militarism. But what was required now was some more imposing expression of the will of the working class than through the organs of the press. The British workers decided to send a delegation to Berlin to attend a grand demonstration that would declare the joint determination of the proletariat of both countries to wage war on war.

The demonstration took place in Berlin on Sunday, September 20 (7, old style). This time the British workers' representatives were able to address the proletariat of Berlin without let or hindrance. Two years before, when J. Jaurès had wanted to speak to the German workers on behalf of the French working class at a Social-Democratic mass meeting in Berlin to protest against the bourgeois jingoes, the German Government banned him. This time it did not venture to eject the delegates of the British proletariat.

A mammoth rally of working men was held in one of Berlin's biggest halls. About 5,000 people immediately packed the place, and an overflow of many thousands occupied the surrounding grounds and the street. Stewards wearing red armbands kept order. Comrade Legien, the well-known leader of the German trade unions (called "free", i.e., actually Social-Democratic unions), greeted the British delegation on behalf of the entire politically and industrially organised working class of Germany. He said that fifty years ago French and British workers had demonstrated on behalf of peace. At that time those pioneer socialists were not backed by the organised masses. Today Britain and Germany together had an army of $4\frac{1}{3}$ million organised workers. It was on behalf of this army that the British delegates and the Berlin rally now spoke, declaring that the decision of war or peace lay in the hands of the working class.

In his speech in reply, the British workers' delegate Madison condemned the jingo slander campaign conducted by the bourgeoisie, and handed over an Address from the Workers of Britain to the Workers of Germany,⁴ signed by

3,000 workmen. Among the signatories, he said, were representatives of both trends in the British labour movement (i.e., both Social-Democrats and adherents of the Independent Labour Party, who do not yet hold any consistent socialist point of view). The Address pointed out that wars serve the interests of the propertied classes. The masses of the workers bear all the burdens of war. The propertied classes derive benefit from national calamities. Let the workers unite to fight militarism, to ensure peace!

After other British delegates and a representative of the German Social-Democratic Party, Richard Fischer, had spoken, the meeting closed with the unanimous adoption of a resolution branding the "selfish and short-sighted policy of the ruling and exploiting classes" and expressing readiness to act in accordance with the resolution of the International Congress in Stuttgart, i.e., to fight war by all ways and means. The meeting broke up in an orderly manner amidst the singing of the workers' *Marseillaise*. There were no street demonstrations. The Berlin police and local military authorities were disappointed. It is characteristic of the regime in Germany that the most peaceful demonstration of the workers had to have a police and military demonstration to accompany it. The Berlin garrison was mobilised. Detachments of troops were stationed in different parts of the city in accordance with a strict plan, mostly in such a way that their hiding-places and numbers could not be easily detected. Police units patrolled the streets and squares in the vicinity of the meeting hall, particularly the road leading from there to the royal palace. The latter was ringed with police in plain clothes and troops concealed in house yards. An intricate system of police pickets was organised; groups of policemen loitered at street corners; police officers were detailed to all "important" spots; police cyclists acted as scouts and kept the military authorities informed on every step the "enemy" made; bridges and canal crossings were put under triple guard. "They stood watch over the threatened monarchy", sarcastically wrote *Vorwärts*.⁵ comment-

ing on all these measures taken by the government of Wilhelm II.

It was a rehearsal, we add for our part. Wilhelm II and the German bourgeoisie were rehearsing military combat with an insurgent proletariat. Such rehearsals are undoubtedly and in any case useful to both the masses of workers and to the soldiers. *Ça ira* (it will be a success!) as the French workers' song says. Repeated rehearsals are leading, may be very slowly as yet, but very surely, to the great historical climax.

Written before September 8 (21)
and October 2 (15), 1908

Collected Works, Vol. 15,
pp. 210-12

EVENTS IN THE BALKANS AND IN PERSIA

The political press in Russia and throughout Europe is preoccupied lately with the events in the Balkans. For a time a European war seemed dangerously close, and that danger has by no means been eliminated, though it is much more probable that the whole thing will end up in shouting and clamour and war will be avoided.

Let us take a glance at the nature of the crisis and the tasks it imposes on the workers' party in Russia.

A powerful impetus to the political awakening of the Asian peoples was given by the Russo-Japanese War and the Russian revolution. But this awakening spread so slowly from one country to another that in Persia Russian counter-revolution played and continues to play what amounts to a decisive role, while in Turkey the revolution was at once confronted with a counter-revolutionary coalition of the powers, Russia at their head. True, the general tone of the European press and of the diplomatic statements would appear to contradict this. If we are to believe these statements and the semi-official press, there is universal "sympathy" with regenerated Turkey, a universal desire to see her constitutional regime strengthened and developed, general praise for the "moderation" of the bourgeois Young Turks.

All these fine words, however, are typical of the base bourgeois hypocrisy of Europe's present-day reactionary governments and present-day reactionary bourgeoisie. For the fact is that not a single European country calling itself a democ-

racy, and not a single European bourgeois party professing to be democratic, progressive, Liberal, Radical, etc., has in any way demonstrated a genuine desire to promote the victory and consolidation of the Turkish revolution. On the contrary, they all *fear* its success, for the inevitable result of it would be, on the one hand, to foster the desire for autonomy and genuine democracy in all the Balkan nations and, on the other, to ensure the victory of the Persian revolution, give fresh impetus to the democratic movement in Asia, intensify the struggle for independence in India, create free institutions along an immense stretch of Russia's frontier and, consequently, new conditions that would hamper the policy of Black-Hundred tsarism and facilitate the rise of the revolution in Russia, etc.

Essentially, what we see now going on in the Balkans, Turkey and Persia is a counter-revolutionary coalition of the European powers *against* the mounting tide of democracy in Asia. All the efforts of our governments, all the preaching of the "big" European papers, are aimed at glossing over this fact, misleading public opinion, covering up with hypocritical speeches and diplomatic hocus-pocus the *counter-revolutionary coalition* of the so-called civilised nations of Europe against the nations of Asia, least civilised but most energetic in their striving for democracy. And the very essence of proletarian policy at this stage should be to tear the mask from these bourgeois hypocrites and to reveal to the broadest masses of the people the reactionary character of the European governments who, out of fear of the proletarian struggle at home, are playing, and helping others play, the part of gendarme in relation to the revolution in Asia.

Europe has woven a dense web of intrigue around all the Turkish and Balkan events, and the man in the street is being hoodwinked by the diplomats, who try to divert public attention to trifles, secondary issues, individual aspects of present developments, in an effort to obscure the meaning of the process as a whole. In contrast to this, our task, the

task of international Social-Democracy, should be to show the people how these developments are interconnected, to bring out their fundamental trend and underlying motives.

Rivalry among the capitalist powers, anxious to "bite off" as big a piece as they can and extend their possessions and colonies, coupled with fear of an independent democratic movement among the nations dependent on or "protected" by Europe—these are two mainsprings of all European policy. The Young Turks are praised for their moderation and restraint, i.e., the Turkish revolution is being praised because it is weak, because it is not rousing the popular masses to really independent action, because it is hostile to the proletarian struggle beginning in the Ottoman Empire—and at the same time the plunder of Turkey continues. The Young Turks are praised for making it possible to go on plundering Turkish possessions. They praise the Young Turks and continue a policy, the obvious purpose of which is *to partition Turkey*. In this connection the Social-Democratic *Leipziger Volkszeitung* made this very true and apt comment:

"In May 1791, far-sighted statesmen who were really concerned for the well-being of their country carried out a political reform in Poland. The King of Prussia and the Emperor of Austria praised the Constitution of May 3, saying it would 'bring prosperity to a neighbouring country'. The whole world extolled the Polish reformers for practising 'moderation', unlike the terrible Jacobins of Paris.... On January 23, 1793, Prussia, Austria and Russia signed a treaty partitioning Poland!

"In August 1908, the Young Turks carried out their political reform with uncommon smoothness. The whole world praised them for practising such respectable 'moderation', unlike the terrible socialists of Russia.... Now, in October 1908, we are witnessing a series of developments that presage the partition of Turkey."

Indeed, it would be childish to believe the *words* of the diplomats and disregard their *deeds*, the collective action of the powers against revolutionary Turkey. The very *fact* that the present developments were preceded by meetings and conversations of the Foreign Ministers and Heads of State of several countries, is enough to dispel this naive faith in

diplomatic statements. In August and September, immediately after the Young Turk revolution and just before the Austrian and Bulgarian declarations, Mr. Izvolsky met King Edward and Premier Clemenceau of the French Republic in Karlsbad and Marienbad; the Austrian and Italian Foreign Ministers, von Aehrenthal and Tittoni, met in Salzburg; then came the meetings between Izvolsky and Aehrenthal in Buchloe on September 15; between Prince Ferdinand of Bulgaria and Emperor Franz-Joseph in Budapest; Izvolsky's meeting with von Schoen, the German Foreign Minister, and later with Tittoni and the King of Italy.

These facts speak for themselves. *All the important points* had been agreed upon *before* the Austrian and Bulgarian action secretly and directly, at personal meetings of kings and ministers, *between* the six powers: Russia, Austria, Germany, Italy, France and Britain. The *subsequent* controversy in the press as to whether Aehrenthal was speaking the truth when he stated that Italy, Germany and Russia had agreed to Austria's annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina was *a farce from beginning to end, a sheer deception*, that can fool only liberal philistines. The foreign policy directors of the European powers—the Izvolskys, Aehrenthals and the whole gang of crowned robbers and their ministers—purposely threw this bone to the press: go on bickering, gentlemen, over who cheated whom and who affronted whom, whether Austria cheated Russia, or Bulgaria cheated Austria, etc., over who was the "first" to begin tearing up the Berlin Treaty,⁶ over the different attitudes to the proposed conference of the powers, and so on and so forth. Please keep public attention preoccupied with these interesting and important—oh, very important!—questions. That is exactly what we need in order to conceal *what really matters*, namely, that we have already come to a preliminary agreement on the main thing, i.e., action against the Young Turk revolution, further steps to partition Turkey, revision of the Dardanelles arrangement on one pretext or another, permission for Russia's Black-Hundred tsar to strangle the

Persian revolution. That is the crux of the matter; that is what we, the leaders of the reactionary bourgeoisie of all Europe, really need, and that is what we are doing. As for the liberal simpletons in the press and in parliament, they can spend their time debating how it all began, who said what, and in what guise the policy of colonial plunder and suppression of democratic movements is to be finally signed, sealed and presented to the world.

In each of the European Great Powers—with the exception of Austria, which for the time being is "satiated"—the liberal press is accusing *its* government of inadequate defence of *its* national interests. Everywhere the liberals present their country and their government as the most maladroit in "utilising" the situation, as having been fooled, etc. And that precisely is the policy of our Cadets⁷ too. They have long been saying that Austria's successes make them "envious" (Mr. Milyukov's own words). This policy of the liberal bourgeoisie in general, and that of our Cadets in particular, is the most revolting hypocrisy, the vilest betrayal of the genuine interests of progress and freedom. For it is a policy which, first, befuddles the democratic consciousness of the masses by hushing up the conspiracy of the reactionary governments. Secondly, it impels every country to follow a so-called active foreign policy, i.e., it sanctions the system of colonial robbery and interference by the powers in Balkan affairs, interference which is always reactionary. Thirdly, it plays directly into the hands of reaction, interesting the people in how much "we" will receive, how much "we" will get out of the booty, how much "we" can bargain for "ourselves". What the reactionary governments need most, at this juncture, is precisely the opportunity to plead that "public opinion" supports their territorial seizures, demands for "compensation", etc. Look, they say, the press of my country accuses me of excessive generosity, of inadequate defence of the national interests, of being too pliable, and it threatens war. Consequently, my demands are most "modest and fair", and must therefore be met in full!

The policy of the Russian Cadets, like that of the European liberal bourgeoisie, is one of subservience to the reactionary governments, defence of colonial aggrandisement and plunder, and interference in the affairs of other countries. The Cadet policy is especially harmful because it is being conducted under the "opposition" flag, and therefore misleads very many, wins the confidence of those who have no faith in the Russian Government and corrupts the masses. Therefore, our Duma deputies and all our Party organisations must bear in mind that we cannot make a single serious step forward in Social-Democratic propaganda and agitation about the Balkan events without revealing—from the *Duma rostrum*, in leaflets and at meetings—the *connection* between the reactionary policy of the autocracy and the hypocritical opposition of the Cadets. We shall never be able to explain to the people how harmful and reactionary the policy of the tsarist government is, unless we explain that Cadet foreign policy is *essentially the same*. We cannot combat chauvinism and the Black-Hundred spirit in foreign policy, unless we combat the phrase-mongering, the posing, the mental reservations and dodges of the Cadets.

Where concessions to the liberal-bourgeois point of view lead socialists will be seen from the following example. In the well-known opportunist journal *Sozialistische Monatshefte*⁸ (*Socialist-???-Monthly*), Max Schippel has this to say on the Balkan crisis: "Nearly all thinking party members would consider it a mistake if the view which was recently expressed once more in our Berlin Central Organ [*Vorwärts*] prevailed, the view that Germany has nothing to look for in either the present or future revolutions in the Balkans. Certainly, we should not strive for territorial acquisitions. . . . But there can be no doubt that the major realignments of the powers in this area, which is an important connecting link between Europe, the whole of Asia and part of Africa, have a direct bearing on our international position. . . . For the time being the reactionary Russian colossus is of no decisive importance. . . . We have no reason

to see in Russia an enemy always and everywhere, as she was regarded by the democrats of the fifties" (S. 1319).

This silly liberal, parading as a socialist, has failed to notice Russia's reactionary intrigues behind her "solicitude" for the "Slav brothers"! By using the words "we" (meaning the German bourgeoisie), "our" position, etc., he has failed to notice either the blow dealt the Young Turk revolution, or Russia's action against the Persian revolution!

Schippel's statement appeared in the October 22 issue of the journal. On October 18 (5), *Novoye Vremya*⁹ published a vitriolic article alleging that the "anarchy in Tabriz has reached incredible dimensions" and the city has been "half destroyed and sacked by semi-savage revolutionaries". In other words, the victory of the revolution over the Shah's troops in Tabriz has immediately aroused the fury of the semi-official Russian journal. It describes Sattar Khan, leader of the Persian revolutionary forces, as the "Pugachov of Aderbaijan" (Aderbaijan, or Azerbaijan, is the northern province of Persia and, according to Reclus, accounts for nearly one-fifth of the total population; Tabriz is the capital of the province). "One is entitled to ask", *Novoye Vremya* wrote, "whether Russia can endlessly tolerate these outrages, which are ruining our lucrative trade on the Persian frontier. . . . It should be borne in mind that all Eastern Transcaucasia and Aderbaijan are an ethnological whole. . . . Tatar semi-intellectuals in Transcaucasia, forgetting that they are Russian subjects, have displayed warm sympathy for the disturbances in Tabriz and are sending volunteers to that city. . . . What is much more important is that Aderbaijan, which borders on Russia, should be pacified. Deplorable though it may be, circumstances might compel Russia, despite her strong desire not to interfere, to take this task upon herself."

On October 20, the German *Frankfurter Zeitung* carried a dispatch from St. Petersburg that Russian occupation of Aderbaijan is contemplated by way of "compensation". On October 24 (11), the same paper published a telegram from

Tabriz: "Two days ago six battalions of Russian infantry, supported by cavalry and artillery, crossed the Persian frontier and are today expected in Tabriz."

The Russian troops were crossing the Persian frontier on the very day when Max Schippel, slavishly repeating the assurances and the *outcries* of the liberal and police press, was telling the German workers that Russia's importance as a reactionary colossus was now a thing of the past, and that to regard Russia as an enemy under all circumstances would be a mistake!

There is to be a new massacre of Persian revolutionaries by the troops of Nicholas the Bloody. The unofficial Lyakhov is being followed by the official occupation of Aderbaijan, and the repetition in Asia of what Russia did in Europe in 1849, when Nicholas I sent his troops against the Hungarian revolution. At that time there were genuine democrats among the bourgeois parties of Europe, who were capable of fighting for freedom, and not only hypocritically talking about freedom, as all the bourgeois democrats do in our day. Russia had then to play the part of European gendarme against at any rate a few European countries. Today *all* the biggest European powers, not excluding the "democratic" republic of the "red" Clemenceau, mortally afraid as they are of any extension of democracy at home because it would benefit the proletariat, are *helping* Russia play the gendarme in Asia.

There cannot be the slightest doubt that "freedom of action" for Russia against the Persian revolution was *part of the September reactionary conspiracy* of Russia, Austria, Germany, Italy, France and Britain. Whether this was explicitly stated in some secret document (which may be published many years hence in a collection of historical materials) or whether it was only intimated by Izvolsky to his most obliging fellow-negotiators, or whether the latter "hinted" that they intended to pass from "occupation" to "annexation", and that the Russians would perhaps like to pass from the Lyakhov policy to "occupation", or whether some other

arrangement was made—all that is not of the least importance. What is important is that, however informal, the September counter-revolutionary conspiracy of the powers *is a fact*, the significance of which becomes increasingly clear with every passing day. It is a conspiracy against the proletariat and democracy. It is a conspiracy for directly suppressing the revolution in Asia, or at least for dealing it indirect blows. It is a conspiracy for the continuation of colonial plunder and territorial conquest in the Balkans today, in Persia tomorrow, maybe in Asia Minor and Egypt the day after, etc., etc.

Only the world proletarian revolution can overthrow this combined power of the crowned bandits and international capital. The urgent task of all socialist parties is to intensify agitation among the masses, unmask the diplomats of all countries at their tricks and bring out all the facts for the people to see—the facts revealing the infamous role of *all the allied powers* without exception—both as direct performers of the functions of the gendarme, and as his abettors, friends and financiers.

An extremely onerous, but at the same time extremely noble and momentous task falls now to the Russian Social-Democratic deputies in the Duma, where a statement by Izvolsky and a question by the Cadets and Octobrists are expected. The Social-Democratic deputies are members of a body that is a screen for the policy of the chief reactionary power, the chief plotter of counter-revolution, and they must find in themselves the courage and ability *to tell the whole truth*. At a time like this, the Social-Democratic deputies in the Black-Hundred Duma are people to whom much is given and of whom much is required. For apart from them there is *no one* in the Duma to voice the protest against tsarism from positions *other* than those of the *Cadets* and *Octobrists*. And a Cadet "protest", at such times and in the present circumstances, is worse than no protest at all since it can be made only *from amidst the selfsame* capitalist wolf-pack, and on behalf of the selfsame wolfish policy.

Our Duma group and all our other Party organisations should therefore set to work at once. Agitation among the masses is now a hundredfold more important than in ordinary times. Three propositions should take first place in all our Party agitation. First, in contrast to the whole of the reactionary and liberal press—from the Black Hundreds to the Cadets—Social-Democrats should expose the diplomatic game of conferences, agreement of the powers, alliances with Britain against Austria, or with Austria against Germany, or any other. Our job is to reveal the *fact* that there exists a reactionary conspiracy of the powers, a conspiracy which the governments are doing everything they possibly can to conceal behind the farce of public negotiations. Our policy should be to denounce this diplomatic farce, bring the truth to the people, expose international anti-proletarian reaction! Secondly, we should reveal the real, as distinct from the asserted, results of this conspiracy, namely, the blow to the Turkish revolution, Russia's assistance in strangling the Persian revolution, interference in the affairs of other nations, and violation of that fundamental democratic principle, the right of nations to self-determination. That right is championed by our programme and the programmes of all the Social-Democratic parties of the world. And there can be nothing more reactionary than the solicitude of the Austrians on the one hand, and the Russian Black Hundreds on the other, for their "Slav brothers". This "solicitude" is being used to screen the vile intrigues that have long won Russia notoriety in the Balkans. This "solicitude" always boils down to encroachments on *genuine* democracy in one Balkan country or another. There is only one sincere way for the powers to show "solicitude" for the Balkan nations, and that is to leave them alone, stop harassing them by foreign interference, stop putting spokes in the wheel of the Turkish revolution. But, of course, the working class cannot expect that kind of policy from the bourgeoisie.

All the bourgeois parties, including the most liberal and "democratic" in name, our Cadets included, support capital-

ist foreign policy. That is the third thing which the Social-Democrats must with special vigour bring to the knowledge of the people. For, to all intents and purposes, the liberals and Cadets stand for the present rivalry between the capitalist nations, differing with the Black Hundreds only as to the forms this should take, and insisting only on international agreements different from those upon which the government now relies. And this liberal struggle against one variety of bourgeois foreign policy in favour of another variety of that same policy, these liberal reproaches levelled at the government for lagging behind other countries (in rapine and intervention!) have the most corrupting effect on the masses. Down with all colonial policy, down with the whole policy of intervention and capitalist struggle for the conquest of foreign lands and foreign populations, for new privileges, new markets, control of the Straits, etc.! Social-Democrats do not subscribe to the stupid philistine utopia of "peaceful and just" capitalist progress. Their struggle is against the whole of capitalist society as such, in the knowledge that there is no other champion of peace and liberty in the world than the international revolutionary proletariat.

P. S. After this article had been sent to the press, the papers published a dispatch of the *St. Petersburg Telegraph Agency* denying the report about Russian troops having crossed the Persian border. The dispatch was published in the *Frankfurter Zeitung* of October 24, in the second morning edition. The *third* edition carried a report from Constantinople dated October 24, 10.50 *p.m.*, stating that on the evening of the 24th news of the Russian troops crossing the Persian border had reached Constantinople. The foreign press, *with the exception of the socialist papers*, is so far silent on the Russian invasion of Persia.

To sum up: we are not yet in a position to learn the whole truth. At any rate, the "denials" emanating from the tsarist government and the *St. Petersburg Telegraph Agency* are

not, of course, to be trusted. That Russia, with the knowledge of the powers, is fighting the Persian revolution with every means at her command, from intrigue to the sending of troops, is a fact. That her policy is to occupy Azerbaijan, is likewise beyond doubt. And if the troops have not yet crossed the border, then very probably all the preparations for them to do so have already been made. There is no smoke without fire.

Proletary No. 37,
October 16 (29), 1908

Collected Works, Vol. 15,
pp. 220-30

MEETING OF THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST BUREAU¹⁰

On Sunday October 11 (N.S.) there took place in Brussels the first meeting of the International Socialist Bureau since the Stuttgart Congress. The gathering of representatives of various socialist parties was chosen also as a convenient occasion for a conference of socialist journalists and parliamentarians. The first conference took place on the eve of the meeting of the Bureau, the second the day after. The composition of both conferences, it should be mentioned, was scarcely different from that of the Bureau: the majority of the members of the Bureau were both journalists and M.P.s. Only a few Belgian socialist deputies were additional members of the conference on Monday October 12.

The conference of journalists opened at 3 p.m. on Saturday. The question under discussion was that of regulating and developing the relations between the periodical press of the various socialist parties. The Belgians drew up a list of correspondents, members of their party, who were ready to give information to the newspapers of other parties on various particular questions. The wish was expressed that similar lists should be drawn up by other parties, and it was suggested that there should be a note of what languages the correspondent knew. The foreign bulletins of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party¹¹ (*La Tribune Russe*, in French) and of the Social-Democrats (in German) were mentioned as particularly useful publications for our foreign comrades. It was

also remarked that in the case of countries where there were different socialist parties, or various tendencies within a single party, a note should be made in the lists stating which party, etc., the correspondents belonged to. Russian Social-Democrats living abroad ought to make use of this international conference to ensure better arrangements for their reports in foreign socialist newspapers.

The conference decided that the International Socialist Bureau was to get in touch with those nations which had no daily socialist papers on the question of publishing regular bulletins (in one of the three official languages of the International, or in all three—French, German and English). Following this, the Bureau was to enquire of the editors of the socialist daily newspapers of the different countries, what sum they would agree to pay in order to receive such bulletins regularly.

The Bureau Abroad of the Central Committee of our Party¹² should take special notice of this decision. The business of informing our foreign comrades about the affairs of Russian Social-Democracy is organised far from satisfactorily, and there should be an immediate and serious discussion on how to put this matter in order, and on publishing a *Party* bulletin abroad in three languages. Everything possible should be done to put such a plan into practice.

The next point discussed was the proposal of Camille Huysmans, the Secretary of the Bureau, that the German Social-Democrats, who have 70 daily newspapers, should take the initiative of setting up an international bureau of telegraph and telephone communications between the editorial offices of the socialist newspapers in Berlin, Vienna, Paris, Brussels, etc. The German delegates said that it was impossible to carry out this plan immediately; but they stated that a central information bureau of the German Social-Democratic Labour Party had recently been set up in Germany, and that when this was working satisfactorily it would be possible to consider transforming this bureau into an international organisation. The conference expressed its

satisfaction at this promise, and the meeting ended after deciding that conferences of the socialist journalists of various countries should be timed as before to coincide with meetings of the International Socialist Bureau.

In the evening there was an international mass meeting at the Maison du Peuple at which Austrian, German, British, Turkish and Bulgarian delegates spoke—mainly on the subject of the international conflicts, and of the struggle of the socialist proletariat of all countries for the preservation of peace. The meeting ended with the unanimous adoption of a resolution as follows: "The international meeting held on October 10 (N.S.) at the Maison du Peuple reaffirms the energetic resolution of the world proletariat to defend peace among the nations and to struggle with all its strength against capitalist militarism, which ruins and oppresses all peoples. The meeting expresses its confidence that the various national sections of the Workers' International will apply in full the decision adopted on this question by the International Socialist Congress in Stuttgart." The meeting concluded with the singing of *The Internationale*.

The whole of the next day was taken up with the meeting of the International Socialist Bureau. The first item on the agenda, namely, the affiliation of the British Labour Party, occupied the whole of the morning session. According to the Rules of the International, organisations eligible for membership are, first, socialist parties which recognise the class struggle, and secondly, working-class organisations whose standpoint is that of the class struggle (i.e., trade unions). The Labour Party recently formed in the British House of Commons does not openly call itself socialist, and does not expressly and definitely recognise the principle of the class struggle (which, be it said in parenthesis, the British Social-Democrats call upon it to do). Needless to say this Labour Party was admitted to the International in general and to the Stuttgart Socialist Congress in particular, because, as a matter of fact, this Party is an organisation of a mixed type, standing between the two types defined in Clauses 1 and 2

of the Rules of the International, and embodying the political representation of the British trade unions. Nevertheless, the question of the affiliation of this Party was raised, and raised by the Party itself, in the person of the so-called Independent Labour Party (the I.L.P., as the British call it), which is one of the two subsections of the British section of the International. The other subsection is the Social Democratic Federation.

The Independent Labour Party demanded the *direct* recognition of the Labour Party as an affiliated organisation of the International. Its delegate Bruce Glasier urged the enormous significance of this representation in Parliament of hundreds of thousands of organised workers who were steadily and surely moving towards socialism. He was very contemptuous of principles, formulas and catechisms. Kautsky, in reply to him, dissociated himself from this attitude of contempt towards the principles and ultimate aim of socialism, but wholly supported the affiliation of the Labour Party as a party waging the class struggle in practice. Kautsky moved the following resolution:

"Whereas by previous resolutions of the International Congresses, all organisations adopting the standpoint of the proletarian class struggle and recognising the necessity for political action have been accepted for membership, the International Bureau declares that the British Labour Party is admitted to International Socialist Congresses, because, while not expressly [*ausdrücklich*] accepting the proletarian class struggle, in practice the Labour Party conducts this struggle, and adopts its standpoint, inasmuch as the Party is organised independently of the bourgeois parties." Kautsky was supported by the Austrians, by Vaillant of the French group, and, as the voting showed, by the majority of the small nations. The opposition came first of all from Hyndman, the representative of the British Social Democratic Federation, who demanded that the *status quo* be maintained until the Labour Party expressly recognised the principle of the class struggle and of socialism; then from Roussel (the second

French delegate and a follower of Guesde), Rubanovich of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party, and Avramov, the delegate of the revolutionary wing of the Bulgarian socialists.

I took the floor in order to associate myself with the first part of Kautsky's resolution. It was impossible, I argued, to refuse to admit the Labour Party, i.e., the parliamentary representation of the trade unions, since Congresses had previously admitted all trade unions whatever, even those which had allowed themselves to be represented by bourgeois parliamentarians. But, I said, the second part of Kautsky's resolution is wrong, because *in practice* the Labour Party is not a party really independent of the Liberals, and does not pursue a fully independent class policy. I therefore proposed an amendment that the end of the resolution, beginning with the word "because", should read as follows:

"because it [the Labour Party] represents the first step on the part of the really proletarian organisations of Britain towards a conscious class policy and towards a *socialist workers' party*". I submitted this amendment to the Bureau, but Kautsky would not accept it, stating in his next speech that the International Bureau could not adopt decisions based on "expectations". But the main struggle was between the supporters and the opponents of Kautsky's resolution as a whole. When it was about to be voted on, Adler proposed that it be divided into two parts. This was done, and both parts were carried by the International Bureau: the first with three against and one abstention, and the second with four against and one abstention. Thus Kautsky's motion became the decision of the Bureau. Rubanovich abstained on both votes. Let me add that Victor Adler, who spoke after me and before Kautsky's second speech, replied to me in the following manner—I am quoting from the Belgian socialist organ *Le Peuple*, which gave the most detailed and exact reports of the sessions: "Lenin's proposal is tempting [*séduisante*, Adler said: *verlockend*, enticing], but it cannot make us for-

get that the Labour Party is now outside the bourgeois parties. It is not for us to judge how it did this. We recognise the fact of progress."

Such was the nature of the debate at the International Bureau on the question under discussion. I shall now take the liberty to deal in greater detail with this debate, in order to explain the position that I took up to the readers of *Proletary*. The arguments advanced by V. Adler and K. Kautsky failed to convince me, and I still think they are wrong. By stating in his resolution that the Labour Party "does not expressly accept the proletarian class struggle", Kautsky undoubtedly voiced a certain "expectation", a certain "judgement" as to what the policy of the Labour Party is now and what that policy should be. But Kautsky expressed this *indirectly*, and in such a way that it amounted to an assertion which, first, is incorrect in substance, and secondly, provides a basis for misrepresenting his *idea*. That by separating in *Parliament* (not during the elections! not in its whole policy! not in its propaganda and agitation!) from the bourgeois parties, the Labour Party in Britain is taking the first step towards socialism and towards a class policy of the proletarian mass organisations is indisputable. This is not an "expectation" but a fact, the very fact which compels us to admit the Labour Party into the International, since we have already admitted the trade unions into the Labour Party. Finally, it is precisely such a formulation that would make hundreds of thousands of British workers, who undoubtedly respect the decisions of the International but have not yet become full socialists, ponder once again over the question why they are regarded as having taken only the *first* step, and what the *next* steps along this road should be. My formulation does not contain even the shadow of a claim that the International should undertake to solve the concrete and detailed problems of a national labour movement, should undertake to determine when the next steps should be taken, and what they should be. But that further steps are necessary in general must be admitted, in relation to a party

which does not expressly and clearly accept the principle of the class struggle. Kautsky in his resolution acknowledged this indirectly, instead of doing so directly. It looked as if the International was certifying that the Labour Party was *in practice* waging a consistent class struggle, as if it was sufficient for a workers' organisation to form a separate labour group in Parliament in order *in its entire conduct* to become independent of the bourgeoisie!

On this question Hyndman, Roussel, Rubanovich and Avramov undoubtedly occupied a still more incorrect position (which Rubanovich did not rectify but confused by his abstention on both parts of the resolution). When Avramov declared that to admit the Labour Party would be to encourage opportunism, he expressed a glaringly wrong view. One need only recall Engels's letters to Sorge. For a number of years Engels strongly insisted that the British Social-Democrats, led by Hyndman, were committing an error by acting like sectarians, failing to link themselves with the unconscious but powerful class instinct of the trade unions, and by turning Marxism into a "dogma", whereas it should be a "guide to action".¹³ When there exist objective conditions which retard the growth of the political consciousness and class independence of the proletarian masses, one must be able patiently and steadfastly to work hand in hand with them, making no concessions in principles but not refraining from activity *right in the midst* of the proletarian masses. These lessons of Engels's have been corroborated by the subsequent development of events, when the British trade unions, insular, aristocratic, philistinely selfish, and hostile to socialism, which have produced a number of outright traitors to the working class who have sold themselves to the bourgeoisie for ministerial posts (like the scoundrel John Burns), have nevertheless begun *moving towards* socialism, awkwardly, inconsistently, in zigzag fashion, but still moving towards socialism. Only the blind can fail to see that socialism is now growing apace among the working class in Britain, that socialism is *once again* becoming a mass movement

in that country, that the social revolution is approaching in Great Britain.

The International would undoubtedly have acted wrongly had it not directly and resolutely expressed its complete sympathy with this vast step forward by the mass labour movement in Britain, and voiced its encouragement of the great turn that had begun in the cradle of capitalism. But it does not in the least follow from this that the Labour Party can already be recognised as a party in practice independent of the bourgeoisie, as a party waging the class struggle, as a socialist party, etc. It was necessary to rectify one undoubted error committed by the British Social Democratic Federation, but there was no need to give even a shadow of encouragement to *other, undoubted and not less important* errors of the British opportunists who lead the so-called Independent Labour Party. That these leaders are opportunists is indisputable. Ramsay MacDonald, the leader of the I.L.P., even proposed at Stuttgart that Clause 2 of the Rules of the International be so amended as to require, in place of the recognition of the class struggle, only the good faith (*bona fides*) of labour associations, for affiliation to the International. Kautsky himself immediately detected the opportunist note in the words of Bruce Glasier and dissociated himself from them—in his speech at the Bureau, but unfortunately not in his resolution. The speech at the Bureau was delivered before a dozen persons, but the resolution was written for millions.

I have before me the newspapers published by both trends of British socialism containing comments on the meeting of the International Bureau. The organ of the Independent (ahem! ahem!) Labour Party, the *Labour Leader*, rejoices, and *openly declares* to tens of thousands of British workers that the International Socialist Bureau not only recognised the Labour Party (that is true, and it had to be done) but also "*vindicated the policy of the I.L.P.*" (*Labour Leader*, October 16, 1908, p. 665). This is not true. The Bureau did *not* vindicate it. This is an illegitimate, opportunist inter-

pretation of a slight awkwardness in Kautsky's resolution. This slight awkwardness is beginning to bear rather abundant fruit; on top of this comes a poor translation: no wonder the Italians say that translators are traducers (*traduttori-tradittori*). The official translations of the Bureau resolutions into the three official languages have not been published yet, and it is not known when they will appear. Kautsky's resolution states that the Labour Party "adopts the standpoint of the class struggle" (end of the resolution; in the original: *sich . . . auf seinen, d. h. des Klassenkampfs, Boden stellt*), which, in the translation of the British *Social-Democrats* reads: "places itself in consequence on the ground of international socialism". In the translation of the British *opportunists* (I.L.P.) it reads: "*adopts the position of international socialism*". (Ibid.) Now try and rectify such mistakes when you carry on agitation among the British workers!

Far be it from me to accuse Bruce Glasier of distorting the resolution. I am sure he could not have had that in mind. And this is not so important. What is important is that the *spirit* of Kautsky's resolution, precisely the *second* part of it, be applied in practical mass work. On the same page of the *Labour Leader*, another member of the I.L.P., describing his impressions of the Bureau meeting and of the mass meeting in Brussels, complains that at the meeting "the emphasis on the ideal and ethical aspect of socialism . . . was almost entirely absent", an aspect which, he averred, was always emphasised at I.L.P. meetings. "*In its stead we had . . . the barren and uninspiring dogma of the class war.*"

When Kautsky was writing his resolution about the British, he had in mind, not a British "Independent", but a German Social-Democrat. . . .

Justice, the organ of the British Social-Democrats, publishes bitter words from Hyndman against the majority of the Bureau as "whittlers-away of principle to suit the convenience of trimmers". "I have not the slightest doubt," writes Hyndman, "that if the British Labour Party had been told plainly that they either had to accept socialist prin-

principles . . . or keep away altogether, they would very quickly have decided to bring themselves into line with the International Socialist Party." And in another article in the same issue, *facts* are quoted to prove that *in practice* the Independent Labour Party got some of its members elected under a *jumbled* flag of both Liberalism and the Independent Labour Party (Liberal-Labour Alliance), and that some of the "Independents" *had the backing of the Liberal Minister, John Burns* (*Justice*, October 17, 1908, pp. 4 and 7).

If Hyndman carries out the plan he speaks of, namely, that of raising this question again at the International Socialist Congress in Copenhagen (1910), then the R.S.D.L.P. must try to get Kautsky's resolution amended.

The second item on the agenda was the question of joint action by the proletariat and the socialists of various countries against the international and colonial conflicts with which the policy of the bourgeois governments is fraught. Vaillant moved a resolution which was adopted with slight amendments. During the discussion the Austrian delegates referred to the fact that their party in its delegations officially opposes the policy of Franz-Joseph, and reaffirms the recognition by socialists of the right of all nationalities to self-determination. But in opposing the policy of Franz-Joseph—said the Austrians—we are also against the policy of Abdul Hamid or Edward VII. Our business is to make the government responsible for the consequences of its actions. The British expressed the desire for more explicit declarations by the Austrian Social-Democrats against their government, but the Austrians did not go further than what has been stated. Avramov, a delegate from the Bulgarian socialists (the "Narrows", i.e., the revolutionary Social-Democrats; in Bulgaria there are also the "Broads", i.e., opportunist Social-Democrats), insisted on the imperialist bourgeoisie of the Balkan states themselves being mentioned, but

the amendment to this effect was rejected. On the subject of the proclamation of Bulgarian independence, stated Avramov, the Bulgarian socialists strongly opposed the bourgeois parties, considering this proclamation to be a harmful piece of adventurism from the point of view of the working class. Bruce Glasier moved that the resolution should include a statement on the necessity of organising international demonstrations; but it was decided that a recommendation to this effect should be sent through the Bureau to the various national parties. Van Kol (a delegate from the Dutch Social-Democrats) suggested that there should be included a protest against the infringements of the Berlin Treaty by the powers. But before the voting he withdrew this proposition, as it had been pointed out that it was not for socialists to make a point of defending treaties concluded by bourgeois states. The text of the resolution adopted by the International Bureau is as follows:

"Whereas, in the first place, the British and German socialists by their demonstrations for peace, the French socialists by their campaign against the Moroccan expedition, the Danish socialists by their proposal for disarmament, were acting in keeping with the decisions of the International,

"Whereas, further, the danger of war persists; capitalist imperialism continues to intrigue in Britain and in Germany; the Moroccan expedition and adventure continues; tsarism, seeking new loans above all, is trying to add an element of confusion to the situation in order to strengthen its position in its struggle against the Russian revolution; in the Balkan Peninsula the intervention of foreign powers and their self-seeking ambitions are inflaming national and religious passions more than ever; the proclamation, quite recently, of the independence of Bulgaria and particularly the annexation by Austria of Bosnia and Herzegovina have increased the peril of war and brought this peril nearer; and whereas, finally, the conspiracies of the governments, their intensified armaments, militarism and capitalist competition and plundering of the colonies everywhere constitute a threat to peace,

"The International Socialist Bureau confirms once more that the socialist party and the organised proletariat are the only force capable of preserving international peace, and that they consider it their duty to safeguard it.

"The Bureau calls upon the socialist parties of all countries, in accordance with the resolution of the Stuttgart International Congress, to strengthen their vigilance and their activity, bending every effort in the direction indicated, and requests the Central Committees and Executives of the parties, their parliamentary groups and their delegates to the Bureau to seek out, together with the Secretariat of the International Socialist Bureau, the means and practical measures, both national and international, which according to particular concrete circumstances could most serve to avert war and maintain peace."

The third item on the agenda was a proposal by the British section to hold regular meetings of the International Socialist Bureau twice yearly. No binding resolution was adopted on this question; only a desire was expressed in this sense. Evidently the vast majority do not consider it necessary to convene a meeting more frequently than once a year, as has been the case hitherto—except, of course, in emergencies.

The fourth item on the agenda was the proposal of the Bureau to alter the contributions made by each party for maintenance of the Bureau. Up till now the nominal income of the Bureau was 14,950 francs a year (about 6,000 rubles); it was proposed that this sum should be raised to 26,800 francs or, allowing for the usual arrears, 20,000 francs (8,000 rubles) in round figures. For this purpose each party would have to contribute 100 francs per annum for each vote it possesses at International Socialist Congresses. Russia has 20 votes, and consequently would have to pay 2,000 francs, made up of 700 francs by the Socialist-Revolutionaries, 1,000 by the Social-Democrats and 300 francs by the trade unions. Hitherto Russia has been paying 1,500 francs a year, of which we (by arrangement with the Socialist-Revolutionary Party) paid 900 francs. On this question, too, no binding resolution was adopted. The Bureau was instructed to contact the national parties, and a wish was expressed that contributions should amount to 100 francs yearly per vote.

The fifth item was the alteration in the number of votes for Sweden—they were raised to 12—and for Hungary—

where a general increase was postponed, but 2 votes were added for Croatia. An Armenian subsection of the Turkish section was also admitted, before the Turkish section itself had yet come into existence. The Armenian socialists in Turkey refused to "wait for" the Turks, and this subsection was given 4 votes. It would be desirable that our comrades, the Armenian Social-Democrats, who know the position of Armenian socialism in Turkey, should express their opinion on this question.

The sixth item on the agenda was on the admission of the Social-Democratic Party of Chile. This party was formed after a split in the Democratic Party of Chile. The Chilean Social-Democrats were admitted without any discussion.

The seventh item on the agenda was the question of the Zionist socialists in Russia.¹⁴ As is known, they approached the Central Committee of our Party before the Stuttgart Congress, asking to be admitted to the Social-Democratic subsection of the Russian section of the International. Our Central Committee refused, and adopted a resolution stating the reasons why *Zionists*, even though they called themselves "Zionist socialists", should not be included among Social-Democrats. A representative of the Z.S. came to Stuttgart, and in Stuttgart too our subsection refused to admit him, while the Socialist-Revolutionaries abstained. As the Rules allow new members of the International to be admitted only with the consent of the national sections (and if two national subsections are in disagreement a final decision is taken by the International Bureau), the Z.S. could not get into the Congress in the normal way. They appealed to the Bureau, which then adopted a compromise decision—to admit the representative of the Z.S. to the Congress with a *consultative* voice. Now we had to clear up the muddle which had been created. Were the Zionist socialists members of the International or not? Victor Adler declared, as at Stuttgart, strongly against the Z.S. and for a refusal to postpone discussion as they had requested (they had sent a telegram saying they could not attend). Non-appearance, said

Adler, was sometimes the best method of defence. I took the floor to recall once again the decision of our Central Committee, and to point out that to admit the Z.S. against the will of both Russian subsections would be an impossible infringement of the Rules of the International. Rubanovich and Zhitlovsky, the representative of the S.J.L.P. (the Socialist Jewish Labour Party,¹⁵ which the S.R.s at Stuttgart had admitted into their subsection) warmly spoke against the non-admission of the Z.S. Rubanovich *could not however* report any other resolution of the S.R. Party, beyond its *abstention* on this question, while Zhitlovsky (in face of the inevitable exclusion of the Z.S.) was obviously *defending himself*, asserting with comic vehemence that, if the Zionist socialists were territorialists, then they too—the S.J.L.P.—were territorialists. Naturally, it followed from this, not that the Z.S. ought to be admitted, but only that there was hardly anyone else in the International except the S.R.s who would agree to admit the S.J.L.P. either. Speaking a second time, I emphatically protested against Rubanovich's manoeuvre in trying to force the Zionists on *someone else's* subsection while at the same time not quoting any resolution of his own subsection in favour of the Zionists. In the upshot, the Bureau (with two abstentions, Rubanovich and Vaillant) un-animously adopted Adler's motion, which runs:

"The Bureau states that the admission of the Zionists (with a consultative voice) took place as an exception in relation to the sessions of the Stuttgart Congress, that the Zionists at present are not affiliated to the International Bureau, and proceeds to the next business."

The eighth and last item on the agenda was the confirmation, almost without discussion, of the special composition of the delegation of the French Socialists to the International Bureau. Guesde was appointed one of the delegates from France, while the second French vote in the Bureau was given to two delegates jointly, Vaillant and Jaurès.

The meeting ended with the unanimous adoption of a resolution of sympathy with the Turkish revolution, moved by the Belgian delegate de Brouckère:

"The International Socialist Bureau greets with joy the fall of the infamous regime which Abdul Hamid so long maintained in Turkey with the help of the powers, and welcomes the possibility now presented to the peoples of the Turkish Empire to work out their own destinies, and the introduction of a regime of political liberty which will allow the nascent proletariat to carry on its class struggle in close unity with the proletariat of the whole world."

On Monday October 12 a session of the inter-parliamentary conference was held. There were three items on the agenda: (1) The last parliamentary session, (2) Colonial reforms (report by van Kol), and (3) Socialist action for peace within the Inter-parliamentary Union (report by the Belgian deputy Lafontaine) followed by four questions: (a) Terms of payment for building workers (in the event of the bankruptcy of their employers), (b) Postal voting, (c) New lists of members of the parliamentary groups and their secretaries, (d) Dispatch of documents.

On the first item, the conference confined itself to confirming, on the proposal of Pernerstorfer, the decision of the Stuttgart Congress: secretaries of the parliamentary groups are invited to send *written reports* of the groups to the International Socialist Bureau. A brief exchange of opinion on the two last "questions" led to a similar reminder. On the first two "questions" materials and proposals put forward by some socialist M.P.s were briefly mentioned. Lafontaine's report was on his suggestion postponed. In this connection the Austrians and Germans said that they were against the participation of socialists in bourgeois parliamentary conferences for peace. The Swedish delegate Branting referred to the special conditions which, allegedly, explained the participation of the Swedish Social-Democrats in these conferences. On his motion, it was decided to put down the question of state insurance for the workers on the agenda of the next inter-parliamentary conference to be held at the same time as the next meeting of the Bureau.

The only subject on the agenda on which a short report was read, and on which there was a discussion of not inconsiderable interest, proved to be the question of colonial reforms. The Dutch delegate van Kol, who made himself famous by his opportunist resolution on the colonial question at Stuttgart, tried in his report by a somewhat different approach to drag in his favourite idea of a "positive" colonial programme for Social-Democracy. Setting aside completely the struggle of Social-Democrats against colonial policy, their agitation among the masses against colonial robbery, the awakening of a spirit of resistance and opposition among the oppressed masses in the colonies, van Kol concentrated all his attention on a list of possible "reforms" of life in the colonies within the present system. Like a benevolent official, he listed a variety of questions, beginning with property in land and ending with schools, encouragement of industry, prisons, etc., all the time underlining the necessity of being as practical as possible—for example, reckoning with the fact that universal suffrage is not always applicable to savages, that sometimes one cannot but agree with the necessity of introducing compulsory labour in the colonies instead of prisons, etc., etc. The whole report was saturated with a spirit, not of proletarian class struggle, but of the most petty-bourgeois—and even, worse, bureaucratic—peddling of "reforms". In conclusion he suggested that a committee be appointed from the five main countries possessing colonies to draw up a colonial programme for Social-Democracy.

Molkenbuhr on behalf of the Germans, and some Belgians, tentatively sought to follow van Kol, differing from him only on details—whether a single common programme was necessary, wouldn't this be stereotyping, and so forth. This approach to the question served van Kol's purpose, because the very thing he wanted was to reduce everything to "practical details", and to show that "in practice" the differences were smaller than it seemed at Stuttgart. But Kautsky and Ledebour discussed the question in principle, and attacked the

fundamental hypocrisy of van Kol's whole position. Van Kol declares, said Kautsky, that in particular cases universal suffrage is inapplicable; therefore, in one form or another he accepts despotism in the colonies, because he does not propose any other electoral system, nor can he do so. Van Kol conceives the possibility of compulsory labour, said Ledebour; therefore, he opens the door to bourgeois policy which uses thousands of different pretexts for preserving slavery in the colonies. Van Kol defended himself extremely stubbornly and extremely badly, asserting for example that sometimes you can't do without taxes in kind, that "he saw this himself in Java", that the Papuans don't know what voting means, that at the elections things are sometimes decided by pure superstition or by getting the voters drunk on rum, etc. Kautsky and Ledebour ridiculed these arguments, asserting that our common democratic programme is unquestionably applicable to the colonies as well, and that it is essential to bring to the fore the struggle against capitalism in the colonies too. Is the superstition of our "educated" Catholics any better than the superstitions of the savages, asked Ledebour. Even if parliamentary and representative institutions are not always applicable, said Kautsky, democracy is always applicable, and the struggle against every departure from democracy is always obligatory. The respective policies of revolutionary and opportunist Social-Democracy were brought out with complete clarity as a result of this discussion, and van Kol, seeing that his motion would undoubtedly receive "a first class funeral", himself withdrew it.

THE TASKS OF REVOLUTIONARY SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY IN THE EUROPEAN WAR¹⁶

The Russian Social-Democrats on the European war

Reports have reached us from most reliable sources, regarding a conference recently held by leaders of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, on the question of the European war. The conference was not of a wholly official nature, since the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. has as yet been unable to gather, as a result of the numerous arrests and unprecedented persecution by the tsarist government. We do, however, have precise information that the conference gave expression to views held by the most influential circles of the R.S.D.L.P.

The conference adopted the following resolution, whose full text we are quoting below as a document:

RESOLUTION OF A GROUP OF SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS

1. The European and world war has the clearly defined character of a bourgeois, imperialist and dynastic war. A struggle for markets and for freedom to loot foreign countries, a striving to suppress the revolutionary movement of the proletariat and democracy in the individual countries, a desire to deceive, disunite, and slaughter the proletarians of all countries by setting the wage slaves of one nation against those of another so as to benefit the bourgeoisie—these are the only real content and significance of the war.

2. The conduct of the leaders of the German Social-Democratic Party, the strongest and the most influential in the Second International (1889-1914), a party which has voted for war credits and repeated the bourgeois-chauvinist phrases of the Prussian Junkers and the bourgeoisie, is sheer betrayal of socialism.¹⁷ Under no circumstances can the conduct of the leaders of the German Social-Democratic Party be condoned, even if we assume that the party was absolutely weak and had temporarily to bow to the will of the bourgeois majority of the nation. This party has in fact adopted a national-liberal policy.

3. The conduct of the Belgian and French Social-Democratic party leaders, who have betrayed socialism by entering bourgeois governments,¹⁸ is just as reprehensible.

4. The betrayal of socialism by most leaders of the Second International (1889-1914) signifies the ideological and political bankruptcy of the International. This collapse has been mainly caused by the actual prevalence in it of petty-bourgeois opportunism, the bourgeois nature and the danger of which have long been indicated by the finest representatives of the revolutionary proletariat of all countries. The opportunists had long been preparing to wreck the Second International by denying the socialist revolution and substituting bourgeois reformism in its stead, by rejecting the class struggle with its inevitable conversion at certain moments into civil war, and by preaching class collaboration; by preaching bourgeois chauvinism under the guise of patriotism and the defence of the fatherland, and ignoring or rejecting the fundamental truth of socialism, long ago set forth in the *Communist Manifesto*, that the workingmen have no country; by confining themselves, in the struggle against militarism, to a sentimental philistine point of view, instead of recognising the need for a revolutionary war by the proletarians of all countries, against the bourgeoisie of all countries; by making a fetish of the necessary utilisation of bourgeois parliamentarianism and bourgeois legality, and forgetting that illegal forms of organisation and agitation are

imperative at times of crises. One of the organs of international opportunism, *Sozialistische Monatshefte*, which has long taken a national-liberal stand, is very properly celebrating its victory over European socialism. The so-called Centre of the German and other Social-Democratic parties has in actual fact faint-heartedly capitulated to the opportunists. It must be the task of the future International resolutely and irrevocably to rid itself of this bourgeois trend in socialism.

5. With reference to the bourgeois and chauvinist sophisms being used by the bourgeois parties and the governments of the two chief rival nations of the Continent—the German and the French—to fool the masses most effectively, and being copied by both the overt and covert socialist opportunists, who are slavishly following in the wake of the bourgeoisie, one must particularly note and brand the following:

When the German bourgeois refer to the defence of the fatherland and to the struggle against tsarism, and insist on the freedom of cultural and national development, they are lying, because it has always been the policy of Prussian Junkerdom, headed by Wilhelm II, and the big bourgeoisie of Germany, to defend the tsarist monarchy; whatever the outcome of the war, they are sure to try to bolster it. They are lying because, in actual fact, the Austrian bourgeoisie have launched a robber campaign against Serbia, and the German bourgeoisie are oppressing Danes, Poles, and Frenchmen (in Alsace-Lorraine); they are waging a war of aggression against Belgium and France so as to loot the richer and freer countries; they have organised an offensive at a moment which seemed best for the use of the latest improvements in military matériel, and on the eve of the introduction of the so-called big military programme in Russia.

Similarly, when the French bourgeois refer to the defence of the fatherland, etc., they are lying, because in actual fact they are defending countries that are backward in capitalist technology and are developing more slowly, and because they

spend thousands of millions to hire Russian tsarism's Black-Hundred gangs for a war of aggression, i.e., the looting of Austrian and German lands.

Neither of the two belligerent groups of nations is second to the other in cruelty and atrocities in warfare.

6. It is the first and foremost task of Russian Social-Democrats to wage a ruthless and all-out struggle against Great-Russian and tsarist-monarchist chauvinism, and against the sophisms used by the Russian liberals, Cadets, a section of the Narodniks,¹⁹ and other bourgeois parties, in defence of that chauvinism. From the viewpoint of the working class and the toiling masses of all the peoples of Russia, the defeat of the tsarist monarchy and its army, which oppress Poland, the Ukraine, and many other peoples of Russia, and foment hatred among the peoples so as to increase Great-Russian oppression of the other nationalities, and consolidate the reactionary and barbarous government of the tsar's monarchy, would be the lesser evil by far.

7. The following must now be the slogans of Social-Democracy:

First, all-embracing propaganda, involving the army and the theatre of hostilities as well, for the socialist revolution and the need to use weapons, not against their brothers, the wage slaves in other countries, but against the reactionary and bourgeois governments and parties of all countries; the urgent necessity of organising illegal nuclei and groups in the armies of all nations, to conduct such propaganda in all languages; a merciless struggle against the chauvinism and "patriotism" of the philistines and bourgeoisie of all countries without exception. In the struggle against the leaders of the present International, who have betrayed socialism, it is imperative to appeal to the revolutionary consciousness of the working masses, who bear the entire burden of the war and are in most cases hostile to opportunism and chauvinism.

Secondly, as an immediate slogan, propaganda for republics in Germany, Poland, Russia, and other countries, and

for the transforming of all the separate states of Europe into a republican United States of Europe.

Thirdly and particularly, a struggle against the tsarist monarchy and Great-Russian, Pan-Slavist chauvinism, and advocacy of a revolution in Russia, as well as of the liberation of and self-determination for nationalities oppressed by Russia, coupled with the immediate slogans of a democratic republic, the confiscation of the landed estates, and an eight-hour working day.

*A group of Social-Democrats,
members of the Russian
Social-Democratic Labour Party*

Written in August, 1914

*Collected Works, Vol. 21,
pp. 15-19*

THE WAR AND RUSSIAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY²⁰

The European war, which the governments and the bourgeois parties of all countries have been preparing for decades, has broken out. The growth of armaments, the extreme intensification of the struggle for markets in the latest—the imperialist—stage of capitalist development in the advanced countries, and the dynastic interests of the more backward East-European monarchies were inevitably bound to bring about this war, and have done so. Seizure of territory and subjugation of other nations, the ruining of competing nations, and the plunder of their wealth, distracting the attention of the working masses from the internal political crises in Russia, Germany, Britain and other countries, disuniting and nationalist stultification of the workers, and the extermination of their vanguard so as to weaken the revolutionary movement of the proletariat—these comprise the sole actual content, importance and significance of the present war.

It is primarily on Social-Democracy that the duty rests of revealing the true meaning of the war, and of ruthlessly exposing the falsehood, sophistry and "patriotic" phrase-mongering spread by the ruling classes, the landowners and the bourgeoisie, in defence of the war.

One group of belligerent nations is headed by the German bourgeoisie. It is hoodwinking the working class and the toiling masses by asserting that this is a war in defence of the fatherland, freedom and civilisation, for the liberation of the peoples oppressed by tsarism, and for the destruction

of reactionary tsarism. In actual fact, however, this bourgeoisie, which servilely grovels before the Prussian Junkers, headed by Wilhelm II, has always been a most faithful ally of tsarism, and an enemy of the revolutionary movement of Russia's workers and peasants. In fact, whatever the outcome of the war, this bourgeoisie will, together with the Junkers, exert every effort to support the tsarist monarchy against a revolution in Russia.

In fact, the German bourgeoisie has launched a robber campaign against Serbia, with the object of subjugating her and throttling the national revolution of the Southern Slavs, at the same time sending the bulk of its military forces against the freer countries, Belgium and France, so as to plunder richer competitors. In fact, the German bourgeoisie, which has been spreading the fable that it is waging a war of defence, chose the moment it thought most favourable for war, making use of its latest improvements in military matériel and forestalling the rearmament already planned and decided upon by Russia and France.

The other group of belligerent nations is headed by the British and the French bourgeoisie, who are hoodwinking the working class and the toiling masses by asserting that they are waging a war for the defence of their countries, for freedom and civilisation and against German militarism and despotism. In actual fact, this bourgeoisie has long been spending thousands of millions to hire the troops of Russian tsarism, the most reactionary and barbarous monarchy in Europe, and prepare them for an attack on Germany.

In fact, the struggle of the British and the French bourgeoisie is aimed at the seizure of the German colonies, and the ruining of a rival nation, whose economic development has been more rapid. In pursuit of this noble aim, the "advanced" "democratic" nations are helping the savage tsarist regime to still more throttle Poland, the Ukraine, etc., and more thoroughly crush the revolution in Russia.

Neither group of belligerents is inferior to the other in spoilation, atrocities and the boundless brutality of war;

however, to hoodwink the proletariat and distract its attention from the only genuine war of liberation, namely, a civil war against the bourgeoisie both of its "own" and of "foreign" countries—to achieve so lofty an aim—the bourgeoisie of each country is trying, with the help of false phrases about patriotism, to extol the significance of its "own" national war, asserting that it is out to defeat the enemy, not for plunder and the seizure of territory, but for the "liberation" of all other peoples except its own.

But the harder the governments and the bourgeoisie of all countries try to disunite the workers and pit them against one another, and the more savagely they enforce, for this lofty aim, martial law and the military censorship (measures which even now, in wartime, are applied against the "internal" foe more harshly than against the external), the more pressing is it the duty of the class-conscious proletariat to defend its class solidarity, its internationalism, and its socialist convictions against the unbridled chauvinism of the "patriotic" bourgeois cliques in all countries. If class-conscious workers were to give up this aim, this would mean renunciation of their aspirations for freedom and democracy, to say nothing of their socialist aspirations.

It is with a feeling of the most bitter disappointment that we have to record that the socialist parties of the leading European countries have failed to discharge this duty, the behaviour of these parties' leaders, particularly in Germany, bordering on downright betrayal of the cause of socialism. At this time of supreme and historic importance, most of the leaders of the present Socialist International, the Second (1889-1914), are trying to substitute nationalism for socialism. As a result of their behaviour, the workers' parties of these countries did not oppose the governments' criminal conduct, but called upon the working class to *identify* its position with that of the imperialist governments. The leaders of the International committed an act of treachery against socialism by voting for war credits, by reiterating the chauvinist ("patriotic") slogans of the bourgeoisie of their

"own" countries, by justifying and defending the war, by joining the bourgeois governments of the belligerent countries, and so on and so forth. The most influential socialist leaders and the most influential organs of the socialist press of present-day Europe hold views that are chauvinist, bourgeois and liberal, and in no way socialist. The responsibility for thus disgracing socialism falls primarily on the German Social-Democrats, who were the strongest and most influential party in the Second International. But neither can one justify the French socialists, who have accepted ministerial posts in the government of that very bourgeoisie which betrayed its country and allied itself with Bismarck so as to crush the Commune.

The German and the Austrian Social-Democrats are attempting to justify their support for the war by arguing that they are thereby fighting against Russian tsarism. We Russian Social-Democrats declare that we consider such justification sheer sophistry. In our country the revolutionary movement against tsarism has again assumed tremendous proportions during the past few years. This movement has always been headed by the working class of Russia. The political strikes of the last few years, which have involved millions of workers, have had as their slogan the overthrow of tsarism and the establishment of a democratic republic. During his visit to Nicholas II on the very eve of the war, Poincaré, President of the French Republic, could see for himself, in the streets of St. Petersburg, barricades put up by Russian workers. The Russian proletariat has not flinched from any sacrifice to rid humanity of the disgrace of the tsarist monarchy. We must, however, say that if there is anything that, under certain conditions, can delay the downfall of tsarism, anything that can help tsarism in its struggle against the whole of Russia's democracy, then that is the present war, which has placed the purses of the British, the French and the Russian bourgeois at the disposal of tsarism, to further the latter's reactionary aims. If there is anything that can hinder the revolutionary struggle of Russia's

working class against tsarism, then that is the behaviour of the German and the Austrian Social-Democratic leaders, which the chauvinist press of Russia is continually holding up to us as an example.

Even assuming that German Social-Democracy was so weak that it was compelled to refrain from all revolutionary action, it should not have joined the chauvinist camp, or taken steps which gave the Italian socialists reason to say that the German Social-Democratic leaders were dishonouring the banner of the proletarian International.

Our Party, the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party, has made, and will continue to make great sacrifices in connection with the war. The whole of our working-class legal press has been suppressed. Most working-class associations have been disbanded, and a large number of our comrades have been arrested and exiled. Yet our parliamentary representatives—the Russian Social-Democratic Labour group in the Duma—considered it their imperative socialist duty not to vote for the war credits, and even to walk out of the Duma, so as to express their protest the more energetically; they considered it their duty to brand the European governments' policy as imperialist.²¹ Though the tsar's government has increased its tyranny tenfold, the Social-Democratic workers of Russia are already publishing their first illegal manifestos against the war,²² thus doing their duty to democracy and to the International.

While the collapse of the Second International has given rise to a sense of burning shame in revolutionary Social-Democrats—as represented by the minority of German Social-Democrats and the finest Social-Democrats in the neutral countries; while socialists in both Britain and France have been speaking up against the chauvinism of most Social-Democratic parties; while the opportunists, as represented, for instance, by the German *Sozialistische Monatshefte*, which have long held a national-liberal stand, are with good reason celebrating their victory over European socialism—the worst possible service is being rendered to the

proletariat by those who vacillate between opportunism and revolutionary Social-Democracy (like the "Centre" in the German Social-Democratic Party), by those who are trying to hush up the collapse of the Second International or to disguise it with diplomatic phrases.

On the contrary, this collapse must be frankly recognised and its causes understood, so as to make it possible to build up a new and more lasting socialist unity of the workers of all countries.

The opportunists have wrecked the decisions of the Stuttgart, Copenhagen and Basle congresses,²³ which made it binding on socialists of all countries to combat chauvinism in all and any conditions, made it binding on socialists to reply to any war begun by the bourgeoisie and governments, with intensified propaganda of civil war and social revolution. The collapse of the Second International is the collapse of opportunism, which developed from the features of a now bygone (and so-called "peaceful") period of history, and in recent years has come practically to dominate the International. The opportunists have long been preparing the ground for this collapse by denying the socialist revolution and substituting bourgeois reformism in its stead; by rejecting the class struggle with its inevitable conversion at certain moments into civil war, and by preaching class collaboration; by preaching bourgeois chauvinism under the guise of patriotism and the defence of the fatherland, and ignoring or rejecting the fundamental truth of socialism, long ago set forth in the *Communist Manifesto*, that the workingmen have no country; by confining themselves, in the struggle against militarism, to a sentimental, philistine point of view, instead of recognising the need for a revolutionary war by the proletarians of all countries, against the bourgeoisie of all countries; by making a fetish of the necessary utilisation of bourgeois parliamentarianism and bourgeois legality, and forgetting that illegal forms of organisation and propaganda are imperative at times of crises. The natural "appendage" to opportunism—one that is just as bourgeois and hostile to

the proletarian, i.e., the Marxist, point of view—namely, the anarcho-syndicalist trend, has been marked by a no less shamefully smug reiteration of the slogans of chauvinism, during the present crisis.

The aims of socialism at the present time cannot be fulfilled, and real international unity of the workers cannot be achieved, without a decisive break with opportunism, and without explaining its inevitable fiasco to the masses.

It must be the primary task of Social-Democrats in every country to combat that country's chauvinism. In Russia this chauvinism has overcome the bourgeois liberals (the "Constitutional-Democrats"), and part of the Narodniks—down to the Socialist-Revolutionaries and the "Right" Social-Democrats. (In particular, the chauvinist utterances of E. Smirnov, P. Maslov and G. Plekhanov, for example, should be branded; they have been taken up and widely used by the bourgeois "patriotic" press.)

In the present situation, it is impossible to determine, from the standpoint of the international proletariat, the defeat of which of the two groups of belligerent nations would be the lesser evil for socialism. But to us Russian Social-Democrats there cannot be the slightest doubt that, from the standpoint of the working class and of the toiling masses of all the nations of Russia, the defeat of the tsarist monarchy, the most reactionary and barbarous of governments, which is oppressing the largest number of nations and the greatest mass of the population of Europe and Asia, would be the lesser evil.

The formation of a republican United States of Europe should be the immediate political slogan of Europe's Social-Democrats. In contrast with the bourgeoisie, which is ready to "promise" anything in order to draw the proletariat into the mainstream of chauvinism, the Social-Democrats will explain that this slogan is absolutely false and meaningless without the revolutionary overthrow of the German, the Austrian and the Russian monarchies.

Since Russia is most backward and has not yet completed its bourgeois revolution, it still remains the task of Social-

Democrats in that country to achieve the three fundamental conditions for consistent democratic reform, viz., a democratic republic (with complete equality and self-determination for all nations), confiscation of the landed estates, and an eight-hour working day. But in all the advanced countries the war has placed on the order of the day the slogan of socialist revolution, a slogan that is the more urgent, the more heavily the burden of war presses upon the shoulders of the proletariat, and the more active its future role must become in the re-creation of Europe, after the horrors of the present "patriotic" barbarism in conditions of the tremendous technological progress of large-scale capitalism. The bourgeoisie's use of wartime laws to gag the proletariat makes it imperative for the latter to create illegal forms of agitation and organisation. Let the opportunists "preserve" the legal organisations at the price of treachery to their convictions—revolutionary Social-Democrats will utilise the organisational experience and links of the working class so as to create illegal forms of struggle for socialism, forms appropriate to a period of crisis, and to unite the workers, not with the chauvinist bourgeoisie of their respective countries, but with the workers of all countries. The proletarian International has not gone under and will not go under. Notwithstanding all obstacles, the masses of the workers will create a new International. Opportunism's present triumph will be short-lived. The greater the sacrifices imposed by the war the clearer will it become to the mass of the workers that the opportunists have betrayed the workers' cause and that the weapons must be turned against the government and the bourgeoisie of each country.

The conversion of the present imperialist war into a civil war is the only correct proletarian slogan, one that follows from the experience of the Commune, and outlined in the Basle resolution (1912); it has been dictated by all the conditions of an imperialist war between highly developed bourgeois countries. However difficult that transformation may seem at any given moment, socialists will never relinquish

systematic, persistent and undeviating preparatory work in this direction now that war has become a fact.

It is only along this path that the proletariat will be able to shake off its dependence on the chauvinist bourgeoisie, and, in one form or another and more or less rapidly, take decisive steps towards genuine freedom for the nations and towards socialism.

Long live the international fraternity of the workers against the chauvinism and patriotism of the bourgeoisie of all countries!

Long live a proletarian International, freed from opportunism!

*Central Committee
of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party*

Written in September, 1914

*Collected Works, Vol. 21,
pp. 25-34*

LECTURE ON "THE PROLETARIAT AND THE WAR" DELIVERED OCTOBER 1 (14), 1914²⁴

Newspaper report

The speaker divided his lecture into two parts: clarifying the nature of the present war, and the attitude of socialists to the war.

For a Marxist clarifying the nature of the war is a necessary preliminary for deciding the question of his attitude to it. But for such a clarification it is essential, first and foremost, to establish the objective conditions and concrete circumstances of the war in question. It is necessary to consider the war in the historical environment in which it is taking place, only then can one determine one's attitude to it. Otherwise, the resulting interpretation will be not materialist but eclectic.

Depending on the historical circumstances, the relationship of classes, etc., the attitude to war must be different at different times. It is absurd once and for all to renounce participation in war in principle. On the other hand, it is also absurd to divide wars into defensive and aggressive. In 1848, Marx hated Russia, because at that time democracy in Germany could not win out and develop, or unite the country into a single national whole, so long as the reactionary hand of backward Russia hung heavy over her.

In order to clarify one's attitude to the present war, one must understand how it differs from previous wars, and what its peculiar features are.

Has the bourgeoisie given such an explanation? No. Far from having given one, it will not manage to give one in

any circumstances. Judging by what is going on among the socialists, one might think that they, too, have no idea of the distinctive features of the present war.

Yet, the socialists have given an excellent explanation of it, and have predicted it. More than that, there is not a single speech by a socialist deputy, not a single article by a socialist publicist, that does not contain that explanation. It is so simple that people somehow do not take notice of it, and yet it provides the key to the correct attitude to the present war.

The present war is an imperialist one, and that is its basic feature.

In order to clarify this, it is necessary to examine the nature of previous wars, and that of the imperialist war.

Lenin dwelt in considerable detail on the characteristics of wars at the end of the 18th and during the whole of the 19th centuries. They were all *national wars*, which accompanied and promoted the creation of national states.

These wars marked the destruction of feudalism, and were an expression of the struggle of the new, bourgeois society against feudal society. The national state was a necessary phase in the development of capitalism. The struggle for the self-determination of a nation, for its independence, for freedom to use its language, for popular representation, served this end—the creation of national states, that ground necessary at a certain stage of capitalism for the development of the productive forces.

Such was the character of wars from the time of the great French Revolution up to and including the Italian and Prussian wars.

This task of the national wars was performed either by democracy itself or with the help of Bismarck, quite independently of the will and the consciousness of those who took part in them. The triumph of present-day civilisation, the full flowering of capitalism, the drawing of the whole people and of all nations into capitalism—that was the outcome of national wars, the wars at the beginning of capitalism.

An imperialist war is quite a different matter. On this point, there was no disagreement among the socialists of all countries and all trends. At all congresses, in discussing resolutions on the attitude to a possible war, everyone was always agreed that this war would be an *imperialist one*. All European countries have already reached an equal stage in the development of capitalism, all of them have already yielded everything that capitalism can yield. Capitalism has already attained its highest form, and is no longer exporting commodities, but capital. It is beginning to find its national framework too small for it, and now the struggle is on for the last free scraps of the earth. If the national wars in the 18th and 19th centuries marked the beginning of capitalism, imperialist wars point to its end.

The whole end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century were filled with imperialist policy.

Imperialism is what impresses a quite specific stamp on the present war, distinguishing it from all the preceding wars.

Only by examining this war in its distinctive historical environment, as a Marxist must do, can we clarify our attitude to it. Otherwise we shall be operating with old conceptions and arguments, applied to a different, an old situation. Among such obsolete conceptions are the fatherland idea and the division, mentioned earlier, of wars into defensive and aggressive.

Of course, even now there are blotches of the old colour in the living picture of reality. Thus, of all the warring countries, the Serbs alone are still fighting for national existence. In India and China, too, class-conscious proletarians could not take any other path but the national one, because their countries have not yet been formed into national states. If China had to carry on an offensive war for this purpose, we could only sympathise with her, because objectively it would be a progressive war. In exactly the same way, Marx in 1848 could call for an offensive war against Russia.

And so the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th are characterised by imperialist policy.

Imperialism is that state of capitalism when, having done all that it could, it turns towards decline. It is a special epoch, not in the minds of socialists, but in actual relationships. A struggle is on for a division of the remaining portions. It is the last historical task of capitalism. We cannot say how long this epoch will last. There may well be several such wars, but there must be a clear understanding that these are quite different wars from those waged earlier, and that, accordingly, the tasks facing socialists have changed.

To tackle these new tasks the proletarian party may need organisations of a very different type.

Kautsky, in his pamphlet *Weg zur Macht*,* pointed out, in making a careful and detailed examination of economic phenomena and drawing very cautious conclusions from them, that we were entering a phase quite unlike the old peaceful and gradual development.

It is hard to say just now what the new form of organisation, corresponding to this phase, should be. But it is clear that in view of the new tasks, the proletariat will have to create new organisations or modify the old. All the more absurd is the fear of disarray in one's organisation, so vividly manifest among the German Social-Democrats; all the more absurd is this legalism at all costs. We know that the St. Petersburg Committee has issued an illegal leaflet against the war. The same has been done by the Caucasian and certain other organisations in Russia. There is no doubt that this could also be done abroad, without any rupture of ties.

Legality, of course, is a most valuable thing, and Engels had good reason to say: "Messrs. Bourgeois, you will have to be the first to break your legality!"²⁵ What is now going on might teach the German Social-Democrats a lesson, because a government which has always boasted of its legality is not

* *The Road to Power.*—Ed.

put out by now having violated it all along the line. In this respect, the brutal order of the Berlin Commandant, which he forced *Vorwärts* to run on its front page, may prove useful.²⁶ But *Vorwärts* itself, once it renounced the class struggle on pain of being closed down, and promised not to refer to it until the end of the war, has committed suicide. It is dead, as the Paris *Golos*, now the best socialist paper in Europe, has rightly said. The more frequently and the more violently I differed with Martov before, the more definitely I must say now that that writer is now doing precisely what a Social-Democrat should do. He is criticising his own government, he is unmasking his own bourgeoisie, he is accusing his own Ministers. Meanwhile, those socialists who have disarmed in relation to their own government, and devote themselves to exposing and shaming the Ministers and ruling classes of another country, play the part of bourgeois writers. Südekum himself is objectively playing the part of agent of the German Government, as others play it in relation to the French and Russian allies.

Socialists who fail to realise that the present war is imperialist, who fail to take a historical view of it, will understand nothing about the war. They are capable of taking a childishly naïve view of it, in this sense, that at night one seized the other by the throat, and the neighbours have to save the victim of attack, or in cowardly fashion to shut themselves away from the fight "behind locked doors" (in Plekhanov's words).

We shall not allow ourselves to be deceived, and let the bourgeois advisers explain the war as simply as that: people were living at peace, then one attacked, and the other is defending himself.

Comrade Lenin read an extract from an article by Luzzatti, carried by an Italian newspaper. In that article, the Italian politician rejoices that the great victor in the war turned out to be . . . the fatherland, the idea of fatherland, and repeats that we should remember the words of Cicero who said that "civil war is the greatest evil".

This is what the bourgeoisie have managed to achieve, this is what excites and delights them most, this is what they have spent vast sums and efforts on. They are trying to convince us that it is the same old, conventional, national war.

No, indeed. The era of national wars is past. This is an imperialist war, and the task of socialists is to turn the "national" war into a civil war.

We all expected this imperialist war, and prepared for it. And if this is so, it is not at all important who attacked first; all were preparing for the war, and the attacker was the one who thought it most advantageous to do so at the particular moment.

Comrade Lenin then went on to define the conception of "fatherland" from the socialist point of view.

This conception was clearly and precisely defined by the *Communist Manifesto*, in the brilliant pages whose truth has been fully tested and justified by experience. Lenin read an extract from the *Communist Manifesto*, where the conception of fatherland is regarded as a historical category, which corresponds to the development of society at a definite stage and which later becomes unnecessary. The proletariat cannot love what it has not got. The proletariat has no country.

What are the tasks of the socialists in the present war?

Comrade Lenin read the Stuttgart resolution, later confirmed and supplemented at Copenhagen and Basle. This resolution clearly states the socialists' methods of combating the trends leading to war and their duties in respect of a war that has broken out. These duties are defined by the examples of the Russian revolution and the Paris Commune. The Stuttgart resolution was carefully worded, in consideration of all kinds of criminal laws, but it indicated the task clearly. The Paris Commune is civil war. The form, the time and the place are a different matter, but the direction of our work is clearly defined.

From this angle, Comrade Lenin then examined the actual stand taken by socialists in the various countries. Apart from

the Serbs, the Russians have done their duty, as the Italian *Avanti!* notes, and Keir Hardie is doing it by exposing the policy of Edward Grey.

Once the war is on, it is impossible to escape it. One must go and do one's duty as a socialist. In a war, people think and ponder probably even more than "at home". One must go out and organise the proletariat there for the final aim, because it is utopian to imagine that the proletariat will tread a peaceful path to it. It is impossible to go over from capitalism to socialism without breaking up the national framework, just as it was impossible to pass from feudalism to capitalism without national ideas.

Golos Nos. 37 and 38,
October 25 and 27, 1914

Collected Works, Vol. 36,
pp. 297-302

**DRAFT DECLARATION OF THE C.C. R.S.D.L.P.
TO THE LONDON CONFERENCE
OF ENTENTE SOCIALISTS²⁷**

The undersigned representatives of the Social-Democratic organisations of Russia (Britain, etc.) express the conviction that

the present war, not only on the part of Germany and Austria-Hungary, but also on the part of Britain and France (acting in alliance with tsarism), is an imperialist war, i.e., a war belonging to the epoch of the last stage in the development of capitalism, an epoch in which bourgeois states have outlived their national boundaries; it is a war aimed solely at the seizure of colonies, the plunder of competitor countries and the weakening of the proletarian movement by inciting the proletarians of one country against those of another.

It is, therefore, the unqualified duty of the socialists of all the belligerent countries to secure an immediate and determined implementation of the Basle resolution, namely:

1) rupture of national blocs and *Burgfrieden** in all countries;

2) appeal to the workers of all the belligerent countries to wage a vigorous class struggle, both economic and political, against the bourgeoisie of their own countries who are making fabulous profits on war contracts and enjoying the support of the military authorities in gagging the workers' mouths and intensifying their oppression;

* Civil Peace.—Ed.

3) decisive condemnation of all voting for war credits;

4) relinquishing posts on the bourgeois ministries of Belgium and France and recognising the entry into ministries and voting war credits to be as much a betrayal of socialism as the behaviour of German and Austrian Social-Democrats;

5) joining hands immediately with the internationalist German Social-Democrats, who refuse to vote for war credits; forming an international committee for agitation in favour of ending the war, not in the spirit of the pacifists, Christians and petty-bourgeois democrats, but in direct connection with the propaganda and organisation of mass revolutionary action by the proletarians of every country against their own government and bourgeoisie;

6) encouragement of all attempts at rapprochement and fraternisation in the army and in the trenches between the socialists of the belligerent countries in defiance of the bans imposed by the military authorities of Britain, Germany and other countries;

7) calling on socialists among women of the belligerent countries to step up agitation on the lines indicated above;

8) calling on the proletariat throughout the world to support the struggle against tsarism and to support those Social-Democratic deputies in Russia who not only refused to vote for credits, but were not deterred by the threat of persecution and proceeded with their socialist work in the spirit of the international revolutionary Social-Democracy.

Written before January 27
(February 9), 1915

Published in English for
the first time

**From THE CONFERENCE
OF THE R.S.D.L.P. GROUPS ABROAD²⁸**

THE CONFERENCE'S RESOLUTIONS

The conference, which stands on the basis of the Central Committee's Manifesto, as published in No. 33,* lays down the following principles designed to bring system into propaganda:

ON THE CHARACTER OF THE WAR

The present war is imperialist in character. This war is the outcome of conditions in an epoch in which capitalism has reached the highest stage in its development; in which the greatest significance attaches, not only to the export of commodities, but also to the export of capital; an epoch in which the cartelisation of production and the internationalisation of economic life have assumed impressive proportions, colonial policies have brought about the almost complete partition of the globe, world capitalism's productive forces have outgrown the limited boundaries of national and state divisions, and the objective conditions are perfectly ripe for socialism to be achieved.

THE "DEFENCE OF THE FATHERLAND" SLOGAN

The present war is, in substance, a struggle between Britain, France and Germany for the partition of colonies and for the plunder of rival countries; on the part of tsarism and the ruling classes of Russia, it is an attempt to seize Persia, Mongolia, Turkey in Asia, Constantinople, Galicia, etc. The

* See pp. 69-77-Ed.

national element in the Austro-Serbian war is an entirely secondary consideration and does not affect the general imperialist character of the war.

The entire economic and diplomatic history of the last few decades shows that both groups of belligerent nations were systematically preparing the very kind of war such as the present. The question of which group dealt the first military blow or first declared war is immaterial in any determination of the tactics of socialists. Both sides' phrases on the defence of the fatherland, resistance to enemy invasion, a war of defence, etc., are nothing but deception of the people.

At the bottom of genuinely national wars, such as took place especially between 1789 and 1871, was a long process of mass national movements, of a struggle against absolutism and feudalism, the overthrow of national oppression, and the formation of states on a national basis, as a prerequisite of capitalist development.

The national ideology created by that epoch left a deep impress on the mass of the petty bourgeoisie and a section of the proletariat. This is now being utilised in a totally different and imperialist epoch by the sophists of the bourgeoisie, and by the traitors to socialism who are following in their wake, so as to split the workers, and divert them from their class aims and from the revolutionary struggle against the bourgeoisie.

The words in the *Communist Manifesto* that "the workingmen have no country" are today truer than ever before. Only the proletariat's international struggle against the bourgeoisie can preserve what it has won, and open to the oppressed masses the road to a better future.

THE SLOGANS OF THE REVOLUTIONARY SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS

"The conversion of the present imperialist war into a civil war is the only correct proletarian slogan, one that follows from the experience of the Commune, and outlined in the

Basle resolution (1912); it has been dictated by all the conditions of an imperialist war between highly developed bourgeois countries."*

Civil war, for which revolutionary Social-Democracy today calls, is an armed struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, for the expropriation of the capitalist class in the advanced capitalist countries, and for a democratic revolution in Russia (a democratic republic, an eight-hour working day, the confiscation of the landowners' estates), for a republic to be formed in the backward monarchist countries in general, etc.

The appalling misery of the masses, which has been created by the war, cannot fail to evoke revolutionary sentiments and movements. The civil war slogan must serve to co-ordinate and direct such sentiments and movements.

The organisation of the working class has been badly damaged. Nevertheless, a revolutionary crisis is maturing. After the war, the ruling classes of all countries will make a still greater effort to throw the proletariat's emancipation movement back for decades. The task of the revolutionary Social-Democrats—both in the event of a rapid revolutionary development and in that of a protracted crisis, will not consist in renouncing lengthy and day-by-day work, or in discarding any of the old methods of the class struggle. To direct both the parliamentary and the economic struggle against opportunism, in the spirit of revolutionary struggle of the masses—such will be the task.

The following should be indicated as the first steps towards converting the present imperialist war into a civil war: (1) an absolute refusal to vote for war credits, and resignation from bourgeois governments; (2) a complete break with the policy of a class truce (*bloc national*, *Burgfrieden*); (3) formation of an underground organisation wherever the governments and the bourgeoisie abolish constitutional liberties by introducing martial law; (4) support for fraternisation

* See p. 76.—Ed.

between soldiers of the belligerent nations, in the trenches and on battlefields in general; (5) support for every kind of revolutionary mass action by the proletariat in general.

OPPORTUNISM AND THE COLLAPSE OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL

The collapse of the Second International is the collapse of socialist opportunism. The latter has grown as a product of the preceding "peaceful" period in the development of the labour movement. That period taught the working class to utilise such important means of struggle as parliamentarism and all legal opportunities, create mass economic and political organisations, a widespread labour press, etc.; on the other hand, the period engendered a tendency to repudiate the class struggle and to preach a class truce, repudiate the socialist revolution, repudiate the very principle of illegal organisations, recognise bourgeois patriotism, etc. Certain strata of the working class (the bureaucracy of the labour movement and the labour aristocracy, who get a fraction of the profits from the exploitation of the colonies and from the privileged position of their "fatherlands" in the world market), as well as petty-bourgeois sympathisers within the socialist parties, have proved the social mainstay of these tendencies, and channels of bourgeois influence over the proletariat.

The baneful influence of opportunism has made itself felt most strongly in the policies of most of the official Social-Democratic parties of the Second International during the war. Voting for war credits, participation in governments, the policy of a class truce, the repudiation of an illegal organisation when legality has been rescinded—all this is a violation of the International's most important decisions, and a downright betrayal of socialism.

THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL

The war-created crisis has exposed the real essence of opportunism as the bourgeoisie's accomplice against the proletariat. The so-called Social-Democratic "Centre", headed by Kautsky, has in practice completely slid into opportunism, behind a cover of exceedingly harmful and hypocritical phrases and a Marxism falsified to resemble imperialism. Experience shows that in Germany, for instance, a defence of the socialist standpoint has been possible only by resolute opposition to the will of the majority of the Party leadership. It would be a harmful illusion to hope that a genuinely socialist International can be restored without a full organisational severance from the opportunists.

The Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party must support all and every international and revolutionary mass action by the proletariat, and strive to bring together all anti-chauvinist elements in the International.

PACIFISM AND THE PEACE SLOGAN

Pacifism, the preaching of peace in the abstract, is one of the means of duping the working class. Under capitalism, particularly in its imperialist stage, wars are inevitable. On the other hand, however, Social-Democrats cannot overlook the positive significance of revolutionary wars, i.e., not imperialist wars, but such as were fought, for instance, between 1789 and 1871, with the aim of doing away with national oppression, and creating national capitalist states out of the feudal decentralised states, or such wars that may be waged to defend the conquests of the proletariat victorious in its struggle against the bourgeoisie.

At the present time, the propaganda of peace unaccompanied by a call for revolutionary mass action can only sow illusions and demoralise the proletariat, for it makes the proletariat believe that the bourgeoisie is humane, and turns it into a plaything in the hands of the secret diplomacy of

the belligerent countries. In particular, the idea of a so-called democratic peace being possible without a series of revolutions is profoundly erroneous.

THE DEFEAT OF THE TSARIST MONARCHY

In each country the struggle against a government that is waging an imperialist war should not falter at the possibility of that country's defeat as a result of revolutionary propaganda. The defeat of the government's army weakens the government, promotes the liberation of the nationalities it oppresses, and facilitates civil war against the ruling classes.

This holds particularly true in respect of Russia. A victory for Russia will bring in its train a strengthening of reaction, both throughout the world and within the country, and will be accompanied by the complete enslavement of the peoples living in areas already seized. In view of this, we consider the defeat of Russia the lesser evil in all conditions.

Written in February 1915

Collected Works, Vol. 21,
pp. 158-63

WHAT HAS BEEN REVEALED BY THE TRIAL OF THE RUSSIAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC LABOUR DUMA GROUP²⁹

The trial, by the tsar's court, of five members of the R.S.D.L. Duma group and six other Social-Democrats seized on November 4, 1914 at a conference near Petrograd has ended. They have all been sentenced to life exile in Siberia. The censor has deleted from accounts of the trial published in the legal press all the passages that may be unpleasant to tsarism and the patriots. The "internal enemies" have been rapidly dealt with and again nothing is to be seen or heard on the surface of public life except the savage howling of a pack of bourgeois chauvinists, echoed by some handfuls of social-chauvinists.

What, then, has the trial of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour group proved?

First of all, it has shown that this advance contingent of revolutionary Social-Democracy in Russia failed to display sufficient firmness at the trial. It was the aim of the accused to prevent the State Prosecutor from finding out the names of the members of the Central Committee in Russia and of the Party's representatives in its contacts with workers' organisations. That aim has been achieved. To continue achieving that aim in the future, we must resort to a method long recommended officially by the Party, i.e., refuse to give evidence. However, to attempt to prove one's solidarity with the social-patriot Mr. Yordansky, as Rosenfeld did, or one's disagree-

ment with the Central Committee, is a wrong method, one that is inexcusable from the standpoint of a revolutionary Social-Democrat.

We shall note that, according to a *Dyen*³⁰ report (No. 40) —there is no official or complete record of the trial—Comrade Petrovsky stated: "In the same period [November] I received the Central Committee resolution . . . and besides I was given resolutions adopted by workers in seven various places concerning their attitude towards the war, resolutions *coinciding with the Central Committee's attitude.*"

This declaration does Petrovsky credit. The tide of chauvinism was running high on all sides. In Petrovsky's diary there is an entry to the effect that *even* the radical-minded Chkheidze spoke with enthusiasm of a war for "liberty". This chauvinism was resisted by the R.S.D.L. group deputies when they were free, but it was also their duty, at the trial, to draw a line of distinction between themselves and chauvinism.

The Cadet *Rech*³¹ had servilely "thanked" the tsar's court for "dispelling the legend" that the Social-Democratic deputies wanted the defeat of the tsar's armies. Taking advantage of the fact that in Russia the Social-Democrats are tied hand and foot in their activities, the Cadets are pretending to take seriously the so-called "conflict" between the Party and the Duma group, and declare that the accused gave their evidence without the least compulsion. What innocent babes! They pretend ignorance of the threat of a court-martial and the death sentence that hung over the deputies in the early stage of the trial.

The comrades should have refused to give evidence concerning the illegal organisation, and, in view of the historic importance of the moment, they should have taken advantage of a public trial to openly set forth the Social-Democratic views, which are hostile, not only to tsarism in general, but also to social-chauvinism of all and every shade.

Let the government and bourgeois press wrathfully attack the R.S.D.L. group; let the Social-Revolutionaries, liquidators and social-chauvinists (who must fight us somehow, if

they cannot fight us on the issue of principles!) with gleeful malice "discover" signs of weakness or of fictitious "disagreement with the Central Committee". The Party of the revolutionary proletariat is strong enough to openly criticise itself, and unequivocally call mistakes and weaknesses by their proper names. The class-conscious workers of Russia have created a party and have placed in the forefront an advance contingent which, during a world war and the world-wide collapse of international opportunism have revealed more than anyone else the ability to perform their duty as internationalist revolutionary Social-Democrats. The road we have been travelling has been tested by the greatest of all crises, and has proved, over and over again, the only correct road. We shall follow it still more firmly and resolutely; we shall throw out fresh advance contingents, and shall see to it that they not only carry out the same work, but carry it through more correctly.

Secondly, the trial has revealed a picture without precedent in world socialism—that of *revolutionary* Social-Democracy making use of parliamentarism. More than any speeches, this example will appeal to the minds and hearts of the proletarian masses; more convincingly than any arguments, it will refute the legalist opportunists and anarchist phrase-mongers. The report on Muranov's illegal work and Petrovsky's notes will long remain a model of *that* kind of work carried out by our deputies, which we have had diligently to conceal, and the meaning of which will give all class-conscious workers in Russia more and more food for thought. At a time when nearly all "socialist" (forgive the debasement of the word!) deputies in Europe have proved chauvinists and servants of chauvinists, when the famous "Europeanism" that once charmed our liberals and liquidators has proved an obtuse habitude of slavish legality, there was to be found in Russia a workers' party whose deputies excelled, not in high-flown speech, or being "received" in bourgeois, intellectualist salons, or in the business acumen of the "European" lawyer and parliamentarian, but in ties

with the working masses, in dedicated work among those masses, in carrying on modest, unpretentious, arduous, thankless and highly dangerous duties of illegal propagandists and organisers. To climb higher, towards the rank of a deputy or minister influential in "society", such has been the *actual* meaning of "European" (i.e., servile) "socialist" parliamentarism. To go into the midst of the masses, to help enlighten and unite the exploited and the oppressed—such is the slogan advanced by the examples set by Muranov and Petrovsky.

This slogan will acquire historic significance. In no country in the world will a single thinking worker agree to confine himself to the old legality of bourgeois parliamentarism, when that legality has been abolished with a stroke of the pen in all the advanced countries, and has led to merely a closer actual alliance between the opportunists and the bourgeoisie. Whoever dreams of "unity" between revolutionary Social-Democratic workers and the "European" Social-Democratic legalists of yesterday, and *of today*, has learned nothing and forgotten everything, and is in fact an ally of the bourgeoisie and an enemy of the proletariat. Whoever has to this day failed to realise why the R.S.D.L. group broke away from the Social-Democratic group that was making its peace with legalism and opportunism can now learn a lesson from the activities of Muranov and Petrovsky as described in the report on the trial. It was *not only* by these two deputies that this work was conducted, and only hopelessly naïve people can dream of a compatibility between such work and a "friendly and tolerant attitude" towards *Nasha Zarya* or *Severnaya Rabochaya Gazeta*, towards *Sovremennik*, the Organising Committee, or the Bund.

Do the government hope to intimidate the workers by sending the members of the R.S.D.L. group to Siberia? They will find themselves mistaken. The workers will not be intimidated, but will the better understand their aims, those of a workers' party as distinct from the liquidators and the social-chauvinists. The workers will learn to elect to the Duma

only men such as the members of the R.S.D.L. group, for similar and ever more extensive work, such that will be conducted among the masses with still more *secrecy*. Do the government intend to do away with "illegal parliamentarism" in Russia? They will merely consolidate the links between the proletariat *exclusively* with that kind of parliamentarism.

Thirdly, and most important, the court proceedings against the R.S.D.L. group have, for the first time, produced open and objective material, disseminated all over Russia in millions of copies, concerning the most fundamental, the most significant and most vital question of the attitude of the *various classes* in Russian society towards the war. Have we not had enough of nauseating intellectualist jabber about the compatibility between "defence of the fatherland" and internationalism "in principle" (i.e., purely verbal and hypocritical internationalism)? Has not the time come to examine the *facts* that bear upon *classes*, i.e., millions of living people, not some dozens of phrase-mongers?

Over half a year has passed since the outbreak of war. The press, both legal and illegal, and expressing all trends, has had its say; all the party groups in the Duma have defined their stands—a highly insufficient index of our class groupings, but the only objective one. The trial of the R.S.D.L. group and the press comment on it have summed up all this material. The trial has shown that the finest representatives of the proletariat in Russia are not only hostile to chauvinism in general but, in particular, share the stand of our Central Organ. The deputies were arrested on November 4, 1914. Consequently, they had been conducting their work for over two months. How and with whom did they carry it on? Which currents in the working class did they reflect and express? The answer is found in the fact that the "theses" and *Sotsial-Demokrat* provided the material for the conference, and that, on several occasions, the Petrograd Committee of our Party issued leaflets of the same nature. There was no other material at the conference. The deputies had

no intention of reporting to the conference on other currents in the working class, because no other currents existed.

Perhaps the members of the R.S.D.L. group were expressing the opinion of a mere minority of the workers? We have no grounds to suppose so, since, in the two and a half years, between the spring of 1912 and the autumn of 1914, four-fifths of the class-conscious workers of Russia rallied around *Pravda*, with which these deputies were working in complete ideological solidarity. That is a fact. Had there been a more or less appreciable protest among the workers against the Central Committee's stand, that protest would have surely found expression in the resolutions proposed. Nothing of the kind emerged at the trial, though the latter, it might be said, did "reveal" much of the work done by the R.S.D.L. group. The corrections made in Petrovsky's handwriting do not reveal even the slightest hint at any difference of opinion.

The facts show that, in the very first months after the outbreak of the war, the class-conscious vanguard of the workers of Russia rallied, *in deed*, about the Central Committee and the Central Organ. However unpleasant this fact may be to certain "groups", it is undeniable. Thanks to the trial, the words cited in the indictment: "The guns should be directed, not against our brothers, the wage slaves of other countries, but against the reactionary and bourgeois governments and parties of all countries"—these words will spread—and have already done so—all over Russia as a call for proletarian internationalism, for the proletarian revolution. Thanks to the trial, the class slogan of the vanguard of the workers of Russia has reached the masses.

An epidemic of chauvinism among the bourgeoisie and a certain section of the petty bourgeoisie, vacillation in the other section of the latter, and a working-class call of this nature—such is the actual and objective picture of our political divisions. It is to this actual situation, not to the pious wishes of intellectuals and founders of grouplets, that one must gear one's "prospects", hopes and slogans.

The Pravdist papers and the "Muranov type" of work have brought about the unity of four-fifths of the class-conscious workers of Russia. About forty thousand workers have been buying *Pravda*; far more read it. Even if war, prison, Siberia, and hard labour should destroy five or even ten times as many—this section of the workers *cannot* be annihilated. It is alive. It is imbued with the revolutionary spirit, is anti-chauvinist. It *alone* stands in the midst of the masses, with deep roots in the latter, as the champion of the internationalism of the toilers, the exploited, and the oppressed. It *alone* has held its ground in the general *débâcle*. It alone is leading the semi-proletarian elements *away* from the social-chauvinism of the Cadets, the Trudoviks, Plekhanov and *Nasha Zarya*, and *towards* socialism. Its existence, its ideas, its work, and its call for the "brotherhood of wage slaves of other countries" have been revealed to the whole of Russia by the trial of the R.S.D.L. group.

It is with this section that we must work, and its unity must be defended against social-chauvinists. That is the only road along which the working-class movement of Russia can develop towards social revolution, and not towards national-liberalism of the "European" type.

Sotsial-Demokrat No. 40,
March 29, 1915

Collected Works, Vol. 21,
pp. 171-77

THE SLOGAN OF CIVIL WAR ILLUSTRATED

On January 8 (New Style), Swiss papers received the following message from Berlin:

"Of late the press has repeatedly carried reports of peaceable attempts made by men in the German and French trenches to enter into friendly relations. According to *Tägliche Rundschau*³² an army order dated December 29 bans any fraternisation and any kind of intercourse with the enemy in the trenches. Disregard of this order is punishable as high treason."

Thus, fraternisation and attempts to enter into friendly relations with the enemy are a fact. The German military authorities are showing concern over the matter, which means that they attach considerable importance to it. The British *Labour Leader* of January 7, 1915, published a series of quotations from the British bourgeois press on instances of fraternisation between British and German soldiers, who arranged a "forty-eight-hour truce" at Christmas, met amicably in no-man's land, and so on. The British military authorities issued a *special order forbidding* fraternisation. And yet, with the utmost complacency and the comfortable feeling that the military censorship will protect them against any denials, the socialist opportunists and their vindicators (or lackeys?) have assured the workers, through the press (as Kautsky has done), that *no* understanding on anti-war action by the socialists of the belligerent countries is possible (the expression literally used by Kautsky in *Die Neue Zeit*)!³³

Try to imagine Hyndman, Guesde, Vandervelde, Plekhanov, Kautsky and the rest—instead of aiding the bourgeoisie (something they are now engaged in)—forming an international committee to agitate for “fraternisation and attempts to establish friendly relations” between the socialists of the belligerent countries, both in the “trenches” and among the troops in general. What would the results be several months from now, if today, only six months after the outbreak of the war and *despite* all the political bosses, leaders and luminaries who have betrayed socialism, opposition is mounting on all sides against those who have voted for war credits and those who have accepted ministerial posts, and the military authorities are threatening that “fraternisation” carries the death sentence?

“There is only one practical issue—victory or defeat for one’s country”, Kautsky, lackey of the opportunists, has written, in concord with Guesde, Plekhanov and Co. Indeed, if one were to forget socialism and the class struggle, that would be the truth. However, if one does not lose sight of socialism, that is untrue. Then there is another *practical* issue: should we perish as blind and helpless slaves in a war between slave-holders, or should we fall in “attempts at fraternisation” between the slaves, with the aim of casting off slavery?

Such, *in reality*, is the “practical” issue.

ON THE STRUGGLE AGAINST SOCIAL-CHAUVINISM

The most interesting and most recent material for this topical problem has been provided by the International Conference of Socialist Women, which adjourned recently in Berne.³⁴ The readers will find below an account of the Conference and the texts of two resolutions—the one adopted and the one rejected. In the present article we would like to discuss only one aspect of the question.

Representatives of the women's organisations attached to the Organising Committee; women members of Troelstra's party in Holland; women from the Swiss organisations that are hostile to *Berner Tagwacht* for its allegedly excessive Leftist leanings; the French representative, who is unwilling to disagree on any important point with the official party, which is known to adhere to the social-chauvinist point of view; the women of Britain, who are hostile to the idea of a clear line of division between pacifism and revolutionary proletarian tactics—all these agreed with the "Left" German Social-Democrat women on one resolution. The representatives of women's organisations connected with our Party's Central Committee disagreed with them, preferring to remain in isolation for the time being rather than join a bloc of *this* kind.

What is the gist of this disagreement? What principles and general political significance are involved in this conflict?

At first glance, the middle-of-the-road resolution, which has united the opportunists and part of the Left wing looks very fitting and correct in principle. The war has been declared an imperialist one, the "defence of the fatherland"

idea has been condemned, the workers have been called upon to hold mass demonstrations, etc., etc. It might seem that our resolution was different *only* in the use of several sharper *expressions* such as "betrayal", "opportunism", "withdrawal from bourgeois governments", etc.

It is undoubtedly from this standpoint that criticism will be levelled against the withdrawal of the representatives of the women's organisations connected with our Party's Central Committee.

However, if we give the matter more attention, without confining ourselves to a purely "formal" recognition of one truth or another, we will realise that such criticism is quite groundless.

Two world-outlooks, two appraisals of the war and the tasks of the International, two tactics of the proletarian parties clashed at the Conference. One view holds that there has been no collapse of the International; no deep and grave obstacles to a return from chauvinism to socialism; no strong "internal enemy" in the shape of opportunism; no direct and obvious betrayal of socialism by opportunism. The conclusion to be drawn might be worded as follows: let us condemn nobody; let us "amnesty" those who have violated the Stuttgart and the Basle resolutions; let us merely advise that the course followed should be more to the left and that the masses be called upon to hold demonstrations.

The other view is diametrically opposed to the former on each of the points enumerated above. Nothing is more harmful or more disastrous to the proletarian cause than a continuation of inner-Party *diplomacy* towards the opportunists and social-chauvinists. The majority resolution proved acceptable to the opportunist delegates and to the adherents of the present-day official parties just because it is imbued with the spirit of diplomacy. Such diplomacy is being used to throw dust in the eyes of the working masses, which *at present* are led by the official social-patriots. An absolutely erroneous and harmful idea is being inculcated upon the working masses, the idea that the present-day Social-Democratic

parties, with their present Executives, *are capable of* changing their course from an erroneous to a correct one.

That is not the case. It is a most egregious and pernicious illusion. The present-day Social-Democratic parties and their Executives are *incapable* of seriously changing their course. *In practice* everything will remain as before; the "Left" wishes expressed in the majority resolution will remain innocent wishes; an unerring political instinct suggested this to the adherents of Troelstra's party and of the present Executive of the French party, when they voted for such a resolution. It is only when it is most actively supported by the present Executives of the Social-Democratic parties that appeal for mass demonstrations can acquire a serious and practical significance.

Can one expect such support? Obviously not. It is common knowledge that such an appeal will meet, not with support, but with stubborn (and mostly *covert*) resistance from the Executives.

If the workers were told this in a straightforward way, they would know the *truth*; they would know that to give *effect* to "Left" wishes, a radical change is necessary in the line of the Social-Democratic parties; a most stubborn struggle is necessary against the opportunists with their "Centrist" friends. As it is, the workers have been *lulled* by "Left" wishes, while the Conference *refused* to call by name, loudly and clearly, the evil which must be combated if those wishes are to be realised.

The diplomatic leaders, who are at present conducting a chauvinist policy within the Social-Democratic parties, will make excellent use of the weakness, the indecision and the insufficient clarity of the majority resolution. Astute parliamentarians that they are, they will distribute the roles among themselves; some of them will say that the "serious" arguments of Kautsky and Co. were not appreciated or analysed, and that therefore they must be discussed in a wider gathering; others will say, "Were we not right when we said that no deep-seated differences existed, if the women ad-

herents of the Troelstra and Guesde-Sembar parties were able to agree with the Left-wing German women?"

The Women's Conference should not have aided Scheidemann, Haase, Kautsky, Vandervelde, Hyndman, Guesde, Sembar, Plekhanov and others to blunt the vigilance of the working masses. On the contrary, it should have tried to rouse them and declared a decisive war against opportunism. Only in that case would the result have been, not a hope that the "leaders" named above would "reform", but a mustering of forces for an arduous and bitter struggle.

Consider the way the opportunists and the "Centrists" violated the Stuttgart and Basle resolutions. That is the *crux* of the matter. Try to visualise, clearly and without diplomacy, what has actually taken place.

Foreseeing war, the International convenes and unanimously decides, should war break out, to work "to hasten the downfall of capitalism"; to work in the spirit of the *Commune, of October and December 1905* (the exact words of the Basle resolution!); to work in a spirit that will consider it a "crime" if "the workers of one country shoot at the workers of another country".

A line of action in an internationalist, proletarian, and revolutionary spirit is indicated here with perfect clarity, a clarity that cannot be improved within the limits of legality.

Then war broke out—the very kind of war and exactly along the lines foreseen at Basle. The official parties acted in an absolutely contrary spirit: not like internationalists but like nationalists; not in a proletarian but in a bourgeois way; not in a revolutionary direction but in the direction of ultra-opportunism. If we say to the workers that this was downright *treachery* to the socialist cause, we thereby reject all evasions and subterfuges, all sophisms *à la* Kautsky and Axelrod. We clearly indicate the extent and the power of the evil; we clearly call for a struggle against that evil, not for conciliation with it.

What about the majority resolution? It does not contain a word of censure for the traitors, or a single word about op-

portunism, but merely a simple *repetition* of the ideas expressed in the Basle resolution! One might think that nothing serious has happened, that an accidental and minor error has been made which calls merely for a *repetition* of the old decision, or that a disagreement has arisen which is inconsequent and not of principle, and can be *papered over*!

This is downright *mockery* of the International's decisions, mockery of the workers. As a matter of fact, the social-chauvinists wish nothing else but a simple *repetition* of the old decisions, if only nothing changes in practice. This is, in fact, a tacit and hypocritically disguised *amnesty* for the social-chauvinist adherents of most of the present parties. We know that there are many who would follow this path and confine themselves to several Left phrases. However, their road is not for us. We have followed a *different* road, and will go on following it; we want to help the working-class movement and the *actual* construction of a working-class party, in the spirit of irreconcilability towards opportunism and social-chauvinism.

Part of the German women delegates seem to have been afraid of a very clear resolution, for reasons relating only to the *tempo* of the development of the struggle against chauvinism within a single party, namely, their own. Such reasoning was obviously out of place and erroneous, since the international resolution did not and could not deal with either the speed or the concrete conditions of the struggle against social-chauvinism within the *individual* countries; in this respect, the autonomy of the various parties is beyond dispute. The proclamation was needed, from an international tribune, of an irrevocable break with social-chauvinism in the entire direction and character of Social-Democratic work. Instead of that, the majority resolution once more reiterated the old error, that of the Second International, which diplomatically veiled opportunism and the gap between word and deed. We repeat: *this* is a road we shall not take.

DRAFT RESOLUTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST WOMEN'S CONFERENCE

Resolution Motioned by the C.C. Delegation

The current world war, which is the cause of so much distress wherever it has broken out, which has devastated and ruined Belgium and Galicia, and which has ruined the lives of thousands upon thousands of workers—this war is an imperialist one, caused by the struggle between the ruling classes of various countries for a division of the colonies and domination of the world market, and by dynastic interests. It is a natural continuation of the policy conducted by the class of capitalists and the governments of all countries, and that is why the question of who struck out first is altogether irrelevant from the socialist standpoint.

This war, far from serving any interests of the workers, is in fact a weapon in the hands of the ruling classes for disrupting the international solidarity of the workers and weakening their movement and class struggle in each country. Similarly, the "defend your country" watchword, put forward by the bourgeoisie and supported by the opportunists, is nothing but a bait to which the bourgeoisie hopes the proletariat will rise and be induced to give their life and blood for its interests.

In view of all this, the Extraordinary International Socialist Women's Conference, on the strength of the Stuttgart resolution, which recommends the use of the economic and political crisis, brought about by the war, for rousing the people to accelerate the collapse of the capitalist system, on

the strength of the Copenhagen resolution, which says that it is the duty of deputies to vote against war credits, and of the Basle resolution, which says that the workers consider it a crime to shoot down each other—declares that the representatives of most of the socialist parties of the belligerent countries acted in complete discord with these resolutions and, succumbing to the pressure of circumstances, committed a real betrayal in respect to socialism, supplanting it with nationalism; it insists that the proletarians of all countries have no enemy other than their class enemy—the class of capitalists.

The horrible suffering caused by this war awakens in all women, especially proletarian women, a growing desire for peace. Declaring *war on all imperialist war*, the conference at the same time believes that if this desire for peace is to be transformed into a *conscious political force, working women must well realise that the propertied classes are striving for nothing but annexations, conquest and domination, that in the epoch of imperialism wars are inevitable, and that imperialism threatens the world with a series of wars, unless the proletariat musters enough strength to put an end to the capitalist system by the final overthrow of capitalism.* Every working woman who wants to shorten the period of suffering connected with the epoch of imperialist wars, must strive to have her urge for peace develop into *indignation and struggle for socialism. The working woman will attain her aim in this struggle only through a revolutionary mass movement, and a strengthening and sharpening of the socialist struggle.* Consequently, her first duty is to support the trade union and socialist organisations and break the civil peace by fighting against the war credits, against entry into bourgeois ministries, by supporting and spreading the idea of soldiers' fraternisation in the trenches on the field of battle, by setting up illegal organisations wherever the government has abolished the constitutional freedoms, and finally, by drawing the mass into manifestations and revolutionary movements.

The International Socialist Women's Conference calls on the working women of all countries to start this struggle right away, organising it on an international scale, and closely tying in their work with that of the socialists of all countries who, like Liebknecht, are fighting against nationalism and waging a revolutionary socialist struggle.

At the same time, the conference gives working women a reminder that in the most advanced countries of Europe the objective conditions for socialist production are already there, that the whole movement is entering a new phase, that the current world war imposes fresh and serious duties upon them, and that their movement may be the forerunner of a general mass action which could give fresh scope to the whole socialist movement and advance the hour of final emancipation. By taking the initiative in staging demonstrations and revolutionary manifestations, working women, marching hand in hand with the proletarians, could usher in a new era of proletarian struggle in the course of which the proletariat will win socialism in the more advanced countries, and a democratic republic in the more backward ones.

Supplement to *Sotsial-Demokrat*
No. 42, June 1, 1915

Collected Works, Vol. 41,
pp. 346-48

From THE COLLAPSE OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL

I

Is it a fact that the principal socialist parties of Europe have forsaken all their convictions and tasks? This, of course, is something that is readily discussed neither by the traitors nor by those who are fully aware—or surmise—that they will have to be friendly and tolerant towards them. However unpleasant that may be to various “authorities” in the Second International or to their fellow-thinkers among the Russian Social-Democrats, we must face the facts and call things by their right names; we must tell the workers the truth.

Do any facts exist that show how the socialist parties regarded their tasks and their tactics before the present war and in anticipation of it? They undoubtedly do. There was the resolution adopted at the Basle International Socialist Congress of 1912, which we are reprinting together with the resolution adopted at the Chemnitz Congress of the German Social-Democratic Party held in the same year,³⁵ as a reminder of socialism’s forgotten ideals. This resolution, which summarises the vast anti-war propagandist and agitational literature in all countries, is a most complete and precise, a most solemn and formal exposition of socialist views on war and tactics towards war. One cannot but qualify as treachery the fact that none of the authorities of yesterday’s International and of today’s social-chauvinism—neither Hyndman and Guesde, nor Kautsky and Plekhanov—dare remind their readers of that resolution. They are either silent about it, or

(like Kautsky) quote excerpts of secondary importance and evade everything that is really of significance. On the one hand, the most "Left" and arch-revolutionary resolutions, and on the other, the most shameless forgetfulness or renunciation of these resolutions—this is one of the most striking manifestations of the International's collapse, and at the same time a most convincing proof that at present only those whose rare simplicity borders on a cunning desire to perpetuate the former hypocrisy can believe that socialism can be "rectified" and "its line straightened out" by means of resolutions alone.

Only yesterday, one might say, when, before the war, Hyndman turned towards a defence of imperialism, all "respectable" socialists considered him an unbalanced crank, of whom nobody spoke otherwise than in a tone of disdain. Today the most prominent Social-Democratic leaders of all countries have sunk entirely to Hyndman's position, differing from one another only in shades of opinion and in temperament. We are quite unable to find some more or less suitable parliamentary expression in appraising or characterising the civic courage of such persons as, for instance, the *Nashe Slovo*³⁶ authors, who write of "Mr." Hyndman with contempt, while speaking—or saying nothing—of "Comrade" Kautsky with deference (or obsequiousness?). Can such an attitude be reconciled with a respect for socialism, and for one's convictions in general? If you are convinced that Hyndman's chauvinism is false and destructive, does it not follow that you should direct your criticism and attacks against Kautsky, the *more influential* and more dangerous defender of such views?

In perhaps greater detail than anywhere else, Guesde's views have recently been expressed by the Guesdist Charles Dumas, in a pamphlet entitled *The Peace That We Desire*. This "Chef du Cabinet de Jules Guesde", as he styles himself on the title-page of the pamphlet, naturally "quotes" the former patriotic declarations of the socialists (David, the German social-chauvinist, does the same in his latest pam-

phlet on defence of the fatherland³⁷), but he fails to refer to the Basle Manifesto! Plekhanov, who utters chauvinist banalities with an extraordinarily smug air, is likewise silent on the Manifesto. Kautsky behaves just like Plekhanov: in quoting from the Basle Manifesto, he *omits* all the revolutionary passages (i.e., all the vital content!), probably on the pretext of the censorship regulations. . . . The police and the military authorities, whose censorship regulations forbid any mention of the class struggle or revolution, have rendered timely aid to the traitors to socialism!

Perhaps the Basle Manifesto is just an empty appeal, which is devoid of any definite content, either historical or tactical, with a direct bearing on the concrete war of today?

The reverse is true. The Basle resolution has less idle declamation and more definite content than other resolutions have. The Basle resolution speaks of the *very same* war that has now broken out, of the *imperialist* conflicts that have flared up in 1914-15. The conflicts between Austria and Serbia over the Balkans, between Austria and Italy over Albania, etc., between Britain and Germany over markets and colonies in general, between Russia and Turkey, etc., over Armenia and Constantinople—all this is what the Basle resolution speaks of in anticipation of the present war. It follows from that resolution that the *present* war between "the Great Powers of Europe" "*cannot be justified on the slightest pretext of being in the least in the interests of the people*".

And if Plekhanov and Kautsky—to take two of the most typical and authoritative socialists, who are well known to us, one of whom writes in Russian while the other is translated into Russian by the liquidators—are now (with the aid of Axelrod) seeking all sorts of "popular justifications" for the war (or, rather, vulgar ones taken from the bourgeois gutter press); if, with a learned mien and with a stock of false quotations from Marx, they refer to "precedents", to the wars of 1813 and 1870 (Plekhanov), or of 1854-71, 1876-77, 1897 (Kautsky), then, in truth, only those without a shad-

ow of socialist conviction, without a shred of socialist conscience, can take such arguments in earnest, can *fail* to call them otherwise than unparalleled Jesuitism, hypocrisy and the prostitution of socialism! Let the Executive (*Vorstand*) of the German Party anathematise Mehring and Rosa Luxemburg's new magazine (*Die Internationale*) for its honest criticism of Kautsky; let Vandervelde, Plekhanov, Hyndman and Co. treat their opponents in the same manner, with the aid of the police of the Allied Powers. We shall reply by simply reprinting the Basle Manifesto, which will show that the leaders have chosen a course that can only be called treachery.

The Basle resolution does not speak of a national or a people's war—examples of which have occurred in Europe, wars that were even typical of the period of 1789-1871—or of a revolutionary war, which Social-Democrats have never renounced, but of the *present* war, which is the outcome of "capitalist imperialism" and "dynastic interests", the outcome of "the policy of conquest" pursued by *both* groups of belligerent powers—the Austro-German and the Anglo-Franco-Russian. Plekhanov, Kautsky and Co. are flagrantly deceiving the workers by repeating the selfish lie of the bourgeoisie of all countries, which is striving with all its might to depict this imperialist and predatory war for colonies as a people's war, a war of defence (for any side); when they seek to justify this war by citing historical examples of *non-imperialist* wars.

The question as to the imperialist, predatory and anti-proletarian character of the present war has long outgrown the purely theoretical stage. Imperialism, all its main features considered, has been theoretically assessed as a struggle waged by the senile and moribund bourgeoisie for the partition of the world and the enslavement of "small" nations; these conclusions have been repeated thousands of times in the vast socialist press in *all* countries; in his pamphlet *The Impending War (1911!)*, for example, the Frenchman Delaisi, a representative of one of our "Allied" nations, has

explained in simple terms the predatory character of the present war, with reference to the French bourgeoisie as well. But that is far from all. At Basle, representatives of the proletarian parties of all countries gave unanimous and formal expression to their unshakable conviction that a war of an imperialist character was impending, and drew *tactical* conclusions therefrom. For this reason, among others, we must flatly reject, as sophistry, all references to an inadequate discussion on the difference between national and international tactics (see Axelrod's latest interview in *Nashe Slovo* Nos. 87 and 90), etc., etc. This is sophistry, because a comprehensive scientific analysis of imperialism is one thing—that analysis is only under way and, in essence, is as infinite as science itself. The principles of socialist tactics against capitalist imperialism, which have been set forth in millions of copies of Social-Democratic newspapers and in the decision of the International, are a quite different thing. Socialist parties are not debating clubs, but organisations of the fighting proletariat; when a number of battalions have gone over to the enemy, they must be named and branded as traitors; we must not allow ourselves to be taken in by hypocritical assertions that "not everybody" understands imperialism "in the same way", or that the chauvinist Kautsky and the chauvinist Cunow can write volumes about it, or that the question has not been "adequately discussed", etc., etc. Capitalism will *never* be completely and *exhaustively* studied in *all* the manifestations of its predatory nature, and in all the most minute ramifications of its historical development and national features. Scholars (and especially the pedants) will never stop arguing over details. It would be ridiculous to give up the socialist struggle against capitalism and to desist from opposing, on such grounds, those who have betrayed that struggle. But what else are Kautsky, Cunow, Axelrod and their like inviting us to do?

Now, when war has broken out, no one has even attempted to examine the Basle resolution and prove that it is erroneous.

II

But perhaps sincere socialists supported the Basle resolution in the anticipation that war would create a revolutionary situation, the events rebutting them, as revolution has proved impossible?

It is by means of sophistry like this that Cunow (in a pamphlet *Collapse of the Party?* and a series of articles) has tried to justify his desertion to the camp of the bourgeoisie. The writings of nearly all the other social-chauvinists, headed by Kautsky, hint at similar "arguments". Hopes for a revolution have proved illusory, and it is not the business of a Marxist to fight for illusions, Cunow argues. This Struvist, however, does not say a word about "illusions" that were shared by all signatories to the Basle Manifesto. Like a most upright man, he would put the blame on the extreme Leftists, such as Pannekoek and Radek!

Let us consider the substance of the argument that the authors of the Basle Manifesto sincerely expected the advent of a revolution, but were rebutted by the events. The Basle Manifesto says: (1) that war will create an economic and political crisis; (2) that the workers will regard their participation in war as a crime, and as criminal any "shooting each other down for the profit of the capitalists, for the sake of dynastic honour and of diplomatic secret treaties", and that war evokes "indignation and revolt" in the workers; (3) that it is the duty of socialists to take advantage of this crisis and of the workers' temper so as to "rouse the people and hasten the downfall of capitalism"; (4) that all "governments" without exception can start a war only at "their own peril"; (5) that governments "are afraid of a proletarian revolution"; (6) that governments "should remember" the Paris Commune (i.e., civil war), the 1905 Revolution in Russia, etc. All these are perfectly clear ideas; they do not *guarantee* that revolution will take place, but lay stress on a precise characterisation of *facts* and *trends*. Whoever declares, with regard to these ideas and arguments, that the anticipated re-

volution has proved illusory, is displaying not a Marxist but a Struivist and police-renegade attitude towards revolution.

To the Marxist it is indisputable that a revolution is impossible without a revolutionary situation; furthermore, it is not every revolutionary situation that leads to revolution. What, generally speaking, are the symptoms of a revolutionary situation? We shall certainly not be mistaken if we indicate the following three major symptoms: (1) when it is impossible for the ruling classes to maintain their rule without any change; when there is a crisis, in one form or another, among the "upper classes", a crisis in the policy of the ruling class, leading to a fissure through which the discontent and indignation of the oppressed classes burst forth. For a revolution to take place, it is usually insufficient for "the lower classes not to want" to live in the old way; it is also necessary that "the upper classes should be unable" to live in the old way; (2) when the suffering and want of the oppressed classes have grown more acute than usual; (3) when, as a consequence of the above causes, there is a considerable increase in the activity of the masses, who uncomplainingly allow themselves to be robbed in "peace time", but, in turbulent times, are drawn both by all the circumstances of the crisis *and by the "upper classes" themselves* into independent historical action.

Without these objective changes, which are independent of the will, not only of individual groups and parties but even of individual classes, a revolution, as a general rule, is impossible. The totality of all these objective changes is called a revolutionary situation. Such a situation existed in 1905 in Russia, and in all revolutionary periods in the West; it also existed in Germany in the sixties of the last century, and in Russia in 1859-61 and 1879-80, although no revolution occurred in these instances. Why was that? It was because it is not every revolutionary situation that gives rise to a revolution; revolution arises only out of a situation in which the above-mentioned objective changes are accom-

panied by a subjective change, namely, the ability of the revolutionary *class* to take revolutionary mass action *strong* enough to break (or dislocate) the old government, which never, not even in a period of crisis, "falls", if it is not toppled over.

Such are the Marxist views on revolution, views that have been developed many, many times, have been accepted as indisputable by all Marxists, and for us, Russians, were corroborated in a particularly striking fashion by the experience of 1905. What, then, did the Basle Manifesto assume in this respect in 1912, and what took place in 1914-15?

It assumed that a revolutionary situation, which it briefly described as "an economic and political crisis", would arise. Has such a situation arisen? Undoubtedly, it has. The social-chauvinist Lensch, who defends chauvinism more candidly, publicly and honestly than the hypocrites Cunow, Kautsky, Plekhanov and Co. do, has gone so far as to say: "What we are passing through is a kind of *revolution*" (p. 6 of his pamphlet, *German Social-Democracy and the War*, Berlin, 1915). A political crisis exists; no government is sure of the morrow, not one is secure against the danger of financial collapse, loss of territory, expulsion from its country (in the way the Belgian Government was expelled). All governments are sleeping on a volcano; all are *themselves* calling for the masses to display initiative and heroism. The entire political regime of Europe has been shaken, and hardly anybody will deny that we have entered (and are entering ever deeper—I write this on the day of Italy's declaration of war) a period of immense political upheavals. When, two months after the declaration of war, Kautsky wrote (October 2, 1914, in *Die Neue Zeit*) that "never is government so strong, never are parties so weak as at the outbreak of a war", this was a sample of the falsification of historical science which Kautsky has perpetrated to please the Südekums and other opportunists. In the first place, never do governments stand in such need of agreement with all the parties of the ruling

classes, or of the "peaceful" submission of the oppressed classes to that rule, as in the time of war. Secondly, even though "at the beginning of a war", and especially in a country that expects a speedy victory, the government *seems* all-powerful, nobody in the world has ever linked expectations of a revolutionary situation exclusively with the "beginning" of a war, and still less has anybody ever identified the "seeming" with the *actual*.

It was generally known, seen and admitted that a European war would be more severe than any war in the past. This is being borne out in ever greater measure by the experience of the war. The conflagration is spreading; the political foundations of Europe are being shaken more and more; the sufferings of the masses are appalling, the efforts of governments, the bourgeoisie and the opportunists to hush up these sufferings proving ever more futile. The war profits being obtained by certain groups of capitalists are monstrously high, and contradictions are growing extremely acute. The smouldering indignation of the masses, the vague yearning of society's downtrodden and ignorant strata for a kindly ("democratic") peace, the beginning of discontent among the "lower classes"—all these are facts. The longer the war drags on and the more acute it becomes, the more the governments themselves foster—and must foster—the activity of the masses, whom they call upon to make extraordinary effort and self-sacrifice. The experience of the war, like the experience of any crisis in history, of any great calamity and any sudden turn in human life, stuns and breaks some people, *but enlightens and tempers others*. Taken by and large, and considering the history of the world as a whole, the number and strength of the second kind of people have—with the exception of individual cases of the decline and fall of one state or another—proved greater than those of the former kind.

Far from "immediately" ending all these sufferings and all this enhancement of contradictions, the conclusion of peace will, in many respects, make those sufferings more

keenly and immediately felt by the most backward masses of the population.

In a word, a revolutionary situation obtains in most of the advanced countries and the Great Powers of Europe. In this respect, the prediction of the Basle Manifesto has been *fully* confirmed. To deny this truth, directly or indirectly, or to ignore it, as Cunow, Plekhanov, Kautsky and Co. have done, means telling a big lie, deceiving the working class, and serving the bourgeoisie. In *Sotsial-Demokrat* (Nos. 34, 40 and 41)* we cited facts which prove that those who *fear* revolution—petty-bourgeois Christian parsons, the General Staffs and millionaires' newspapers—are compelled to admit that symptoms of a revolutionary situation exist in Europe.

Will this situation last long? How much more acute will it become? Will it lead to revolution? This is something we do not know, and nobody can know. The answer can be provided only by the *experience* gained during the development of revolutionary sentiment and the transition to revolutionary action by the advanced class, the proletariat. There can be no talk in this connection about "illusions" or their repudiation, since no socialist has ever guaranteed that this war (and not the next one), that today's revolutionary situation (and not tomorrow's) will produce a revolution. What we are discussing is the indisputable and fundamental duty of all socialists—that of revealing to the masses the existence of a revolutionary situation, explaining its scope and depth, arousing the proletariat's revolutionary consciousness and revolutionary determination, helping it to go over to revolutionary action, and forming, for that purpose, organisations suited to the revolutionary situation.

No influential or responsible socialist has ever dared to feel doubt that this is the duty of the socialist parties. With-

* See V. I. Lenin, "A German Voice on the War", "The Slogan of Civil War Illustrated", "Bourgeois Philanthropists and Revolutionary Social-Democracy" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 21, pp. 92-93, 181-82 and 192-93).—Ed.

out spreading or harbouring the least "illusions", the Basle Manifesto spoke specifically of this duty of the socialists—to rouse and to stir up the people (and not to lull them with chauvinism, as Plekhanov, Axelrod and Kautsky have done), to take advantage of the crisis so as to *hasten* the downfall of capitalism, and to be guided by the *examples* of the Commune and of October-December 1905. The present parties' failure to perform that duty means their treachery, political death, renunciation of their own role and desertion to the side of the bourgeoisie.

Written in the second half
of May and the first half
of June 1915

Collected Works, Vol. 21,
pp. 205-17

THE MAIN GERMAN OPPORTUNIST WORK ON THE WAR

Eduard David's book *Die Sozialdemokratie im Weltkrieg* (Vorwärts Publishers, Berlin, 1915) provides a good collection of facts and arguments on the tactics pursued by the official German Social-Democratic Party in the present war. Those who follow opportunist literature and that of the German Social-Democrats in general will find nothing new in this book. It is, however, quite useful, and not only for purposes of reference. Anyone who would gain a deeper insight into the historic collapse of German Social-Democracy, anyone who really wishes to understand the reasons why a leading Social-Democratic party has "suddenly" (allegedly all of a sudden) become a party of lackeys of the German bourgeoisie and the Junkers, anyone who wishes to inquire into the meaning of the commonplace sophisms which serve to justify or conceal that collapse, will find David's dull book far from tedious. As a matter of fact, there is an integral quality in David's opinions; he has the conviction of a liberal-labour politician, something that is entirely missing in the works of Kautsky, for instance, that hypocrite who trims his sails to the wind.

David is an opportunist through and through, a contributor of long standing to *Sozialistische Monatshefte*—the German counterpart of *Nashe Dyelo*, he is the author of a big volume on the agrarian question, which contains not even a grain of socialism or Marxism.³⁸ The very fact that a person like this, whose entire life has been devoted to corrupting the working-class movement in the bourgeois spirit, has become one of many just as opportunist party leaders, a deputy, and even a member of the Executive (*Vorstand*) of the German Social-Democratic parliamentary party, is a

serious enough indication of the extent, depth and violence of the process of putrefaction within the German Social-Democracy.

David's book is of no scientific value whatever, since the author cannot or will not even pose the question of how the principal classes of present-day society have for decades been preparing, encouraging and building up their present attitude towards the war, this through *definite* politics that stem from *definite* class interests. Even the thought that, without an examination like the one just mentioned, no Marxist attitude towards the war can exist, and that only an examination such as this can provide the basis for a study of the *ideology* of the various classes in their attitude towards the war, is entirely alien to David. He is an *advocate* of a liberal-labour policy, who adapts all his exposition and all his arguments to the task influencing *working-class* audiences, concealing from them the weak points in his stand, making liberal tactics acceptable to them, and stifling proletarian revolutionary instincts with the aid of the greatest possible number of authoritative examples from "The Socialists' Tactics in the West-European States" (Chapter 7 in David's book), etc., etc.

From the ideological standpoint David's book is therefore interesting only inasmuch as it provides an opportunity to analyse how the bourgeoisie *should* speak to the workers *in order to influence them*. The essence of Eduard David's ideological stand, considered from this angle, the only correct one, is contained in the following proposition: "The significance of our vote (for war credits) = *We voted, not for war but against defeat*" (p. 3, table of contents, and many passages in the book). This is the theme of the entire book. To back this main thesis, David has hand-picked examples of the way Marx, Engels and Lassalle regarded Germany's national wars (Chapter 2), data on the Triple Entente's vast plans of conquest (Chapter 4), as well as facts from the diplomatic history of the war (Chapter 5), the latter being nothing more than an attempt to whitewash Germany by

referring to the ridiculously trivial and no less ridiculously insincere official exchange of telegrams on the eve of the war, etc. A special chapter (6) entitled "The Magnitude of the Danger" contains considerations and figures on the Triple Entente's preponderance of might, the reactionary nature of tsarism, etc. Of course, David is fully in favour of *peace*. The preface to the book, dated May 1, 1915, winds up with the slogan, "Peace on Earth!" David, of course, considers himself an internationalist: the German Social-Democratic Party, he says, "has not betrayed the spirit of the International" (p. 8); it has "fought against the sowing of poisonous hatred among the peoples" (p. 8); it "has declared since the very first day of the war that in principle it is ready for peace as soon as the security of the country has been achieved" (p. 8).

David's book strikingly reveals that, to influence the workers and the masses in general, the liberal bourgeoisie (and their agents in the labour movement, i.e., the opportunists) are prepared to swear allegiance to internationalism any number of times, accept the peace slogan, renounce the annexationist aims of the war, condemn chauvinism, and so on and so forth—anything *except* revolutionary action against their own government, anything in the world, if only they can come out "against defeat". In point of fact, this ideology, in terms of mathematics, is both *necessary and sufficient* to fool the workers. One cannot offer them less because the masses cannot be rallied unless they are promised a just peace, and scared with the danger of invasion, and unless allegiance to internationalism is sworn to; one *need not* offer them more because all that is "more", i.e., the seizure of colonies, the annexation of foreign territories, the pillaging of conquered countries, the conclusion of advantageous trade agreements, etc., will be effected, *not* directly by the liberal bourgeoisie, but by the imperialist-militarist governmental war clique *after* the war.

The roles are well distributed; while the government and the military clique—with the support of the multi-million-

aires and all bourgeois "men of affairs"—are waging the war, the liberals console and dupe the masses with the nationalist ideology of a defensive war, with promises of a democratic peace, etc. Eduard David's ideology is that of the liberal and humanitarian pacifist bourgeois; so is the ideology of the Russian opportunists in the Organising Committee, who are waging a struggle against the desirability of defeat, against the disintegration of Russia, for the peace slogan, etc.

A non-liberal brand of tactics, one that differs in principle from the above, begins with the onset of a decisive break with *any* attempts to justify participation in the war, with the *practical* conduct of a policy of propaganda and preparation for revolutionary action, in wartime and with the full exploitation of wartime difficulties, against the respective governments. David does *approach* this borderline, the real line between bourgeois and proletarian politics, but he approaches it only with the purpose of glossing over an unpleasant subject. He mentions the Basle Manifesto several times, but he carefully steers clear of all its revolutionary passages; he recalls how Vaillant appealed in Basle "for a military strike and social revolution" (p. 119), but does so only to *defend* himself by using the example of the chauvinist Vaillant, not in order to cite and analyse the revolutionary directives of the resolution of the Basle Congress.

David quotes a considerable portion of our Central Committee's Manifesto, including its main slogan—the conversion of the imperialist war into a civil war—but he does it only to declare that these "Russian" tactics are nothing short of "madness" and "gross distortion of the decisions of the International" (pp. 169, 172). This, he says, is Hervéism (p. 176); Hervé's book, he says "contains the whole theory of Lenin, Luxemburg, Radek, Pannekoek, etc." But, my dear David, is not there some Hervéism in the revolutionary passages of the Basle resolution and the *Communist Manifesto*? The mention of the latter document is just as unpleasant to David as the name of our journal, which is reminiscent of

that very document, is unpleasant to Semkovsky. The thesis of the *Communist Manifesto* to the effect that "the workmen have no country" has, as David is convinced, "long been disproved" (p. 176 ff.). As to the question of nationalities, the entire concluding chapter of David's book offers us the most unmitigated bourgeois nonsense about the "biological law of differentiation" (!), etc.

What is international is not at all anti-national; we stand for the right of nations to self-assertion; we are against the browbeating of weak nations. David asserts, failing to understand (or rather pretending not to understand) that justifying participation in the imperialist war and advancing the "against-defeat" slogan in this war means acting, not only as an anti-socialist, but also as an anti-national politician. For the present-day imperialist war is a war between Great Powers (i.e., powers that oppress a number of other nations), conducted *for the purpose* of oppressing new nations. One cannot be "national" in an imperialist war otherwise than by being a socialist politician, i.e., by recognising the right of oppressed nations to liberation, to secession from the Great Powers that oppress them. In the era of imperialism, there can be no other *salvation* for *most* of the world's nations than through revolutionary action undertaken by the proletariat of the Great Powers, spreading beyond the boundaries of nationality, smashing those boundaries, and overthrowing the international bourgeoisie. Until the bourgeoisie is overthrown, there will remain nations known as "Great Powers", i.e., the oppression will remain of nine-tenths of the nations of the whole world. The overthrow of the bourgeoisie will enormously accelerate the downfall of national *partitions* of every kind, this without decreasing but, on the contrary, increasing a millionfold the "differentiation" of humanity, in the meaning of the wealth and the variety in spiritual life, ideological trends, tendencies, and shades.

Written in June-July 1915

Collected Works, Vol. 21,
pp. 270-74

From THE DEFEAT OF ONE'S OWN GOVERNMENT IN THE IMPERIALIST WAR

A revolution in wartime means civil war; the *conversion* of a war between governments into a civil war is, on the one hand, facilitated by military reverses ("defeats") of governments; on the other hand, one *cannot* actually strive for such a conversion without thereby facilitating defeat.

The reason why the chauvinists (including the Organising Committee and the Chkheidze group) repudiate the defeat "slogan" is that *this slogan alone* implies a consistent call for revolutionary action against one's own government in wartime. Without such action, millions of ultra-revolutionary phrases such as a war against "the war and the conditions, etc." are not worth a brass farthing.

Anyone who would in all earnest refute the "slogan" of defeat for one's own government in the imperialist war should prove one of three things: (1) that the war of 1914-15 is not reactionary, or (2) that a revolution stemming from that war is impossible, or (3) that co-ordination and mutual aid are possible between revolutionary movements in *all* the belligerent countries. The third point is particularly important to Russia, a most backward country, where an immediate socialist revolution is impossible. That is why the Russian Social-Democrats had to be the first to advance the "theory and practice" of the defeat "slogan". The tsarist government was perfectly right in asserting that the agitation conducted by the Russian Social-Democratic Labour group in the Duma—the *sole* instance in the International, not only

of parliamentary opposition but of genuine revolutionary anti-government agitation among the masses—that this agitation has weakened Russia's "military might" and is likely to lead to its defeat. This is a fact to which it is foolish to close one's eyes.

The opponents of the defeat slogan are simply afraid of themselves when they refuse to recognise the very obvious fact of the inseparable link between revolutionary agitation against the government and helping bring about its defeat.

Are co-ordination and mutual aid possible between the Russian movement, which is revolutionary in the bourgeois-democratic sense, and the socialist movement in the West? No socialist who has publicly spoken on the matter during the last decade has doubted this, the movement among the Austrian proletariat after October 17, 1905,³⁹ *actually* proving it possible.

Ask any Social-Democrat who calls himself an internationalist whether or not he approves of an understanding between the Social-Democrats of the various belligerent countries on joint revolutionary action against all belligerent governments. Many of them will reply that it is impossible, as Kautsky has done (*Die Neue Zeit*, October 2, 1914), thereby *fully proving* his social-chauvinism. This, on the one hand, is a deliberate and vicious lie, which clashes with the generally known facts and the Basle Manifesto. On the other hand, if it were true, *the opportunists would be quite right in many respects!*

Many will voice their approval of such an understanding. To this we shall say: if this approval is not hypocritical, it is ridiculous to think that, in wartime and for the conduct of a war, some "formal" understanding is necessary, such as the election of representatives, the arrangement of a meeting, the signing of an agreement, and the choice of the day and hour! Only the Semkovskys are capable of thinking so. An understanding on revolutionary action even in a *single* country, to say nothing of a number of countries, can be achieved *only* by the force of the *example* of serious revolu-

tionary action, by *launching* such action and *developing* it. However, such action cannot be launched without desiring the defeat of the government, and without contributing to such a defeat. The conversion of the imperialist war into a civil war cannot be "made", any more than a revolution can be "made". It *develops* out of a number of diverse phenomena, aspects, features, characteristics and consequences of the imperialist war. That development is *impossible* without a series of military reverses and defeats of governments that receive blows from their *own* oppressed classes.

To repudiate the defeat slogan means allowing one's revolutionary ardour to degenerate into an empty phrase, or sheer hypocrisy.

Sotsial-Demokrat No. 43,
July 26, 1915

Collected Works, Vol. 21,
pp. 276-78

THE QUESTION OF PEACE

The question of peace as an immediate programme of action for the socialists, and in this connection the question of peace terms, presents a universal interest. One can only be grateful to *Berner Tagwacht* for its efforts to pose the question, not from the usual petty-bourgeois national angle, but from one that is genuinely proletarian and internationalist. The editorial note in No. 73 ("*Friedenssehnsucht*"), that the German Social-Democrats who wish for peace must break (*sich lossagen*) with the policies of the Junker government, was excellent. Also excellent was Comrade A.P.'s attack (Nos. 73 and 75) on the "pompous airs of impotent phrasemongers" (*Wichtigtuerei machtloser Schönredner*), who are vainly attempting to solve the peace question from the petty-bourgeois point of view.

Let us see how this question should be posed by socialists.

The peace slogan can be advanced either in connection with definite peace terms, or without any conditions at all, as a struggle, not for a definite kind of peace, but for peace in general (*Frieden ohne weiters*). In the latter case, we obviously have a slogan that is not only non-socialist but entirely devoid of meaning and content. Most people are definitely in favour of peace in general, including even Kitchener, Joffre, Hindenburg, and Nicholas the Bloodstained, for *each* of them wants an end to the war. The trouble is that every one of them advances peace terms that are imperialist (i.e., predatory and oppressive, towards other peoples),

and to the advantage of his "own" nation. Slogans must be brought forward so as to enable the masses, through propaganda and agitation, to see the unbridgeable distinction between socialism and capitalism (imperialism), and *not* for the purpose of *reconciling* two hostile classes and two hostile political lines, with the aid of a formula that "unites" the most different things.

To continue: can the socialists of different countries be united on definite *terms* of peace? If so, such terms must undoubtedly include the recognition of the right to self-determination for all nations, and also renunciation of all "annexations", i.e., infringements of that right. If, however, that right is recognised only for *some* nations, then you are defending the *privileges* of certain nations, i.e., you are a nationalist and imperialist, not a socialist. If, however, that right is recognised for *all* nations, then you cannot single out Belgium alone, for instance; you must take *all* the oppressed peoples, both in Europe (the Irish in Britain, the Italians in Nice, the Danes in Germany, fifty-seven per cent of Russia's population, etc.) and *outside of Europe*, i.e., all colonies. Comrade A.P. has done well to remind us of them. Britain, France, and Germany have a total population of some one hundred and fifty million, whereas the populations they oppress in the colonies number over four hundred million! The essence of the imperialist war, i.e., a war waged for the interests of the capitalists, consists, not only in the war being waged with the aim of oppressing new nations, of carving up the colonies, but also in its being waged primarily by the advanced nations, which *oppress* a number of other peoples comprising the *majority* of the earth's population.

The German Social-Democrats, who justify the seizure of Belgium or reconcile themselves to it, are actually imperialists and nationalists, not Social-Democrats, since they defend the "right" of the German bourgeoisie (partly also of the German workers) to oppress the Belgians, the Alsations, the Danes, the Poles, the Negroes in Africa, etc. They are not socialists, but *menials* to the German bourgeoisie,

whom they are aiding to rob other nations. The Belgian socialists who demand the liberation and indemnification of Belgium *alone* are also actually defending a demand of the Belgian bourgeoisie, who would go on plundering the 15,000,000 Congolese population and obtaining concessions and privileges in other countries. The Belgian bourgeoisie's foreign investments amount to something like three thousand million francs. Safeguarding the profits from these investments by using every kind of fraud and machinations is the *real* "national interest" of "gallant Belgium". The same applies in a still greater degree to Russia, Britain, France and Japan.

It follows that if the demand for the freedom of nations is not to be a false phrase covering up the imperialism and the nationalism of *certain individual* countries, it must be extended to *all* peoples and to *all* colonies. Such a demand, however, is obviously meaningless *unless* it is accompanied by a series of revolutions in *all* the advanced countries. Moreover, it cannot be accomplished without a successful *socialist* revolution.

Should this be taken to mean that socialists can remain indifferent to the peace demand that is coming from ever greater masses of the people? By no means. The slogans of the workers' class-conscious vanguard are one thing, while the spontaneous demands of the masses are something quite different. The yearning for peace is one of the most important *symptoms* revealing the beginnings of *disappointment* in the bourgeois lie about a war of "liberation", the "defence of the fatherland", and similar falsehoods that the class of capitalists beguiles the mob with. This symptom should attract the closest attention from socialists. All efforts must be bent towards *utilising* the masses' desire for peace. But *how* is it to be utilised? To recognise the peace *slogan* and repeat it would mean encouraging "pompous airs of impotent [and frequently what is worse: *hypocritical*] phrase-mongers"; it would mean *deceiving* the people with illusion that the existing governments, the present-day master classes, are *cap-*

able—without being “taught” a lesson (or rather without being eliminated) by a series of revolutions—of granting a peace in any way satisfactory to democracy and the working class. Nothing is more harmful than such deception. Nothing throws more dust in the eyes of the workers, nothing imbues them with a more deceptive idea about the *absence of deep* contradictions between capitalism and socialism, nothing *embellishes* capitalist slavery more than this deception does. No, we must make use of the desire for peace so as to explain to the masses that the benefits they expect from peace cannot be obtained without a series of revolutions.

An end to wars, peace among the nations, the cessation of pillaging and violence—such is our ideal, but only bourgeois sophists can seduce the masses with this ideal, if the latter is divorced from a direct and immediate call for revolutionary action. The ground for such propaganda is prepared; to practice that propaganda, one need only break with the opportunists, those allies of the bourgeoisie, who are hampering revolutionary work both directly (even to the extent of passing information to the authorities) and indirectly.

The slogan of self-determination of nations should also be advanced *in connection* with the imperialist era of capitalism. We do not stand for the *status quo*, or for the philistine Utopia of *standing aside* in great wars. We stand for a revolutionary struggle against imperialism, i.e., capitalism.* Imperialism consists in a striving of nations that oppress a number of other nations to extend and increase that oppression and to repartition the colonies. That is why the question of self-determination of nations today *hinges* on the conduct of socialists of the *oppressor* nations. A socialist of any of the oppressor nations (Britain, France, Germany, Japan, Russia, the United States of America, etc.) who does not recognise and does not struggle for the right of oppressed

* The following phrase was crossed out in the M.S.: “But propaganda of this sort, truly revolutionary propaganda, is impossible unless the question of the self-determination of nations is presented in the socialist way.”—Ed.

nations to self-determination (i.e., the right to secession) is in reality a chauvinist, not a socialist.

Only this point of view can lead to a sincere and consistent struggle against imperialism, to a proletarian, not a philistine approach (today) to the national question. Only this point of view can lead to a consistent application of the principle of combating any form of the oppression of nations; it removes mistrust among the proletarians of the oppressor and oppressed nations, makes for a united international struggle for the socialist revolution (i.e., for the only accomplishable regime of complete national equality), as distinct from the philistine Utopia of freedom for all small states in general, under capitalism.

This is the point of view adopted by our Party, i.e., by those Social-Democrats of Russia who have rallied around the Central Committee. This was the point of view adopted by Marx when he taught the proletariat that "no nation can be free if it oppresses other nations". It was from this point of view that Marx demanded the separation of Ireland from Britain, this in the interests of the freedom movement, not only of the Irish, but especially of the *British* workers.

If the socialists of Britain do not recognise and uphold Ireland's right to secession, if the French do not do the same for Italian Nice, the Germans for Alsace-Lorraine, Danish Schleswig, and Poland, the Russians for Poland, Finland, the Ukraine, etc., and the Poles for the Ukraine—if all the socialists of the "Great" Powers, i.e., the great robber powers, do not uphold that right in respect of the colonies, it is solely because they are in fact imperialists, not socialists. It is ridiculous to cherish illusions that people who do *not* fight for "the right to self-determination" of the oppressed nations, while they themselves belong to the oppressor nations, are capable of practising socialist policies.

Instead of leaving it to the hypocritical phrase-mongers to deceive the people by phrases and promises concerning the possibility of a democratic peace, socialists must explain to the masses the impossibility of anything resembling a demo-

cratic peace, unless there are a series of revolutions and unless a revolutionary struggle is waged in every country against the *respective* government. Instead of allowing the bourgeois politicians to deceive the peoples with talk about the freedom of nations, socialists must explain to the masses in the *oppressor* nations that they cannot hope for their liberation, as long as they help oppress other nations, and do not recognise and uphold the right of those nations to self-determination, i.e., the freedom to secede. That is the socialist, as distinct from the imperialist, policy to be applied to all countries, on the question of peace and the national question. True, this line is in most cases incompatible with the laws punishing high treason—but so is the Basle resolution, which has been so shamefully betrayed by almost all the socialists of the *oppressor* nations.

The choice is between socialism and submission to the laws of Joffre and Hindenburg, between revolutionary struggle and servility to imperialism. There is no middle course. The greatest harm is caused to the proletariat by the hypocritical (or obtuse) authors of the "middle-course" policy.

Written in July-August 1915

Collected Works, Vol. 21,
pp. 290-94

From SOCIALISM AND WAR

The attitude of the R.S.D.L.P. towards the war

Chapter I

THE PRINCIPLES OF SOCIALISM AND THE WAR OF 1914-1915

THE ATTITUDE OF SOCIALISTS TOWARDS WARS

Socialists have always condemned wars between nations as barbarous and brutal. Our attitude towards war, however, is fundamentally different from that of the bourgeois pacifists (supporters and advocates of peace) and of the anarchists. We differ from the former in that we understand the inevitable connection between wars and the class struggle within a country; we understand that wars cannot be abolished unless classes are abolished and socialism is created; we also differ in that we regard civil wars, i.e., wars waged by an oppressed class against the oppressor class, by slaves against slaveholders, by serfs against landowners, and by wage-workers against the bourgeoisie, as fully legitimate, progressive and necessary. We Marxists differ from both pacifists and anarchists in that we deem it necessary to study each war historically (from the standpoint of Marx's dialectical materialism) and separately. There have been in the past numerous wars which, despite all the horrors, atrocities, distress and suffering that inevitably accompany all wars, were progressive, i.e., benefited the development of mankind by helping to destroy most harmful and reactionary institutions (e.g., an autocracy or serfdom) and the most barbarous despotisms in Europe (the Turkish and the Russian). That is why the features historically specific to the present war must come up for examination.

THE HISTORICAL TYPES OF WARS IN MODERN TIMES

The Great French Revolution ushered in a new epoch in the history of mankind. From that time down to the Paris Commune, i.e., between 1789 and 1871, one type of war was of a bourgeois-progressive character, waged for national liberation. In other words, the overthrow of absolutism and feudalism, the undermining of these institutions, and the overthrow of alien oppression, formed the chief content and historical significance of such wars. These were therefore progressive wars; during *such* wars, all honest and revolutionary democrats, as well as all socialists, always wished success to that country (i.e., that bourgeoisie) which had helped to overthrow or undermine the most baneful foundations of feudalism, absolutism and the oppression of other nations. For example, the revolutionary wars waged by France contained an element of plunder and the conquest of foreign territory by the French, but this does not in the least alter the fundamental historical significance of those wars, which destroyed and shattered feudalism and absolutism in the whole of the old, serf-owning Europe. In the Franco-Prussian war, Germany plundered France but this does not alter the fundamental historical significance of that war, which liberated tens of millions of German people from feudal disunity and from the oppression of two despots, the Russian tsar and Napoleon III.

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN WARS OF AGGRESSION AND OF DEFENCE

The period of 1789-1871 left behind it deep marks and revolutionary memories. There could be no development of the proletarian struggle for socialism prior to the overthrow of feudalism, absolutism and alien oppression. When, in speaking of the wars of *such* periods, socialists stressed the legitimacy of "defensive" wars, they always had these aims in mind, namely revolution against medievalism and serfdom. By a

"defensive" war socialists have always understood a "just" war in this particular sense (Wilhelm Liebknecht once expressed himself precisely in this way⁴⁰). It is only in this sense that socialists have always regarded wars "for the defence of the fatherland", or "defensive" wars, as legitimate, progressive and just. For example, if tomorrow Morocco were to declare war on France, or India on Britain, or Persia or China on Russia, and so on, these would be "just", and "defensive" wars, *irrespective* of who would be the first to attack; any socialist would wish the oppressed, dependent and unequal states victory over the oppressor, slave-holding and predatory "Great" Powers.

But imagine a slave-holder who owns 100 slaves warring against another who owns 200 slaves, for a more "just" redistribution of slaves. The use of the term of a "defensive" war, or a war "for the defence of the fatherland", would clearly be historically false in such a case and would in practice be sheer deception of the common people, philistines, and the ignorant, by the astute slave-holders. It is in this way that the peoples are being deceived with "national" ideology and the term of "defence of the fatherland", by the present-day imperialist bourgeoisie, in the war now being waged between slave-holders with the purpose of consolidating slavery.

THE WAR OF TODAY IS AN IMPERIALIST WAR

It is almost universally admitted that this war is an imperialist war. In most cases, however, this term is distorted, or applied to one side, or else a loophole is left for the assertion that this war may, after all, be bourgeois-progressive, and of significance to the national-liberation movement. Imperialism is the highest stage in the development of capitalism, reached only in the twentieth century. Capitalism now finds that the old national states, without whose formation it could not have overthrown feudalism, are too cramped for it. Capitalism has developed concentration to such a de-

gree that entire branches of industry are controlled by syndicates, trusts and associations of capitalist multimillionaires and almost the entire globe has been divided up among the "lords of capital" either in the form of colonies, or by entangling other countries in thousands of threads of financial exploitation. Free trade and competition have been superseded by a striving towards monopolies, the seizure of territory for the investment of capital and as sources of raw materials, and so on. From the liberator of nations, which it was in the struggle against feudalism, capitalism in its imperialist stage has turned into the greatest oppressor of nations. Formerly progressive, capitalism has become reactionary; it has developed the forces of production to such a degree that mankind is faced with the alternative of adopting socialism or of experiencing years and even decades of armed struggle between the "Great" Powers for the artificial preservation of capitalism by means of colonies, monopolies, privileges and national oppression of every kind.

A WAR BETWEEN THE BIGGEST SLAVE-HOLDERS FOR THE MAINTENANCE AND CONSOLIDATION OF SLAVERY

To make the significance of imperialism clear, we will quote precise figures showing the partition of the world among the so-called "Great" Powers (i.e., those successful in great plunder) [see p. 139].

Hence it will be seen that, since 1876, most of the nations which were foremost fighters for freedom in 1789-1871, have, on the basis of a highly developed and "over-mature" capitalism, become oppressors and enslavers of most of the population and the nations of the globe. From 1876 to 1914, six "Great" Powers grabbed 25 million square kilometres, i.e., an area two and a half times that of Europe! Six Powers have enslaved 523 *million* people in the colonies. For every four inhabitants in the "Great" Powers there are five in "their" colonies. It is common knowledge that colonies are

**Partition of the World Among the "Great"
Slave-Holding Powers**

	Colonies				Metropolis		Total	
	1876		1914		1914			
	Square kilo- metres	Population	Square kilo- metres	Population	Square kilo- metres	Population	Square kilo- metres	Population
"Great" Powers	millions		millions		millions		millions	
Britain	22.5	251.9	33.5	393.5	0.3	46.5	33.8	440.0
Russia	17.0	15.9	17.4	33.2	5.4	136.2	22.8	169.4
France	0.9	6.0	10.6	55.5	0.5	39.6	11.1	95.1
Germany	—	—	2.9	12.3	0.5	64.9	3.4	77.2
Japan	—	—	0.3	19.2	0.4	53.0	0.7	72.2
United States of America	—	—	0.3	9.7	9.4	97.0	9.7	106.7
Total for the six "Great" Powers	40.4	273.8	65.0	523.4	16.5	437.2	81.5	960.6
Colonies belonging to <i>other</i> than "Great" Powers (Belgium, Hol- land and other states)			9.9	45.3			9.9	45.3
Three "semi-colo- nial" countries (Turkey, China and Persia)							14.5	361.2
<i>Total</i>							105.9	1,367.1
Other states and countries							28.0	289.9
Entire globe (ex- clusive of Arc- tic and Antar- ctic regions)								
Grand Total							133.9	1,657.0

conquered with fire and sword, that the population of the colonies are brutally treated, and that they are exploited in a thousand ways (by exporting capital, through concessions, etc., cheating in the sale of goods, by subjugating them to the authorities of the "ruling" nation, and so on and so forth). The Anglo-French bourgeoisie are deceiving the people when they say that they are waging a war for the freedom of nations and of Belgium; in fact they are waging a war for the purpose of retaining the numerous colonies they have grabbed. The German imperialists would free Belgium, etc., at once if the British and French would agree to "fairly" share their colonies with them. A feature of the situation is that in this war the fate of the colonies is being decided by a war on the Continent. From the standpoint of bourgeois justice and national freedom (or the right of nations to existence), Germany might be considered absolutely in the right as against Britain and France, for she has been "done out" of colonies, her enemies are oppressing an immeasurably far larger number of nations than she is, and the Slavs that are being oppressed by her ally, Austria, undoubtedly enjoy far more freedom than those of tsarist Russia, that veritable "prison of nations". Germany, however, is fighting, not for the liberation of nations, but for their oppression. It is not the business of socialists to help the younger and stronger robber (Germany) to plunder the older and overgorged robbers. Socialists must take advantage of the struggle between the robbers to overthrow all of them. To be able to do this, socialists must first of all tell the people the truth, namely, that this war is, in three respects, a war between slave-holders with the aim of consolidating slavery. This is a war, firstly, to increase the enslavement of the colonies by means of a "more equitable" distribution and subsequent more concerted exploitation of them; secondly, to increase the oppression of other nations within the "Great" Powers, since *both* Austria and Russia (Russia in greater degree and with results far worse than Austria) maintain their rule only by such oppression, intensifying it by means of war; and thirdly, to increase

and prolong wage slavery, since the proletariat is split up and suppressed, while the capitalists are the gainers, making fortunes out of the war, fanning national prejudices and intensifying reaction, which has raised its head in all countries, even in the freest and most republican.

“WAR IS THE CONTINUATION OF POLITICS
BY OTHER” (I. E.: VIOLENT) “MEANS”⁴¹

This famous dictum was uttered by Clausewitz, one of the profoundest writers on the problems of war. Marxists have always rightly regarded this thesis as the theoretical basis of views on the significance of any war. It was from this viewpoint that Marx and Engels always regarded the various wars.

Apply this view to the present war. You will see that for decades, for almost half a century, the governments and the ruling classes of Britain and France, Germany and Italy, Austria and Russia have pursued a policy of plundering colonies, oppressing other nations, and suppressing the working-class movement. It is this, and only this, policy that is being continued in the present war. In particular, the policy of both Austria and Russia, in peacetime as well as in wartime, is a policy of enslaving nations, not of liberating them. In China, Persia, India and other dependent countries, on the contrary, we have seen during the past decades a policy of rousing tens and hundreds of millions of people to a national life, of their liberation from the reactionary “Great” Powers’ oppression. A war waged on such a historical basis can even today be a bourgeois-progressive war of national liberation.

If the present war is regarded as a continuation of the politics of the “Great” Powers and of the principal classes within them, a glance will immediately reveal the glaring anti-historicity, falseness and hypocrisy of the view that the “defence-of-the-fatherland” idea can be justified in the present war.

THE CASE OF BELGIUM

The favourite plea of the social-chauvinists of the Triple (now Quadruple) Entente⁴² (in Russia, Plekhanov and Co.) is the case of Belgium. This instance, however, speaks against them. The German imperialists have brazenly violated the neutrality of Belgium, as belligerent states have done always and everywhere, trampling upon *all* treaties and obligations if necessary. Let us suppose that all states interested in the observance of international treaties should declare war on Germany with the demand that Belgium be liberated and indemnified. In that case, the sympathies of socialists would, of course, be with Germany's enemies. But the whole point is that the Triple (and Quadruple) Entente is waging war, *not* over Belgium: this is common knowledge and only hypocrites will disguise the fact. Britain is grabbing at Germany's colonies and Turkey; Russia is grabbing at Galicia and Turkey, France wants Alsace-Lorraine and even the left bank of the Rhine; a treaty has been concluded with Italy for the division of the spoils (Albania and Asia Minor); bargaining is going on with Bulgaria and Rumania, also for the division of the spoils. In the present war waged by the governments of today, it is *impossible* to help Belgium *otherwise* than by helping to throttle Austria or Turkey, etc.! Where does "defence of the fatherland" come in here? Herein lies the specific feature of imperialist war, a war between reactionary-bourgeois and historically outmoded governments, waged for the purpose of oppressing other nations. Whoever justifies participation in the present war is perpetuating the imperialist oppression of nations. Whoever advocates taking advantage of the present embarrassments of the governments so as to fight for the social revolution is championing the real freedom of really all nations, which is possible only under socialism.

WHAT RUSSIA IS FIGHTING FOR

In Russia, capitalist imperialism of the latest type has fully revealed itself in the policy of tsarism towards Persia, Manchuria and Mongolia, but, in general, military and feudal imperialism is predominant in Russia. In no country in the world are the majority of the population oppressed so much as in Russia; Great Russians constitute only 43 per cent of the population, i.e., less than half; the non-Russians are denied all rights. Of the 170 million inhabitants of Russia, *about 100 million* are oppressed and denied their rights. Tsarism is waging a war to seize Galicia and finally crush the liberties of the Ukrainians, and to obtain possession of Armenia, Constantinople, etc. Tsarism regards the war as a means of diverting attention from the mounting discontent within the country and of suppressing the growing revolutionary movement. To every two Great Russians in Russia today there are two or three non-Russians without even elementary rights: tsarism is striving, by means of the war, to increase the number of nations oppressed by Russia, to perpetuate this oppression, and thereby undermine the struggle for freedom which the Great Russians themselves are waging. The possibility of oppressing and robbing other nations perpetuates economic stagnation, because the source of income is frequently, not the development of productive forces, but the semi-feudal exploitation of non-Russians. Thus on the part of Russia, the war is marked by its profoundly reactionary character, its hostility to national liberation.

WHAT SOCIAL-CHAUVINISM IS

Social-chauvinism is advocacy of the idea of "defence of the fatherland" in the present war. This idea logically leads to the abandonment of the class struggle during the war, to voting for war credits, etc. In fact, the social-chauvinists are pursuing an anti-proletarian bourgeois policy, for

they are actually championing, not "defence of the fatherland" in the sense of combating foreign oppression, but the "right" of one or other of the "Great" Powers to plunder colonies and to oppress other nations. The social-chauvinists reiterate the bourgeois deception of the people that the war is being waged to protect the freedom and existence of nations, thereby taking sides with the bourgeoisie against the proletariat. Among the social-chauvinists are those who justify and varnish the governments and bourgeoisie of *one* of the belligerent groups of powers, as well as those who, like Kautsky, argue that the socialists of *all* the belligerent powers are equally entitled to "defend the fatherland". Social-chauvinism, which is, in effect, defence of the privileges, the advantages, the right to pillage and plunder, of one's "own" (or any) imperialist bourgeoisie, is the utter betrayal of all socialist convictions and of the decision of the Basle International Socialist Congress.

THE BASLE MANIFESTO

The Manifesto on war unanimously adopted in Basle in 1912 has in view the very kind of war between Britain and Germany and their present allies, which broke out in 1914. The Manifesto openly declares that no interests of the people can serve to justify such a war waged "for the sake of the profits of the capitalists and the ambitions of dynasties", on the basis of the imperialist, predatory policy of the Great Powers. The Manifesto openly declares that war is dangerous to "governments" (all of them without exception), notes their fear of "a proletarian revolution", and very definitely points to the example set by the Commune of 1871, and by October-December 1905, i.e., *to the examples of revolution and civil war*. Thus, the Basle Manifesto lays down, precisely for the present war, the tactics of the workers' revolutionary struggle on an international scale against their governments, the tactics of proletarian revolution. The Basle Manifesto repeats the words in the Stuttgart resolution that,

in the event of war, socialists must take advantage of the "economic and political crisis" it will cause so as to "hasten the downfall of capitalism", i.e., take advantage of the governments' wartime difficulties and the indignation of the masses, to advance the socialist revolution.

The social-chauvinists' policy, their justification of the war from the bourgeois-liberation standpoint, their sanctioning of "defence of the fatherland", their voting for credits, membership in governments, and so on and so forth, are downright treachery to socialism, which can be explained only, as we will soon show, by the victory of opportunism and of the national liberal-labour policy in the majority of European parties.

FALSE REFERENCES TO MARX AND ENGELS

The Russian social-chauvinists (headed by Plekhanov) make references to Marx's tactics in the war of 1870; the German (of the type of Lensch, David and Co.)—to Engels's statement in 1891 that, in the event of war against Russia and France combined, it would be the duty of the German socialists to defend their fatherland; finally, the social-chauvinists of the Kautsky type, who want to reconcile and legitimatise international chauvinism, refer to the fact that Marx and Engels, while condemning war, nevertheless, from 1854-55 to 1870-71 and 1876-77, always took the side of one belligerent state or another, once war had broken out.

All these references are outrageous distortions of the views of Marx and Engels, in the interest of the bourgeoisie and the opportunists, in just the same way as the writings of the anarchists Guillaume and Co. distort the views of Marx and Engels so as to justify anarchism. The war of 1870-71 was historically progressive on the part of Germany, until Napoleon III was defeated: the latter, together with the tsar, had oppressed Germany for years, keeping her in a state of feudal disunity. But as soon as the war developed into the plunder-

ing of France (the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine), Marx and Engels emphatically condemned the Germans. Even at the beginning of the war, Marx and Engels approved of the refusal of Bebel and Liebknecht to vote for war credits, and advised Social-Democrats not to merge with the bourgeoisie, but to uphold the independent class interests of the proletariat. To apply to the present imperialist war the appraisal of this bourgeois-progressive war of national liberation is a mockery of the truth. The same applies with still greater force to the war of 1854-55, and to all the wars of the nineteenth century, when there existed *no* modern imperialism, *no* mature objective conditions for socialism, and *no* mass socialist parties *in any* of the belligerent countries, i.e., none of the conditions from which the Basle Manifesto deduced the tactics of a "proletarian revolution" *in connection* with a war between Great Powers.

Anyone who today refers to Marx's attitude towards the wars of the epoch of the *progressive* bourgeoisie, and forgets Marx's statement that "the workingmen have no country"—a statement that applies *precisely* to the period of the reactionary and outmoded bourgeoisie, to the epoch of the socialist revolution, is shamelessly distorting Marx, and is substituting the bourgeois point of view for the socialist.

THE COLLAPSE OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL

Socialists of all the world solemnly declared in Basle, in 1912, that they regarded the impending war in Europe as the "criminal" and most reactionary deed of *all* the governments, which must hasten the downfall of capitalism by inevitably engendering a revolution against it. The war came, the crisis was there. Instead of revolutionary tactics, most of the Social-Democratic parties launched reactionary tactics, and went over to the side of their respective governments and bourgeoisie. This betrayal of socialism signifies

the collapse of the Second (1889-1914) International, and we must realise what caused this collapse, what brought social-chauvinism into being and gave it strength.

SOCIAL-CHAUVINISM IS THE ACME OF OPPORTUNISM

Throughout the existence of the Second International, a struggle was raging within all the Social-Democratic parties, between their revolutionary and the opportunist wings. In a number of countries a split took place along this line (Britain, Italy, Holland, Bulgaria). Not one Marxist has ever doubted that opportunism expresses bourgeois policies within the working-class movement, expresses the interests of the petty bourgeoisie and the alliance of a tiny section of bourgeoisified workers with their "own" bourgeoisie, against the interests of the proletarian masses, the oppressed masses.

The objective conditions at the close of the nineteenth century greatly intensified opportunism, converted the utilisation of bourgeois legality into subservience to the latter, created a thin crust of a working-class officialdom and aristocracy and attracted numerous petty-bourgeois "fellow travellers" to the Social-Democratic parties.

The war has speeded up this development and transformed opportunism into social-chauvinism, transformed the secret alliance between the opportunists and the bourgeoisie into an open one. Simultaneously, the military authorities have everywhere instituted martial law and have muzzled the mass of the workers, whose old leaders have nearly all gone over to the bourgeoisie.

Opportunism and social-chauvinism stand on a common economic basis—the interests of a thin crust of privileged workers and of the petty bourgeoisie, who are defending their privileged position, their "right" to some modicum of the profits that their "own" national bourgeoisie obtain from robbing other nations, from the advantages of their Great-Power status, etc.

Opportunism and social-chauvinism have the same politico-ideological content—class collaboration instead of the class struggle, renunciation of revolutionary methods of struggle, helping one's "own" government in its embarrassed situation, instead of taking advantage of these embarrassments so as to advance the revolution. If we take Europe as a whole and if we pay attention, not to individuals (even the most authoritative), we will find that it is the opportunist *trend* that has become the bulwark of social-chauvinism, whereas from the camp of the revolutionaries more or less consistent protests against it are heard from almost all sides. And if we take, for example, the grouping of trends at the Stuttgart International Socialist Congress in 1907, we shall find that international Marxism was opposed to imperialism, while international opportunism was already in favour of it at the time.

UNITY WITH THE OPPORTUNISTS MEANS AN ALLIANCE
BETWEEN THE WORKERS AND THEIR "OWN" NATIONAL
BOURGEOISIE, AND SPLITTING THE INTERNATIONAL
REVOLUTIONARY WORKING CLASS

In the past, before the war, opportunism was often looked upon as a legitimate, though "deviationist" and "extremist", component of the Social-Democratic Party. The war has shown the impossibility of this in the future. Opportunism has "matured", and is now playing to the full its role as emissary of the bourgeoisie in the working-class movement. Unity with the opportunists has become sheer hypocrisy, exemplified by the German Social-Democratic Party. On every important occasion (e.g., the August 4 vote), the opportunists present an ultimatum, to which they give effect through their numerous links with the bourgeoisie, their majority on the executives of the trade unions, etc. Today *unity* with the opportunists *actually* means subordinating the working class to their "own" national bourgeoisie, and an alliance with the latter for the purpose of oppressing other

nations and of fighting for dominant-nation privileges; it means *splitting* the revolutionary proletariat of all countries.

No matter how hard, in individual instances, the struggle may be against the opportunists, who predominate in many organisations, whatever the specific nature of the purging of the workers' parties of opportunists in individual countries, this process is inevitable and fruitful. Reformist socialism is dying; regenerated socialism "will be revolutionary, uncompromising and insurrectionary", to use the apt expression of the French Socialist Paul Golay.⁴³

"KAUTSKYISM"

Kautsky, the leading authority in the Second International, is a most typical and striking example of how a verbal recognition of Marxism has led in practice to its conversion into "Struivism" or into "Brentanoism".⁴⁴ Another example is Plekhanov. By means of patent sophistry, Marxism is stripped of its revolutionary living spirit; *everything* is recognised in Marxism *except* the revolutionary methods of struggle, the propaganda and preparation of those methods, and the education of the masses in this direction. Kautsky "reconciles" in an unprincipled way the fundamental idea of social-chauvinism, recognition of defence of the fatherland in the present war, with a diplomatic sham concession to the Left—his abstention from voting for war credits, his verbal claim to be in the opposition, etc. Kautsky, who in 1909 wrote a book on the approaching epoch of revolutions and on the connection between war and revolution, Kautsky, who in 1912 signed the Basle Manifesto on taking revolutionary advantage of the impending war, is outdoing himself in justifying and embellishing social-chauvinism and, like Plekhanov, joins the bourgeoisie in ridiculing any thought of revolution and all steps towards the immediate revolutionary struggle.

The working class cannot play its world-revolutionary role unless it wages a ruthless struggle against this backsliding,

spinelessness, subservience to opportunism, and unparalleled vulgarisation of the theories of Marxism. Kautskyism is not fortuitous; it is the social product of the contradictions within the Second International, a blend of loyalty to Marxism in word, and subordination to opportunism in deed.

This fundamental falseness of "Kautskyism" manifests itself in different ways in different countries. In Holland, Roland-Holst, while rejecting the idea of defending the fatherland, defends unity with the opportunists' party. In Russia, Trotsky, while rejecting this idea, also defends unity with the opportunist and chauvinist *Nasha Zarya* group. In Rumania, Rakovsky, while declaring war on opportunism as being responsible for the collapse of the International, is at the same time ready to recognise the legitimacy of the idea of defending the fatherland. All this is a manifestation of the evil which the Dutch Marxists (Gorter and Pannekoek) have called "passive radicalism", and which amounts to replacing revolutionary Marxism with eclecticism in theory, and servility to or impotence towards opportunism, in practice.

THE MARXISTS' SLOGAN IS A SLOGAN OF REVOLUTIONARY SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY

The war has undoubtedly created a most acute crisis and has immeasurably increased the distress of the masses. The reactionary nature of this war, and the unblushing lies told by the bourgeoisie of *all* countries to conceal their predatory aims with "national" ideology are, on the basis of an objectively revolutionary situation, inevitably creating revolutionary moods among the masses. It is our duty to help the masses become conscious of these moods, deepen them and give them shape. This task finds correct expression only in the slogan: convert the imperialist war into a civil war; *all* consistently waged class struggles in wartime and all seriously conducted "mass-action" tactics inevitably lead to this. It is impossible to foretell whether a powerful revolu-

tionary movement will flare up in connection with, during or after the first or the second imperialist war of the Great Powers; in any case it is our bounden duty to work systematically and unswervingly in this direction.

The Basle Manifesto makes direct reference to the example set by the Paris Commune, i.e., the conversion of a war between governments into a civil war. Half a century ago, the proletariat was too weak; the objective conditions for socialism had not yet matured, there could be no co-ordination and co-operation between the revolutionary movements in all the belligerent countries; the "national ideology" (the traditions of 1792), with which a section of the Parisian workers were imbued, was a petty-bourgeois weakness, which Marx noted at the time, and was one of the causes of the downfall of the Commune. Half a century since that time, the conditions that then weakened the revolution have ceased to operate, and today it is unpardonable for a socialist to resign himself to a renunciation of activities in the spirit of the Paris Communards.

THE EXAMPLE SET BY THE FRATERNISATION IN THE TRENCHES

Cases of fraternisation between the soldiers of the belligerent nations, even in the trenches, have been reported in the bourgeois newspapers of all the belligerent countries. The grave importance attached to the matter by the governments and the bourgeoisie is evidenced by the harsh orders against such fraternisation issued by the military authorities (of Germany and Britain). If such cases of fraternisation have proved possible even when opportunism reigns supreme in the top ranks of the Social-Democratic parties of Western Europe, and when social-chauvinism has the support of the entire Social-Democratic press and all the authorities of the Second International, then that shows us how possible it would be to shorten the present criminal, reactionary and slave-holders' war and to organise a revolu-

tionary international movement, if systematic work were conducted in this direction, at least by the Left-wing socialists in all the belligerent countries.

THE IMPORTANCE OF AN UNDERGROUND ORGANISATION

No less than the opportunists, leading anarchists all over the world have disgraced themselves with social-chauvinism (in the spirit of Plekhanov and Kautsky) in this war. One of the useful results of this war will undoubtedly be that it will kill both opportunism and anarchism.

While under no circumstances or conditions refraining from utilising all legal opportunities, however small, for organising the masses and for the propaganda of socialism, the Social-Democratic parties must break with subservience to legality. "You shoot first, Messieurs the Bourgeoisie," wrote Engels, hinting at civil war and at the necessity of our violating legality *after* the bourgeoisie had done so. The crisis has shown that the bourgeoisie violate it in all countries, even the freest, and that it is impossible to lead the masses to a revolution unless an underground organisation is set up for the purpose of advocating, discussing, appraising and preparing revolutionary methods of struggle. In Germany, for example, all the *honest* things that socialists are doing, are being done despite despicable opportunism and hypocritical "Kautskyism", and moreover are being done secretly. In Britain, people are being sentenced to penal servitude for printing appeals against joining up.

It is a betrayal of socialism to consider compatible with membership in the Social-Democratic Party any repudiation of underground methods of propaganda, and ridicule of those methods, in the legally published press.

ON THE DEFEAT OF ONE'S "OWN" GOVERNMENT IN THE IMPERIALIST WAR

The standpoint of social-chauvinism is shared equally by both advocates of victory for their governments in the pre-

sent war and by advocates of the slogan of "neither victory nor defeat". A revolutionary class cannot but wish for the defeat of its government in a reactionary war, and cannot fail to see that the latter's military reverses must facilitate its overthrow. Only a bourgeois who believes that a war started by governments must necessarily end as a war between governments, and wants it to end as such, can regard as "ridiculous" and "absurd" the idea that the socialists of *all* the belligerent countries should express their wish that *all* their "own" governments should be defeated. On the contrary, it is a statement of this kind that would be in keeping with the innermost thoughts of every class-conscious worker, and be in line with our activities for the conversion of the imperialist war into a civil war.

The serious anti-war agitation being conducted by a section of the British, German and Russian socialists has undoubtedly "weakened the military might" of the respective governments, but that agitation stands to the credit of the socialists. The latter must explain to the masses that they have no other road of salvation except the revolutionary overthrow of their "own" governments, whose difficulties in the present war must be taken advantage of precisely for that purpose.

PACIFISM AND THE PEACE SLOGAN

The temper of the masses in favour of peace often expresses the beginning of protest, anger and a realisation of the reactionary nature of the war. It is the duty of all Social-Democrats to utilise that temper. They will take a most ardent part in any movement and in any demonstration motivated by that sentiment, but they will not deceive the people with admitting the idea that a peace without annexations, without oppression of nations, without plunder, and without the embryo of new wars among the present governments and ruling classes, is possible in the absence of a revolutionary movement. Such deception of the people

would merely mean playing into the hands of the secret diplomacy of the belligerent governments and facilitating their counter-revolutionary plans. Whoever wants a lasting and democratic peace must stand for civil war against the governments and the bourgeoisie.

THE RIGHT OF NATIONS TO SELF-DETERMINATION

The most widespread deception of the people by the bourgeoisie in the present war consists in their using the ideology of "national liberation" to cloak their predatory aims. The British have promised the liberation of Belgium, the Germans—of Poland, etc. Actually, as we have seen, this is a war waged by the oppressors of most of the world's nations for the purpose of increasing and expanding that oppression.

Socialists cannot achieve their great aim without fighting against all oppression of nations. They must, therefore, unequivocally demand that the Social-Democratic parties of the *oppressor* countries (especially of the so-called "Great" Powers) should recognise and champion the *oppressed* nation's right to self-determination, in the specifically political sense of the term, i.e., the right to political secession. The socialist of a ruling or a colonial nation who does not stand for that right is a chauvinist.

The championing of this right, far from encouraging the formation of petty states, leads, on the contrary, to the freer, fearless and therefore wider and more universal formation of large states and federations of states, which are more to the advantage of the masses and are more in keeping with economic development.

In their turn, the socialists of the *oppressed* nations must unfailingly fight for complete unity of the *workers* of the oppressed and oppressor nationalities (this including organisation unity). The idea of the juridical separation of one national from another (the so-called "cultural-national autonomy" advocated by Bauer and Renner) is reactionary.

Imperialism is the epoch of the constantly increasing oppression of the nations of the world by a handful of "Great" Powers; it is therefore impossible to fight for the socialist international revolution against imperialism unless the right of nations to self-determination is recognised. "No nation can be free if it oppresses other nations" (Marx and Engels). A proletariat that tolerates the slightest coercion of other nations by its "own" nation cannot be a socialist proletariat.

Written in July-August 1915

Collected Works, Vol. 21,
pp. 299-317

From LETTER TO A. G. SHLYAPNIKOV

August 23, 1915

Events in Russia have completely endorsed our position, which the social-patriot donkeys (from Alexinsky to Chkheidze) have christened defeatism. The facts have proved that we are right!! The military reverses are helping to shake the foundations of tsarism, and facilitating an alliance of the revolutionary workers of Russia and other countries. People say: what will "you" do, if "you", the revolutionaries, defeat tsarism? I reply: (1) our victory will fan the flames of the "Left" movement in Germany a hundredfold; (2) if "we" defeated tsarism completely, we would propose peace to all the belligerent powers on democratic terms and, if this were rejected, we would conduct a *revolutionary* war.

It is clear that the advanced section of Pravdist workers, that bulwark of our Party, has survived, in spite of terrible devastations in its ranks. It would be extremely important for leading groups to come together in two or three centres (*most secretly*), establish contact with us, restore a Bureau of the Central Committee (one exists, I think, in Petersburg already) and the C.C. itself in Russia. They should establish firm ties with us (*if necessary*, one or two persons should be brought to Sweden for this purpose). We would send news-sheets, leaflets, etc. The most important thing is firm and constant relations.

First published in 1924

Collected Works, Vol. 35,
pp. 204-05

APPEAL ON THE WAR

Worker Comrades:

The European war has been in progress for over a year. All things considered, it will last for a long time, because, while Germany is best prepared and at present the strongest, the Quadruple Entente (Russia, Britain, France, and Italy) has more men and money, and besides, freely gets war material from the United States of America, the world's richest country.

What is this war being fought for, which is bringing mankind unparalleled suffering? The government and the bourgeoisie of each belligerent country are squandering millions of rubles on books and newspapers so as to lay the blame on the foe, arouse the people's furious hatred of the enemy, and stop at no lie so as to depict themselves as the side that has been unjustly attacked and is now "defending" itself. In reality, this is a war between two groups of predatory Great Powers, and it is being fought for the partitioning of colonies, the enslavement of other nations, and advantages and privileges of the world market. This is a most reactionary war, a war of modern slave-holders aimed at preserving and consolidating capitalist slavery. Britain and France are lying when they assert that they are warring for Belgium's freedom. In reality, they have long been preparing the war, and are waging it with the purpose of robbing Germany and stripping her of her colonies; they have signed a treaty with Italy and Russia on the pillage and carving up of Turkey and Austria. The tsarist monarchy in Russia is waging a

predatory war aimed at seizing Galicia, taking territory away from Turkey, enslaving Persia, Mongolia, etc. Germany is waging war with the purpose of grabbing British, Belgian, and French colonies. Whether Germany or Russia wins, or whether there is a "draw", the war will bring humanity fresh oppression of hundreds and hundreds of millions of people in the colonies, in Persia, Turkey and China, a fresh enslavement of nations, and new chains for the working class of all countries.

What are the tasks of the working class with regard to this war? The answer to this question is provided in a resolution unanimously adopted by the socialists of the whole world, at the Basle International Socialist Congress of 1912. This resolution was adopted in anticipation of a war of the very kind as started in 1914. This resolution says that the war is reactionary, that it is being prepared in the interests of "capitalist profits", that the workers consider it "a crime to shoot each other down", that the war will lead to "a proletarian revolution", that an example for the workers' tactics was set by the Paris Commune of 1871, and by October-December 1905, in Russia, i.e., by a revolution.

All class-conscious workers in Russia are on the side of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour group in the Duma, whose members (Petrovsky, Badayev, Muranov, Samoilov, and Shagov) have been exiled by the tsar to Siberia for revolutionary propaganda against the war and against the government. It is only in such revolutionary propaganda, and in revolutionary activities leading to a revolt of the masses, that the salvation of humanity from the horrors of the present and the future wars lies. Only the revolutionary overthrow of the bourgeois governments, in the first place of the most reactionary, brutal, and barbarous tsarist government, will open the road to socialism and peace among nations.

The conscious or unwitting servants of the bourgeoisie are lying when they wish to persuade the people that the revolutionary overthrow of the tsarist monarchy can lead only to victories for and consolidation of the German reac-

tionary monarchy and the German bourgeoisie. Although the leaders of the German socialists, like many leading socialists in Russia, have gone over to the side of their "own" bourgeoisie and are helping to deceive the people with fables of a war of "defence", there is mounting among the working masses of Germany an ever stronger protest and indignation against their government. The German socialists who have not gone over to the side of the bourgeoisie have declared in the press that they consider the tactics of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour group in the Duma "heroic". In Germany, calls against the war and against the government are being published illegally. Tens and hundreds of the finest socialists of Germany, including Clara Zetkin, the well-known representative of the women's labour movement, have been thrown into prison by the German Government for propaganda in a revolutionary spirit. In all the belligerent countries without exception, indignation is mounting in the working masses, and the example of revolutionary activities set by the Social-Democrats of Russia, and even more so any success of the revolution in Russia, will not fail to advance the great cause of socialism, of the victory of the proletariat over the blood-stained bourgeois exploiters.

The war is filling the pockets of the capitalists, into whose pockets gold is pouring from the treasuries of the Great Powers. The war is provoking a blind bitterness against the enemy, the bourgeoisie doing its best to direct the indignation of the people into such channels, to divert their attention from the *chief* enemy—the government and the ruling classes of their *own* country. However, the war which brings in its train endless misery and suffering for the toiling masses, enlightens and steels the finest representatives of the working class. If perish we must, let us perish in the struggle for our own cause, for the cause of the workers, for the socialist revolution, and not for the interests of the capitalists, the landowners, and tsars—this is what every class-conscious worker sees and feels. Revolutionary Social-Democratic work may be difficult at present, but it is possible. It

is advancing throughout the world, and in this alone lies salvation.

Down with the tsarist monarchy, which has drawn Russia into a criminal war, and which oppresses the peoples! Long live the world brotherhood of the workers, and the international revolution of the proletariat!

Written in August 1915

Collected Works, Vol. 21,
pp. 367-69

THE VOICE OF AN HONEST FRENCH SOCIALIST

In French-speaking Switzerland, where Francophile chauvinism is raging with only a little less intensity than in France, the voice of an honest socialist has been heard. In our despicable times this is quite an event. We must pay all the more attention to this voice because in this instance we have here to do with a socialist of typically French (or rather Romance, because the Italians, for instance, are the same) temperament and frame of mind.

We are referring to a little pamphlet by Paul Golay, the editor of a minor socialist paper published in Lausanne. It was in that city that on March 11, 1915, the author delivered a lecture on the subject: "The Socialism That Is Dying and the Socialism That Must Be Reborn", the contents of which he later published separately.*

"On August 1, 1914, war broke out. During the weeks preceding this now famous date and after it, millions of people were waiting." That is how the author begins. Millions of people were waiting, he says, to see whether the resolutions and the declarations of the leaders of socialism would not lead "to a mighty uprising, whose whirlwind would sweep away the criminal governments". However, the expectations of millions were thwarted. "We attempted," says

* Paul Golay, *Le socialisme qui meurt et le socialisme qui doit renaitre*, Lausanne, 1915, 22 pages, 15 centimes. En vente à l'Administration du "Grutlén", Maison du Peuple, Lausanne.

Golay, "in a comradely fashion" to exonerate the socialists by referring to the "lightning suddenness of the war", and to the lack of information, but these excuses did not satisfy us. "We felt ill at ease, as if our conscience were steeped in the filthy waters of equivocation and lies." From this the reader will have concluded that Golay is sincere, a quality almost extraordinary in our times.

Golay recalls the "revolutionary traditions" of the proletariat. Perfectly aware of the fact that "for each situation fitting action is required", he reminds us that "for exceptional situations exceptional measures are necessary. *Aux grands maux les grands remèdes*".* He recalls "congress decisions" "addressed directly to the masses and urging them to start revolutionary and insurrectionary action". There come excerpts from the Stuttgart and Basle resolutions.⁴⁵ The author emphasises that "these various resolutions do not contain any argument as to a defensive or offensive war; consequently they do not propose any special nationalist tactics to supersede the generally accepted fundamental principles".

After reading this, the reader sees that Golay is not only a sincere socialist, but also an honest, convinced socialist, a quality quite exceptional among leaders of the Second International!

"The proletariat was congratulated by military commanders, and the bourgeois press warmly praised the resurrection of what it called 'the soul of the nation'. This resurrection has cost us three million corpses.

"And yet never has a workers' organisation had such a large number of dues-paying members; never has there been such an abundance of parliamentarians, such a splendidly organised press. And never has there been a more hideous cause against which one should have risen up.

"In the circumstances so tragic, when the lives of millions are at stake, all revolutionary actions are not only permissible, but legitimate. They are more than legitimate—they are sacred. The impera-

* Great evils call for strong remedies.—Ed.

tive duty of the proletariat demanded an attempt to achieve the impossible so as to save our generation from events which are turning Europe into a shambles.

"There have been no energetic steps, no attempts at a revolt, nothing leading to an uprising. . . .

"Our opponents cry out about the collapse of socialism. They are too hasty. Still, who will dare assert that they are wrong in all respects? What is dying at this hour is not socialism in general, but a brand of socialism, a saccharine socialism without the spirit of idealism and without passion, with the manners of a governmental officeholder, and with the paunch of a respectable *paterfamilias*; a socialism without audacity or frenzy, a devotee of statistics, up to its neck in amicable agreements with capitalism; a socialism preoccupied only with reforms; a socialism that has sold its birthright for a mess of pottage; a socialism that controls people's impatience in order to aid the bourgeoisie—a sort of automatic brake on audacious proletarian action.

"This socialism, which threatens to contaminate the entire International, is in certain measure responsible for the impotence we are reproached with."

Elsewhere in the pamphlet Golay is outspoken about "reformist socialism" and "opportunism" as a distortion of socialism.

In referring to that distortion, recognising the "general responsibility" of the proletariat of *all* the belligerent countries, and emphasising that "this responsibility falls on the heads of the leaders whom the masses trusted and from whom they expected a slogan", Golay correctly takes as an example German socialism, which was "the best organised, best formed, the most indoctrinated", to show "its numerical strength and its revolutionary feebleness".

"Inspired with revolutionary fervour, German Social-Democracy could have confronted militarist undertakings with a resistance sufficiently definite and stubborn to make the proletariat of the other countries of central Europe follow it on this, the only road to salvation. . . .

"German socialism enjoyed great influence in the International. It could have done more than all other parties. The greatest effort was expected of it. But numbers are nothing if individual energy is paralysed by too rigorous discipline and if the 'leaders' utilise . . . their influence to achieve the least effort. [Much as the second part of the

sentence is correct, the first is wrong: discipline is a splendid and necessary thing, for instance, the discipline of a party that expels opportunists and opponents of revolutionary action.] The German proletariat, owing to its responsible leaders, obeyed the call of the military camarilla . . . the other sections of the International took fright and acted likewise; in France, two socialists found it necessary to join a bourgeois government! Thus, several months after the solemn declaration at a congress that socialists considered it a crime to shoot at each other, millions of workers were called to the colours and began to commit that crime with a persistency and a zeal which won them repeated tribute from the capitalist bourgeoisie and governments."

Golay, however, does not confine himself to mercilessly branding "the socialism that is dying". He also manifests a full understanding of the cause of that dying, and the kind of socialism that should supersede the dying one. "The working masses in every country," he writes, "submit in some measure to the influence of ideas current in bourgeois circles." "When, under the name of revisionism, Bernstein formulated a kind of democratic reformism," he writes, "Kautsky shattered him with the aid of relevant facts." "But when appearances had been preserved, the party nevertheless continued its *Realpolitik*. The Social-Democratic Party became what it is today. An excellent organisation. A powerful body, from which the soul has gone." Not only German Social-Democracy, but all sections of the International reveal the same tendencies. "The growing number of officials" leads to certain consequences; attention is focussed only on the regular payment of membership dues; strikes are looked upon as "manifestations aiming at securing better conditions of agreement" with the capitalists. It becomes customary to link the interests of the workers with those of the capitalists; "to subordinate the fate of the workers to that of capitalism itself", "to wish an intensive development of one's 'own' 'national' industry to the detriment of foreign industry".

In one of his articles, R. Schmiedt, a Reichstag deputy, says that regulation of working conditions by the trade unions is also advantageous to the capitalists, since it "introduces order and stability in economic life" and since it

"makes the capitalists' calculations easier, and counteracts unfair competition".

In quoting these words, Golay exclaims:

"It appears that the trade union movement must consider it an honour to make the capitalist profits more stable! It is apparently the aim of socialism to demand, within the framework of capitalist society, the maximum of advantages compatible with the existence of the capitalist system itself. In that case, we have here renunciation of all principles. The proletariat strives, not to consolidate the capitalist regime, not to obtain minimal conditions for hired labour, but to eliminate the system of private property and to destroy the system of hired labour....

"The secretaries of large organisations become important personages. In the political movement, deputies, men of letters, scientists, lawyers, all those who, together with their science, bring with themselves certain personal ambitions, wield an influence which is at times dangerous.

"The powerful organisation of the trade unions and their substantial treasuries have developed a corporative spirit among their members. One of the negative aspects of the trade union movement, which is reformist in essence, is that the condition of various categories of wage workers is improved by placing one above the other. This destroys their fundamental unity and creates among the most favoured an apprehension which compels them sometimes to fear a 'movement' that might undermine their condition, their treasury and their balance sheet. Thus a certain division between the various categories of the proletariat comes into existence, categories artificially created by the trade union movement itself."

This, of course, is no argument against strong organisations, says the author, obviously to counter arguments from a certain kind of "critic". This, he says, only proves that organisations must have a "soul", must have "enthusiasm".

"What are the chief characteristics that must distinguish the socialism of tomorrow? It will be international, intransigent, and rebellious."

"Intransigence is a force," Golay says with good reason, inviting the reader to cast a glance at the "history of doctrines". "When did they exercise an influence? When they were tamed by the authorities, or when they remained in-

transigent? When did Christianity lose its value? Was it not on the day Constantine promised it revenues and offered it, not persecution and executions but the gold-braided vestment of Court servants? . . .

"A French philosopher has said: 'Dead ideas are those that appear in elegant garments, with no asperity or daring. They are dead because they are put into general circulation and become part of the ordinary intellectual baggage of the great army of philistines. Strong ideas are those that shock and scandalise, evoke indignation, anger, and animosity in some, and enthusiasm in others.'" The author finds it necessary to call this truth to the minds of present-day socialists, among whom he very often finds an absence of any kind of "ardent convictions": "They believe in nothing," he says, "neither in reforms that are belated, nor in a revolution that has not yet arrived."

Intransigence, a readiness for rebellion, the author says, "lead, not to dreaminess but to action. A socialist will neglect no form of action. He will find new ones according to the demands and the circumstances of the moment. . . . He demands immediate reforms; he gets them, not by bickering with the opponent, but he takes them by force, as a concession by a bourgeoisie intimidated by the enthusiasm and audacity of the masses."

After the most bare-faced vulgarising of Marxism and degrading of socialism by Plekhanov, Kautsky, and Co., Golay's pamphlet is really refreshing. However, the two following shortcomings must be noted.

First, Golay, in common with most socialists in the Romance countries, not excluding the present-day Guesdists, pays insufficient attention to "doctrine", i.e., to the *theory* of socialism. He has a certain prejudice against Marxism, which can be explained, though not justified, by the present prevalence of the most vicious caricature of Marxism in the writings of Kautsky, in *Die Neue Zeit*, and among the Germans in general. A man like Golay, who has recognised the necessity of the *death* of reformist socialism and the *revival*

of a revolutionary, "rebellious" socialism, i.e., one who understands the necessity of an uprising, who advocates it, and is capable of seriously preparing himself and others for it, is *in deed* a thousand times closer to Marxism than those gentlemen who know the "texts" by heart but are now busy (for instance, in *Die Neue Zeit*) justifying social-chauvinism of every kind, including that which says that one must at present "make peace" with the chauvinist *Vorstand* and "forget the past".

Much as Golay's disdain for Marxism is explainable and much as he can be cleared of the blame, which can be placed on the moribund or *dead* trend of the French Marxists (Guesdists), the blame is still there. The world's greatest movement for liberation of the oppressed class, the most revolutionary class in history, is impossible without a revolutionary theory. That theory cannot be thought up. It *grows out* of the sum total of the revolutionary experience and the revolutionary thinking of all countries in the world. Such a theory *has developed* since the second half of the nineteenth century. It is known as Marxism. One cannot be a socialist, a revolutionary Social-Democrat, without participating, in the measure of one's powers, in developing and applying that theory, and without waging a ruthless struggle today against the mutilation of this theory by Plekhanov, Kautsky, and Co.

Inattention to theory has led Golay to make a number of erroneous or hasty attacks against, for instance, centralism or discipline in general, or against "historical materialism", which, the author alleges, is not sufficiently "idealistic", etc. Hence also a remarkable lack of completeness in the question of slogans. For instance, the demand that socialism should become "rebellious" is full of profound content and is the sole correct thought, without which all talk about internationalism, the revolutionary spirit, and Marxism is sheer stupidity, and, as often as not, hypocrisy. However, this idea, that of civil war, should have been developed, and made the pivot of tactics, whereas Golay confines himself to

stating it. This is a lot for our days, but it is insufficient from the standpoint of the demands of the proletariat's revolutionary struggle. For instance, Golay's treatment of the problem of revolution as a reply to war is, if one may put it so, far too narrow. He fails to consider the fact that, though a revolutionary *reply* to the war has not been given, yet, the war itself has begun to teach, and is teaching, the masses the lesson of revolution, by creating a revolutionary situation and by expanding and deepening it.

Golay's second shortcoming is best illustrated by the following argument in his pamphlet:

"We blame nobody. To be reborn, the International needs a fraternal spirit to animate the various sections; but it is permissible to affirm that, in the sight of the great task placed before it by the capitalist bourgeoisie in July and August 1914, reformist, centralist (?) and hierarchical socialism cut a poor figure."

"We blame nobody. . . ." This is where you are mistaken, Comrade Golay! You yourself have admitted that "the socialism that is dying" is tied up to bourgeois ideas (which means that it is nurtured and supported by the bourgeoisie), to a certain ideological current in socialism ("reformism"), to the interests and the specific position of certain strata (parliamentarians, officials, intellectuals, some of the better-off sections or groups of workers), etc. From this follows an *inevitable* conclusion, which you fail to draw. Individuals "die" what is called a natural death; *ideological and political* trends, however, *cannot die in that way*. Just as the bourgeoisie will not die until it is overthrown, a trend nurtured and supported by the bourgeoisie, and expressing the interests of a small group of intellectuals and members of the labour aristocracy that have joined hands with the bourgeoisie, will not die unless it is "killed", i.e., overthrown, deprived of *all* influence on the socialist proletariat. This trend is strong in its links with the bourgeoisie. Because of the objective conditions of the "peaceful" period of 1871-1914, it has become a kind of commanding, parasitic *stratum* in the working-class movement.

In such conditions, it is our duty, not only to "blame", but to ring the tocsin, ruthlessly unmask, overthrow, and oust this parasitic stratum from their posts, and destroy *their* "unity" with the working-class movement, because such unity means, in practice, unity of the proletariat with the national bourgeoisie and a *split* in the international proletariat, the unity of lackeys and a split among the revolutionaries.

"Intransigence is a force," Golay says with justice; he demands that "the socialism that must be reborn" should be intransigent. But is it not all the same to the bourgeoisie whether the proletariat practises reconciliation with it *directly*, or *indirectly* through bourgeois adherents, defenders, and agents *within* the working-class movement, i.e., through the opportunists? The latter is even *more advantageous* to the bourgeoisie, because it secures for it a stronger influence over the workers.

Golay is a thousand times right when he says that there is a socialism that is dying and a socialism that must be reborn; this death and this rebirth, however, comprise a ruthless struggle against the trend of opportunism—not merely an ideological struggle, but the removal of that hideous excrescence from the body of the working-class parties, the expulsion from those organisations of certain representatives of this tactic, which is alien to the proletariat, a definite break with them. They will die neither physically nor politically, but the workers will break with them, will throw them into the cesspool of the servitors of the bourgeoisie. The example of their corruption will educate a new generation, or, more correctly, new proletarian armies capable of an uprising.

THE FIRST STEP

The development of the international socialist movement is slow during the tremendous crisis created by the war. Yet it is moving towards a break with opportunism and social-chauvinism, as was clearly shown by the International Socialist Conference held at Zimmerwald, Switzerland, between September 5 and 8, 1915.⁴⁶

For a whole year, the socialists of the warring and the neutral countries vacillated and temporised. Afraid to admit to themselves the gravity of the crisis, they did not wish to look reality in the face, and kept deferring in a thousand ways the inevitable break with the opportunism and Kautskyism prevalent in the official parties of Western Europe.

However, the analysis of events which we gave a year ago in the Manifesto of the Central Committee (*Sotsial-Demokrat* No. 33)* has proved correct; the events have borne out its correctness. They took a course that resulted in the first International Socialist Conference being attended by representatives of the protesting elements of the minorities in Germany, France, Sweden, and Norway, who acted *against* the decisions of the official parties, i.e., in fact acted schismatically.

The work of the Conference was summed up in a manifesto and a resolution expressing sympathy with the arrested and the persecuted. Both documents appear in this issue

* See pp. 69-77.—Ed.

of *Sotsial-Demokrat*. By nineteen votes to twelve, the Conference refused to submit to a committee the draft resolution proposed by us and other revolutionary Marxists; our draft manifesto was passed on to the committee together with two others, for a joint manifesto to be drawn up. The reader will find elsewhere in this issue our two drafts; a comparison of the latter with the manifesto adopted clearly shows that a number of fundamental ideas of revolutionary Marxism were adopted.

In practice, the manifesto signifies a step towards an ideological and practical break with opportunism and social-chauvinism. At the same time, the manifesto, as any analysis will show, contains inconsistencies, and does not say everything that should be said.

The manifesto calls the war imperialist and emphasises two features of imperialism: the striving of the capitalists of *every* nation for profits and the exploitation of others, and the striving of the Great Powers to partition the world and "enslave" weaker nations. The manifesto repeats the most essential things that should be said of the imperialist nature of the war, and were said in our resolution. In this respect, the manifesto merely *popularises* our resolution. Popularisation is undoubtedly a useful thing. However, if we want clear thinking in the working class and attach importance to systematic and unflagging propaganda, we must accurately and fully define the principles to be popularised. If that is not done, we risk repeating the error, the fault of the Second International which led to its collapse, viz., we shall be leaving room for ambiguity and misinterpretations. Is it, for instance, possible to deny the signal importance of the idea, expressed in our resolution, that the objective conditions are mature for socialism? The "popular" exposition of the manifesto omitted this idea; failure has attended the attempt to combine, in one document, a clear and precise resolution based on principle, and an appeal.

"The capitalists of all countries ... claim that the war serves to defend the fatherland. ... They are lying...", the

manifesto continues. Here again, this forthright statement that the fundamental idea of opportunism in the present war—the “defence-of-the-fatherland” idea—is a lie, is a repetition of the kernel of the revolutionary Marxists’ resolution. Again, the manifesto regrettably fails to say everything that should be said; it is half-hearted, afraid to speak the whole truth. After a year of war, who today is not aware of the actual damage caused to socialism, not only by the capitalist press *repeating and endorsing* the capitalists’ lies (it is its business as a capitalist press to repeat the capitalists’ lies), but also by the greater part of the socialist press doing so? Who does not know that European socialism’s greatest crisis has been brought about not by the “capitalists’ lies”, but by the *lies* of Guesde, Hyndman, Vandervelde, Plekhanov and *Kautsky*? Who does not know that the *lies* spoken by such leaders suddenly revealed all the strength of the opportunism that swept them away at the decisive moment?

Let us take a look at what has come about: To make the masses see things in a clearer light, the manifesto says that in the present war the defence of the fatherland idea is a capitalist lie. The European masses, however, are not illiterate, and almost all who have read the manifesto have heard, and still hear *that same lie* from hundreds of socialist papers, journals, and pamphlets, echoing them after Plekhanov, Hyndman, Kautsky and Co. What will the readers of the manifesto think? What thoughts will arise in them after this display of timidity by the authors of the manifesto? Disregard the capitalists’ lie about the defence of the fatherland, the manifesto tells the workers. Well and good. Practically all of them will say or think: the *capitalists’ lie* has long stopped bothering us, but the lie of Kautsky and Co. . . .

The manifesto goes on to repeat another important idea in our resolution, viz., that the socialist parties and the workers’ organisations of the various countries “have *flouted* obligations stemming from the decisions of the Stuttgart, Copenhagen and Basle congresses”; that the International Socialist Bureau⁴⁷ too has *failed to do its duty*; that this failure

to do its duty consisted in voting for war credits, joining governments, recognising "a class truce" (submission to which the manifesto calls *slavish*; in other words, it accuses Guesde, Plekhanov, Kautsky and Co. of substituting for propaganda of socialism the propaganda of *slavish* ideas).

Is it consistent, we shall ask, to speak, in a "popular" manifesto, of the failure of a number of parties to do their duty (it is common knowledge that the reference is to the strongest parties and the workers' organisations in the most advanced countries: Britain, France and Germany), without giving any explanation of this startling and unprecedented fact? The greater part of the socialist parties and the International Socialist Bureau itself have failed to do their duty! What is this—an accident and the failure of individuals, or the turning-point of an entire epoch? If it is the former, and *we* circulate that idea among the masses, it is tantamount to *our* renouncing the fundamentals of socialist doctrine. If it is the latter, how can we fail to say so forthright? We are facing a moment of historic significance—the collapse of the International as a whole, a turning-point of an entire epoch—and yet we are *afraid* to tell the masses that the whole truth must be sought for and found, and that we must do our thinking to the very end. It is preposterous and ridiculous to suppose that the International Socialist Bureau and a number of parties could have collapsed, *without* linking up this event with the long history of the origin, the growth, the maturing and *over-maturity* of the general European opportunist movement, with its deep economic roots—deep, not in the sense that it is intimately linked with the masses, but in the sense that it is connected with a certain stratum of society.

Passing on to the "struggle for peace", the manifesto states that: "This struggle is a struggle for freedom, the brotherhood of peoples, and socialism". It goes on to explain that in wartime the workers make sacrifices "in the service of the ruling classes", whereas they must learn to make sacrifices "*for their own cause*" (doubly underscored in the manifesto),

"for the sacred aims of socialism". The resolution which expresses sympathy with arrested and persecuted fighters says that "the Conference solemnly undertakes to honour the living and the dead by *emulating their example*" and that its aim will be to "arouse the revolutionary spirit in the international proletariat".

All these ideas are a reiteration of our resolution's fundamental idea that a struggle for peace *without* a revolutionary struggle is a hollow and false phrase, and that a revolutionary struggle for socialism is the only way to put an end to the horror of war. But here too we find inconsistency, timidity, and a failure to say everything that ought to be said: it calls upon the masses to *emulate the example* of the revolutionary fighters; it declares that the five members of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Duma group who have been sentenced to exile in Siberia have carried on "the glorious revolutionary tradition of Russia"; it proclaims the necessity of "arousing the revolutionary spirit", but *it does not specify* forthright and clearly the revolutionary methods of struggle.

Was our Central Committee right in signing this manifesto, with all its inconsistency and timidity? We think it was. Our non-agreement, the non-agreement, not only of our Central Committee but of the entire *international* Left-wing section of the Conference, which stands by the principles of *revolutionary Marxism*, is openly expressed in a special resolution, a separate draft manifesto, and a separate declaration on the vote for a compromise manifesto.⁴⁸ We did not conceal a jot of our views, slogans, or tactics. A German edition of our pamphlet, *Socialism and War*,* was handed out at the Conference. We have spread, are spreading, and shall continue to spread our views with no less energy than the manifesto will. It is a fact that this manifesto is a *step forward* towards a real struggle against opportunism, towards a rupture with it. It would be sectarianism to refuse to take this step forward *together* with the minority of Ger-

* See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, pp. 295-338.—Ed.

man, French, Swedish, Norwegian, and Swiss socialists, when we retain full freedom and full opportunity to criticise inconsistency and to work for greater things.* It would be poor war tactics to refuse to adhere to the mounting international protest movement against social-chauvinism just because this movement is slow, because it takes "only" a single step forward and because it is ready and willing to take a step backward tomorrow and make peace with the old International Socialist Bureau. Its readiness to make peace with the opportunists is so far merely wishful thinking. Will the opportunists agree to a peace? Is peace *objectively* possible between *trends* that are dividing more and more deeply—social-chauvinism and Kautskyism on the one hand, and on the other, revolutionary internationalist Marxism? We consider it impossible, and we shall continue our line, encouraged as we are by its *success* at the Conference of September 5-8.

The success of our line is beyond doubt. Compare the facts: In September 1914, our Central Committee's Manifesto seemed almost isolated. In March 1915, an international women's conference adopted a miserable pacifist resolution, which was blindly followed by the Organising Committee. In September 1915, we rallied in a whole group of the international Left wing. We came out with our own tactics, voiced a number of our fundamental ideas in a joint manifesto, and took part in the formation of an I.S.C. (International Socialist Committee), i.e., a practically new International Socialist Bureau, against the wishes of the old one, and

* We are not frightened by the fact that the Organising Committee and the Social-Revolutionaries signed the manifesto diplomatically, retaining all their links with—and *all their attachment* to *Nasha Zarya*, Rubanovich, and the July 1915 Conference of the Popular Socialists and the Social-Revolutionaries in Russia.⁴⁹ We have means enough to combat corrupt diplomacy and unmask it. It is more and more unmasking itself. *Nasha Zarya* and Chkheidze's group are *helping* us unmask Axelrod and Co.

on the basis of a manifesto that openly condemns the tactics of the latter.

The workers of Russia, whose overwhelming majority followed our Party and its Central Committee even in the years 1912-14, will now, from the experience of the international socialist movement, see that our tactics are being confirmed in a wider area, and that our fundamental ideas are shared by an ever growing and finer part of the proletarian International.

Sotsial-Demokrat No. 45-46,
October 11, 1915

Collected Works, Vol. 21,
pp. 383-88.

**REVOLUTIONARY MARXISTS
AT THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIALIST
CONFERENCE,
SEPTEMBER 5-8, 1915**

The ideological struggle at the Conference was waged between a compact group of internationalists, revolutionary Marxists, and the vacillating near-Kautskyites, who formed the Right wing of the Conference. The unitedness of the former group is one of the most important facts and greatest achievements of the Conference. After a year of war, the trend represented by our Party proved the *only* trend in the International to adopt a fully definite resolution as well as a draft manifesto based on the latter, and to unite the consistent Marxists of Russia, Poland, the Lettish territory, Germany, Sweden, Norway, Switzerland, and Holland.

What arguments did the vacillating elements advance against us? The Germans admitted that we were advancing towards revolutionary battles, but, they said, we do not have to proclaim from the house-tops such things as fraternisation in the trenches, political strikes, street demonstrations and civil war. Such things are done, they said, but not spoken of. Others added: this is childishness, verbal pyrotechnics.

The German semi-Kautskyites castigated themselves for these ridiculously, indecently contradictory and evasive speeches by passing a resolution of sympathy and a declaration on the need to "follow the example" of the members of the R.S.D.L. Duma group, who distributed *Sotsial-Demokrat*, our Central Organ, which proclaimed civil war from the house-tops.

You are following the bad example set by Kautsky, we replied to the Germans; in word, you recognise the impending revolution; in deed, you refuse to tell the masses about it openly, to call for it, and indicate the most concrete means of struggle which the masses are to test and legitimise in the course of the revolution. In 1847, Marx and Engels, who were living *abroad*—the German philistines were horrified at revolutionary methods of struggle being spoken of from abroad!—called for revolution, in their celebrated *Manifesto of the Communist Party*; they spoke forthright of the use of force, and branded as contemptible any attempt to conceal the revolutionary aims, tasks and methods of the struggle. The Revolution of 1848 proved that Marx and Engels *alone* had applied the correct tactics to the events. Several years prior to the 1905 Revolution in Russia, Plekhanov, who was then still a Marxist, wrote an unsigned article in the old *Iskra* of 1901,⁵⁰ expressing the editorial board's views on the coming insurrection, on ways of preparing it, such as street demonstrations, and even on technical devices, such as using wire in combating cavalry. The Russian revolution proved that the old *Iskra* alone had approached the events with the correct tactics. We are now faced with the following alternative: either we are really and firmly convinced that the war is creating a revolutionary situation in Europe, and that all the economic and socio-political circumstances of the imperialist period are leading up to a revolution of the proletariat—in which case we are in duty bound to explain to the masses the need for revolution, call for it, create the necessary organisations, and speak fearlessly and most concretely of the various methods of the forcible struggle and its "technique". This duty of ours does not depend upon whether the revolution will be strong enough, or whether it will arrive with a first or a second imperialist war, etc. Or else we are not convinced that the situation is revolutionary, in which case there is no sense in our just talking about a war against war. In that case, we are, in fact, national liberal-labour politicians of the Südekum-Plekhanov or Kautsky variety.

The French delegates also declared that the present situation in Europe, as they saw it, would lead to revolution. But, they said, first, "we have not come here to provide a formula for a Third International"; secondly, the French worker "believes nobody and nothing"; he is demoralised and satiated with anarchist and Hervéist phrases. The former argument is unreasonable, because the joint compromise manifesto *does* "provide a formula" for a Third International, though it is inconsistent, incomplete and not given sufficient thought. The latter argument is very important as a very serious factual argument, which takes the specific situation in France into account, not in the meaning of defence of the fatherland, or the enemy invasion, but in taking note of the "sore points" in the French labour movement. The only thing that logically follows from this, however, is that the French socialists would perhaps join general European revolutionary action by the proletariat *more slowly* than others, and not that such action is unnecessary. The question as to *how rapidly*, in which way and in which particular forms, the proletariat of the various countries are capable of taking revolutionary action was not raised at the Conference and could not have been. The conditions for this are not yet ripe. For the present it is our task to jointly *propagandise* the correct tactics and leave it to events to indicate the *tempo* of the movement, and the modifications in the mainstream (according to nation, locality and trade). If the French proletariat has been demoralised by anarchist phrases, it has been demoralised by Millerandism too, and it is not our business to *increase* this demoralisation by *leaving things unsaid* in the manifesto.

It was none other than Merrheim who uttered the characteristic and profoundly correct phrase: "The [Socialist] Party, Jouhaux [Secretary of the General Confederation of Labour⁵¹] and the government are three heads under one bonnet." This is the truth, a fact proved by the experience of the year of struggle waged by the French internationalists against the Party and Messrs. Jouhaux. There is, however, only one conclusion to be drawn: the government cannot be fought

unless the opportunist parties and the leaders of anarcho-syndicalism are fought against. Unlike our resolution, the joint manifesto merely indicated the tasks in the struggle but did not say everything that should have been said about them.

Arguing against our tactics, one of the Italians said: "Your tactics come either too late [since the war has already begun] or too soon [because the war has not yet created the conditions for revolution]; besides, you propose to 'change the programme' of the International, since all our propaganda has always been conducted 'against violence'." It was very easy for us to reply to this by quoting Jules Guesde in *En garde!* to the effect that not a single influential leader of the Second International ever rejected the use of violence and direct revolutionary methods of the struggle in general. It has always been argued that the legal struggle, parliamentarism and insurrection are interlinked, and *must inevitably* pass into each other according to the changes in the conditions of the movement. From the same book, *En garde!*, we quoted a passage in a speech delivered by Guesde in 1899, in which he spoke of the possibility of a war for markets, colonies, etc., and went on to say that if there were any French, German and British Millerands in such a war, then "what would become of international working-class solidarity?" In this speech Guesde condemned himself in advance. As for declaring propaganda of revolution "inopportune", this objection rests on a confusion of concepts usual among socialists in the Romance countries: they confuse the beginning of a revolution with open and direct propaganda for revolution. In Russia, nobody places the beginning of the 1905 Revolution before January 1905, whereas revolutionary propaganda, in the very narrow sense of the word, the propaganda and the preparation of mass action, demonstrations, strikes, barricades, had been conducted *for years* prior to that. The old *Iskra*, for instance, began to propagandise the matter at the end of 1900, as Marx did in 1847, when nobody thought as yet of the *beginning of a revolution* in Europe.

After a revolution has begun, it is "recognised" even by the liberals and its other enemies; they often recognise it so as to deceive and betray it. *Before* the revolution, revolutionaries foresee it, realise its inevitability, make the masses understand its necessity, and explain its course and methods to the masses.

By the irony of history, Kautsky and his friends, who tried to take out of Grimm's hands the initiative of convening the Conference, and attempted to disrupt the Conference of the Left wing (Kautsky's closest friends even went *on a tour* for this purpose, as Grimm disclosed at the Conference), were *the very ones* who pushed the Conference *to the left*. By *their* deeds, the opportunists and the Kautskyites have proved the correctness of the stand taken by our Party.

Sotsial-Demokrat No. 45-46,
October 11, 1915

Collected Works, Vol. 21,
pp. 389-93

OPPORTUNISM AND THE COLLAPSE OF THE SECOND INTERNATIONAL

I

Has the Second International really ceased to exist? This is being stubbornly denied by its most authoritative representatives, like Kautsky and Vandervelde. Their point of view is that, save for the rupture of relations, nothing has really happened; all is quite well.

To get at the truth of the matter, let us turn to the *Manifesto of the Basle Congress* of 1912, which applies particularly to the present imperialist world war and which was accepted by all the socialist parties of the world. No socialist, be it noted, will dare in theory deny the necessity of making a concrete, historical appraisal of every war.

Now that war has broken out, neither the avowed opportunists nor the Kautskyites dare repudiate the Basle Manifesto or compare its demands with the conduct of the socialist parties during the war. Why? Because the Manifesto completely exposes both.

There is not a single word in the Basle Manifesto about the defence of the fatherland, or about the difference between a war of aggression and a war of defence; there is nothing in it at all about what the opportunists and Kautskyites* of Germany and of the Quadruple Alliance at all

* This does not refer to the personalities of Kautsky's followers in Germany, but to the international type of pseudo-Marxist who vacillates between opportunism and radicalism, but is in reality only a fig-leaf for opportunism.

crossroads are now dinning into the ears of the world. Nor could it have said anything of the sort, because what it does say absolutely rules out the use of such concepts. It makes a highly concrete reference to the series of economic and political conflicts which had for decades been preparing the ground for the present war, which had become quite apparent in 1912, and which brought about the war in 1914. The Manifesto recalls the Russo-Austrian conflict for "hegemony in the Balkans"; the conflicts between Britain, France and Germany (between *all* these countries!) over their "policy of conquest in Asia Minor"; the Austro-Italian conflict over the "striving for domination" in Albania, etc. In short, the Manifesto defines all these as conflicts emanating from "capitalist imperialism". Thus, the Manifesto very clearly recognises the predatory, imperialist, reactionary, slave-driving character of the present war, i.e., a character which makes the idea of defending the fatherland theoretical nonsense and a practical absurdity. The big sharks are fighting each other to gobble up other peoples' "fatherlands". The Manifesto draws the inevitable conclusions from undisputed historical facts: the War "cannot be justified on the slightest pretext of its being in the interest of the people"; it is being prepared "for the sake of the capitalists' profits and the ambitions of dynasties". It would be a "crime" for the workers to "shoot each other down". That is what the Manifesto says.

The epoch of capitalist imperialism is one of ripe and rotten-ripe capitalism, which is about to collapse, and which is mature enough to make way for socialism. The period between 1789 and 1871 was one of progressive capitalism, when the overthrow of feudalism and absolutism, and liberation from the foreign yoke were on history's agenda. "Defence of the fatherland", i.e., defence against oppression, was permissible on these grounds, and on these *alone*. The term would be applicable even now in a war *against* the imperialist Great Powers, but it would be absurd to apply it to a war *between* the imperialist Great Powers, a war to decide who

gets the biggest piece of the Balkan countries, Asia Minor, etc. It is not surprising, therefore, that the "socialists" who advocate "defence of the fatherland" in the present war shun the Basle Manifesto as a thief shuns the scene of his crime. For the Manifesto proves them to be social-chauvinists, i.e., socialists in words, but chauvinists in deeds, who are helping "their own" bourgeoisie to rob other countries and enslave other nations. That is the very substance of chauvinism—to defend one's "own" fatherland even when its acts are aimed at enslaving other peoples' fatherlands.

Recognition that a war is being fought for national liberation implies one set of tactics; its recognition as an imperialist war, another. The Manifesto clearly points to the latter. The war, it says, "will bring on an economic and political crisis", which must be "utilised", not to lessen the crisis, not to defend the fatherland, but, on the contrary, to "rouse" the masses and "hasten the downfall of capitalist rule". It is impossible to hasten something for which historical conditions are not yet mature. The Manifesto declares that social revolution is *possible*, that the conditions for it *have matured*, and that it will break out precisely in *connection* with war. Referring to the examples of the *Paris Commune and the Revolution of 1905* in Russia, i.e., examples of mass strikes and of civil war, the Manifesto declares that "the ruling classes" fear "a proletarian revolution". It is sheer falsehood to claim, as Kautsky does, that the socialist attitude to the *present* war has not been defined. This question was not merely discussed, but decided in Basle, where the tactics of revolutionary proletarian mass struggle were recognised.

It is downright hypocrisy to ignore the Basle Manifesto altogether, or in its most essential parts, and to quote instead the speeches of leaders, or the resolutions of various parties, which, in the first place, *antedate* the Basle Congress, secondly, were not decisions adopted by the parties of the whole world, and thirdly, applied to various *possible* wars, but never to the present war. The point is that the epoch of national wars between the big European powers has been su-

perseded by an epoch of imperialist wars between them, and that the Basle Manifesto had to recognise this fact officially for the first time.

It would be a mistake to regard the Basle Manifesto as an empty threat, a collection of platitudes, as so much hot air. Those whom the Manifesto exposes would like to have it that way. But it is not true. The Manifesto is but the fruit of the great propaganda work carried on throughout the entire epoch of the Second International; it is but the summary of all that the socialists had disseminated among the masses in the hundreds of thousands of speeches, articles and manifestos in all languages. It merely reiterates what *Jules Guesde*, for example, wrote in 1899, when he castigated socialist ministerialism in the event of war: he wrote of war provoked by the "capitalist pirates" (*En gardel*, p. 175); it merely repeats what *Kautsky* wrote in 1909 in his *Road to Power*, where he admitted that the "peaceful" epoch was over and that the epoch of wars and revolutions was on. To represent the Basle Manifesto as so much talk, or as a mistake, is to regard as mere talk, or as a mistake, everything the socialists have done in the last twenty-five years. The opportunists and the Kautskyites find the contradiction between the Manifesto and its non-application so intolerable because it lays bare the profound contradictions in the work of the Second International. The relatively "peaceful" character of the period between 1871 and 1914 served to foster opportunism first as a *mood*, then as a *trend*, until finally it formed a *group or stratum* among the labour bureaucracy and petty-bourgeois fellow-travellers. These elements were able to gain control of the labour movement only by paying lip-service to revolutionary aims and revolutionary tactics. They were able to win the confidence of the masses only by their protestations that all this "peaceful" work served to *prepare* the proletarian revolution. This contradiction was a boil which just had to burst, and burst it has. Here is the question: is it worth trying, as Kautsky and Co. are doing, to force the pus back into the body for the sake of "unity" (with the pus), or should

the pus be removed as quickly and as thoroughly as possible, regardless of the pang of pain caused by the process, to help bring about the complete recovery of the body of the labour movement.

Those who voted for war credits, entered cabinets and advocated defence of the fatherland in 1914-15 have patently betrayed socialism. Only hypocrites will deny it. This betrayal must be explained.

II

It would be absurd to regard the whole question as one of personalities. What has opportunism to do with it when men like *Plekhanov* and *Guesde*, etc.?—asks *Kautsky* (*Die Neue Zeit*, May 28, 1915). What has opportunism to do with it when *Kautsky*, etc.?—replies *Axelrod* on behalf of the opportunists of the Quadruple Alliance (*Die Krise der Sozialdemokratie*, Zurich, 1915, p. 21). This is a sheer farce. *If the crisis of the whole movement is to be explained, an examination must be made, firstly, of the economic significance of the present policy; secondly, its underlying ideas; and thirdly, its connection with the history of the various trends in the socialist movement.*

What is the economic substance of defencism in the war of 1914-15? The bourgeoisie of *all* the big powers are waging the war to divide and exploit the world, and oppress other nations. A few crumbs of the bourgeoisie's huge profits may come the way of the small group of labour bureaucrats, labour aristocrats, and petty-bourgeois fellow-travellers. Social-chauvinism and opportunism have the same class basis, namely, the alliance of a small section of privileged workers with "their" national bourgeoisie *against* the working-class masses; the alliance between the lackeys of the bourgeoisie and the bourgeoisie *against* the class the latter is exploiting.

Opportunism and social-chauvinism have the same political content, namely, class collaboration, repudiation of the dictatorship of the proletariat, repudiation of revolutionary

action, unconditional acceptance of bourgeois legality, confidence in the bourgeoisie and lack of confidence in the proletariat. *Social-chauvinism is the direct continuation and consummation of British liberal-labour politics, of Millerandism and Bernsteinism.*

The struggle between the two main trends in the labour movement—revolutionary socialism and opportunist socialism—fills the entire period from 1889 to 1914. Even today there are two main trends on the attitude to war in every country. Let us drop the bourgeois and opportunist habit of referring to personalities. Let us take the *trends* in a number of countries. Let us take ten European countries: Germany, Britain, Russia, Italy, Holland, Sweden, Bulgaria, Switzerland, Belgium and France. In the first eight the division into opportunist and revolutionary trends corresponds to the division into social-chauvinists and internationalists. In Germany the strongholds of social-chauvinism are *Sozialistische Monatshefte* and Legien and Co.; in Britain the Fabians and the Labour Party (the I.L.P. has always been allied with them and has supported their organ, and in this bloc it has always been weaker than the social-chauvinists, whereas three-sevenths of the B.S.P. are internationalists); in Russia this trend is represented by *Nasha Zarya* (now *Nashe Dyelo*), by the Organising Committee, and by the Duma group led by Chkheidze; in Italy it is represented by the reformists with Bissolati at their head; in Holland, by Troelstra's party; in Sweden, by the majority of the Party led by Branting; in Bulgaria, by the so-called "Shiroki" socialists; in Switzerland by Greulich and Co. In *all* these countries it is the revolutionary Social-Democrats who have voiced a more or less vigorous protest against social-chauvinism. France and Belgium are the two exceptions; there internationalism also exists, but is very weak.

Social-chauvinism is opportunism in its finished form. It is quite ripe for an open, frequently vulgar, alliance with the bourgeoisie and the general staffs. It is this alliance that gives it great power and a monopoly of the legal press and of de-

ceiving the masses. *It is absurd to go on regarding opportunism as an inner-party phenomenon.* It is ridiculous to think of carrying out the Basle resolution together with David, Legien, Hyndman, Plekhanov and Webb. Unity with the social-chauvinists means unity with one's "own" national bourgeoisie, which exploits other nations; it means splitting the international proletariat. This does not mean that an immediate break with the opportunists is possible everywhere; it means only that historically this break is imminent; that it is necessary and inevitable for the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat; that history, which has led us from "peaceful" capitalism to imperialist capitalism, has paved the way for this break. *Volentem ducunt fata, nolentem trahunt.**

III

This is very well understood by the shrewd representatives of the bourgeoisie. That is why they are so lavish in their praise of the present socialist parties, headed by the "defenders of the fatherland", i.e., the defenders of imperialist plunder. That is why the social-chauvinist leaders are rewarded by their governments either with ministerial posts (in France and Britain), or with a monopoly of unhindered legal existence (in Germany and Russia). That is why in Germany, where the Social-Democratic Party was strongest and where its transformation into a national-liberal *counter-revolutionary* labour party has been most obvious, things have got to the stage where the public prosecutor qualifies the struggle between the "minority" and the "majority" as "incitement to class hatred"! That is why the greatest concern of the clever opportunists is to retain the former "unity" of the old parties, which did the bourgeoisie so many good turns in 1914 and 1915. The views held by these opportunists in all countries of the world were expounded with commendable frankness by a German Social-Democrat in an

* The fates lead the willing, drag the unwilling.—Ed.

article signed "Monitor" which appeared in April 1915, in the reactionary magazine *Preussische Jahrbücher*. Monitor thinks that it would be very dangerous for the bourgeoisie if the Social-Democrats were to move *still further to the right*. "It must preserve its character as a labour party with socialist ideals; for the day it gives this up a new party will arise and adopt the programme the old party had disavowed, giving it a still more radical formulation" (*Preussische Jahrbücher*, 1915, No. 4, pp. 50-51).

Monitor hit the nail on the head. That is just what the British Liberals and the French Radicals have always wanted—phrases with a revolutionary ring to deceive the masses and induce them to place their trust in the Lloyd Georges, the Sembats, the Renaudels, the Legiens, and the Kautskys, in the men capable of preaching "defence of the fatherland" in a predatory war.

But Monitor represents only one variety of opportunism, the frank, crude, cynical variety. Others act with stealth, subtlety, and "honesty". Engels once said that for the working class "honest" opportunists were the greatest danger.⁵² Here is one example.

Kautsky wrote in *Die Neue Zeit* (November 26, 1915) as follows: "The opposition against the majority is growing; the masses are in an opposition mood. . . . After the war [only *after* the war?—*N.L.*] class antagonisms will become so sharp that radicalism will gain the upper hand among the masses. . . . After the war [only *after* the war?—*N.L.*] we shall be menaced with the desertion of the radical elements from the Party and their influx into the party of anti-parliamentary [?? meaning extra-parliamentary] mass action. . . . Thus, our Party is splitting up into two extreme camps which have nothing in common." To preserve unity, *Kautsky* tries to persuade the majority in the Reichstag to allow the minority to make a few radical parliamentary speeches. That means *Kautsky* wants to use a few radical parliamentary speeches to reconcile the revolutionary masses with the opportunists, who have "nothing in common" with revolution, who have

long had the leadership of the trade unions, and now, relying on their close alliance with the bourgeoisie and the government, have also captured the leadership of the Party. What essential difference is there between this and Monitor's "programme"? There is none, save for the sugary phrases which prostitute Marxism.

At a meeting of the Reichstag group on March 18, 1915, *Wurm*, a Kautskyite, "warned" against "pulling the strings too taut. There is growing opposition among the workers' masses to the majority of the group, we must keep to the Marxist [?! probably a misprint: this should read "the Monitor"] Centre" (*Klassenkampf gegen den Krieg! Material zum Fall Liebknecht*. Als Manuskript gedruckt,* p. 67). Thus we find that the revolutionary sentiment of the masses was admitted as a *fact* on behalf of *all* the Kautskyites (the so-called Centre) *as early as March, 1915!!* But eight and a half months later, Kautsky again comes forward with the proposal to "reconcile" the militant masses with the opportunist, counter-revolutionary party—and he wants to do this with a few revolutionary-sounding phrases!!

War is often useful in exposing what is rotten and discarding the conventionalities.

Let us compare the British Fabians with the German Kautskyites. Here is what a *real* Marxist, Frederick Engels, wrote about the former on January 18, 1893: "... a band of careerists who have understanding enough to realise the inevitability of the social revolution, but who could not possibly entrust this gigantic task to the raw proletariat alone. . . . Fear of the revolution is their fundamental principle" (*Letters to Sorge*, p. 390).

And on November 11, 1893, he wrote: "... these haughty bourgeois who kindly condescend to emancipate the proletariat from above if only it would have sense enough to realise that such a raw, uneducated mass cannot liberate itself

* *The Class Struggle Against the War. Material on the Liebknecht Case*. Printed for private circulation only.—Ed.

and can achieve nothing without the kindness of these clever lawyers, writers and sentimental old women" (ibid., p. 401).

In theory Kautsky looks down upon the Fabians with the contempt of a Pharisee for a poor sinner, for he swears by "Marxism". But what actual difference is there between the two? Both signed the Basle Manifesto, and both treated it as Wilhelm II treated Belgian neutrality. But Marx all his life castigated those who strove to quench the revolutionary spirit of the workers.

Kautsky has put forward his new theory of "ultra-imperialism" in opposition to the revolutionary Marxists. By this he means that the "rivalries of national finance capitals" are to be superseded by the "joint exploitation of the world by international finance capital" (*Die Neue Zeit*, April 30, 1915). But he adds: "We do not as yet have sufficient data to decide whether this new phase of capitalism is possible." On the grounds of the mere assumption of a "new phase", which he does not even dare declare definitely "possible", the inventor of this "phase" rejects his own revolutionary declarations as well as the revolutionary tasks and revolutionary tactics of the proletariat—rejects them *now*, in the "phase" of a crisis, which *has already broken out*, the phase of war and the unprecedented aggravation of class antagonisms! Is this not Fabianism at its most abominable?

Axelrod, the leader of the Russian Kautskyites, says, "The centre of gravity of the problem of internationalising the proletarian movement for emancipation is the internationalisation of everyday practice"; for example, "labour protection and insurance legislation must become the object of the workers' international organisation and action" (*Axelrod, The Crisis of Social-Democracy*, Zurich, 1915, pp. 39-40). Not only Legien, David and the Webbs, but even Lloyd George himself, and Naumann, Briand and Milyukov would quite obviously subscribe to such "internationalism". As in 1912, Axelrod is quite prepared to utter the most revolutionary phrases for the very distant future, if the future International "comes out [against the governments in the event of war]

and raises a revolutionary storm". How brave we are! But when it comes to supporting and developing the incipient revolutionary ferment among the masses *now*, Axelrod says that these tactics of revolutionary mass action "would be justified to some extent if we were on the very eve of the social revolution, as was the case in Russia, for example, where the student demonstrations of 1901 heralded the approaching decisive battles against absolutism". At the present moment, however, all that is "utopia", "Bakunism", etc. This is fully in the spirit of Kolb, David, Südekum and Legien.

What dear old Axelrod forgets is that in 1901 nobody in Russia knew, or could have known, that the first "decisive battle" would take place four years later—please note, *four* years later—and that it would be "indecisive". Nevertheless, we revolutionary Marxists alone were right at that time: we ridiculed the Krichevskys and Martynovs, who called for an immediate assault. We merely advised the workers to kick out the opportunists everywhere and to exert every effort to support, sharpen and extend the demonstrations and other mass revolutionary action. The present situation in Europe is absolutely similar. It would be absurd to call for an "immediate" assault; but it would be a shame to call oneself a Social-Democrat and not to advise the workers to break with the opportunists and exert all their efforts to strengthen, deepen, extend and sharpen the incipient revolutionary movement and demonstrations. Revolution never falls ready-made from the skies, and when revolutionary ferment starts no one can say whether and when it will lead to a "real", "genuine" revolution. Kautsky and Axelrod are giving the workers old, shop-worn, counter-revolutionary advice. Kautsky and Axelrod are feeding the masses with hopes that the *future* International will surely be revolutionary, but they are doing this for the sole purpose of protecting camouflaging and prettifying the *present* domination of the counter-revolutionary elements—the Legiens, Davids, Vanderveldes and Hyndmans. Is it not obvious that "unity" with Legien and

Co. is the best means of preparing the "future" revolutionary International?

"It would be folly to strive to convert the world war into civil war," declares *David*, the leader of the German opportunists (*Die Sozialdemokratie und der Weltkrieg*, 1915, p. 172), in reply to the manifesto of the Central Committee of our Party, November 1, 1914. This manifesto says, *inter alia*:

"However difficult such a transformation may seem at any given moment, socialists will never relinquish systematic, persistent and undeviating preparatory work in this direction now that war has become a fact."*

(This passage is also quoted by *David*, p. 171.) A month before *David's* book appeared our Party published its resolutions defining "systematic preparation" as follows: (1) refusal to vote for credits; (2) disruption of the class truce; (3) formation of illegal organisations; (4) support for solidarity manifestations in the trenches; (5) support for all revolutionary mass action.**

David is almost as brave as *Axelrod*. In 1912, he did not think that reference to the Paris Commune in anticipation of the war was "folly".

Plekhanov, a typical representative of the Entente social-chauvinists, takes the same view of revolutionary tactics as *David*. He calls them a "farcical dream". But listen to *Kolb*, an avowed opportunist, who wrote: "The consequence of the tactics of *Liebknecht's* followers would be that the struggle within the German nation would be brought up to boiling point" (*Die Sozialdemokratie am Scheidewege*, p. 50).

But what is a struggle brought up to boiling point if not civil war?

If our Central Committee's tactics, which broadly coincide with those of the Zimmerwald Left, were "folly", "dreams", "adventurism", "Bakunism"—as *David*, *Plekhanov*, *Axelrod*, *Kautsky* and others have asserted—they could never lead

* See pp. 69-77.—*Ed.*

** See pp. 88-92.—*Ed.*

to a "struggle within a nation", let alone to a struggle brought up to boiling point. Nowhere in the world have anarchist phrases brought about a struggle within a nation. But the facts indicate that precisely in 1915, as a result of the crisis produced by the war, revolutionary ferment among the masses is on the increase, and there is a spread of strikes and political demonstrations in Russia, strikes in Italy and in Britain, and hunger demonstrations and political demonstrations in Germany. Are these not the beginnings of revolutionary mass struggles?

*The sum and substance of Social-Democracy's practical programme in this war is to support, develop, extend and sharpen mass revolutionary action, and to set up illegal organisations, for without them there is no way of telling the truth to the masses of people even in the "free" countries. The rest is either lies or mere verbiage, whatever its trappings of opportunist or pacifist theory.**

When we are told that these "Russian tactics" (David's expression) are not suitable for Europe, we usually reply by pointing to the facts. On October 30, a delegation of Berlin women comrades called on the Party's Presidium in Berlin, and stated that "now that we have a large organising apparatus it is much easier to distribute illegal pamphlets and leaflets and to organise 'banned meetings' than it was under the Anti-Socialist Law. . . . Ways and means are not lacking, but the will evidently is" (*Berner Tagwacht*, 1915, No. 271).

Had these bad comrades been led astray by the Russian sectarians", etc.? Is it these comrades who represent the

* At the International Women's Congress held in Berne in March 1915, the representatives of the Central Committee of our Party urged that it was absolutely necessary to set up illegal organisations. This was rejected. The British women laughed at this proposal and praised British "Liberty". But a few months later British newspapers, like the *Labour Leader*, reached us with blank spaces, and then came the news of police raids, confiscation of pamphlets, arrests, and Draconian sentences imposed on comrades who had spoken in Britain about peace, nothing but peace!

real masses, or is it Legien and Kautsky? Legien, who in his report on January 27, 1915, fumed against the "anarchistic" idea of forming underground organisations; or Kautsky, who has become such a counter-revolutionary that on November 26, four days before the 10,000-strong demonstration in Berlin, he denounced street demonstrations as "adventurism"!!

We've had enough of empty talk, and of prostituted "Marxism" à la Kautsky! After twenty-five years of the Second International, after the Basle Manifesto, the workers will no longer believe fine words. Opportunism is rotten-ripe; it has been transformed into social-chauvinism and has definitely deserted to the bourgeois camp. It has severed its spiritual and political ties with Social-Democracy. It will also break off its organisational ties. The workers are already demanding "illegal" pamphlets and "banned" meetings, i.e., underground organisations to support the revolutionary mass movement. Only when "war against war" is conducted on these lines does it cease to be empty talk and becomes Social-Democratic work. In spite of all difficulties, set-backs, mistakes, delusions and interruptions, this work will lead humanity to the victorious proletarian revolution.

Published in January 1916
in *Vorbote* No. 1

Collected Works, Vol. 22,
pp. 108-20

**SPEECH DELIVERED
AT AN INTERNATIONAL MEETING
IN BERNE, FEBRUARY 8, 1916⁵³**

Comrades! The European war has been raging for more than eighteen months. With every passing day, and month, it becomes clearer and clearer to the mass of the workers that the Zimmerwald Manifesto expressed the truth when it declared that talk about "defence of the fatherland" and suchlike phrases are nothing but a capitalist fraud. It is becoming more evident every day that this is *a war between capitalists, between big robbers*, who are quarrelling over who is to get the largest slice, who is to plunder the greatest number of countries, and to suppress and enslave the greatest number of nations.

It may sound incredible, especially to Swiss comrades, but it is true, nevertheless, that *in Russia*, too, it is not only murderous tsarism, or the capitalists, but also a section of the so-called, or former, socialists who are saying that Russia is fighting a "defensive war", that she is only fighting against the German invasion. But the whole world knows that for decades tsarism has been oppressing more than a hundred million people belonging to other nationalities in Russia, and that for decades Russia has been pursuing a predatory policy towards China, Persia, Armenia and Galicia. *Neither Russia, nor Germany, nor any other Great Power for that matter has any right to claim that it is waging a "defensive war"*: all the Great Powers are waging a capitalist, imperialist war, a predatory war, a war for the oppression of small and foreign nations, a war for the profits of the capitalists,

who have been converting proletarian blood and the horrible sufferings of the masses into the pure gold of their immense fortunes.

Four years ago, in November 1912, when it had become quite clear that war was in the offing, representatives of the socialist parties of the world met at the International Socialist Congress in Basle. Even at that time there was no room for doubt that the impending war would be a war between the Great Powers, between these great plunderers and that the responsibility would fall upon the governments and the capitalist class of *all* the Great Powers. This truth was openly stated in the Basle Manifesto, which was adopted *unanimously* by the socialist parties of the world. *The Basle Manifesto says nothing at all about a "defensive war" or "defence of the fatherland"*. It castigates the governments and the bourgeoisie of *all* the Great Powers, without exception. It says openly that war would be the greatest of crimes, that the workers consider it a crime to shoot at each other, and that the horrors of war and the indignation these would rouse among the workers would inevitably lead to a *proletarian revolution*.

When the war actually broke out it became evident that its character had been correctly defined at Basle. But the socialist and labour organisations were not unanimous in carrying out the Basle decisions; they split. We find that the socialist and labour organisations are now split into two big camps in all countries of the world. The smaller section, the leaders, functionaries and officials, have betrayed socialism and have sided with their governments. The other section, to which the mass of class-conscious workers belong, continues to gather its forces and to fight against the war and for the proletarian revolution.

The views of this latter section were expressed in the Zimmerwald Manifesto, to mention one document.

In Russia, from the very beginning of the war, the *workers' deputies* in the Duma waged a determined revolutionary struggle against the war and the tsarist monarchy. Five work-

ers' deputies—Petrovsky, Badayev, Muranov, Shagov and Samoïlov—distributed revolutionary leaflets against the war and carried on persistent revolutionary agitation. The tsarist government ordered the arrest of these five deputies; they were tried and sentenced to exile in Siberia for life. The leaders of the working class of Russia have languished in Siberia for months, but their cause has not been defeated; their work is being continued along the same lines by the class-conscious workers of all Russia.

Comrades! You have heard speakers from various countries who have told you about the workers' revolutionary struggle against the war. I merely want to add another example, that of the United States of America, the biggest and richest country. Its capitalists are now making enormous profits out of the European war. And they are also campaigning for war. They are saying that America, too, must prepare to enter the war, and that hundreds of millions of the people's dollars must be siphoned off into new armaments, into armaments without end. A section of the socialists in America have also responded to this false, criminal call. Let me read a statement by Comrade *Eugene Debs*, a most popular leader of the American socialists, and the presidential candidate of the American Socialist Party.

In the September 11, 1915, issue of the American weekly, *Appeal to Reason*,⁵⁴ he says: "*I am not a capitalist soldier; I am a proletarian revolutionist. I do not belong to the regular army of the plutocracy, but to the irregular army of the people. I refuse to obey any command to fight from the ruling class. . . . I am opposed to every war but one; I am for that war with heart and soul, and that is the world-wide war of the social revolution. In that war I am prepared to fight in any way the ruling class may make necessary. . . .*"

This is what *Eugene Debs*, the American Bebel, the beloved leader of the American workers, is telling them.

This goes to show once again, comrades, that *the rallying of the working class forces is truly under way in all*

countries of the world. War inflicts horrible sufferings on the people, but we must not, and we have no reason at all, to despair of the future.

The millions of victims who will fall in the war, and as a consequence of the war, will not have died in vain. The millions who are starving, the millions who are sacrificing their lives in the trenches, are not only suffering, they are also gathering strength; they are pondering over the real causes of the war; they are becoming more determined and are acquiring a clearer revolutionary understanding. In *all* countries of the world there is growing discontent among the masses and greater ferment; there are strikes, demonstrations and protests against the war. *This is an earnest of the proletarian revolution against capitalism that is bound to follow the European war.*

Berner Tagwacht No. 33,
February 9, 1916

Collected Works, Vol. 22,
pp. 123-26

From LETTER TO G. Y. ZINOVIEV

One cannot understand the present war without understanding the epoch.

When people say this about the epoch, this is not just a phrase. It is correct. And your quotations from my old articles say *only* that. *They are correct.*

But when people draw from this the conclusion, *as they have begun to do*, that "in the epoch of imperialism there cannot be national wars", that is nonsense. It is an obvious error—historical and political and *logical* (for an epoch is a sum of varied phenomena, in which in addition to the typical there is *always* something else).

And you *repeat this error*, when you write in your remarks:

"Small countries cannot in the present epoch defend their fatherland."

[=the vulgarisers]

Untrue!! This is just the error of Junius, Radek, the "disarmers" and the Japanese!!

One should say: "Small countries, *too*, cannot in imperialist wars, which are most typical of the current imperialist epoch, defend their fatherland."

That is quite different.

In this difference lies the *whole essence* of the case against the *vulgarisers*. And it's just the *essence* which you haven't noticed.

Grimm repeats the error of the vulgarisers, and you *indulge* him by providing a wrong formulation. On the con-

trary, it is just now that we must (both in talks and in articles) refute the vulgarisers for Grimm's benefit.

We are not at all against "defence of the fatherland" *in general*, not against "defensive wars" *in general*. You will *never* find that nonsense in a single resolution (or in any of my articles). We are against defence of the fatherland and a defensive position in the *imperialist war* of 1914-16 and in other *imperialist wars*, typical of the imperialist *epoch*. But in the imperialist *epoch* there *may* be also "just", "defensive", revolutionary wars [namely (1) national, (2) civil, (3) socialist *and suchlike*].

Written in August 1916

Collected Works, Vol. 35,
pp. 228-29

REPLY TO P. KIEVSKY (G. PYATAKOV)⁵⁵

Like every crisis in the life of individuals or in the history of nations, war oppresses and breaks some, steels and enlightens others.

The truth of that is making itself felt in Social-Democratic thinking on the war and in connection with the war. It is one thing to give serious thought to the causes and significance of an imperialist war that grows out of highly developed capitalism, Social-Democratic tactics in connection with such a war, the causes of the crisis within the Social-Democratic movement, and so on. But it is quite another to allow the war to *oppress* your thinking, to stop thinking and analysing *under the weight* of the terrible impressions and tormenting consequences or features of the war.

One such form of *oppression* or *repression* of human thinking caused by the war is the contemptuous attitude of imperialist Economism towards *democracy*. P. Kievsky does not notice that running like a red thread through all his arguments is this war-inspired oppression, this fear, this refusal to analyse. What point is there in discussing defence of the fatherland when we are in the midst of such a terrible holocaust? What point is there in discussing nations' rights when outright strangulation is everywhere the rule? Self-determination and "independence" of nations—but look what they have done to "independent" Greece! What is the use of talking and thinking of "rights", when rights are everywhere being trampled upon in the interests of the militarists! What sense is there in talking and thinking of a

republic, when there is absolutely no difference whatsoever between the most democratic republics and the most reactionary monarchies, when the war has obliterated every trace of difference!

Kievsky is very angry when told that he has given way to fear, to the extent of rejecting democracy in general. He is angry and objects: I am not against democracy, only against *one* democratic demand, which I consider "bad". But though Kievsky is offended, and though he "*assures*" us (and himself as well, perhaps) that he is not at all "against" democracy, his *arguments*—or, more correctly, the endless *errors* in his arguments—*prove* the very opposite.

Defence of the fatherland is a lie in an imperialist war, but not in a democratic and revolutionary war. All talk of "rights" seems absurd during a war, because *every* war replaces rights by direct and outright violence. But that should not lead us to forget that history has known in the past (and very likely will know, must know, in the future) wars (democratic and revolutionary wars) which, while replacing every kind of "right", every kind of democracy, by violence during the war, nevertheless, in their social content and implications, *served* the cause of democracy, and *consequently* socialism. The example of Greece, it would seem, "*refutes*" all national self-determination. But if you stop to think, analyse and weigh matters, and do not allow yourself to be deafened by the sound of words or frightened and oppressed by the nightmarish impressions of the war, then this example is no more serious or convincing than ridiculing the republican system because the "democratic" republics, the most democratic—not only France, but also the United States, Portugal and Switzerland—have already introduced or are introducing, in the course of this war, exactly the same kind of militarist arbitrariness that exists in Russia.

That imperialist war obliterates the difference between republic and monarchy is a fact. But to therefore reject the republic, or even be contemptuous towards it, is to allow

oneself to be frightened by the war, and one's thinking to be *oppressed* by its horrors. That is the mentality of many supporters of the "disarmament" slogan (Roland-Holst, the younger element in Switzerland, the Scandinavian "Lefts"⁵⁶ and others). What, they imply, is the use of discussing revolutionary utilisation of the army or a militia when there is no difference in this war between a republican militia and a monarchist standing army, and when militarism is *everywhere* doing its horrible work?

That is all *one* trend of thought, *one and the same* theoretical and practical political error Kievsky unwittingly makes at every step. He *thinks* he is arguing only against self-determination, he *wants* to argue only against self-determination, but the *result*—against his will and conscience, and that is the curious thing!—is that he has adduced *not a single* argument which could not be just as well applied to democracy in general!

The real source of all his curious logical errors and confusion—and this applies to not only self-determination, but also to defence of the fatherland, divorce, "rights" in general—lies in the *oppression* of his thinking by the war, which makes him completely distort the Marxist position on democracy.

Imperialism is highly developed capitalism; imperialism is progressive; imperialism *is* the negation of democracy—"hence", democracy is "unattainable" under capitalism. Imperialist war is a flagrant violation of all democracy, whether in backward monarchies or progressive republics—"hence" there is no point in talking of "rights" (i.e., democracy!). The "only" thing that can be "opposed" to imperialist war is socialism; socialism alone is "the way out"; "hence" to advance democratic slogans in our minimum programme, i.e., under capitalism, is a deception or an illusion, befuddlement or postponement, etc., of the slogan of socialist revolution.

Though Kievsky does not realise it, that is the real source of all his mishaps. That is his *basic* logical error which,

precisely because it is basic and is not realised by the author, "explodes" at every step like a punctured bicycle tire. It "bursts out" now on the question of defending the fatherland, now on the question of divorce, now in the phrase about "rights", in this remarkable phrase (remarkable for its utter contempt for "rights" and its utter failure to understand the issue): we shall discuss *not* rights, *but* the destruction of age-old slavery!

To say that is to show a lack of understanding of the relationship between capitalism and democracy, between socialism and democracy.

Capitalism in general, and imperialism in particular, turn democracy into an illusion—though at the same time capitalism engenders democratic aspirations in the masses, creates democratic institutions, aggravates the antagonism between imperialism's denial of democracy and the mass striving for democracy. Capitalism and imperialism can be overthrown only by economic revolution. They cannot be overthrown by democratic transformations, even the most "ideal". But a proletariat not schooled in the struggle for democracy is incapable of performing an economic revolution. Capitalism cannot be vanquished without *taking over the banks*, without repealing *private ownership* of the means of production. These revolutionary measures, however, cannot be implemented without organising the entire people for democratic administration of the means of production captured from the bourgeoisie, without enlisting the entire mass of the working people, the proletarians, semi-proletarians and small peasants, for the democratic organisation of their ranks, their forces, their participation in state affairs. Imperialist war may be said to be a triple negation of democracy (*a.* every war replaces "rights" by violence; *b.* imperialism as such is the negation of democracy; *c.* imperialist war fully equates the republic with the monarchy), but the awakening and growth of socialist revolt against imperialism are *indissolubly* linked with the growth of democratic resistance and unrest. Socialism leads to the withering away

of every state, consequently also of every democracy, but socialism can be implemented only *through* the dictatorship of the proletariat, which combines violence against the bourgeoisie, i.e., the minority of the population, with *full* development of democracy, i.e., the genuinely equal and genuinely universal participation of the *entire* mass of the population in all *state* affairs and in all the complex problems of abolishing capitalism.

It is in these "contradictions" that Kievsky, having forgotten the Marxist teaching on democracy, got himself confused. Figuratively speaking, the war has so oppressed his thinking that he uses the agitational slogan "break out of imperialism" to replace all thinking, just as the cry "get out of the colonies" is used to replace analysis of what, properly speaking, is the *meaning*—economically and politically—of the civilised nations "getting out of the colonies".

The Marxist solution of the problem of democracy is for the proletariat to *utilise all* democratic institutions and aspirations in its class struggle against the bourgeoisie in order to prepare for its overthrow and assure its own victory. Such utilisation is no easy task. To the Economists, Tolstoyans, etc., it often seems an unpardonable concession to "bourgeois" and opportunist views, just as to Kievsky defence of national self-determination "in the epoch of finance capital" seems an unpardonable concession to bourgeois views. Marxism teaches us that to "fight opportunism" by renouncing utilisation of the democratic institutions created and distorted by the bourgeoisie of the *given*, capitalist, society is to *completely surrender* to opportunism!

The slogan of *civil war* for socialism indicates the quickest way out of the imperialist war and *links* our struggle against the war with our struggle against opportunism. It is the only slogan that correctly takes into account both war-time peculiarities—the war is dragging out and threatening to grow into a whole "epoch" of war—and the general character of our activities as distinct from opportunism with its pacifism, legalism and adaptation to one's "own" bourgeoisie. In addi-

tion, civil war against the bourgeoisie is a *democratically* organised and *democratically* conducted war of the propertyless mass against the propertied minority. But civil war, like every other, must inevitably replace rights by violence. However, violence in the name of the interests and rights of the majority is of a different nature: it tramples on the "rights" of the exploiters, the bourgeoisie, it is *unachievable* without democratic organisation of the army and the "rear". Civil war forcibly expropriates, immediately and first of all, the banks, factories, railways, the big estates, etc. But *in order* to expropriate all this, we shall have to introduce election of all officials and officers by the people, *completely merge* the army conducting the war against the bourgeoisie with the mass of the population, completely democratise administration of the food supply, the production and distribution of food, etc. The object of civil war is to seize the banks, factories, etc., destroy all possibility of resistance by the bourgeoisie, destroy *its* armed forces. But that aim cannot be achieved *either* in its purely military, *or* economic, *or* political aspects, unless we, during the war, simultaneously introduce and extend democracy among *our* armed forces and in *our* "rear". We tell the masses now (and they instinctively feel that we are right): "They are deceiving you in making you fight for imperialist capitalism in a war disguised by the great slogans of democracy. You must, you shall wage a *genuinely* democratic war *against* the bourgeoisie for the achievement of genuine democracy and socialism." The present war unites and "merges" nations into coalitions by means of violence and financial dependence. In our civil war against the bourgeoisie, *we* shall unite and merge the nations *not* by the force of the ruble, *not* by the force of the truncheon, not by violence, but by *voluntary* agreement and solidarity of the working people against the exploiters. For the bourgeoisie the proclamation of equal rights for all nations has become a deception. For us it will be the truth that will facilitate and accelerate the winning over of all nations. Without effectively organised *democratic*

relations between nations—and, consequently, without freedom of secession—civil war of the workers and working people generally of all nations against the bourgeoisie is *impossible*.

Through utilisation of bourgeois democracy to socialist and consistently democratic organisation of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie and against opportunism. There is no other path. There is *no* other way out. Marxism, just as life itself, knows no other way out. We must direct free secession and free merging of nations along that path, not fight shy of them, not fear that this will “defile” the “purity” of our economic aims.

Written August-September 1916

Collected Works, Vol. 23,
pp. 22-27

From A CARICATURE OF MARXISM AND IMPERIALIST ECONOMISM

1. THE MARXIST ATTITUDE TOWARDS WAR AND "DEFENCE OF THE FATHERLAND"

Kievsky is convinced, and wants to convince his reader, that he "disagrees" *only* with §9 of our Party Programme dealing with national self-determination. He is very angry and tries to refute the charge that on the question of democracy he is departing from the fundamentals of Marxism *in general*, that he has "betrayed" (the angry quotation marks are Kievsky's) Marxism on basic issues. But the point is that the moment our author begins to discuss his allegedly partial disagreement on an individual issue, the moment he adduces his arguments, considerations, etc., he immediately reveals that he is deviating from Marxism all along the line. Take §b (Section 2) of his article. "This demand [i.e., national self-determination] directly [! !] leads to social-patriotism," our author proclaims, explaining that the "treasonous" slogan of fatherland defence follows "quite [!] logically [!] from the right of nations to self-determination"... In his opinion, self-determination implies "sanctioning the treason of the French and Belgian social-patriots, who are defending this independence [the national independence of France and Belgium] with arms in hand! They are *doing* what the supporters of 'self-determination' only advocate..." "Defence of the fatherland belongs to the arsenal of our worst enemies..." "We categorically refuse to understand how one can *simultaneously* be against defence of the fatherland and for self-determination, against the fatherland and for it."

That's Kievsky. He obviously has not understood our resolutions against the fatherland defence slogan in the present war. It is therefore necessary again to explain the meaning of what is so clearly set out in our resolutions.

The resolution our Party adopted at its Berne Conference in March 1915, "On the Defence of the Fatherland Slogan",* begins with the words: "*The present war is, in substance*". . . .

That the resolution deals with the *present* war could not have been put more plainly. The words "in substance" indicate that we must distinguish between the apparent and the real, between appearance and substance, between the word and the deed. The purpose of all talk about defence of the fatherland in this war is mendaciously to present as national the imperialist war of 1914-16, waged for the division of colonies, the plunder of foreign lands, etc. And to obviate even the slightest possibility of distorting our views, we added to the resolution a special paragraph on "*genuinely national wars*", which "took place *especially* (especially does not mean exclusively!) between 1789 and 1871".

The resolution explains that the "basis" of these "genuinely" national wars was a "long process of mass national movements, of a struggle against absolutism and feudalism, the overthrow of national oppression". . . .

Clear, it would seem. The present imperialist war stems from the general conditions of the imperialist era and is not accidental, not an exception, not a deviation from the general and typical. Talk of defence of the fatherland is therefore a deception of the people, for this war is *not* a national war. In a *genuinely* national war the words "defence of the fatherland" are *not* a deception and *we are not opposed to it*. Such (genuinely national) wars took place "especially" in 1789-1871, and our resolution, while not denying by a single word that they are possible now too, explains how we should distinguish a genuinely national from an imperialist war covered by deceptive national

* See pp. 87-92.—Ed.

slogans. Specifically, in order to distinguish the two we must examine whether the "basis" of the war is a "long process of mass national movements", the "overthrow of national oppression".

The resolution on "pacifism" expressly states: "Social-Democrats cannot overlook the positive significance, of revolutionary wars, i.e., not imperialist wars, but such as were conducted, for instance [note: "for instance"], between 1789 and 1871 with the aim of doing away with national oppression..." Could our 1915 Party resolution speak of the national wars waged from 1789 to 1871 and say that we do not deny the positive significance of such wars if they were not considered possible today too? Certainly not.

A commentary, or popular explanation, of our Party resolutions is given in the Lenin and Zinoviev pamphlet *Socialism and War*. It plainly states, on page 5, that "socialists have regarded wars 'for the defence of the fatherland', or 'defensive' wars, as legitimate, progressive and just" *only* in the sense of "overthrowing alien oppression". It cites an example: Persia against Russia, "etc.", and says: "These would be just, and defensive wars, irrespective of who would be the first to attack; any socialist would wish the oppressed, dependent and unequal states victory over the oppressor, slave-holding and predatory 'Great' Powers."*

The pamphlet appeared in August 1915 and there are German and French translations. Kievsky is fully aware of its contents. And never, on no occasion, has he or anyone else challenged the resolution on the defence of the fatherland slogan, or the resolution on pacifism, or their interpretation in the pamphlet. Never, not once! We are therefore entitled to ask: are we slandering Kievsky when we say that he has absolutely failed to understand Marxism if, beginning with March 1915, he has not challenged our Party's views on the war, whereas now, in August 1916, in an article on self-determination, i.e., on a supposedly partial

* See pp. 136-37.—Ed.

issue, he reveals an amazing lack of understanding of a *general* issue?

Kievsky says that the fatherland defence slogan is "treasonous". We can confidently assure him that *every* slogan is and always will be "treasonous" *for those* who mechanically repeat it without understanding its meaning, without giving it proper thought, *for those* who merely memorise the words without analysing their implications.

What, generally speaking, is "defence of the fatherland"? Is it a scientific concept relating to economics, politics, etc.? No. It is a much bandied about current expression, sometimes simply a philistine phrase, intended to *justify the war*. Nothing more. Absolutely nothing! The term "treasonous" can apply only in the sense that the philistine is capable of justifying *any* war by pleading "we are defending our fatherland", whereas Marxism, which does not degrade itself by stooping to the philistine's level, requires an historical analysis of each war in order to determine whether or not *that particular* war can be considered progressive, whether it serves the interests of democracy and the proletariat and, in *that sense*, is legitimate, just, etc.

The defence of the fatherland slogan is all too often unconscious philistine justification of war and reveals inability to analyse the meaning and implications of a particular war and see it in historical perspective.

Marxism makes that analysis and says: *if* the "substance" of a war is, *for example*, the overthrow of alien oppression (which was *especially* typical of Europe in 1789-1871), then such a war is progressive as far as the oppressed state or nation is concerned. *If*, however, the "substance" of a war is redivision of colonies, division of booty, plunder of foreign lands (and such is the war of 1914-16), then all talk of defending the fatherland is "sheer deception of the people".

How, then, can we disclose and define the "substance" of a war? War is the continuation of policy. Consequently, we must examine the policy pursued prior to the war, the policy that led to and brought about the war. If it was an imperialist

policy, i.e., one designed to safeguard the interests of finance capital and rob and oppress colonies and foreign countries, then the war stemming from that policy is imperialist. If it was a national liberation policy, i.e., one expressive of the mass movement against national oppression, then the war stemming from that policy is a war of national liberation.

The philistine does not realise that war is "the continuation of policy", and consequently limits himself to the formula that "the enemy has attacked us", "the enemy has invaded my country", without stopping to think *what issues* are at stake in the war, *which* classes are waging it, and with *what* political objects. Kievsky stoops right down to the level of such a philistine when he declares that Belgium has been occupied by the Germans, and hence, from the point of view of self-determination, the "Belgian social-patriots are right", or: the Germans have occupied part of France, hence "Guesde can be satisfied", for "what is involved is territory populated by his nation" (and not by an alien nation).

For the philistine the important thing is *where* the armies stand, who is winning *at the moment*. For the Marxist the important thing is *what issues* are at stake in *this* war, during which first one, then the other army may be on top.

What is the present war being fought over? The answer is given in our resolution (based on the *policy* the belligerent powers pursued for *decades* prior to the war). England, France and Russia are fighting to keep the colonies they have seized, to be able to rob Turkey, etc. Germany is fighting to take over these colonies and to be able herself to rob Turkey, etc. Let us suppose even that the Germans take Paris or St. Petersburg. Would that change the nature of the present war? Not at all. The Germans' purpose—and more important, the policy that would bring it to realisation if they were to win—is to seize the colonies, establish domination over Turkey, annex areas populated by other nations, for instance, Poland, etc. It is definitely not to bring the French or the Russians under foreign domination. The

real essence of the present war is not national but imperialist. In other words, it is not being fought to enable one side to overthrow national oppression, which the other side is trying to maintain. It is a war between two groups of oppressors, between two freebooters over the division of their booty, over who shall rob Turkey and the colonies.

In short: a war *between* imperialist Great Powers (i.e., powers that oppress a whole number of nations and enmesh them in dependence on finance capital, etc.), or *in alliance* with the Great Powers, is an imperialist war. Such is the war of 1914-16. And in *this* war "defence of the fatherland" is a deception, an attempt to justify the war.

A war *against* imperialist, i.e., oppressing, powers by oppressed (for example, colonial) nations is a genuine national war. It is possible today too. "Defence of the fatherland" in a war waged by an oppressed nation against a foreign oppressor is not a deception. Socialists are *not* opposed to "defence of the fatherland" in *such* a war.

National self-determination is the same as the struggle for complete national liberation, for complete independence, against annexation, and socialists *cannot*—without ceasing to be socialists—reject *such* a struggle in whatever form, right down to an uprising or war.

Written August-October 1916

Collected Works, Vol. 23,
pp. 29-34

From LETTER TO INESSA ARMAND

You are being captious about the thesis that Social-Democrats (1) in *Switzerland* (2) now should not vote in any circumstances for war credits. After all, the beginning goes on *all the time* about the *present*, imperialist war. Nothing else but that.

"The working men have no country"—this means that (α) his economic position (*le salariat**) is not national but international, (β) his class enemy is international, (γ) the conditions of his emancipation also, (δ) the international unity of the workers is *more important* than the national.

Does this mean, does it follow from this, that we *should not fight when it is a question* of throwing off a foreign yoke? Yes or no?

A war of colonies for emancipation?

—of Ireland against England?

And an insurrection (national), is not that defence of the fatherland?

Written on November 20, 1916

Collected Works, Vol. 35,
p. 247

* Wages system.—Ed.

From LETTER TO INESSA ARMAND

Dear Friend,

As regards "defence of the fatherland" I don't know whether we differ or not. You find a contradiction between my article* in the collection of articles *To the Memory of Marx*⁵⁷ and my present statements, *without quoting* either precisely. I cannot reply to this, I haven't got the collection *To the Memory of Marx*. Of course, I cannot remember word for word what I wrote in it. Without *precise* quotations, then and now, I am not able to reply to *such* an argument on your part.

But *generally* speaking, it seems to me that you argue somehow in a somewhat one-sided and formalist manner. You have taken *one* quotation from the *Communist Manifesto* (the working men have no country) and you seem to want to apply it without any reservations, *up to and including the repudiation of national wars*.

The whole spirit of Marxism, its whole system, demands that each proposition should be considered (α) only historically, (β) only in connection with others, (γ) only in connection with the concrete experience of history.

The fatherland is an historical concept. The fatherland in an epoch or, more precisely, at the *moment* of struggle for the overthrow of national oppression, is one thing. At the moment when national movements have been left far behind, it is another thing. For the "three types of countries" (§6 of our theses on self-determination**) there *cannot*

* See V. I. Lenin, "Marxism and Revisionism" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 15, pp. 29-39).—Ed.

** See V. I. Lenin, "The Socialist Revolution and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 22, pp. 150-52).—Ed.

be a proposition about the fatherland, and its defence, identically applicable in all conditions.

In the *Communist Manifesto* it is said that the working men have no country.

Correct. But *not only* this is stated there. It is stated there also that when national states are being formed the role of the proletariat is somewhat special. To take the first proposition (the working men have no country) and *forget* its *connection* with the second (the workers are constituted as a class nationally, though not in the same sense as the bourgeoisie) will be exceptionally incorrect.

Where, then, does the connection lie? In my opinion, precisely in the fact that in the *democratic* movement (at such a moment, in such concrete circumstances) the proletariat cannot refuse to support it (and, consequently, support defence of the fatherland in a national war).

Marx and Engels said in the *Communist Manifesto* that the working men have no country. But the same Marx *called* for a *national* war more than once: Marx in 1848, Engels in 1859 (the end of his pamphlet *Po and Rhine*, where the *national* feeling of the Germans is directly inflamed, where they are directly called upon to wage a national war). Engels in 1891, in view of the then threatening and advancing war of France (Boulangier)+Alexander III against Germany, *directly* recognised "defence of the fatherland".⁵⁸

Were Marx and Engels muddlers who said one thing today and another thing tomorrow? No. In my view, admission of "defence of the fatherland" in a national war *fully* answers the requirements of Marxism. In 1891 the German *Social-Democrats* really *should have* defended their fatherland in a war against Boulangier+Alexander III. This would have been a peculiar variety of *national* war.

Written on November 30, 1916

Collected Works, Vol. 35,
pp. 250-51

**From DRAFT THESES,
MARCH 4 (17), 1917⁵⁹**

The new government cannot give the peoples of Russia (and the nations tied to us by the war) either peace, bread, or full freedom. The working class must therefore continue its fight for socialism and peace, utilising for this purpose the new situation and explaining it as widely as possible among the masses.

The new government cannot give the people peace, because it represents the capitalists and landlords and because it is tied to the English and French capitalists by treaties and financial commitments. Russian Social-Democracy must therefore, while remaining true to internationalism, first and foremost explain to the people who long for peace that it cannot be won under the present government. Its first appeal to the people (March 17) does not as much as mention the chief and basic issue of the time, peace. It is keeping secret the predatory treaties tsarism concluded with England, France, Italy, Japan, etc. It wants to conceal from the people the truth about its war programme, the fact that it stands for continuation of the war, for victory over Germany. It is not in a position to do what the people so vitally need: directly and frankly propose to all belligerent countries an immediate ceasefire, to be followed by peace based on complete liberation of all the colonies and dependent and unequal nations. That requires a workers' government acting in alliance with, first, the poorest section of the rural population, and, second, the revolutionary workers of all countries in the war.

LETTERS FROM AFAR

Fourth letter

HOW TO ACHIEVE PEACE

I have just (March 12, [25]) read in the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* (No. 517 of March 24) the following telegraphic dispatch from Berlin:

"It is reported from Sweden that Maxim Gorky has sent the government and the Executive Committee greetings couched in enthusiastic terms. He greets the people's victory over the lords of reaction and calls upon all Russia's sons to help erect the edifice of the new Russian state. At the same time he urges the government to crown the cause of emancipation by concluding peace. It must not, he says, be peace at any price; Russia now has less reason than ever to strive for peace at any price. It must be a peace that will enable Russia to live in honour among the other nations of the earth. Mankind has shed much blood; the new government would render not only Russia, but all mankind, the greatest service if it succeeded in concluding an early peace."

That is how Maxim Gorky's letter is reported.

It is with deep chagrin that one reads this letter, impregnated through and through with stock philistine prejudices. The author of these lines has had many occasions, in meetings with Gorky in Capri, to warn and reproach him for his political mistakes. Gorky parried these reproaches with his inimitable charming smile and with the ingenuous remark: "I know I am a bad Marxist. And besides, we artists are all somewhat irresponsible." It is not easy to argue against that.

There can be no doubt that Gorky's is an enormous artistic talent which has been, and will be, of great benefit to the world proletarian movement.

But why should Gorky meddle in politics?

In my opinion, Gorky's letter expresses prejudices that are exceedingly widespread not only among the petty bourgeoisie, but also among a section of the workers under its influence. *All* the energies of our Party, all the efforts of the class-conscious workers, must be concentrated on a persistent, persevering, all-round struggle against these prejudices.

The tsarist government began and waged the present war as an *imperialist*, predatory war to rob and strangle weak nations. The government of the Guchkovs and Milyukovs, which is a landlord and capitalist government, is forced to continue, and wants to continue, *this very same kind* of war. To urge that government to conclude a democratic peace is like preaching virtue to brothel keepers.

Let me explain what is meant.

What is imperialism?

In my *Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism*, the manuscript of which was delivered to the Parus Publishers some time before the revolution, was accepted by them and announced in the magazine *Letopis*, I answered this question as follows:

"Imperialism is capitalism at that stage of development at which the dominance of monopolies and finance capital is established; in which the export of capital has acquired pronounced importance; in which the division of the world among the international trusts has begun; in which the division of all territories of the globe among the biggest capitalist powers has been completed" (Chapter VII of the above-mentioned book, the publication of which was announced in *Letopis*, when the censorship still existed, under the title: "Modern Capitalism", by V. Ilyin).*

The whole thing hinges on the fact that capital has grown to huge dimensions. Associations of a small number of the biggest capitalists (cartels, syndicates, trusts) manipulate *billions* and divide the whole world among themselves. The

* See V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, pp. 266-67.—Ed.

world has been *completely* divided up. The war was brought on by the clash of the two most powerful groups of multi-millionaires, Anglo-French and German, for the *redivision* of the world.

The Anglo-French group of capitalists wants first to rob Germany, deprive her of her colonies (nearly all of which have already been seized), and then to rob Turkey.

The German group of capitalists wants to seize Turkey for *itself* and to compensate itself for the loss of its colonies by seizing neighbouring small states (Belgium, Serbia, Rumania).

This is the real truth; it is being concealed by all sorts of bourgeois lies about a "liberating", "national" war, a "war for right and justice", and similar jingle with which the capitalists always fool the common people.

Russia is waging this war with foreign money. Russian capital is a *partner* of Anglo-French capital. Russia is waging the war in order to rob Armenia, Turkey, Galicia.

Guchkov, Lvov and Milyukov, our present ministers, are not chance comers. They are the representatives and leaders of the entire landlord and capitalist class. They are *bound* by the interests of capital. The capitalists can no more renounce their interests than a man can lift himself by his bootstraps.

Secondly, Guchkov-Milyukov and Co. are *bound* by Anglo-French capital. They have waged, and are still waging, the war with foreign money. They have borrowed billions, promising to pay *hundreds of millions* in interest *every year*, and to squeeze this *tribute* out of the Russian workers and Russian peasants.

Thirdly, Guchkov-Milyukov and Co. are *bound* to England, France, Italy, Japan and other groups of robber capitalists by direct *treaties* concerning the predatory aims of this war. These treaties were concluded by *Tsar Nicholas II*. Guchkov-Milyukov and Co. took advantage of the workers' struggle against the tsarist monarchy to seize power, and *they have confirmed the treaties* concluded by the tsar.

This was done by the whole of the Guchkov-Milyukov government in a manifesto which the St. Petersburg Telegraph Agency circulated on March 7 (20): "The government [of Guchkov and Milyukov] will faithfully abide by all the treaties that bind us with other powers," says the manifesto. Milyukov, the new Minister for Foreign Affairs, said the *same thing* in his telegram of March 5 (18), 1917 to all Russian representatives abroad.

These are all *secret* treaties, and Milyukov and Co. *refuse* to make them public for two reasons: (1) they fear the people, who are opposed to the predatory war; (2) they are bound by Anglo-French capital which insists that the treaties remain secret. But every newspaper reader who has followed events knows that these treaties envisage the robbery of China by Japan; of Persia, Armenia, Turkey (especially Constantinople) and Galicia by Russia; of Albania by Italy; of Turkey and the German colonies by France and England, etc.

This is how things stand.

Hence, to urge the Guchkov-Milyukov government to conclude a speedy, honest, democratic and good-neighbourly peace is like the good village priest urging the landlords and the merchants to "walk in the way of God", to love their neighbours and to turn the other cheek. The landlords and merchants listen to these sermons, continue to oppress and rob the people and praise the priest for his ability to console and pacify the "muzhiks".

Exactly the same role is played—consciously or unconsciously—by all those who in the present imperialist war address pious peace appeals to the bourgeois governments. The bourgeois governments either refuse to listen to such appeals and even prohibit them, or they allow them to be made and assure all and sundry that they are only fighting to conclude the speediest and "justest" peace, and that all the blame lies with the enemy. Actually, talking peace to *bourgeois* governments turns out to be *deception of the people*.

The groups of capitalists who have drenched the world in blood for the sake of dividing territories, markets and concessions *cannot* conclude an "honourable" peace. They can conclude only a *shameful* peace, a peace based on the *division of the spoils, on the partition of Turkey and the colonies.*

Moreover, the Guchkov-Milyukov government is in general opposed to peace at the present moment, because the "only" "loot" it would get *now* would be Armenia and part of Galicia, whereas it *also* wants to get Constantinople *and* regain from the Germans Poland, which tsarism has always so inhumanly and shamelessly oppressed. Further, the Guchkov-Milyukov government is, in essence, only the agent of Anglo-French capital, which wants to retain the colonies it has wrested from Germany and, *on top of that*, compel Germany hand back Belgium and part of France. Anglo-French capital helped the Guchkovs and Milyukovs remove Nicholas II in order that they might help it to "vanquish" Germany.

What, then, is to be done?

To achieve peace (and still more to achieve a really democratic, a really honourable peace), it is necessary that political power be in the hands of *the workers and poorest peasants*, not the landlords and capitalists. The latter represent an insignificant minority of the population, and the capitalists, as everybody knows, are making fantastic profits out of the war.

The workers and poorest peasants are the *vast* majority of the population. They are not making profit out of the war; on the contrary, they are being reduced to ruin and starvation. They are bound neither by capital nor by the treaties between the predatory groups of capitalists; they *can* and sincerely want to end the war.

If political power in Russia were in the hands of the *Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies*, these Soviets, and the *All-Russia Soviet* elected by them, could, and no doubt would, agree to carry out the peace programme

which our Party (the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party) outlined as early as October 13, 1915, in No. 47 of its Central Organ, *Sotsial-Demokrat** (then published in Geneva because of the Draconic tsarist censorship).

This programme would probably be the following:

1) The All-Russia Soviet of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies (or the St. Petersburg Soviet temporarily acting for it) would forthwith declare that it is *not* bound by *any* treaties concluded *either* by the tsarist monarchy *or* by the bourgeois governments.

2) It would forthwith publish *all* these treaties in order to hold up to public shame the predatory aims of the tsarist monarchy and of *all* the bourgeois governments without exception.

3) It would forthwith publicly call upon *all* the belligerent powers to conclude an *immediate armistice*.

4) It would immediately bring to the knowledge of all the people our, the workers' and peasants' *peace terms*:
liberation of *all* colonies;

liberation of *all* dependent, oppressed and unequal nations.

5) It would declare that it expects nothing good from the bourgeois governments and calls upon the workers of all countries to overthrow them and to transfer all political power to Soviets of Workers' Deputies.

6) It would declare that the *capitalist gentry themselves* can repay the billions of debts contracted by the bourgeois governments to wage this criminal, predatory war, and that the workers and peasants *refuse to recognise* these debts. To pay the interest on these loans would mean paying the capitalists *tribute* for many years for having graciously allowed the workers to kill one another in order that the capitalists might divide the spoils.

Workers and peasants!—the Soviet of Workers' Deputies would say—are you willing to pay these gentry, the capi-

* See V. I. Lenin, "Several Theses" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 21, pp. 401-04).—Ed.

talists, *hundreds of millions of rubles every year* for a war waged for the division of the African colonies, Turkey, etc.?

For *these* peace terms the Soviet of Workers' Deputies would, in my opinion, agree to *wage war* against *any* bourgeois government and against *all* the bourgeois governments of the world, because this would really be a just war, because *all* the workers and toilers in *all* countries would *work for its success*.

The German worker now sees that the bellicose monarchy in Russia is being replaced by a *bellicose* republic, a republic of capitalists who want to continue the imperialist war, and who have confirmed the predatory treaties of the tsarist monarchy.

Judge for yourselves, can the German worker trust *such* a republic?

Judge for yourselves, can the war continue, can the capitalist domination continue on earth, if the Russian people, always sustained by the living memories of the great Revolution of 1905, win complete freedom and transfer all political power to the Soviets of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies?

Zurich, March 12 (25), 1917

N. Lenin

First published in the magazine
The Communist International
No. 3-4, 1924

Collected Works, Vol. 23,
pp. 333-39

From THE TASKS OF THE PROLETARIAT IN THE PRESENT REVOLUTION

I did not arrive in Petrograd until the night of April 3, and therefore at the meeting on April 4 I could, of course, deliver the report on the tasks of the revolutionary proletariat only on my own behalf, and with reservations as to insufficient preparation.

The only thing I could do to make things easier for myself—and for *honest* opponents—was to prepare the theses *in writing*. I read them out, and gave the text to Comrade Tsereteli. I read them *twice* very slowly: first at a meeting of Bolsheviks and then at a meeting of both Bolsheviks and Mensheviks.

I publish these personal theses of mine with only the briefest explanatory notes, which were developed in far greater detail in the report.

THESES

1) In our attitude towards the war, which under the new government of Lvov and Co. unquestionably remains on Russia's part a predatory, imperialist war owing to the capitalist nature of that government, not the slightest concession to "revolutionary defencism" is permissible.

The class-conscious proletariat can give its consent to a revolutionary war, which would really justify revolutionary defencism, only on condition: (a) that the power pass to the

proletariat and the poorest sections of the peasants aligned with the proletariat; (b) that all annexations be renounced in deed and not in word; (c) that a complete break be effected in actual fact with all capitalist interests.

In view of the undoubted honesty of those broad sections of the mass believers in revolutionary defencism who accept the war only as a necessity, and not as a means of conquest, in view of the fact that they are being deceived by the bourgeoisie, it is necessary with particular thoroughness, persistence and patience to explain their error to them, to explain the inseparable connection existing between capital and the imperialist war, and to prove that without overthrowing capital *it is impossible* to end the war by the truly democratic peace, a peace not imposed by violence.

The most widespread campaign for this view must be organised in the army at the front.

Fraternisation.

2) The specific feature of the present situation in Russia is that the country is *passing* from the first stage of the revolution—which, owing to the insufficient class-consciousness and organisation of the proletariat, placed power in the hands of the bourgeoisie—to its *second* stage, which must place power in the hands of the proletariat and the poorest sections of the peasants.

This transition is characterised, on the one hand, by a maximum of legally recognised rights (Russia is *now* the freest of all the belligerent countries in the world); on the other, by the absence of violence towards the masses, and, finally, by their unreasoning trust in the government of capitalists, those worst enemies of peace and socialism.

This peculiar situation demands of us an ability to adapt ourselves to the *special* conditions of Party work among unprecedentedly large masses of proletarians who have just awakened to political life.

3) No support for the Provisional Government; the utter falsity of all its promises should be made clear, particularly of those relating to the renunciation of annexations. Exposure

in place of the impermissible, illusion-breeding "demand" that *this* government, a government of capitalists, should *cease* to be an imperialist government.

Written on April 4
and 5 (17 and 18), 1917

Collected Works, Vol. 24,
pp. 19-22

APPEAL TO THE SOLDIERS OF ALL THE BELLIGERENT COUNTRIES⁶⁰

Brothers, soldiers!

We are all worn out by this frightful war, which has cost millions of lives, crippled millions of people and caused untold misery, ruin, and starvation.

And more and more people are beginning to ask themselves: What started this war, what is it being waged for?

Every day it is becoming clearer to us, the workers and peasants, who bear the brunt of the war, that it was started and is being waged by the capitalists of all countries for the sake of the capitalists' interests, for the sake of world supremacy, for the sake of markets for the manufacturers, factory owners and bankers, for the sake of plundering the weak nationalities. They are carving up colonies and seizing territories in the Balkans and in Turkey—and for this the European peoples must be ruined, for this we must die, for this we must witness the ruin, starvation and death of our families.

The capitalist class in all countries is deriving colossal, staggering, scandalously high profits from contracts and war supplies, from concessions in annexed countries, and from the rising price of goods. The capitalist class has imposed contribution on all the nations for decades ahead in the shape of high interest on the billions lent in war loans. And we, the workers and peasants, must die, suffer ruin, and starve, must patiently bear all this and strengthen our oppressors, the capitalists, by having the workers of the dif-

ferent countries exterminate each other and feel hatred for each other.

Are we going to continue submissively to bear our yoke, to put up with the war between the capitalist classes? Are we going to let this war drag on by taking the side of our own national governments, our own national bourgeoisies, our own national capitalists, and thereby destroying the international unity of the workers of all countries, of the whole world?

No, brother soldiers, it is time we opened our eyes, it is time we took our fate into our own hands. In all countries popular wrath against the capitalist class, which has drawn the people into the war, is growing, spreading, and gaining strength. Not only in Germany, but even in Britain, which before the war had the reputation of being one of the freest countries, hundreds and hundreds of true friends and representatives of the working class are languishing in prison for having spoken the honest truth against the war and against the capitalists. The revolution in Russia is only the first step of the first revolution; it should be followed and will be followed by others.

The new government in Russia—which has overthrown Nicholas II, who was as bad a crowned brigand as Wilhelm II—is a government of the capitalists. It is waging just as predatory and imperialist a war as the capitalists of Germany, Britain, and other countries. It has endorsed the predatory secret treaties concluded by Nicholas II with the capitalists of Britain, France, and other countries; it is not publishing these treaties for the world to know, just as the German Government is not publishing its secret and equally predatory treaties with Austria, Bulgaria, and so on.

On April 20 the Russian Provisional Government published a Note re-endorsing the old predatory treaties concluded by the tsar and declaring its readiness to fight the war to a victorious finish, thereby arousing the indignation even of those who have hitherto trusted and supported it.

But, in addition to the capitalist government, the Russian revolution has given rise to spontaneous revolutionary organisations representing the vast majority of the workers and peasants, namely, the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies in Petrograd and in the majority of Russia's cities. Most of the soldiers and some of the workers in Russia—like very many workers and soldiers in Germany—still preserve an unreasoning trust in the government of the capitalists and in their empty and lying talk of a peace without annexations, a war of defence, and so on.

But unlike the capitalists, the workers and poor peasants have no interest in annexations or in protecting the profits of the capitalists. And, therefore, every day, every step taken by the capitalist government, both in Russia and in Germany, will expose the deceit of the capitalists, will expose the fact that as long as capitalist rule lasts there can be no really democratic, non-coercive peace based on a real renunciation of all annexations, i.e., on the liberation of all colonies without exception, of all oppressed, forcibly annexed or underprivileged nationalities without exception, and the war will in all likelihood become still more acute and protracted.

Only if state power in both the, at present, hostile countries, for example, in both Russia and Germany, passes wholly and exclusively into the hands of the revolutionary Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, which are really capable of rending the whole mesh of capitalist relations and interests, will the workers of both the belligerent countries acquire confidence in each other and be able to put a speedy end to the war on the basis of a really democratic peace that will really liberate *all* the nations and nationalities of the world.

Brothers, soldiers!

Let us do everything we can to hasten this, to achieve this aim. Let us not fear sacrifices—any sacrifice for the workers' revolution will be less painful than the sacrifices of war. Every victorious step of the revolution will save hundreds

of thousands and millions of people from death, ruin, and starvation.

Peace to the hovels, war on the palaces! Peace to the workers of all countries! Long live the fraternal unity of the revolutionary workers of all countries! Long live socialism!

*Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.
Petrograd Committee of the R.S.D.L.P.
Editorial Board of Pravda*

Pravda No. 37,
May 4 (April 21), 1917

Collected Works, Vol. 24,
pp. 186-88

THE PROVISIONAL GOVERNMENT'S NOTE

The cards are on the table. We have every reason to be grateful to Guchkov and Milyukov for their Note, printed today in all the newspapers.

The majority of the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, the Narodniks, Mensheviks, all those who until now have appealed for confidence in the Provisional Government, have received condign punishment. They hoped, expected, and believed that the Provisional Government, under the beneficent influence of "contact" with Chkheidze, Skobelev, and Steklov, would for ever repudiate annexations. Things have turned out somewhat differently. . . .

In its Note of April 18, the Provisional Government speaks of "the desire of the whole nation (!) to fight the world war out to a *decisive victory*".

"Needless to say," the Note adds, "the Provisional Government . . . will fully stand by its obligations towards our Allies."

Short and clear. War to a decisive victory. The alliance with the British and French bankers is sacred. . . .

Who concluded this alliance with "our" Allies, i.e., with the British and French multimillionaires? The tsar, Rasputin, the tsar's gang, of course. But to Milyukov and Co. this treaty is sacred.

Why?

Some say: because Milyukov is insincere, he is a crafty person and so on.

But that is not the point. The point is that Guchkov, Milyukov, Tereshchenko, and Konovalov are spokesmen of the *capitalists*. And the seizure of foreign lands is necessary to the capitalists. They will receive new markets, new places to export capital to, new opportunities to arrange profitable jobs for tens of thousands of their sons, etc. The point is that at the present moment the *interests* of the Russian capitalists are identical with those of the British and French capitalists. That, and that alone, is the reason why the tsar's treaties with the British and French capitalists are precious to the Provisional Government of the Russian capitalists.

The new Note of the Provisional Government will pour oil on the flames. It can only encourage a bellicose spirit in Germany. It will help Wilhelm the Brigand to go on deceiving "his own" workers and soldiers and drag them into a war "to a finish".

The new Note of the Provisional Government puts the issue squarely: what next?

From the very first moment of our revolution, the British and French capitalists have been assuring us that the Russian revolution was made solely and exclusively in order to fight the war out "to a finish". The capitalists want to plunder Turkey, Persia, and China. If this should entail the slaughter of another ten million or so Russian muzhiks—what of it? What we need is a "decisive victory"... And now the Provisional Government, with utter frankness, has adopted the same course.

"Fight—because we want to plunder."

"Die in your tens of thousands every day—because 'we' have not yet fought it out and have not yet got our share of the spoils!"

No class-conscious worker, no class-conscious soldier will support the policy of "confidence" in the Provisional Government any longer. The policy of confidence is bankrupt.

Our Social-Democratic City Conference stated in its resolution that the correctness of *our* view would be corroborated now every day. But not even we had expected events to move so fast.

The present Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies is faced with the alternative: either to swallow the pill offered by Guchkov and Milyukov, which would mean renouncing an independent political role once and for all, for tomorrow Milyukov would put his "feet on the table" and reduce the Soviet to a mere cipher; or to reject Milyukov's Note, which would mean breaking with the old policy of confidence and adopting the course proposed by *Pravda*.

Naturally, a middle-of-the-road course might be found. But would it be for long?

Workers and soldiers, you must now loudly declare that there must be only one power in the country—the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. The Provisional Government, the government of a handful of capitalists, must make way for these Soviets.

Written April 20 (May 3), 1917

Collected Works, Vol. 24,
pp. 189-91

**RESOLUTION OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE
OF THE R.S.D.L.P. (BOLSHEVIKS)
ADOPTED APRIL 21 (MAY 4), 1917**

Having considered the situation which has arisen in Petrograd after the imperialist, annexationist, and predatory Note of the Provisional Government of April 18, 1917, and after a number of meetings and demonstrations of the people held in the streets of Petrograd on April 20, the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. resolves:

1. Party propagandists and speakers must refute the despicable lies of the capitalist papers and of the papers supporting the capitalists to the effect that we are holding out the threat of *civil war*. This is a despicable lie, for only at the present moment, as long as the capitalists and their government cannot and dare not use force against the masses, as long as the mass of soldiers and workers are freely expressing their will and freely electing and displacing *all* authorities—*at such a moment* any thought of civil war would be naïve, senseless, preposterous; at such a moment *there must be compliance with the will of the majority of the population* and free criticism of this will by the discontented minority; should violence be resorted to, the responsibility will fall on the Provisional Government and its supporters.

2. By their outcries against civil war the government of the capitalists and its newspapers are only trying to conceal the reluctance of the capitalists, who admittedly constitute an insignificant minority of the people, to submit to the will of the majority.

3. In order to learn the will of the majority of the population in Petrograd, where there is now an unusually large number of soldiers who are familiar with the sentiment of the peasants and correctly express it, a popular vote must at once be arranged in all the districts of Petrograd and its suburbs to ascertain what the attitude is towards the government's Note, what support the various parties enjoy, and what kind of Provisional Government is desired.

4. All Party propagandists must advocate these views and this proposal at factories, in regiments, in the streets, etc., by means of *peaceful* discussion and peaceful demonstrations, as well as meetings everywhere; we must endeavour to organise regular voting in factories and regiments, taking care that order and comradely discipline are strictly observed.

5. Party propagandists must again and again protest against the despicable slander spread by the capitalists alleging that our Party stands for a separate peace with Germany. We consider Wilhelm II as bad a crowned brigand meriting execution as Nicholas II, and the German Guchkovs, i.e., the German capitalists, just as much annexationists, robbers, and imperialists as the Russian, British, and all other capitalists. We *are against* negotiating with the capitalists, we are for negotiating and fraternising *with the revolutionary workers and soldiers of all countries*. We are convinced that the reason why the Guchkov-Milyukov government is trying to aggravate the situation is because it knows that the workers' revolution in Germany is beginning, and that this revolution will be a blow to the capitalists of all countries.

6. When the Provisional Government spreads rumours about utter and unavoidable economic chaos, it is not only trying to frighten the people into leaving the power in the hands of this Provisional Government, but is also vaguely, fumblingly expressing the profound and indubitable truth that *all* the nations of the world have been led into a blind alley, that the war waged in the interests of the capitalists has driven them to the brink of an abyss, and that there is really no way out except through the transfer of power to

the revolutionary class, i.e., to the revolutionary proletariat, which is capable of adopting revolutionary measures.

If there are any stocks of grain, etc., in the country, the new government of the workers and soldiers will know how to dispose of them too. But if the capitalist war has brought economic ruin to a stage where there is no bread at all, the capitalist government will only aggravate the condition of the people instead of improving it.

7. We consider the policy of the present majority of leaders of the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, of the Narodnik and Menshevik parties, to be profoundly erroneous, since confidence in the Provisional Government, attempts to compromise with it, dickering over amendments, etc., would in fact mean only so many more useless scraps of paper and useless delays; and besides, this policy threatens to create a divergence between the will of the Soviet on the one hand, and that of the majority of revolutionary soldiers at the front and in Petrograd and of the majority of workers, on the other.

8. We call upon those workers and soldiers who believe that the Soviet must change its policy and renounce the policy of confidence in and compromise with the capitalist government, to hold new elections of delegates to the Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies, and to send to that body only people who would steadfastly hold to a quite definite opinion consonant with the actual will of the majority.

HONEST DEFENCISM REVEALS ITSELF

Events in Petrograd during the last few days, especially yesterday, illustrate how right we were in speaking of the "honest" defencism of the *mass* as distinguished from the defencism of the leaders and parties.

The mass of the population is made up of proletarians, semi-proletarians, and poor peasants. They are the vast majority of the nation. *These* classes are not at all interested in annexations. Imperialist policies, the profits of banking capital, incomes from railways in Persia, lucrative jobs in Galicia and Armenia; putting restraints on the freedom of Finland—all these are things in which these classes are *not* interested.

But all these things taken together just go to make up what is known in science and the press as imperialist, annexationist, predatory policy.

The crux of the matter is that the Guchkovs, Milyukovs, and Lvovs—be they even all paragons of virtue, disinterestedness, and love of their fellow-man—are the spokesmen, leaders, and chosen representatives of the capitalist *class*, a class which has a vested interest in a predatory, annexationist policy. This class invested billions "in the war", and is making hundreds of millions "out of the war" and annexations (i.e., out of the subjugation or forced *incorporation* of alien nationalities).

To believe that the capitalist *class* will "mend its ways", will cease to be a capitalist class, will give up its profits, is a fatuous hope, an idle dream, and in effect a deception

of the people. Only petty-bourgeois politicians, fluctuating between capitalist and proletarian policies, can entertain or encourage such fatuous hopes. Herein lies the mistake of the present leaders of the Narodnik parties and the Mensheviks, Chkheidze, Tsereteli, Chernov, and the others.

The mass representatives of defencism are not at all versed in politics. They have not been able to learn politics from books, from participation in the Duma, or from close observation of people engaged in politics.

The mass representatives of defencism still do not know that wars are waged by *governments*, that governments represent the interests of certain *classes*, that the present war, on the part of both belligerent groups, is waged by the capitalists in the predatory interests of and for the predatory aims of the capitalists.

Unaware as they are of this, the mass representatives of defencism argue quite simply: we do not want annexations, we demand a democratic peace, we do not want to fight for Constantinople, for putting down Persia, for plundering Turkey, and so on; we "demand" that the Provisional Government give up its policy of annexations.

The mass representatives of defencism are *sincere* in wishing this, not in a personal but in a class sense, because they speak for classes that are *not interested* in annexations. But what these representatives of the masses do not know is that the capitalists and their government may throw over the policy of annexations in words, may dangle promises and mouth fine phrases, but cannot *really* abandon the idea of annexations.

That is why the mass representatives of defencism were so strongly and legitimately shocked by the Provisional Government's Note of April 18.

People familiar with politics could not have been surprised by this Note, for they knew only too well that when the capitalists "renounce annexations" they do not really mean it. It is just the usual trick and phrase-mongering of diplomats.

But the "honest" mass representatives of defencism were surprised, shocked, indignant. They *felt*—they did not understand it quite clearly, but they felt that they had been tricked.

This is the *essence* of the crisis and it should be clearly distinguished from the opinions, expectations, and suppositions of single individuals and parties.

To patch up this crisis for a while with a new declaration, with a new Note (that is what Mr. Plekhanov's advice in *Yedinstvo* and the aspirations of Milyukov and Co., on the one hand, and those of Chkheidze, Tsereteli and the like, on the other, amount to)—to paper over the cracks with a new promise is of course possible, but this can do nothing but harm. A new promise would inevitably mean a new deception of the masses; therefore a new outburst of indignation, and such an outburst; if lacking intelligent orientation, might easily become very harmful.

The masses should be told the whole truth. The government of the capitalists *cannot* abandon annexations; it is caught in its own meshes, and there is no escape. It feels, it realises, it sees that without revolutionary measures (of which only a revolutionary class is capable) *there is no way out*, and it is becoming panicky, losing its head; it promises one thing, but does another; at one minute it threatens the masses with violence (Guchkov and Shingaryov), at the next it proposes that the power be taken out of its hands.

Economic ruin, crisis, the horrors of war, an impasse from which there is no way out—this is what the capitalists have brought *all* the nations to.

Indeed there is no way out—*except* through the transfer of power to the revolutionary class, to the revolutionary proletariat, which alone, supported by the majority of the population, is capable of aiding the revolution to victory in *all* the belligerent countries and leading humanity to lasting peace and liberation from the yoke of capitalism.

"DISGRACE" AS THE CAPITALISTS AND THE PROLETARIANS UNDERSTAND IT

Today's *Yedinstvo* prints on its front page in bold type a proclamation signed by Plekhanov, Deutsch, and Zasulich. We read:

"Every nation has a right freely to determine its own destiny. Wilhelm of Germany and Karl of Austria will never agree to this. In waging war against them, we are defending our own freedom, as well as the freedom of others. Russia cannot betray her Allies. That would bring disgrace upon her."

That is how all capitalists argue. To them non-observance of treaties *between* capitalists is a disgrace, just as to monarchs non-observance of treaties between monarchs is a disgrace.

What about the workers? Do they regard non-observance of treaties concluded by monarchs and capitalists a disgrace?

Of course not! Class-conscious workers are *for* scrapping *all* such treaties, they are for recognising only such agreements *between the workers and soldiers of all* countries as would benefit the people, i.e., not the capitalists, but the workers and poor peasants.

The workers of the world *have* a treaty of their own, namely, the Basle Manifesto of 1912 (signed, among others, by Plekhanov and betrayed by him). This workers' "treaty" calls it a "crime" for workers of different countries to shoot at each other for the sake of the capitalists' profits.

The writers in *Yedinstvo* argue like capitalists (so do *Rech* and others), and not like workers.

It is quite true that neither the German monarch nor the Austrian will agree to freedom for every nation, as both these monarchs are crowned brigands, and so was Nicholas II. Nor, for one thing, are the English, Italian, and other monarchs (the "Allies" of Nicholas II) any better. To forget this is to become a monarchist or a defender of the monarchists.

Secondly, the *uncrowned* brigands, i.e., the capitalists, have shown themselves in the present war to be no better than the monarchs. Has not American "democracy", i.e., the democratic capitalists, robbed the Philippines, and does it not rob Mexico?

The German Guchkovs and Milyukovs, if they were to take the place of Wilhelm II, would be brigands, *too*, no better than the British and Russian capitalists.

Third, will the Russian capitalists "agree" to "freedom" for nations which they themselves oppress: Armenia, Khiva, Ukraine, Finland?

By evading this question the *Yedinstvo* writers are, in effect, turning into defenders of "our own" capitalists in their predatory war with other capitalists.

The internationalist workers of the world stand for the overthrow of *all* capitalist governments, for the rejection of all agreements and understandings with any capitalists, for *universal peace* concluded by the *revolutionary workers of all countries*, a peace capable of giving real freedom to "every" nation.

Written April 22 (May 5), 1917

Collected Works, Vol. 24,
pp. 220-21

**RESOLUTION ON THE WAR ADOPTED
AT THE 7TH (APRIL) ALL-RUSSIA CONFERENCE
OF THE R.S.D.L.P.(B.)⁶¹**

I

The present war is, on the part of both groups of the belligerent powers, an imperialist war, i.e., one waged by the capitalists for the division of the profits obtained from world domination, for markets for finance (banking) capital, for the subjugation of the weaker nationalities, etc. Each day of war enriches the financial and industrial bourgeoisie and impoverishes and saps the strength of the proletariat and the peasantry of all the belligerents, as well as of the neutral countries. In Russia, moreover, prolongation of the war involves a grave danger to the revolution's gains and its further development.

The passing of state power in Russia to the Provisional Government, a government of the landowners and capitalists, did not and could not alter the character and meaning of the war as far as Russia is concerned.

This fact was most strikingly demonstrated when the new government not only failed to publish the secret treaties between Tsar Nicholas II and the capitalist governments of Britain, France, etc., but even formally and without consulting the nation confirmed these secret treaties, which promise the Russian capitalists a free hand to rob China, Persia, Turkey, Austria, etc. By concealing these treaties from the people of Russia the latter are being deceived as to the true character of the war.

For this reason, no proletarian party that does not wish to break completely with internationalism, i.e., with the

fraternal solidarity of the workers of all countries in their struggle against the yoke of capital, can support the present war, or the present government, or its loans.

No trust can be placed in the present government's promises to renounce annexations, i.e., conquests of foreign countries or retention by force of any nationality within the confines of Russia. For, in the first place, the capitalists, bound together by the thousand threads of banking capital, cannot renounce annexations in this war without renouncing the profits from the thousands of millions invested in loans, concessions, war industries, etc. And secondly, the new government, after renouncing annexations to mislead the people, declared through Milyukov (Moscow, April 9, 1917) that it had no intention of renouncing them, and, in the Note of April 18 and its elucidation of April 22, confirmed the expansionist character of its policy. Therefore, in warning the people against the capitalists' empty promises, the Conference declares that it is necessary to make a clear distinction between a renunciation of annexations in word and a renunciation of annexations in deed, i.e., the immediate publication and abrogation of all the secret predatory treaties and the immediate granting to all nationalities of the right to determine by free voting whether they wish to be independent states or to be part of another state.

II

The "revolutionary defencism", which in Russia has now permeated all the Narodnik parties (the Popular Socialists, Trudoviks, and Socialist-Revolutionaries), the opportunist party of the Menshevik Social-Democrats (the Organising Committee, Chkheidze, Tsereteli, etc.), and the majority of the non-party revolutionaries, reflects, in point of class significance, the interests and point of view of the well-to-do peasants and a part of the small proprietors, who, like the capitalists, profit by oppressing weak peoples. On the other hand, "revolutionary defencism" is a result of the decep-

tion by the capitalists of a part of the urban and rural proletariat and semi-proletariat, who, by their class position, have no interest in the profits of the capitalists and in the imperialist war.

The Conference recognises that any concessions to "revolutionary defencism" are absolutely impermissible and virtually signify a complete break with internationalism and socialism. As for the defencist tendencies among the broad masses, our Party will fight against these tendencies by ceaselessly explaining the truth that the attitude of unreasoning trust in the government of the capitalists, at the moment, is one of the chief obstacles to a speedy termination of the war.

III

In regard to the most important question of all, namely, how to end the present capitalist war as soon as possible, not by a coercive peace, but by a truly democratic peace, the Conference recognises and declares the following:

This war cannot be ended by a refusal of the soldiers of one side only to continue the war, by a simple cessation of hostilities by one of the belligerents.

The Conference reiterates its protest against the base slander spread by the capitalists against our Party to the effect that we are in favour of a separate peace with Germany. We consider the German capitalists to be as predatory as the Russian, British, French, and other capitalists, and Emperor Wilhelm as bad a crowned brigand as Nicholas II or the British, Italian, Rumanian, and all other monarchs.

Our Party will patiently but persistently explain to the people the truth that wars are waged by *governments*, that wars are always indissolubly bound up with the policies of definite *classes*, that this war can be terminated by a democratic peace *only* if the entire state power, in at least several of the belligerent countries, has passed to the class of the proletarians and semi-proletarians which is really

capable of putting an end to the oppressive rule of capital.

In Russia, the revolutionary class, having taken state power, would adopt a series of measures that would undermine the economic rule of the capitalists, as well as measures that would render them completely harmless politically, and would immediately and frankly offer to all nations a democratic peace on the basis of a complete renunciation of every possible form of annexation and indemnity. Such measures and such a frank offer of peace would bring about complete confidence of the workers of the belligerent countries in each other and would inevitably lead to uprisings of the proletariat against those imperialist governments as might resist the offered peace.

Until the revolutionary class in Russia takes the entire state power, our Party will do all it can to support those proletarian parties and groups abroad that are in fact, already during the war, conducting a revolutionary struggle against their imperialist governments and their bourgeoisie. Our Party will particularly support the mass fraternisation of the soldiers of all the belligerent countries that has already begun at the front, endeavouring to turn this instinctive expression of solidarity of the oppressed into a politically-conscious movement as well organised as possible for the transfer of all state power in all the belligerent countries to the revolutionary proletariat.

Pravda No. 44,
May 12 (April 29), 1917

Collected Works, Vol. 24,
pp. 270-73

**RESOLUTION OF THE CURRENT SITUATION
ADOPTED AT THE 7TH (APRIL) ALL-RUSSIA
CONFERENCE OF THE R.S.D.L.P.(B.)**

The world war, brought about by the struggle of world trusts and banking capital for domination over the world market, has already led to the mass destruction of material values, to exhaustion of productive forces, and to such a growth in the war industry that it is impossible to produce even the absolutely necessary minimum of consumer goods and means of production.

The present war, therefore, has brought humanity to an impasse and placed it on the brink of ruin.

The objective conditions for a socialist revolution, which undoubtedly existed even before the war in the more developed and advanced countries, have been ripening with tremendous rapidity as a result of the war. Small and middle enterprises are being squeezed out and ruined at a faster rate than ever. The concentration and internationalisation of capital are making gigantic strides; monopoly capitalism is developing into state monopoly capitalism. In a number of countries regulation of production and distribution by society is being introduced by force of circumstances. Some countries are introducing universal labour conscription.

Under private ownership of the means of production, all these steps towards greater monopolisation and control of production by the state are inevitably accompanied by intensified exploitation of the working people, by an increase in oppression; it becomes more difficult to resist the exploiters,

and reaction and military despotism grow. At the same time these steps inevitably lead to a tremendous growth in the profits of the big capitalists at the expense of all other sections of the population. The working people for decades to come are forced to pay tribute to the capitalists in the form of interest payments on war loans running into thousands of millions. But with private ownership of the means of production abolished and state power passing completely to the proletariat, these very conditions are a pledge of success for society's transformation that will do away with the exploitation of man by man and ensure the well-being of everyone.

* * *

On the other hand, the course of events is clearly confirming the forecast of the socialists of the whole world who, precisely in connection with the imperialist war, then impending and now raging, unanimously declared in the 1912 Basle Manifesto that a *proletarian revolution* was inevitable.

The Russian revolution is only the first stage of the first of the proletarian revolutions which are the inevitable result of war.

In all countries a spirit of rebellion against the capitalist class is growing among the masses, and the proletariat is becoming aware that only the transfer of power to the proletariat and the abolition of private ownership of the means of production can save humanity from ruin.

In all countries, especially in the most advanced, Britain and Germany, hundreds of socialists who have not gone over to the side of "their own" national bourgeoisie have been thrown into prison by the capitalist governments. By this action the latter have clearly demonstrated their fear of the mounting proletarian revolution. In Germany the impending revolution is apparent both in the mass strikes, which have assumed particularly large proportions in recent

weeks, and in the growth of fraternisation between the German and Russian soldiers at the front.

Fraternal trust and unity are gradually being restored among the workers of different countries, the very workers who are now killing each other in the interests of the capitalists. This, in turn, creates conditions for united revolutionary action by the workers of different countries. Only such action can guarantee the most systematic development and the most likely success of the world socialist revolution.

Operating as it does in one of the most backward countries of Europe amidst a vast population of small peasants, the proletariat of Russia cannot aim at immediately putting into effect socialist changes.

But it would be a grave error, and in effect even a complete desertion to the bourgeoisie, to infer from this that the working class must support the bourgeoisie, or that it must keep its activities within limits acceptable to the petty bourgeoisie, or that the proletariat must renounce its leading role in the matter of explaining to the people the urgency of taking a number of practical steps towards socialism for which the time is now ripe.

These steps are: first, nationalisation of the land. This measure, which does not directly go beyond the framework of the bourgeois system, would, at the same time, be a heavy blow at private ownership of the means of production, and as such would strengthen the influence of the socialist proletariat over the semi-proletariat in the countryside.

The next steps are the establishment of state control over all banks, and their amalgamation into a single central bank; also control over the insurance agencies and big capitalist syndicates (for example, the Sugar Syndicate, the Coal Syndicate, the Metal Syndicate, etc.), and the gradual introduction of a more just progressive tax on incomes and properties. Economically, these measures are timely; technically, they can be carried out immediately; politically they are

likely to receive the support of the overwhelming majority of the peasants, who have everything to gain by these reforms.

The Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', Peasants', and other Deputies, which now cover Russia with a dense and growing network, could also introduce, parallel with the above measures, universal labour conscription, for on the one hand the character of the Soviets guarantees that all these new reforms will be introduced only when an overwhelming majority of the people has clearly and firmly realised the practical need for them; on the other hand their character guarantees that the reforms will not be sponsored by the police and officials, but will be carried out by way of voluntary participation of the organised and armed masses of the proletariat and peasantry in the management of their own affairs.

All these and other similar measures can and should be not only discussed and prepared for enforcement on a national scale in the event of all power passing to the proletarians and semi-proletarians, but also implemented by the local revolutionary organs of power of the whole people when the opportunity arises.

Great care and discretion should be exercised in carrying out the above measures; a solid majority of the population must be won over and this majority must be clearly convinced of the country's practical preparedness for any particular measure. This is the direction in which the class-conscious vanguard of the workers must focus its attention and efforts, because it is the bounden duty of these workers to help the peasants find a way out of the present debacle.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF FRATERNISATION

The capitalists either sneer at the fraternisation of the soldiers at the front or savagely attack it. By lies and slander they try to make out that the whole thing is "deception" of the Russians by the Germans, and threaten—through *their* generals and officers—punishment for fraternisation.

From the point of view of safeguarding the "sacred right of property" in capital and the profits on capital, such a policy of the capitalists is quite correct. Indeed, if the proletarian socialist revolution is to be *suppressed* at its inception it is *essential* that fraternisation be regarded the way the capitalists regard it.

The class-conscious workers, followed by the mass of semi-proletarians and poor peasants guided by the true instinct of oppressed classes, regard fraternisation with profound sympathy. Clearly, fraternisation is a path to peace. Clearly, this path does not run through the capitalist governments, through an alliance with them, but runs *against* them. Clearly, this path tends to develop, strengthen, and consolidate fraternal confidence between the workers of different countries. Clearly, this path is *beginning to wreck* the hateful discipline of the barrack prisons, the discipline of blind obedience of the soldier to "his" officers and generals, to his capitalists (for most of the officers and generals either belong to the capitalist class or protect its interests). Clearly, fraternisation is the revolutionary initiative of the *masses*,

it is the awakening of the conscience, the mind, the courage of the oppressed classes; in other words, it is a rung in the ladder leading up to the socialist proletarian revolution.

Long live fraternisation! Long live the *rising* world-wide socialist revolution of the proletariat!

In order that fraternisation achieve the goal we set it more easily, surely and rapidly, we must see to it that it is well organised and has a clear political programme.

However much the enraged press of the capitalists and their friends may slander us, calling us anarchists, we shall never tire of repeating: we are not anarchists, we are ardent advocates of the best possible organisation of the masses and the firmest "state" power—only the state we want is not a bourgeois parliamentary republic, but a republic of Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', and Peasants' Deputies.

We have always recommended that fraternisation be conducted in the most organised manner, taking care—with the help of the intelligence, experience and observation of the soldiers themselves—that there should be no catch in it, and that the officers and generals, who for the most part spread vicious slander against fraternisation, be kept away from the meetings.

Our aim is not to have fraternisation confine itself to talk about peace in general, but pass on to a discussion of a *clear* political programme, to a discussion of *how* to end the war, *how* to throw off the yoke of the capitalists, who started this war and are now dragging it out.

Our Party has therefore issued an appeal to the soldiers of all the belligerent countries (for the text of which see *Pravda* No. 37),* which gives a definite and precise answer to these questions and a clear political programme.

It is a good thing that the soldiers are cursing the war. It is a good thing that they are demanding peace. It is a good thing that they are beginning to realise that the war is advantageous to the capitalists. It is a good thing that they

* See pp. 229-32.—Ed.

are wrecking the harsh discipline and beginning to fraternise on all the fronts. All this is good.

But it is not enough.

The soldiers must now pass to a form of fraternisation in which a clear political programme is discussed. We are not anarchists. We do not think that the war can be ended by a simple "refusal", a refusal of individuals, groups or casual "crowds". We are for the war being ended, as it will be, by a *revolution* in a number of countries, i.e., by the conquest of *state* power by a new class, not the capitalists, not the small proprietors (who are always half-dependent on the capitalists), but by the proletarians and semi-proletarians.

And so, in our appeal to the soldiers of all the belligerent countries we have set forth our programme for a workers' revolution in all countries, namely, the transfer of all state power to the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies.

Comrades, soldiers, discuss this programme among yourselves and with the German soldiers! Such a discussion will help you to find the true path, the most organised and shortest path, to end the war and overthrow the yoke of capital.

* * *

A word about one of the servants of Capital, Plekhanov. It is pitiful to see how low this former socialist has sunk! He compares fraternisation to "treachery"! His argument is: will not fraternisation, if it succeeds, lead to a separate peace?

No, Mr. ex-socialist, fraternisation, which we have supported on *all* the fronts, will not lead to a "separate" peace between the capitalists of several countries, but to a universal peace between the revolutionary workers of all countries, *despite* the capitalists of all countries, *against* the capitalists, and for the overthrow of their yoke.

WAR AND REVOLUTION⁶²

A lecture delivered May 14 (27), 1917

The question of war and revolution has been dealt with so often lately in the press and at every public meeting that probably many of you are not only familiar with many aspects of the question but have come to find them tedious. I have not yet had a single opportunity to address or even attend any Party or for that matter any public meetings in this district, and therefore I run the risk, perhaps, of repetition or of not dealing in sufficient detail with those aspects of the question that interest you most.

It seems to me that the most important thing that is usually overlooked in the question of the war, a key issue to which insufficient attention is paid and over which there is so much dispute—useless, hopeless, idle dispute, I should say—is the question of the class character of the war: what caused that war, what classes are waging it, and what historical and historico-economic conditions gave rise to it. As far as I have been able to follow the way the question of the war is dealt with at public and Party meetings, I have come to the conclusion that the reason why there is so much misunderstanding on the subject is because all too often, when dealing with the question of the war, we speak in entirely different languages.

From the point of view of Marxism, that is, of modern scientific socialism, the main issue in any discussion by socialists on how to assess the war and what attitude to adopt towards it is this: what is the war being waged for, and what classes staged and directed it. We Marxists do

not belong to that category of people who are unqualified opponents of all war. We say: our aim is to achieve a socialist system of society, which, by eliminating the division of mankind into classes, by eliminating all exploitation of man by man and nation by nation, will inevitably eliminate the very possibility of war. But in the war to win that socialist system of society we are bound to encounter conditions under which the class struggle within each given nation may come up against a war between the different nations, a war conditioned by this very class struggle. Therefore, we cannot rule out the possibility of revolutionary wars, i.e., wars arising from the class struggle, wars waged by revolutionary classes, wars which are of direct and immediate revolutionary significance. Still less can we rule this out when we remember that though the history of European revolutions during the last century, in the course of 125-135 years, say, gave us wars which were mostly reactionary, it also gave us revolutionary wars, such as the war of the French revolutionary masses against a united monarchist, backward, feudal and semi-feudal Europe. No deception of the masses is more widespread today in Western Europe, and latterly here in Russia, too, than that which is practised by citing the example of revolutionary wars. There are wars and wars. We must be clear as to what historical conditions have given rise to the war, what classes are waging it, and for what ends. Unless we grasp this, all our talk about the war will necessarily be utterly futile, engendering more heat than light. That is why I take the liberty, seeing that you have chosen war and revolution as the subject of today's talk, to deal with this aspect of the matter at greater length.

We all know the dictum of Clausewitz, one of the most famous writers on the philosophy and history of war, which says: "War is a continuation of policy by other means."⁶³ This dictum comes from a writer who reviewed the history of wars and drew philosophic lessons from it shortly after the period of the Napoleonic wars. This writer,

whose basic views are now undoubtedly familiar to every thinking person, nearly eighty years ago challenged the ignorant man-in-the-street conception of war as being a thing apart from the policies of the governments and classes concerned, as being a simple attack that disturbs the peace, and is then followed by restoration of the peace thus disturbed, as much as to say: "They had a fight, then they made up!" This is a grossly ignorant view, one that was repudiated scores of years ago and is repudiated by any more or less careful analysis of any historical epoch of wars.

War is a continuation of policy by other means. All wars are inseparable from the political systems that engender them. The policy which a given state, a given class within that state, pursued for a long time before the war is inevitably continued by that same class during the war, the form of action alone being changed.

War is a continuation of policy by other means. When the French revolutionary townspeople and revolutionary peasants overthrew the monarchy at the close of the eighteenth century by revolutionary means and established a democratic republic—when they made short work of their monarch, and short work of their landowners, too, in a revolutionary fashion—that policy of the revolutionary class was bound to shake all the rest of autocratic, tsarist, imperial, and semi-feudal Europe to its foundations. And the inevitable continuation of this policy of the victorious revolutionary class in France was the wars in which all the monarchist nations of Europe, forming their famous coalition, lined up against revolutionary France in a counter-revolutionary war. Just as within the country the revolutionary people of France had then, for the first time, displayed revolutionary energy on a scale it had never shown for centuries, so in the war at the close of the eighteenth century it revealed a similar gigantic revolutionary creativeness when it remodelled its whole system of strategy, broke with all the old rules and traditions of warfare, replaced the old troops with a new revolutionary people's army, and

created new methods of warfare. This example, to my mind, is noteworthy in that it clearly demonstrates to us things which the bourgeois journalists are now always forgetting when they pander to the philistine prejudices and ignorance of the backward masses who do not understand this intimate economic and historical connection between every kind of war and the preceding policy of every country, every class that ruled before the war and achieved its ends by so-called "peaceful" means. So-called, because the brute force required to ensure "peaceful" rule in the colonies, for example, can hardly be called peaceful.

Peace reigned in Europe, but this was because domination over hundreds of millions of people in the colonies by the European nations was sustained only through constant, incessant, interminable wars, which we Europeans do not regard as wars at all, since all too often they resembled, not wars, but brutal massacres, the wholesale slaughter of unarmed peoples. The thing is that if we want to know what the present war is about we must first of all make a general survey of the policies of the European powers as a whole. We must not take this or that example, this or that particular case, which can easily be wrenched out of the context of social phenomena and which is worthless, because an opposite example can just as easily be cited. We must take the whole policy of the entire system of European states in their economic and political interrelations if we are to understand how the present war steadily and inevitably grew out of this system.

We are constantly witnessing attempts, especially on the part of the capitalist press—whether monarchist or republican—to read into the present war an historical meaning which it does not possess. For example, no device is more frequently resorted to in the French Republic than that of presenting this war on France's part as a continuation and counterpart of the wars of the Great French Revolution of 1792. No device for hoodwinking the French masses, the French workers and the workers of all countries is more

widespread than that of applying to our epoch the "jargon" of that other epoch and some of its watchwords, or the attempt to present matters as though now, too, republican France is defending her liberty against the monarchy. One "minor" fact overlooked is that then, in 1792, war was waged in France by a revolutionary class, which had carried out an unparalleled revolution and displayed unmatched heroism in utterly destroying the French monarchy and rising against a united monarchist Europe with the sole and single aim of carrying on its revolutionary struggle.

The war in France was a continuation of the policy of the revolutionary class which had carried out the revolution, won the republic, settled accounts with the French capitalists and landowners with unprecedented vigour, and was waging a revolutionary war against a united monarchist Europe in continuation of that policy.

What we have at present is primarily two leagues, two groups of capitalist powers. We have before us all the world's greatest capitalist powers—Britain, France, America, and Germany—who for decades have doggedly pursued a policy of incessant economic rivalry aimed at achieving world supremacy, subjugating the small nations, and making threefold and tenfold profits on banking capital, which has caught the whole world in the net of its influence. That is what Britain's and Germany's policies really amount to. I stress this fact. This fact can never be emphasised strongly enough, because if we forget this we shall never understand what this war is about, and we shall then be easy game for any bourgeois publicist who tries to foist lying phrases on us.

The real policies of the two groups of capitalist giants—Britain and Germany, who, with their respective allies, have taken the field against each other—policies which they were pursuing for decades before the war, should be studied and grasped in their entirety. If we did not do this we should not only be neglecting an essential requirement of scientific socialism and of all social science in general, but we should

be unable to understand anything whatever about the present war. We should be putting ourselves in the power of Mi-lyukov, that deceiver, who is stirring up chauvinism and hatred of one nation for another by methods which are applied everywhere without exception, methods which Clausewitz wrote about eighty years ago when he ridiculed the very view some people are holding today, namely, that the nations lived in peace and then they started fighting. As if this were true! How can a war be accounted for without considering its bearing on the preceding policy of the given state, of the given system of states, the given classes? I repeat: this is a basic point which is constantly overlooked. Failure to understand it makes nine-tenth of all war discussions mere wrangling, so much verbiage. We say: if you have not studied the policies of both belligerent groups over a period of decades—so as to avoid accidental factors and the quoting of random examples—if you have not shown what bearing this war has on preceding policies, then you don't understand what this war is all about.

These policies show us just one thing—continuous economic rivalry between the world's two greatest giants, capitalist economies. On the one hand we have Britain, a country which owns the greater part of the globe, a country which ranks first in wealth, which has created this wealth not so much by the labour of its workers as by the exploitation of innumerable colonies, by the vast power of its banks which have developed at the head of all the others into an insignificantly small group of some four or five super-banks handling billions of rubles, and handling them in such a way that it can be said without exaggeration that there is not a patch of land in the world today on which this capital has not laid its heavy hand, not a patch of land which British capital has not enmeshed by a thousand threads. This capital grew to such dimensions by the turn of the century that its activities extended far beyond the borders of individual states and formed a group of giant banks possessed of fabulous wealth. Having begotten this tiny

group of banks, it has caught the whole world in the net of its billions. This is the sum and substance of Britain's economic policy and of the economic policy of France, of which even French writers, some of them contributors to *L'Humanité*, a paper now controlled by ex-socialists (in fact, no less a man than Lysis, the well-known financial writer), stated several years before the war: "France is a financial monarchy, France is a financial oligarchy, France is the world's money-lender."

On the other hand, opposed to this, mainly Anglo-French group, we have another group of capitalists, an even more rapacious, even more predatory one, a group who came to the capitalist banqueting table when all the seats were occupied, but who introduced into the struggle new methods for developing capitalist production, improved techniques, and superior organisation, which turned the old capitalism, the capitalism of the free-competition age, into the capitalism of giant trusts, syndicates, and cartels. This group introduced the beginnings of state-controlled capitalist production, combining the colossal power of capitalism with the colossal power of the state into a single mechanism and bringing tens of millions of people within the single organisation of state capitalism. Here is economic history, here is diplomatic history, covering several decades, from which no one can get away. It is the one and only guide-post to a proper solution of the problem of war; it leads you to the conclusion that the present war, too, is the outcome of the policies of the classes who have come to grips in it, of the two supreme giants, who, long before the war, had caught the whole world, all countries, in the net of financial exploitation and economically divided the globe up among themselves. They were bound to clash, because a redivision of this supremacy, from the point of view of capitalism, had become inevitable.

The old division was based on the fact that Britain, in the course of several centuries, had ruined her former competitors. A former competitor was Holland, which had

dominated the whole world. Another was France, which had fought for supremacy for nearly a hundred years. After a series of protracted wars Britain was able, by virtue of her economic power, her merchant capital, to establish her unchallenged sway over the world. In 1871 a new predator appeared, a new capitalist power arose, which developed at an incomparably faster pace than Britain. That is a basic fact. You will not find a book on economic history that does not acknowledge this indisputable fact—the fact of Germany's faster development. This rapid development of capitalism in Germany was the development of a young strong predator, who appeared in the concert of European powers and said: "You ruined Holland, you defeated France, you have helped yourself to half the world—now be good enough to let us have our fair share". What does "a fair share" mean? How is it to be determined in the capitalist world, in the world of banks? There power is determined by the number of banks, there power is determined in the way described by a mouthpiece of the American multimillionaires, which declared with typically American frankness and typically American cynicism: "The war in Europe is being waged for world domination. To dominate the world two things are needed: dollars and banks. We have the dollars, we shall make the banks and we shall dominate the world." This statement was made by a leading newspaper of the American multimillionaires. I must say, there is a thousand times more truth in this cynical statement of a blustering American multimillionaire than in thousands of articles by bourgeois liars who try to make out that this war is being waged for national interests, on national issues, and utter similar glaringly patent lies which dismiss history completely and take an isolated example like the case of the German beast of prey who attacked Belgium.⁶⁴ The case is undoubtedly a real one. This group of predators did attack Belgium with brutal ferocity, but it did the same thing the other group did yesterday by other means and is doing today to other nations.

When we argue about annexations—and this bears on the question I have been trying briefly to explain to you as the history of the economic and diplomatic relations which led up to the present war—when we argue about annexations we always forget that these, generally, are what the war is being waged for; it is for the carve-up of conquered territories, or, to put it more popularly, for the division of the spoils plundered by the two robber gangs. When we argue about annexations we constantly meet with methods which, scientifically speaking, do not stand up to criticism, and which, as methods of public journalism, are deliberate humbug. Ask a Russian chauvinist or a social-chauvinist what annexation by Germany means, and he will give you an excellent explanation, because he understands that perfectly well. But he will never answer a request for a general definition of annexation that will fit them all—Germany, Britain, and Russia. He will never do that! And when *Rech* (to pass from theory to practice) sneered at *Pravda*, saying, "These Pravdists consider Kurland a case of annexation! How can you talk to such people!" and we answered: "Please give us such a definition of annexation as would apply to the Germans, the English, and the Russians, and we add that either you will evade this issue or we shall expose you on the spot"*—*Rech* kept silent. We maintain that no newspaper, either of the chauvinists in general, who simply say that the fatherland must be defended, or of the social-chauvinists, has ever given a definition of annexation that would fit both Germany and Russia, that would be applicable to any side. It cannot do this for the simple reason that this war is the continuation of a policy of annexations, that is, a policy of conquest, of capitalist robbery on the part of both groups involved in the war. Obviously, the question of which of these two robbers was the first to draw the knife is of small account to us. Take the history of the naval and

* See V. I. Lenin, "Blancism" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 24, pp. 35-36).—Ed.

military expenditures of these two groups over a period of decades, take the history of the little wars they waged before the big war—"little" because few Europeans died in those wars, whereas hundreds of thousands of people belonging to the nations they were subjugating died in them, nations which from their point of view could not be regarded as nations at all (you couldn't very well call those Asians and Africans nations!); the wars waged against these nations were wars against unarmed people, who were simply shot down, machine-gunned. Can you call them wars? Strictly speaking, they were not wars at all, and you could forget about them. That is their attitude to this downright deception of the masses.

The present war is a continuation of the policy of conquest, of the shooting down of whole nationalities, of unbelievable atrocities committed by the Germans and the British in Africa, and by the British and the Russians in Persia—which of them committed most it is difficult to say. It was for this reason that the German capitalists looked upon them as their enemies. Ah, they said, you are strong because you are rich? But we are stronger, therefore we have the same "sacred" right to plunder. That is what the real history of British and German finance capital in the course of several decades preceding the war amounts to. That is what the history of Russo-German, Russo-British and German-British relations amounts to. There you have the clue to an understanding of what the war is about. That is why the story that is current about the cause of the war is sheer duplicity and humbug. Forgetting the history of finance capital, the history of how this war had been brewing over the issue of redivision, they present the matter like this: two nations were living at peace, then one attacked the other, and the other fought back. All science, all banks are forgotten, and the peoples are told to take up arms, and so are the peasants, who know nothing about politics. All they have to do is to fight back! The logical thing, following this line of argument, would be to close down all newspapers, burn all books

and ban all mention of annexations in the press. In this way such a view of annexations could be justified. They can't tell the truth about annexations because the whole history of Russia, Britain, and Germany has been one of continuous, ruthless and sanguinary war over annexations. Ruthless wars were waged in Persia and Africa by the Liberals, who flogged political offenders in India for daring to put forward demands which were being fought for here in Russia. The French colonial troops oppressed peoples too. There you have the pre-history, the real history of unprecedented plunder! Such is the policy of these classes, of which the present war is a continuation. That is why, on the question of annexations, they cannot give the reply that we give, when we say that any nation joined to another one, not by the voluntary choice of its majority but by a decision of a king or government, is an annexed nation. To renounce annexation is to give each nation the right to form a separate state or to live in union with whomsoever it chooses. An answer like that is perfectly clear to every worker who is at all class-conscious.

In every resolution, of which dozens are passed, and published even in such a paper as *Zemlya i Volya*,⁶⁵ you will find the answer, poorly expressed: We don't want a war for supremacy over other nations, we are fighting for our freedom. That is what all the workers and peasants say, that is how they express the view of the workingman, his understanding of the war. They imply by this that if the war were in the interests of the working people against the exploiters they would be for such a war. So would we, and there is not a revolutionary party that could be against it. Where they go wrong, these movers of numerous resolutions, is when they believe that the war is being waged by them. We soldiers, we workers, we peasants are fighting for our freedom. I shall never forget the question one of them asked me after a meeting. "Why do you speak against the capitalists all the time?" he said. "I'm not a capitalist, am I? We're workers, we're defending our freedom." You're

wrong, you are fighting because you are obeying your capitalist government; it's the governments, not the peoples, who are carrying on this war. I am not surprised at a worker or a peasant, who doesn't know his politics, who has not had the good or bad fortune of being initiated into the secrets of diplomacy or the picture of this finance plunder (this oppression of Persia by Russia and Britain, say)—I am not surprised at him forgetting this history and saying naïvely: Who cares about the capitalists, when it's me who's fighting! He doesn't understand the connection between the war and the government, he doesn't understand that the war is being waged by the government, and that he is just a tool in the hands of that government. He can call himself a revolutionary people and write eloquent resolutions—to Russians this means a lot, because this has come into their lives only recently. There has recently appeared a "revolutionary" declaration by the Provisional Government. This doesn't mean anything. Other nations, more experienced than we are in the capitalist art of hoodwinking the masses by penning "revolutionary" manifestos, have long since broken all the world's records in this respect. If you take the parliamentary history of the French Republic since it became a republic supporting tsarism, you will find dozens of examples during the decades of this history when manifestos full of the most eloquent phrases served to mask a policy of the most outrageous colonial and financial plunder. The whole history of the Third Republic in France is a history of this plunder. Such are the origins of the present war. It is not due to malice on the part of capitalists or the mistaken policy of some monarch. To think so would be incorrect. No, this war is an inevitable outgrowth of super-capitalism, especially banking capital, which resulted in some four banks in Berlin and five or six in London dominating the whole world, appropriating the world's funds, reinforcing their financial policy by armed force, and finally clashing in a savage armed conflict because they had come to the end of their free tether in the matter of conquests. One or

the other side had to relinquish its colonies. Such questions are not settled voluntarily in this world of capitalists. This issue could only be settled by war. That is why it is absurd to blame one or another crowned brigand. They are all the same, these crowned brigands. That is why it is equally absurd to blame the capitalists of one or another country. All they are to blame for is for having introduced such a system. But this has been done in full keeping with the law, which is safeguarded by all the forces of a civilised state. "I am fully within my rights, I am a buyer of shares. All the law courts, all the police, the whole standing army and all the navies in the world are safeguarding my sacred right to these shares." Who's to blame for banks being set up which handle hundreds of millions of rubles, for these banks casting their nets of plunder over the whole world, and for their being locked in mortal combat? Find the culprit if you can! The blame lies with half a century of capitalist development, and the only way out of this is by the overthrow of the rule of the capitalists and by a workers' revolution. That is the answer our Party has arrived at from an analysis of the war, and that is why we say: the very simple question of annexations has been so muddled up and the spokesmen of the bourgeois parties have uttered so many lies that they are able to make out that Kurland is not annexation by Russia. They have shared Kurland and Poland between them, those three crowned brigands. They have been doing this for a hundred years, carving up the living flesh. And the Russian brigand snatched most because he was then the strongest. And now that the young beast of prey, Germany, who was then a party to the carve-up, has grown into a strong capitalist power, she demands a redivision. You want things to stay as they were? she says. You think you are stronger? Let's try conclusions!

That is what the war boils down to. Of course, the challenge "let's try conclusions" is merely an expression of the decade-long policy of plunder, the policy of the big banks. That is why no one but we can tell this truth about

annexations, a simple truth that every worker and peasant will understand. That is why the question of treaties, such a simple question, is deliberately and disgracefully confused by the whole press. You say that we have a revolutionary government, that there are ministers in that government who are well-nigh socialists—Narodniks and Mensheviks. But when they make declarations about peace without annexations, on condition that this term is not defined (because it means taking away German annexations and keeping our own), then we say: Of what value are your "revolutionary" cabinet, your declarations, your statements that you are not out for a war of conquest, if at the same time you tell the army to take the offensive? Don't you know that we have treaties, that these treaties were concluded by Nicholas the Bloody in the most predatory fashion? You don't know it? It is pardonable for the workers or peasants not to know that. They did not plunder, they read no clever books. But when educated Cadets preach this sort of stuff they know perfectly well what these treaties are about. Although they are "secret" treaties, the whole diplomatic press in all countries talks about them, saying: "You'll get the Straits, you'll get Armenia, you'll get Galicia, you'll get Alsace-Lorraine, you'll get Trieste, and we'll make a final carve-up of Persia." And the German capitalist says: "I'll seize Egypt, I'll subjugate the European nations unless you return my colonies to me with interest." Shares are things that can't do without interest. That is why the question of treaties, itself a clear, simple question, has touched off such a torrent of barefaced outrageous lies as those that are now pouring from the pages of all the capitalist newspapers.

Take today's paper *Dyen*. Vodovozov, a man absolutely innocent of Bolshevism, but who is an honest democrat, states in it: I am opposed to secret treaties; let me say this about the treaty with Rumania. There is a secret treaty with Rumania and it says that Rumania will receive a number of foreign peoples if she fights on the side of the Allies. The treaties which the other Allies have are all the same.

They wouldn't have started to subjugate nations if they had not had these treaties. To know their contents you do not have to burrow in special journals. It is sufficient to recollect the basic facts of economic and diplomatic history. For decades Austria has been after the Balkans with an eye to subjugation. And if they have clashed it is because they couldn't help clashing. That is why, when the masses demand that these treaties should be published, a demand that is growing more insistent every day, ex-Minister Milyukov and the present Minister Tereshchenko (one in a government without socialist ministers, the other in a government with a number of near-socialist ministers) declare that publication of the treaties would mean a break with the Allies.

Obviously, you can't publish the treaties because you are all participants in the same gang of robbers. We agree with Milyukov and Tereshchenko that the treaties cannot be published. Two different conclusions can be drawn from this. If we agree with Milyukov and Tereshchenko that the treaties cannot be published—what follows from this? If the treaties cannot be published, then we've got to help the capitalist ministers continue the war. The other conclusion is this: since the capitalists cannot publish the treaties themselves, then the capitalists have got to be overthrown. Which of these two conclusions you consider to be correct, I leave it to you to decide, but be sure to consider the consequences. If we reason the way the Narodnik and Menshevik ministers reason, we come to this: once the government says that the treaties cannot be published, then we must issue a new manifesto. Paper is not so dear yet that we cannot write new manifestos. We shall write a new manifesto and start an offensive. What for? With what aims? Who is to set these aims? The soldiers are called upon to carry out the predatory treaties with Rumania and France. Send Vodovozov's article to the front and then complain that this is all the Bolsheviks' doing, the Bolsheviks must have invented this treaty-with-Rumania business. In that case

you would not only have to make life a hell for *Pravda*, but even kick Vodovozov out for having studied history. You would have to make a bonfire of all Milyukov's books—terribly dangerous books those. Just open any book by the leader of the party of "people's freedom", by this ex-Minister of Foreign Affairs. They are good books. What do they say? They say that Russia has "a right" to the Straits, to Armenia, to Galicia, to Eastern Prussia. He has carved them all up, and even appends a map. Not only the Bolsheviks and Vodovozov will have to be sent to Siberia for writing such revolutionary articles, but Milyukov's books will have to be burnt too, because if you collected simple quotations from these books today and sent them to the front, no inflammatory leaflet would have such an inflammatory effect as this would have.

It remains for me now, according to the brief plan of this talk I have sketched for myself, to touch on the question of "revolutionary defencism". I believe, after what I have had the honour of reporting to you, that I may now be allowed to touch only briefly on this question.

By "revolutionary defencism" we mean vindication of the war on the plea that, after all, we have made the revolution, after all, we are a revolutionary people, a revolutionary democracy. But what answer do we give to that? What revolution did we make? We overthrew Nicholas. The revolution was not so very difficult compared with one that would have overthrown the whole class of landowners and capitalists. Who did the revolution put in power? The landowners and capitalists—the very same classes who have long been in power in Europe. Revolutions like this occurred there a hundred years ago. The Tereshchenkos, Milyukovs, and Konovalovs have been in power there for a long time and it doesn't matter a bit whether they have a civil list⁶⁶ to pay their tsars or whether they do without this luxury. A bank remains a bank, whether capital is invested in concessions by the hundred or not; profits remain profits, be it in a republic or in a monarchy. If any savage country dares

to disobey our civilised Capital, which sets up such splendid banks in the colonies, in Africa and Persia—if any savage nation should disobey our civilised bank, we send troops out who restore culture, order, and civilisation, as Lyakhov did in Persia, and the French “republican” troops did in Africa, where they exterminated peoples with equal ferocity. What difference does it make? We have here the same “revolutionary defencism”, displayed only by the unenlightened masses, who see no connection between war and the government, who do not know that this policy is sanctioned by treaties. The treaties have remained, the banks have remained, the concessions have remained. In Russia the best men of their class are in the government, but the nature of the world war has not changed a bit because of this. The new “revolutionary defencism” uses the great concept of revolution merely as a cloak to cover up the dirty and bloody war waged for the sake of dirty and outrageous treaties.

The Russian revolution has not altered the war, but it has created organisations which exist in no other country and were seldom found in revolutions in the West. Most of the revolutions were confined to the emergence of governments of our Tereshchenko and Konovalov type, while the country remained passive and disorganised. The Russian revolution has gone further than that. In this we have the germ of hope that it may overcome the war. Besides the government of “near-socialist” ministers, the government of imperialist war, the government of offensive, a government tied up with Anglo-French capital—besides this government and independent of it we have all over Russia a network of the Soviets of Workers, Soldiers, and Peasants’ Deputies. Here is a revolution which has not said its last word yet. Here is a revolution which Western Europe, under similar conditions, has not known. Here are organisations of those classes which really have no need for annexations, which have not put millions in the banks, and which are probably not interested in whether the Russian Colonel Lyakhov and the

British Liberal ambassador divided Persia properly or not. Here is the pledge of this revolution being carried further, i.e., that the classes which have no interests in annexations, and despite the fact that they put too much trust in the capitalist government, despite the appalling muddle and appalling deception contained in the very concept "revolutionary defencism", despite the fact that they support the war loan, support the government of imperialist war—despite all this—have succeeded in creating organisations in which the mass of the oppressed classes are represented. These are the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers', and Peasants' Deputies, which, in very many local areas in Russia, have gone much further than the Petrograd Soviet in their revolutionary work. It is only natural, because in Petrograd we have the central authority of the capitalists.

And when Skobelev in his speech yesterday said: "We'll take all the profits, we'll take 100 per cent", he was just letting himself go with ministerial *élan*. If you take today's *Rech* you will see what the response is to this passage in Skobelev's speech. They write there: "Why, this means starvation, death! One hundred per cent means all!" Minister Skobelev goes farther than the most extreme Bolshevik. It's slandering the Bolsheviks to say that they are the extreme Left. Minister Skobelev is much more "Left". They called me all the ugly names they could think of, saying that I wanted to take their last shirt from the capitalists. At any rate, it was Shulgin who said: "Let them take our last shirt!" Imagine a Bolshevik going up to Citizen Shulgin and wanting to take his shirt from him. He could just as well and with greater justification accuse Minister Skobelev of this. We never went as far as that. We never suggested taking 100 per cent of profits. Nevertheless, it is a valuable promise. If you take the resolution of our Party you will see that we propose there, only in a more reasoned form, exactly what I have been proposing. Control must be established over the banks, followed by a fair tax on incomes.⁶⁷ And nothing more! Skobelev suggests taking a hundred

kopeks in the ruble. We proposed and propose nothing of the sort. Skobelev doesn't really mean it, and if he does he would not be able to do it for the simple reason that to promise such things while making friends with Tere-shchenko and Konovalov is somewhat ludicrous. You could take 80 or 90 per cent of a millionaire's income, but not arm in arm with such ministers. If the Soviets had the power they would really take it, but not all of it—they have no need to. They would take the bulk of the income. No other state authority could do that. Minister Skobelev may have the best of intentions. I have known those parties for several decades—I have been in the revolutionary movement for thirty years. I am the last person, therefore, to question their good intentions. But that is not the point. It is not a question of good intentions. Good intentions pave the road to hell. All the government offices are full of papers signed by our ministers, but nothing has changed as a result of it. If you want to introduce control, start it! Our programme is such that in reading Skobelev's speech we can say: we do not demand more. We are much more moderate than Minister Skobelev. He proposes both control and 100 per cent. We don't want to take 100 per cent, but we say: "Until you start doing things we don't believe you!" Here lies the difference between us: we don't believe words and promises and don't advise others to believe them. The lessons of parliamentary republics teach us not to believe in paper utterances. If you want control, you've got to start it. One day is enough to have a law on such control issued. The employees' council at every bank, the workers' council at every factory, and all the parties receive the right of control. But you can't do that, we shall be told. This is a commercial secret, this is sacred private property. Well, just as you like, make your choice. If you want to safeguard all those ledgers and accounts, all the transactions of the trusts, then don't chatter about control, about the country going to ruin.

In Germany the situation is still worse. In Russia you can get grain but in Germany you can't. You can do a lot

in Russia through organisation, but you can do nothing more in Germany. There is no more grain left, and the whole nation is faced with disaster. People today write that Russia is on the brink of ruin. If that is so, then it is a crime to safeguard "sacred" private property. Therefore, what do the words about control mean? Surely you haven't forgotten that Nicholas Romanov, too, wrote a good deal about control. You will find him repeating a thousand times the words "state control", "public control", "appointment of senators". In the two months following the revolution the industrialists have robbed the whole of Russia. Capitalists have made staggering profits; every financial report tells you that. And when the workers, two months after the revolution, had the "audacity" to say they wanted to live like human beings, the whole capitalist press throughout the country set up a howl. Every number of *Rech* is a wild howl about the workers wanting to rob the country, but all we promise is merely control over the capitalists. Can't we have less promises and more deeds? If what you want is bureaucratic control, control through the same organs as before, our Party declares its profound conviction that you cannot be given support in this, even if there were a dozen Narodnik and Menshevik ministers in your government instead of half a dozen. Control can only be exercised by the people. You must arrange control by bank employees' councils, engineers' councils, and workers' councils, and start that control right away, tomorrow. Every official should be made responsible, on pain of criminal persecution, for any wrong information he may give in any of these institutions. It is a matter of life and death to the country. We want to know how much grain there is, how much raw material, how many work hands there are and where they are to be placed.

This brings me to the last question—that of how to end the war. The ridiculous view is ascribed to us that we are out for a separate peace. The German robber capitalists are making peace overtures, saying: "We'll give you a piece of Turkey and Armenia if you give us ore-bearing lands."

That is what the diplomats are talking about in every neutral city! Everybody knows it. Only it is veiled with conventional diplomatic phrases. That's what diplomats are for—to speak in diplomatic language. What nonsense it is to allege that we are for ending the war by a separate peace! To end the war which is being waged by the capitalists of all the wealthiest powers, a war stemming from the decade-long history of economic development, by one-sided withdrawal from military operations is such a stupid idea that it would be absurd even to refute it. The fact that we specially drew up a resolution to refute it is because we wanted to explain things to the broad masses before whom we were being slandered. It is not a matter that can be seriously discussed. The war which the capitalists of all countries are waging cannot be ended without a workers' revolution against these capitalists. So long as control remains a mere phrase instead of deed, so long as the government of the capitalists has not been replaced by a government of the revolutionary proletariat, the government is doomed merely to reiterate: we are heading for disaster, disaster, disaster. Socialists are now being jailed in "free" Britain for saying what I am saying. In Germany Liebknecht has been imprisoned for saying what I am saying, and in Austria Friedrich Adler is in jail for saying the same thing with the help of a revolver (he may have been executed by now). The sympathy of the mass of workers in all countries is with these socialists and not with those who have sided with their capitalists. The workers' revolution is mounting throughout the world. In other countries it is a more difficult matter, of course. They have no half-wits there like Nicholas and Rasputin. There the best men of their class are at the head of the government. They lack conditions there for a revolution against autocracy. They have there a government of the capitalist class. The most talented representatives of that class have been governing there for a long time. That is why the revolution there, though it has not come yet, is bound to come, no matter how many revolutionaries, men

like Friedrich Adler and Karl Liebknecht, may die in the attempt. The future belongs to them, and the workers of all countries follow their lead. The workers in all countries are bound to win.

On the question of America entering the war I shall say this. People argue that America is a democracy, America has the White House. I say: Slavery was abolished there half a century ago. The anti-slave war ended in 1865. Since then multimillionaires have mushroomed. They have the whole of America in their financial grip. They are making ready to subdue Mexico and will inevitably come to war with Japan over a carve-up of the Pacific. This war has been brewing for several decades. All literature speaks about it. America's real aim in entering the war is to prepare for this future war with Japan. The American people do enjoy considerable freedom and it is difficult to conceive them standing for compulsory military service, for the setting up of an army pursuing any aims of conquest—a struggle with Japan, for instance. The Americans have the example of Europe to show them what this leads to. The American capitalists have stepped into this war in order to have an excuse, behind a smoke-screen of lofty ideals championing the rights of small nations, for building up a strong standing army.

The peasants refuse to give up their grain for money and demand implements, boots, and clothes. There is a great measure of profound truth in this decision. Indeed, the country has reached a stage of ruin when it now faces the same situation, although to a less intensive degree, that other countries have long been facing, a situation in which money has lost its value. The rule of capitalism is being so strongly undermined by the whole course of events that the peasants, for instance, refuse to accept money. They say: "What do we want money for?" And they are right. The rule of capitalism is being undermined not because somebody is out to seize power. "Seizure" of power would be senseless. It would be impossible to put an end to the rule of capitalism if the whole course of economic development in the capitalist

countries did not lead up to it. The war has speeded up this process, and this has made capitalism impossible. No power could destroy capitalism if it were not sapped and undermined by history.

And now we see this clearly demonstrated. The peasant expresses what everybody sees—that the power of money has been undermined. The only way out is for the Soviets to agree to give implements, boots, and clothes in exchange for grain. This is what we are coming to, this is the answer that life dictates. Without this, tens of millions of people will go hungry, without clothes and boots. Tens of millions of people are facing disaster and death; safeguarding the interests of the capitalists is the last thing that should bother us. The only way out is for all power to be transferred to the Soviets, which represent the majority of the population. Possibly mistakes may be made in the process. No one claims that such a difficult task can be disposed of offhand. We do not say anything of the sort. We are told that we want the power to be in the hands of the Soviets, but they don't want it. We say that life's experience will suggest this solution to them, and the whole nation will see that there is no other way out. We do not want a "seizure" of power, because the entire experience of past revolutions teaches us that the only stable power is the one that has the backing of the majority of the population. "Seizure" of power, therefore, would be adventurism, and our Party will not have it. If the government will be a government of the majority, it may perhaps embark on a policy that will prove, at first, to be erroneous, but there is no other way out. We shall then have a peaceful policy shift within the same organisations. No other organisations can be invented. That is why we say that no other solution of the question is conceivable.

How can the war be ended? If the Soviets were to assume power and the Germans continued the war—what would we do then? Anyone interested in the views of our Party could have read in *Pravda* the other day an exact quotation of what we said abroad as far back as 1915, namely, that if

the revolutionary class in Russia, the working class, comes to power, it will have to offer peace. And if our terms are rejected by the German capitalists or by the capitalists of any other country then that class will stand wholly for war.* We are not suggesting that the war be ended at one blow. We do not promise that. We preach no such impossible and impracticable thing as that the war can be ended by the will of one side alone. Such promises are easy to give but impossible to fulfil. There is no easy way out of this terrible war. It has been going on for three years. You will go on fighting for ten years unless you accept the idea of a difficult and painful revolution. There is no other way out. We say: The war which the capitalist governments have started can only be ended by a workers' revolution. Those interested in the socialist movement should read the Basle Manifesto of 1912 adopted unanimously by all the socialist parties of the world, a manifesto that was published in our newspaper *Pravda*, a manifesto that can be published now in none of the belligerent countries, neither in "free" Britain nor in republican France, because it said the truth about war before the war. It said that there would be war between Britain and Germany as a result of capitalist competition. It said that so much powder had accumulated that the guns would start shooting of their own accord. It told us what the war would be fought for, and said that the war would lead to a proletarian revolution. Therefore, we tell those socialists who signed this Manifesto and then went over to the side of their capitalist governments that they have betrayed socialism. There has been a split among the socialists all over the world. Some are in ministerial cabinets, others in prison. All over the world some socialists are preaching a war build-up, while others, like Eugene Debs, the American Bebel, who enjoys immense popularity among the American workers, say: "I'd rather be shot than give a

* See V. I. Lenin, "Statements About the War Made by Our Party Before the Revolution" (*Collected Works*, Vol. 24, p. 394).—Ed.

cent towards the war. I'm willing to fight only the proletariat's war against the capitalists all over the world." That is how the socialists have split throughout the world. The world's social-patriots think they are defending their country. They are mistaken—they are defending the interests of one band of capitalists against another. We preach proletarian revolution—the only true cause, for which scores of people have gone to the scaffold, and hundreds and thousands have been thrown into prison. These imprisoned socialists are a minority, but the working class is for them, the whole course of economic development is for them. All this tells us that there is no other way out. The only way to end this war is by a workers' revolution in several countries. In the meantime we should make preparations for that revolution, we should assist it. For all its hatred of war and desire for peace, the Russian people could do nothing against the war, so long as it was being waged by the tsar, except work for a revolution against the tsar and for the tsar's overthrow. And that is what happened. History proved this to you yesterday and will prove it to you tomorrow. We said long ago that the mounting Russian revolution must be assisted. We said that at the end of 1914. Our Duma deputies were deported to Siberia for this, and we were told: "You are giving no answer. You talk about revolution when the strikes are off, when the deputies are doing hard labour, and when you haven't a single newspaper!" And we were accused of evading an answer. We heard those accusations for a number of years. We answered: You can be indignant about it, but so long as the tsar has not been overthrown we can do nothing against the war. And our prediction was justified. It is not fully justified yet, but it has already begun to receive justification. The revolution is beginning to change the war on Russia's part. The capitalists are still continuing the war, and we say: Until there is a workers' revolution in several countries the war cannot be stopped, because the people who want that war are still in power. We are told: "In a number of countries everything seems

to be asleep. In Germany all the socialists to a man are for the war, and Liebknecht is the only one against it." To this I say: This only one, Liebknecht, represents the working class. The hopes of all are in him alone, in his supporters, in the German proletariat. You don't believe this? Carry on with the war then! There is no other way. If you don't believe in Liebknecht, if you don't believe in the workers' revolution, a revolution that is coming to a head—if you don't believe this, then believe the capitalists!

Nothing but a workers' revolution in several countries can defeat this war. The war is not a game, it is an appalling thing taking toll of millions of lives, and it is not to be ended easily.

The soldiers at the front cannot tear the front away from the rest of the state and settle things their own way. The soldiers at the front are a part of the country. So long as the country is at war the front will suffer along with the rest. Nothing can be done about it. The war has been brought about by the ruling classes and only a revolution of the working class can end it. Whether you will get a speedy peace or not depends on how the revolution will develop. Whatever sentimental things may be said, however much we may be told: Let us end the war immediately—this cannot be done without the development of the revolution. When power passes to the Soviets the capitalists will come out against us. Japan, France, Britain, the governments of all countries will be against us. The capitalists will be against, but the workers will be for us. That will be the end of the war which the capitalists started. There you have the answer to the question of how to end the war.

THE HARM OF PHRASE-MONGERING

The answers of the French and the British governments clearly demonstrate the soundness of our repeated assertions that neither the Russian, nor the French, nor the British, nor the German capitalist government can throw over the policy of annexations, and that all such promises are designed to deceive the peoples.⁶⁸

We are fighting to seize Alsace-Lorraine, we are fighting for victory, the French replied. Be good enough to comply with the treaty and fight for Russian and German Poland, the British replied.

The bitter truth that capitalism cannot be reconciled to a non-annexationist policy has been exposed once more. The policy of the "conciliators", of those who wish to reconcile the capitalists and the proletariat, the policy of the Narodnik and Menshevik ministerialists, is an obvious failure. All their hopes on a coalition government have been shattered, all their promises have been exposed as mere verbiage.

And most harmful of all, as far as the cause of the revolution and the interests of the toiling masses are concerned, is the attempt to cover up the whole thing with phrases. Two shadings stand out in this torrent of phrases, one as bad as the other.

Rabochaya Gazeta, the organ of the Menshevik ministerialists, brings grist to the Cadet mill. On the one hand, it says: "On this basis [on the basis of the answers of the two Allied powers] there can be no agreement between them and us..." When they say "us", do they mean the Russian

capitalists? The theory of the class struggle is thrown overboard; it is much more profitable to spout phrases about "democracy" in the abstract, while trampling underfoot the elementary truth of Marxism, namely, that it is precisely *within* a "democracy" that the gulf between the capitalists and the proletarians is widest.

On the other hand, *Rabochaya Gazeta* wishes to make "an attempt at revision [of the agreements and the treaties] through a conference of representatives of the Allied governments to be specially convened". The same old story: agreement with the capitalists, which, in fact, signifies *deception of the workers* by playing at negotiations with their class foes.

"The pressure of the rank and file of the French and British democracies, even pressure by the French and British proletariat alone upon their respective governments..." writes *Rabochaya Gazeta*. In Russia the Mensheviks are supporting *their own* imperialist government, but in other countries they want *pressure* to be brought to bear... What is this, if not sheer phrase-mongering and humbug from beginning to end?

"We are working for it (for world peace) by convening an international socialist conference" ... to be attended by ministers from among those ex-socialists who have sided with *their* governments! This is "working" with a vengeance to deceive the people on a major scale by means of a series of minor deceptions.

We have *Dyelo Naroda* phrase-mongering "à la Jacobin". That stern tone, those spectacular revolutionary exclamations: "we know enough" ... "faith in the victory of our Revolution" (with a capital letter, of course), "upon this or that step ... of the Russian revolutionary democracy ... depend the destinies ... of the *entire* Uprising [with a capital letter, of course] which the working people have so happily and so victoriously begun."

Obviously, if you write the words Revolution and Uprising with capital letters it makes the thing look "awfully"

frightening, just like the Jacobins. Plenty of effect at small expense. For the people who write this are virtually helping to crush the revolution and impede the uprising of the working people by supporting the *Russian* government of the imperialists, by supporting *their* methods of concealing from the people the secret treaties, *their* tactics of putting off the immediate abolition of the landed estates, by supporting *their* war policy of "offensive", *their* high-handed insulting behaviour towards the local representative bodies, *their* presumption to appoint or endorse the local officers elected by the local population, and so on *ad infinitum*.

Gentlemen, heroes of the phrase, knights of revolutionary bombast! Socialism demands that we distinguish between capitalist democracy and proletarian democracy, between bourgeois revolution and proletarian revolution, between a rising of the rich against the tsar and a rising of the working people *against the rich*. . . . Socialism demands that we distinguish our bourgeois revolution, which has ended (the bourgeoisie now is counter-revolutionary) from the mounting revolution of the proletarians and poor peasants. The former revolution is *for war*, *for* preserving the landed estates, *for* "subordinating" the local organs of self-government to the central government, *for* secret treaties. The latter revolution has *begun* to throttle the war by revolutionary fraternisation, by abolishing the power of the landowners in the local areas, by increasing the number and the power of the Soviets, and by introducing everywhere the elective principle.

The Narodnik and Menshevik ministerialists are spouting phrases about "democracy" in the abstract, about "Revolution" in the abstract in order to *cover up* their agreement with the imperialist, now definitely counter-revolutionary, bourgeoisie of their own country—an agreement which, in effect, is turning into a struggle *against* the revolution of the proletarians and semi-proletarians.

**SPEECH ON THE WAR DELIVERED
AT THE FIRST
ALL-RUSSIA CONGRESS OF SOVIETS
OF WORKERS' AND SOLDIERS' DEPUTIES,
JUNE 9 (22), 1917⁶⁹**

Comrades, allow me, by way of an introduction to an analysis of the war issue, to remind you of two passages in the Manifesto to all countries published by the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies on March 14. "The time has come," said the Manifesto, "to begin a resolute struggle against the predatory designs of the governments of all countries. The time has come for the people to take the decision on war and peace into their own hands." Another passage in the Manifesto, addressed to the workers of the Austro-German coalition, reads: "Refuse to serve as tools of conquest and violence in the hands of kings, landowners and bankers." These are the two passages that have been repeated in different wordings in dozens, hundreds and, I should even imagine, thousands of resolutions by Russia's workers and peasants.

I am sure these two passages show best of all the contradictory and hopelessly complicated position in which the revolutionary workers and peasants find themselves owing to the present policy of the Mensheviks and Narodniks. On the one hand, they support the war. On the other, they belong to classes which have no interest in the predatory designs of the government of any country, and they cannot help saying so. This psychology and ideology, much as it may be vague, is unusually deep-rooted in every worker and peasant. It is realisation that the war is being waged because of the predatory designs of the governments of all countries. But, together with this, it is very vaguely understood, or even not understood at all, that a government, whatever its form, expresses the interests of definite classes and that, therefore,

to contrast the government to the people, as the first passage I quoted does, is an awful theoretical muddle, utter political helplessness, and means condemning yourselves and the whole of your policy to the shakiest and most unstable position and trend. By exactly the same token, the closing words in the second passage I have quoted—that excellent call, “Refuse to serve as tools of conquest and violence in the hands of kings, landowners and bankers”—are splendid. Only—“including your own”, because if you Russian workers and peasants turn to the workers and peasants of Austria and Germany, whose governments and ruling classes are waging the same kind of predatory war of plunder as the Russian capitalists and bankers, and as those of Britain and France—if you say: “Refuse to serve as tools in the hands of your bankers” but admit your own bankers into the Ministry and give them a seat next to socialist Ministers, you are reducing all your appeals to nothing, and in fact you are refuting your whole policy. Your excellent aspirations or wishes might just as well not exist, for you are helping Russia to wage the very same imperialist war, the very same predatory war. You are coming into conflict with the masses you represent, because these masses will never adopt the capitalist point of view, openly expressed by Milyukov, Maklakov and others, who say: “No idea could be more criminal than that the war is being waged in the interests of capital.”

I wonder whether that idea is criminal. I have no doubt that from the point of view of those who half-exist today and will perhaps no longer exist tomorrow, the idea actually is criminal. But it is the only correct idea. It alone expresses our conception of this war. It alone expresses the interests of the oppressed classes as a struggle against their oppressors. And when we say the war is capitalist and predatory, we must have no illusions—there is not the slightest hint that the crimes of individuals, of individual kings, could have provoked this kind of war.

Imperialism is a definite stage in the development of world capital. Capitalism, which has been developing for

decades, created a situation in which a small group of immensely rich countries—there are no more than four: Britain, France, Germany and the U.S.A.—amassed wealth amounting to hundreds of thousands of millions, and concentrated vast power in the hands of the big banks and big capitalists—there are only a couple or half a dozen of them at most in each of these countries—immense power encompassing the whole world, and literally divided the whole globe territorially by setting up colonies. These powers had colonies in every country of the world. They redivided the globe among themselves economically as well, because concessions, and the threads of finance capital, penetrated into every single part of the globe. This is the basis for annexations. Annexations are not a figment of the imagination. They did not happen because people who loved liberty unexpectedly became reactionaries. Annexations are nothing but a political expression and political form of the domination of giant banks that has arisen inevitably from capitalism, through no one's fault, because shares are the basis of banks and because the accumulation of shares is the basis of imperialism. And the big banks, which dominate the whole world through their billions in capital and link entire industries with capitalist and monopoly alliances—that is where we have imperialism, which has split the whole world into three groups of immensely rich plunderers.

One group—the first, which is closer to us in Europe—is headed by Britain, and the other two, by Germany and the U.S.A. The other accomplices are compelled to help while capitalist relations persist. Therefore, if you have a clear idea of the essence of the matter, which every oppressed person realises instinctively, and which every Russian worker and the vast majority of peasants realise instinctively—if you have a clear idea of it, you will see how laughable is the idea of fighting the war with words, manifestos, leaflets and socialist congresses. It is laughable because the banks are still omnipotent no matter how many declarations you issue, no matter how many political revolutions you carry

out—you have overthrown Nicholas Romanov in Russia and have to some extent made her a republic; Russia has taken a gigantic stride forward, and may be said to have overtaken, almost overnight, France, which in different conditions required a hundred years to do as much and yet remained a capitalist country. And the capitalists are still there. They have lost some ground. They did so in 1905 as well, but did that undermine their strength? While this may be new to Russians, in Europe every revolution showed that with every upswing of the revolutionary movement the workers achieved something more than they had before, but capitalist power remained. The struggle against the imperialist war is impossible unless it is a struggle waged by the revolutionary classes against the ruling classes on a world scale. It is not a question of landowners in general. There *are* landowners in Russia and they play a greater role in Russia than in any other country but they are not the class which brought imperialism into being. It is a question of the capitalist class led by the biggest finance magnates and banks, and there will be no way out of this war until this class, which dominates the oppressed workers and their allies, the poor peasants, the semi-proletarians, as our programme calls them, until this class is overthrown. The illusion that you can unite the working people of the world by leaflets and appeals to other nations can only come from the narrow Russian outlook ignorant of how the press in Western Europe, where the workers and peasants are used to political revolutions and have seen dozens of them, laughs at such phrases and appeals. They don't know that the mass of workers has actually risen in Russia, where most of the workers are absolutely sincere in their faith and condemn the predatory designs of the capitalists of every country and want to see the people freed from the bankers. But they, the Europeans, cannot understand why you, who have an organisation which no one else on earth has, the Soviets of Workers', Peasants' and Soldiers' Deputies, which are armed—why you make Ministers of your socialists.

After all, you are handing power to the bankers. People abroad accuse you not only of naïveté—this is not the worst—Europeans can no longer understand naïveté in politics, they cannot understand that there are tens of millions of people in Russia who are stirring to life for the first time, and that people in Russia know nothing of the link between the classes and the government, of the link between the government and war. War is a continuation of bourgeois politics, nothing else. The ruling class shapes the country's policy in war-time as well. War is politics from beginning to end. It is pursuit of the same old aims by these classes using a different method. That is why, when you write in your workers' and peasants' appeals "overthrow your bankers", every politically-conscious worker in a European country either laughs at you or cries bitterly over you, saying to himself: "What can we do since people there have overthrown a half-savage idiot and monster of a monarch, the kind we did away with a long time ago—this is the only crime we have committed—and now, with their 'near-socialist' Ministers, they back the Russian bankers?!"

The bankers remain in power. They pursue a foreign policy through an imperialist war, fully supporting the treaties concluded by Nicholas II in Russia. This is particularly evident in our country. All the principles of Russia's imperialist foreign policy were predetermined not by the present-day capitalists, but by the previous government and Nicholas Romanov whom we have overthrown. He concluded those treaties, they remain secret, and the capitalists cannot publish them because they are capitalists. But no worker or peasant can see his way clear of this tangle because he tells himself: "Since we call for the overthrow of the capitalists in other countries, we must first of all get rid of our own bankers, otherwise nobody will believe in us and nobody will take us seriously. People will say we are naïve Russian savages who put on paper words that are excellent in themselves but lack political substance, or, worse still, they will think us hypocrites. You would see these things in the

foreign press if that press, every shade of it, passed freely into Russia across the frontier instead of being stopped by the British and French authorities at Torneå. You would see from a mere selection of quotations from foreign newspapers the glaring contradiction in which you find yourselves. You would see how incredibly ridiculous and erroneous is this idea of fighting the war with socialist conferences, with agreements with the socialists at congresses. Had imperialism been the fault or crime of individuals, socialism could remain socialism. Imperialism is the final stage of capitalism's development, a stage at which it has gone as far as to divide the whole world, and two gigantic groups are locked in a life-and-death struggle. You must serve one group or the other, or overthrow both groups. There is no other way. When you reject a separate peace treaty, saying you don't want to serve the German imperialists, you are perfectly right, and that is why we, too, are against a separate peace treaty. Yet in effect, and in spite of yourselves, you continue to serve the Anglo-French imperialists, who have predatory designs of the kind that the Russian capitalists have translated into treaties with the aid of Nicholas Romanov. We do not know the texts of those treaties, but anyone who has followed political writings and has glanced through at least one book on economics or diplomacy must be familiar with the content of the treaties. Moreover, as far as I can remember, Milyukov wrote in his books about those treaties and promises that they would plunder Galicia, the Straits and Armenia, retain what they had annexed earlier and get plenty of other territories. Everyone knows that, but still the treaties are kept secret, and we are told that if we annul them it will mean breaking with our Allies.

With regard to a separate peace treaty, I have already said there can be no separate peace treaty for us, and our Party resolution leaves not the slightest room for doubt that we reject it as we reject all agreement with the capitalists. To us, a separate peace treaty means coming to terms with the German plunderers, because they are plundering in the

same way as the others. Coming to terms with Russian capital within the Russian Provisional Government is the same kind of separate peace treaty. The tsarist treaties remain, and they, too, help to plunder and strangle other peoples. When it is said, "Peace without annexations and indemnities", as every worker and every peasant in Russia should say because life teaches him so, because he has no interest in bank profits and because he wants to live, I reply: Your leaders in the present Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies from the Narodnik and Menshevik parties have become tangled up in that slogan. They have said in their *Izvestia* that it means retaining the status quo, that is, the pre-war state of affairs, going back to what existed before the war. Isn't that capitalist peace? And what capitalist peace, too! Since you are putting forward that slogan, you must remember that the course of events may bring your parties to power. That is possible during a revolution, and you will have to do what you say. But if you propose peace without annexations now, the Germans will accept and the British will not, because the British capitalists have not lost an inch of territory but have grabbed plenty in every part of the world. The Germans grabbed a lot too, but they also lost a lot, and not only lost a lot but found themselves up against the U.S.A., a most formidable enemy. If you who propose peace without annexations mean retaining the status quo, you are drifting into a situation in which your proposal will produce a separate peace treaty with the capitalists, because, if you propose that, the German capitalists, being faced by the U.S.A. and Italy with whom they signed treaties in the past, will say: "We shall accept that peace treaty without annexations. It will not be a defeat for us, it will be victory over the U.S.A. and Italy." Objectively, you are drifting into the same kind of separate peace treaty with the capitalists which you accuse us of, because fundamentally you are not breaking—in your policy, in reality, in your practical moves—with those bankers expressing imperialist domination all over the world whom you and your "social-

ist" Ministers support in the Provisional Government.

You are thereby creating a contradictory and precarious situation for yourselves in which the masses misunderstand you. The masses, who have no interest in annexations, say: "We refuse to fight for any capitalist's sake." When we are told that this sort of policy can be ended by means of congresses and agreements among the socialists of the world, we reply: "It probably could, if only imperialism were the handiwork of individual criminals; but imperialism is an outgrowth of world capitalism with which the working-class movement is connected."

Imperialism's victory is the beginning of an inevitable, unavoidable split of the socialists of all countries into two camps. Anyone who keeps on talking about the socialists as an integral body, as something that can be integral, is deceiving himself and others. The entire course of the war, the two and a half years of it, has been leading to this split—ever since the Basle Manifesto, signed unanimously, which said that imperialist capitalism was at the root of this war. The Basle Manifesto does not say a word about "defence of the fatherland". No other manifesto could have been written before the war, just as today no socialist would propose writing a manifesto about "defence of the fatherland" in the war between Japan and the U.S.A., in which it is not a matter of risking his own skin, his own capitalists and his own Ministers. Draft a resolution for international congresses! You know that war between Japan and the U.S.A. is a foregone conclusion. This war has been brewing for decades. It is no accident. Tactics do not depend on who fires the first shot. That is ridiculous. You know very well that Japanese and U.S. capitalism are equally predatory. There will be talk about "defence of the fatherland" on both sides. It will be a crime or an indication of terrible weakness due to the "defence" of the interests of our capitalist enemies. That is why we say that socialism has been split irrevocably. The socialists have completely departed from socialism—or rather, those who have deserted to their

government, their bankers and their capitalists, no matter what they may say against them and however much they may condemn them. Condemnation is beside the point. Sometimes, however, condemnation of the Germans' backing for their capitalists covers up defence of the same "sin" by the Russians! If you accuse the German social-chauvinists, i.e., people who are socialists in words—many of them may well be socialists at heart—but chauvinists in fact, people who actually defend the dirty, selfish and predatory German capitalists rather than the German people, then don't defend the British, French and Russian capitalists. The German social-chauvinists are no worse than those in our Ministry who continue the policy of secret treaties, of plunder, and cover this up with pious wishes in which there is much that is kind, and which I admit are absolutely sincere from the point of view of the masses, but in which I do not and cannot see a single word of political truth. It is merely your wish, while the war remains as imperialist and is being waged for the same secret treaties as ever! You are calling on other peoples to overthrow the bankers, yet you are backing your own! When you spoke of peace, you did not say what peace. No one answered us when we pointed out the glaring contradiction in a peace treaty on the basis of the status quo. In your resolution, speaking of peace without annexations, you cannot say that it will not mean retaining the status quo. You cannot say that it will mean retaining the status quo, that is, restoration of the pre-war state of affairs. What will it be, then? Taking the German colonies away from Britain? Try that through peaceful agreements! Everyone will laugh at you. Try to take away from Japan, without a revolution, Kiaochow or the Pacific islands she has grabbed!

You have got yourselves mixed up in hopeless contradictions. When we say "without annexations", we mean that this slogan is only a subordinate part of the struggle against world imperialism. We say we want to liberate all peoples and begin with our own. You talk of war against annexations and of peace without annexations, but in Russia you

continue the policy of annexations. That's simply ridiculous. You and your government, your new Ministers, actually continue the policy of annexations in regard to Finland and the Ukraine. You find fault with the Ukrainian congress and, through your Ministers, prohibit its sittings.⁷⁰ Isn't that annexation? It amounts to a mockery of the rights of a nationality which was tormented by the tsars because its children wanted to speak their mother tongue. That means being afraid of separate republics. From the point of view of the workers and peasants, there is nothing terrible about that. Let Russia be a union of free republics. The workers and peasants will not fight to prevent that. Let every nation be free, and first of all let all the nationalities with which you are making the revolution in Russia be free. By not taking that step, you are condemning yourselves to being "revolutionary democrats" in words while your entire policy is in fact counter-revolutionary.

Your foreign policy is anti-democratic and counter-revolutionary. A revolutionary policy may mean you have to wage a revolutionary war. But that is not inevitable. This point has been dealt with at length by the main speaker, and lately by the newspapers as well. I should very much like to dwell on this point.

What is the practical way out of this war as we see it? We say: the way out of this war lies only through revolution. Support the revolution of the classes oppressed by the capitalists, overthrow the capitalist class in your country and thereby set an example to other countries. That alone is socialism. That alone means fighting the war. Everything else is empty promises, phrase-mongering or pious wishes. Socialism has been split all over the world. You continue to confuse things by associating with socialists who back their governments. You forget that in Britain and Germany, the true socialists, who express the socialism of the masses, are isolated and have been thrown into gaol. Yet they alone express the interests of the proletarian movement. But what if in Russia the oppressed class found itself in power? When

asked how we shall break out of the war by ourselves, we answer: you cannot break out of it by yourself. All our Party resolutions and all speakers at our public meetings call it absurd to say you can break out of this war by yourself. This war involves hundreds of millions of people and hundreds of thousands of millions in capital. The only way out is the transfer of power to the revolutionary class which must really break imperialism, its financial, banking and annexationist threads. Until this happens nothing will have been done. The revolution was limited to your getting, in place of tsarism and imperialism, a near-republic which is imperialist through and through and which cannot treat Finland and the Ukraine democratically, i.e., without being afraid of division, even through revolutionary worker and peasant representatives.

It is untrue to say that we are seeking a separate peace treaty. We say: No separate peace treaty with any capitalists, least of all with the Russian capitalists. But the Provisional Government has a separate peace treaty with the Russian capitalists. Down with that separate peace treaty! (*Applause.*) We recognise no separate peace treaty with the German capitalists and we shall not enter into any negotiations. Nor must there be a separate peace treaty with the British and French imperialists. We are told that to break with them would mean coming to terms with the German imperialists. That is not true. We must break with them immediately because it is an alliance for plunder. It is said that the treaties cannot be published because that would mean showing up the whole of our government and the whole of our policy in the eyes of every worker and peasant. If we were to publish these treaties and plainly tell the Russian workers and peasants at meetings, especially in every remote hamlet: "What you are now fighting for is the Straits, and because they want to keep Armenia," they would all say: "We want no such war." (*The Chairman: "Your time is up." Voices: "Let him speak."*) I ask for ten minutes more. (*Voices: "Let him speak."*)

I say that this contrast—"either with the British or with the German imperialists"—is wrong. It implies that if we make peace with the German imperialists we must fight the British, and vice versa. This contrasting suits those who are not breaking with their capitalists and bankers, and who accept any alliance with them. But it doesn't suit us. We speak of our defending the alliance with the oppressed class, with the oppressed people. Remain loyal to this alliance, and then you will be revolutionary democrats. It's no easy task. This task will not let you forget that under certain circumstances we shall be unable to do without a revolutionary war. No revolutionary class can rule out revolutionary war, or it will doom itself to ridiculous pacifism. We are not Tolstoyans. If the revolutionary class takes power, if its state keeps no annexed territories, and if no power is left to the banks and big capital, which is not easy to do in Russia, then that class will be waging a revolutionary war in reality and not merely in words. You cannot rule out this kind of war. That would mean succumbing to the Tolstoyan philosophy and to philistinism, forgetting the whole of Marxist science and the experience of all European revolutions.

You cannot pull Russia alone out of the war. But she is winning more and more great allies who do not believe you now because your attitude is contradictory or naïve, and because you advise other peoples to "end annexations" while introducing them in your own country. You tell other peoples to overthrow the bankers. Yet you do not overthrow your own. Try another policy. Publish the treaties and show them up in front of every worker and peasant and at public meetings. Say: No peace with the German capitalists, and a complete break with the Anglo-French capitalists. Let the British get out of Turkey and stop fighting for Baghdad. Let them get out of India and Egypt. We refuse to fight for the retention of booty that has been seized, just as we shall not put an ounce of energy into helping the German plunderers to keep their booty. If you *do* that—so far you

have only talked about it, and in politics words are not credited, which is just as well—if you do that, and not only talk about it, then the allies you now have will show what they can do. Think of the mood of every oppressed worker and peasant. They sympathise with you and regret that you are so weak you leave the bankers alone even though you have arms. It is the oppressed workers of the world that are your allies. It will be just what the revolution of 1905 showed in practice. It was tremendously weak at first. But what is its international effect? How did that policy, and the history of 1905, shape the foreign policy of the Russian revolution? Today you are conducting the Russian revolution's whole foreign policy with the capitalists. Yet 1905 showed what the Russian revolution's foreign policy should be like. It is an indisputable fact that October 17, 1905, was followed by mass unrest and barricade-building in the streets of Vienna and Prague. After 1905 came 1908 in Turkey, 1909 in Persia and 1910 in China. If, instead of compromising with the capitalists, you call on the truly revolutionary democrats, the working class, the oppressed, you will have as allies the oppressed classes instead of the oppressors, and the nationalities which are now being rent to pieces instead of the nationalities in which the oppressing classes now temporarily predominate.

We have been reminded of the German front where the only change we proposed is the unrestricted dissemination of our appeals written in Russian on one side of the sheet and German on the reverse. In them we say: The capitalists of both countries are robbers. To get them out of the way would be merely a step towards peace. But there are other fronts. I don't know how strong our army is on the Turkish front. Let us assume it is roughly three million strong. It would be better if that army, which is now kept in Armenia and is carrying out annexations that you tolerate while preaching peace without annexations to other peoples, although you have strength and authority—if that army adopted this programme, and if it made Armenia an inde-

pendent Armenian republic and gave her the money which the financiers of Britain and France take from us.

It is said that we cannot do without the financial support of Britain and France. But this support "supports" us like the rope supporting a hanged man. Let the Russian revolutionary class say: down with that support, I refuse to recognise debts contracted with the French and British capitalists, and I call for a general revolt against the capitalists. No peace treaty with the German capitalists and no alliance with the British and French! If this policy were actually pursued, our army fighting the Turks could be released and sent to other fronts, because all Asian peoples would see that the Russian people do not merely proclaim peace without annexations on the basis of self-determination but that the Russian worker and peasant are in fact placing themselves at the head of all oppressed nationalities, and that with them, the struggle against imperialism is not a pious wish nor a high-flown ministerial phrase but a matter of vital concern to the revolution.

As we stand now, a revolutionary war may threaten us, but this war is not bound to take place, since the British imperialists will hardly be able to wage war against us if you act as a practical example to the peoples surrounding Russia. Prove that you are liberating the Armenian republic and reaching agreement with the Soviets of Workers' and Peasants' Deputies in every country, that you are for a free republic, and then the Russian revolution's foreign policy will become really revolutionary and really democratic. At present it is that only in words. In reality it is counter-revolutionary, because you are bound hand and foot by the Anglo-French imperialists and refuse to say so openly, you are afraid to admit it. Instead of issuing that appeal "to overthrow foreign bankers", you would have done better to tell the Russian people, the workers and peasants, in so many words: "We are too weak, we cannot throw off the tyranny of the Anglo-French imperialists, we are their slaves and are therefore fighting." It would have been a bitter

truth that would have been of revolutionary significance. It would actually have brought this predatory war closer to its end. That means a thousand times more than an agreement with the French and British social-chauvinists, than the convening of congresses which they would agree to attend, than the continuation of this policy by which you are actually afraid to break with the imperialists of one country while remaining the allies of another. You can draw on the support of the oppressed classes of Europe, of the oppressed people of the weaker countries which Russia strangled under the tsars and which she is still strangling now, as she is strangling Armenia. With their support, you can bring freedom by helping their workers' and peasants' committees. You would put yourselves at the head of all the oppressed classes, all oppressed peoples, in the war against the German and British imperialists, who cannot join forces against you because they are locked in a life-and-death struggle against each other and because they are in a hopeless position, in which the Russian revolution's foreign policy, a sincere and real alliance with the oppressed classes, the oppressed peoples, can be successful—it has 99 chances in 100 of being successful!

Recently we read in our Moscow Party newspaper a letter from a peasant commenting on our programme. I should like to bring my speech to a close with a brief quotation from that letter, showing what a peasant makes of our programme. The letter was printed in No. 59 of *Sotsial-Demokrat*, our Moscow Party newspaper, and was reprinted in *Pravda* No. 68.

"We must," says the letter, "press the bourgeoisie harder to make them burst at the seams. Then the war will be over. But things will turn out badly if we don't press the bourgeoisie hard enough." (*Applause.*)

Pravda Nos. 95, 96 and 97,
July 13, 14 and 15 (June 30,
July 1 and 2), 1917

Collected Works, Vol. 25,
pp. 29-42

THE DIEHARDS OF JUNE 3 FAVOUR AN IMMEDIATE OFFENSIVE

The gentlemen of June 3, who after 1905 helped Nicholas Romanov drench our country in blood, strangle the revolutionaries and re-establish the unlimited power of the landowners and capitalists, are holding their meetings simultaneously with the Congress of Soviets.⁷¹

While Tsereteli, who found himself in bourgeois captivity, tried by a thousand tricks to hush up the vital importance and urgency of the political question of an immediate offensive, the diehards of June 3, companions-in-arms of Nicholas the Bloody and Stolypin the Hangman, landowners and capitalists, did not hesitate to put the question straightforwardly and openly. Here is the latest and most essential resolution on the offensive which they adopted *unanimously*:

"The Duma (??) considers that only an immediate offensive and close co-operation with the Allies will guarantee a speedy termination of the war and consolidation of the liberties won by the people."

That is clear enough.

These people are real politicians, men of action, faithful servants of *their* class, of the landowners and capitalists.

And how do Tsereteli, Chernov and the rest serve *their* class? They offer pious wishes in words and support the capitalists in actions.

Tsereteli asserted that the question of an *immediate* offensive could not even be raised, for were he, Minister

Tsereteli, to know anything about an "immediate" offensive, he, a Minister, would say nothing about it to anyone. In saying that, Tsereteli had no inkling (poor innocent man) that he was *refuted* by the diehards of June 3, refuted by *actions*, for they did not hesitate to speak, even in a resolution, and in *everyone's hearing*, about an offensive—not an offensive in general, but an *immediate* offensive. And they were right, for this is a political issue, an issue bearing on the destiny of our revolution as a whole.

There is no middle course. You must either be for or against an "immediate offensive". You cannot abstain from expressing an opinion. In this situation, to evade the issue by referring or alluding to military secrecy would be positively unworthy of a responsible politician.

To favour an immediate offensive means being in favour of continuing the imperialist war, slaughtering Russian workers and peasants in order to strangle Persia, Greece, Galicia, the Balkan peoples, etc., reviving and strengthening the counter-revolution, completely nullifying all the phrases about "peace without annexations", and waging war *for* annexations.

To be against an immediate offensive means being in favour of all power passing to the Soviets, of arousing the revolutionary initiative of the oppressed classes, of an *immediate* offer by the oppressed classes of *all* countries of "peace without annexations", peace based on the precise condition of overthrowing the tyranny of capital and liberating *all* colonies, *all* the oppressed nationalities, or nationalities not enjoying full rights, bar none.

The former way is, together with the capitalists, in the interests of the capitalists and for attaining the aims of the capitalists. It is the way of confidence in the capitalists, who for more than two years have been promising everything under the sun and many things besides, provided the war is "carried on to victory".

The latter way is one of breaking with the capitalists, of distrusting them, of curbing their vile self-interest, of putting

an end to their business of making hundreds of millions in profits from contracts. It is the way of confidence in the oppressed classes, primarily in the workers of *all* countries, the way of confidence in a world *workers' revolution against capital*, the way of supporting it in full measure.

You must choose the one or the other. Tsereteli, Chernov and the rest prefer a middle course. But there is no middle course. If they vacillate or try to get away with mere talk, they, Tsereteli, Chernov and the rest, will completely make themselves tools in the hands of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie.

Pravda No. 74,
June 19 (6), 1917

Collected Works, Vol. 25,
pp. 48-50

AN ALLIANCE TO STOP THE REVOLUTION

That the new coalition government is precisely this sort of alliance between the capitalists and the Narodnik and Menshevik leaders is far from obvious to all. Perhaps it is not obvious even to the Ministers belonging to these parties. Yet it is a fact.

This fact became all the more evident on Sunday, June 4, when the morning papers carried reports on speeches made by Milyukov and Maklakov at the meeting of the counter-revolutionaries of the Third Duma (called the "State Duma", by tradition of Nicholas Romanov and Stolypin the Hangman), and when, in the evening, Tsereteli and other Ministers made speeches in defence of the government and of the policy of an offensive at the All-Russia Congress of the Soviets of Soldiers' and Workers' Deputies.

Milyukov and Maklakov, like all capitalist and counter-revolutionary leaders of any merit, are men of action who appreciate full well the meaning of the class struggle when it concerns *their* class. That is why they put the question of an offensive with such perfect clarity, without wasting a single minute on utterly meaningless talk about the offensive from the strategic point of view—the kind of talk with which Tsereteli deceived himself and others.

The Cadets certainly know their business. They know that the question of an offensive is now *posed by reality* as a political and not a strategic question, as the question of a *radical turn in the Russian revolution as a whole*. It is from the political point of view that the Cadets raised it in the "State Duma", just as the Bolsheviks, and internationalists

generally, raised it on Saturday evening in their written statement to the Steering Committee of the Congress of Soviets.

“Russia’s fate is in her own hands,” announced Maklakov, the well-known accomplice of Stolypin the Hangman, “and it will be decided very soon [hear, hear!]. If we do succeed in launching an offensive and waging the war, not only by means of resolutions, not only by speeches at public meetings and by banners borne through the city, but by waging the war as intently as we have been waging it so far [listen to this—it is a capitalist leader speaking these historic words: “as *we* have been waging it so far”], then it will not be long before Russia recovers completely.”

These are remarkable words which should be learned by heart and thought about time and again. They are remarkable because they tell the *class truth*. This was repeated, in a slightly different way, by Milyukov, who reproached the Petrograd Soviet: “Why is it that its [the Soviet’s] statement says nothing about an offensive?”, and stressed that the Italian imperialists had put “a modest [Mr. Milyukov’s irony!] question: ‘Are you going to take the offensive or not?’ Moreover, no specific answer was given [by the Petrograd Soviet] to this question of theirs, either”. Maklakov voiced his “profound respect” for Kerensky, and Milyukov explained:

“I have a very uneasy feeling that what our War Minister [“our” is right, meaning one who is in the hands of the capitalists!] has organised may again be disorganised from here and that we shall miss the last opportunity we still have [mark the “still”] of answering our Allies, who are asking whether we are going to attack or not, in a manner satisfactory both to ourselves and to them.”

“Both to ourselves and to them”, meaning both to the Russian and to the Anglo-French and other imperialists! An offensive can “still” “satisfy” them, i.e., help them finish off Persia, Albania, Greece and Mesopotamia, and ensure that they retain all the booty snatched from the Germans and take away the booty seized by the German plunderers. This is the point. This is the class truth concerning the offensive’s

political significance. It is to satisfy the appetites of the imperialists of Russia, Britain, etc., protract the imperialist, predatory war, and take the road *not* of peace without annexations (this road is possible only if the revolution continues), *but of war for annexations*.

That is the meaning of an offensive from the standpoint of foreign policy. Maklakov defined its meaning, in the historic phrase quoted above, from the standpoint of *home* policy. What Maklakov means by "Russia's complete recovery" is the complete victory of the counter-revolution. Those who have not forgotten Maklakov's excellent speeches about the period of 1905 and 1907-13 see almost his every speech reaffirm this appraisal.

To wage the war "*as we have been waging it so far*"—"we" being the capitalists with the tsar at the head!—to wage this imperialist war means enabling Russia to "recover", i.e., ensuring the victory of the capitalists and the landowners.

This is the class truth.

An offensive, whatever its outcome may be from the military point of view, means politically strengthening imperialist morale, imperialist sentiments, and infatuation with imperialism. It means strengthening the old, unchanged army officers ("*waging the war as we have been waging it so far*"), and strengthening *the main position of the counter-revolution*.

Quite independently of whether they wish it or not, and whether they are aware of it or not, Tsereteli and Kerensky, Skobelev and Chernov, as leaders of the Narodnik and Menshevik parties, not as individuals, have given their support to the counter-revolution, gone over, *at this decisive moment*, to its side, and taken a stand inside the alliance for stopping the revolution and continuing the war "*as we have been waging it so far*".

There must be no illusions on this score.

IS THERE A WAY TO A JUST PEACE?

Is there a way to peace without an exchange of annexations, without the division of spoils among the capitalist robbers?

There is: through a workers' revolution against the capitalists of the world.

Russia today is nearer to the beginning of such a revolution than any other country.

Only in Russia can power pass to existing institutions, to the Soviets, immediately, peacefully, without an uprising, for the capitalists could not resist the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies.

With such a transfer of power it would be possible to curb the capitalists, now making thousands of millions in profits from contracts, to expose all their tricks, arrest the millionaire embezzlers of public property, break their unlimited power.

Only after the transfer of power to the oppressed classes could Russia approach the oppressed classes of other countries, not with empty words, not with mere appeals, but calling their attention to her example, and immediately and explicitly *proposing* clear-cut terms for *universal peace*.

"Comrade workers and toilers of the world," she would say in the proposal for an immediate peace. "Enough of the bloodshed. Peace is possible. A just peace means peace without annexations, without seizures. Let the German capitalist robbers and their crowned robber Wilhelm know

that we shall not come to terms with them, that we regard as robbery on their part not only what they have grabbed since the war, but also Alsace and Lorraine, and the Danish and Polish areas of Prussia.

"We also consider that Poland, Finland, the Ukraine, and other non-Great-Russian lands were seized by the Russian tsars and capitalists.

"We consider that *all* colonies, Ireland, and so on, were seized by the British, French and other capitalists.

"We Russian workers and peasants shall *not* hold *any* of the non-Great-Russian lands or colonies (such as Turkestan, Mongolia, or Persia) by force. Down with war *for the division of colonies*, for the division of annexed (seized) lands, for the division of capitalist spoils!"

The example of the Russian workers will be followed inevitably, perhaps not tomorrow (revolutions are not made to order), but inevitably all the same by the workers and all the working people of *at least two great countries*, Germany and France.

For *both are perishing*, the first of hunger, the second of depopulation. Both will conclude peace on our terms, which are just, *in defiance of their capitalist governments*.

The road to peace lies before us.

Should the capitalists of England, Japan and America try to resist *this* peace, the oppressed classes of Russia and other countries will not shrink from a revolutionary war *against the capitalists*. In *this* war they will defeat the capitalists of *the whole world*, not just those of the three countries lying far from Russia and taken up with their own rivalries.

The road to a just peace lies before us. Let us not be afraid to *take* it.

THE REVOLUTION, THE OFFENSIVE, AND OUR PARTY

"The Russian revolution has reached a turning-point," said Tsereteli informing the Congress of Soviets that the offensive⁷² had begun. Yes, the whole course of the world war as well as the Russian revolution has reached a turning-point. After three months of vacillation the Russian Government has actually come to the decision demanded by the "Allied" governments.

The offensive has been declared in the name of peace. And it is also "in the name of peace" that the imperialists of the world send their troops into battle. Every time there is an offensive the generals in every belligerent country try to raise their troops' morale by holding out the real hope of that particular offensive leading to early peace.

The Russian "socialist" Ministers have garnished this common imperialist method with very high-sounding phrases in which words about socialism, democracy, and revolution sound like rattles in the hands of a clever juggler. But no high-sounding phrases can conceal the fact that the revolutionary armies of Russia have been sent into battle in the name of the imperialist designs of Britain, France, Italy, Japan, and America. No arguments from Chernov, once a Zimmerwaldist and now Lloyd George's partner, can conceal the fact that while the Russian Army and the Russian proletariat do not really pursue any annexationist aims, this does not in the least change the imperialist, predatory nature

of the struggle between the two world trusts. Until the secret treaties binding Russia to the imperialists of other countries are revised, and as long as Ribot, Lloyd George and Sonnino, Russia's allies, continue to talk about the annexationist aims of their foreign policy, the offensive of the Russian troops will continue to serve the imperialists.

Tsereteli and Chernov object, however, that they have repeatedly declared their renunciation of all annexations. So much the worse, we reply. That means your actions do not accord with your words, for your actions serve both Russian and foreign imperialism. And when you begin to co-operate actively with the imperialist "Allies" you render splendid service to the Russian counter-revolution. The joy of all the Black Hundreds and all counter-revolutionaries over the decisive turn in your policy is the best evidence of that. Yes, the Russian revolution has come to a turning-point. Through its "socialist" Ministers, the Russian Government has done something which the imperialist Ministers, Guchkov and Milyukov, could not do. It has put the Russian Army at the disposal of the general staffs and the diplomats who act in the name and on the basis of unabrogated secret treaties, in the name of designs frankly proclaimed by Ribot and Lloyd George. The government could only fulfil its task, however, because the army trusted and followed it. The army marched to death because it believed it was making sacrifices for freedom, the revolution and early peace.

But the army did so because it is only a part of the people, who at this stage of the revolution are following the Socialist-Revolutionary and the Menshevik parties. This general and basic fact, the trust of the majority in the petty-bourgeois policy of the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries which is dependent on the capitalists, determines our Party's stand and conduct.

We shall keep up our efforts to expose government policy, resolutely warning the workers and soldiers, as in the past, against pinning their hopes on uncoordinated and disorganised actions.

It is a question of a phase in the people's revolution. The Tseretelis and Chernovs, having become dependent on imperialism, are putting into effect a phase of petty-bourgeois illusions and petty-bourgeois phrases, which serve to disguise the same old cynical imperialism.

This phase must be brought to an end. Let us help to end it as speedily and as painlessly as possible. This will rid the people of the *last* petty-bourgeois illusions and bring about the transfer of power to the revolutionary class.

Pravda No. 87,
July 4 (June 21), 1917

Collected Works, Vol. 25,
pp. 113-15

TO WHAT STATE HAVE THE SOCIALIST-REVOLUTIONARIES AND THE MENSHEVIKS BROUGHT THE REVOLUTION?

They have brought it to a state of subjection to the imperialists.

The offensive is a renewal of the imperialist war. Nothing essential has changed in the relations between the two gigantic capitalist blocs waging war on one another. Even after the revolution of February 27, Russia remains under the complete sway of the capitalists, who are bound to Anglo-French imperialist capital by alliance and by the old, tsarist, secret treaties. Both the economics and politics of the continuing war are the same as before: the same old imperialist banking capital dominating economic life, and the same old secret treaties, the same old foreign policy of alliances of one group of imperialists against another.

The empty phrases of the 'Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries are still empty phrases, in practice only serving to adorn the resumption of the imperialist war, which quite naturally meets with enthusiastic howls of approval from all the counter-revolutionaries, the whole bourgeoisie, and Plekhanov, "who tails after the bourgeois press", as the Menshevik *Rabochaya Gazeta* put it, which itself tails after the whole horde of social-chauvinists.

But we must not overlook the distinguishing features of this particular resumption of the imperialist war. The resumption came after three months of hesitation, during which time the mass of workers and peasants thousands of times expressed their condemnation of a war of conquest (while

continuing in practice to support the government of the predatory Russian bourgeoisie bent on conquest). The masses hesitated, as though they were about to carry out *at home* the advice which the March 14 appeal to the peoples of the world gave to *other* peoples, namely, "Refuse to serve as tools of conquest and violence in the hands of the bankers!" But here at home, in "revolutionary-democratic" Russia, the masses have remained in effect an instrument of conquest and violence in "the hands of the bankers".

A distinguishing feature of this situation is that it was created by the Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik parties at a time when the people enjoyed a comparatively large measure of freedom of organisation. It is these parties that have gained the majority at the moment: the All-Russia Congress of Soviets and the All-Russia Peasants' Congress have undoubtedly proved this.

It is these parties that are at present responsible for Russia's policy.

It is these parties that are responsible for the resumption of the imperialist war, for more hundreds of thousands of lives sacrificed virtually with the aim of enabling certain capitalists to "overcome" other capitalists, and for the further aggravation of the economic dislocation inevitably resulting from the offensive.

Here we had, in the purest form, the self-deception of the petty-bourgeois masses and the deception of them by the bourgeoisie with the aid of the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks. These parties both claim to be "revolutionary democrats". But in fact it was they who placed the people's fate in the hands of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie, the Cadets; it was they who deserted the revolution to continue the imperialist war, who deserted democracy to make "concessions" to the Cadets on the issue of power (take, for instance, the "confirmation" from above of the election of authorities by the local population), on the land issue (the Mensheviks' and Socialist-Revolutionaries' renunciation of *their own* programme, namely, to support the revolutionary

actions of the peasants, *including confiscation* of the landed estates), and on the national question (defence of the undemocratic attitude of the Cadets towards the Ukraine and Finland).

The petty-bourgeois masses cannot help vacillating between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. This has been the case in all countries, especially between 1789 and 1871. And it is also the case in Russia. The Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries have *induced the masses* to submit to the policy of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie.

That is the heart of the matter. That is the meaning of the offensive. That is the peculiarity of the situation: it was not violence, but trust in the Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks that led the people astray.

Will it be for long?

No, not long. The masses will learn from their own experience. The sad experience of the new stage of the war (a stage already begun), of further ruin accentuated by the offensive, will inevitably lead to the *political* downfall of the Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik parties.

The task of the workers' party is, first of all, to help the masses realise and take proper account of this experience, to prepare properly for this great downfall, which will show the masses their true leader—the organised urban proletariat.

From THE TASKS OF THE REVOLUTION

PEACE TO THE PEOPLES

3. The Soviet Government must *straight away* offer to *all* the belligerent peoples (i.e., simultaneously both to their governments and to the worker and peasant masses) to conclude an immediate general peace on democratic terms, and also to conclude an immediate armistice (even if only for three months).

The main condition for a democratic peace is the renunciation of annexations (seizures)—not in the incorrect sense that all powers get back what they have lost, but in the only correct sense that *every* nationality without any exception, both in Europe and in the colonies, shall obtain its freedom and the possibility to decide for itself whether it is to form a *separate* state or whether it is to enter into the composition of some other state.

In offering the peace terms, the Soviet Government must itself immediately take steps towards their fulfilment, i.e., it must publish and repudiate the secret treaties by which we have been bound up to the present time, those which were concluded by the tsar and which give Russian capitalists the promise of the pillaging of Turkey, Austria, etc. Then we must immediately satisfy the demands of the Ukrainians and the Finns, ensure them, as well as all other non-Russian nationalities in Russia, full freedom, including freedom of secession, applying the same to *all* Armenia, undertaking to evacuate that country as well as the Turkish lands occupied by us, etc.

Such peace terms will not meet with the approval of the capitalists, but they will meet with such tremendous sympathy on the part of all the peoples and will cause such a great world-wide outburst of enthusiasm and of general indignation against the continuation of the predatory war that it is extremely probable that we shall at once obtain a truce and a consent to open peace negotiations. For the workers' revolution against the war is irresistibly growing everywhere, and it can be spurred on, not by phrases about peace (with which the workers and peasants have been deceived by *all* the imperialist governments including our own Kerensky government), but by a break with the capitalists and by the offer of peace.

If the least probable thing happens, i.e., if not a single belligerent state accepts even a truce, then as far as we are concerned the war becomes truly forced upon us, it becomes a truly just war of defence. If this is understood by the proletariat and the poor peasantry Russia will become many times stronger even in the military sense, especially after a complete break with the capitalists who are robbing the people; furthermore, under such conditions it would, as far as we are concerned, be a war in league with the oppressed classes of all countries, a war in league with the oppressed peoples of the whole world, not in word, but in deed.

Written in the first half of
September 1917

Collected Works, Vol. 26,
pp. 62-63

**REPORT ON PEACE DELIVERED AT
THE SECOND ALL-RUSSIA CONGRESS OF SOVIETS
OF WORKERS' AND SOLDIERS' DEPUTIES
OCTOBER 26 (NOVEMBER 8), 1917⁷³**

The question of peace is a burning question, the painful question of the day. Much has been said and written on the subject, and all of you, no doubt, have discussed it quite a lot. Permit me, therefore, to proceed to read a declaration which the government you elect should publish.

DECREE ON PEACE

The workers' and peasants' government, created by the Revolution of October 24-25 and basing itself on the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies, calls upon all the belligerent peoples and their governments to start immediate negotiations for a just, democratic peace.

By a just or democratic peace, for which the overwhelming majority of the working class and other working people of all the belligerent countries,⁷⁴ exhausted, tormented and racked by the war, are craving—a peace that has been most definitely and insistently demanded by the Russian workers and peasants ever since the overthrow of the tsarist monarchy—by such a peace the government means an immediate peace without annexations (i.e., without the seizure of foreign lands, without the forcible incorporation of foreign nations) and without indemnities.

The Government of Russia proposes that this kind of peace be immediately concluded by all the belligerent nations, and expresses its readiness to take all the resolute measures now,

without the least delay, pending the final ratification of all the terms of such a peace by authoritative assemblies of the people's representatives of all countries and all nations.

In accordance with the sense of justice of democrats in general, and of the working classes in particular, the government conceives the annexation or seizure of foreign lands to mean every incorporation of a small or weak nation into a large or powerful state without the precisely, clearly and voluntarily expressed consent and wish of that nation, irrespective of the time when such forcible incorporation took place, irrespective also of the degree of development or backwardness of the nation forcibly annexed to the given state, or forcibly retained within its borders, and irrespective, finally, of whether this nation is in Europe or in distant, overseas countries.

If any nation whatsoever is forcibly retained within the borders of a given state, if, in spite of its expressed desire—no matter whether expressed in the press, at public meetings, in the decisions of parties, or in protests and uprisings against national oppression—it is not accorded the right to decide the forms of its state existence by a free vote, taken after the complete evacuation of the troops of the incorporating or, generally, of the stronger nation and without the least pressure being brought to bear, such incorporation is annexation, i.e., seizure and violence.

The government considers it the greatest of crimes against humanity to continue this war over the issue of how to divide among the strong and rich nations the weak nationalities they have conquered, and solemnly announces its determination immediately to sign terms of peace to stop this war on the terms indicated, which are equally just for all nationalities without exception.

At the same time the government declares that it does not regard the above-mentioned peace terms as an ultimatum; in other words, it is prepared to consider any other peace terms, and insists only that they be advanced by any of the belligerent countries as speedily as possible, and that

in the peace proposals there should be absolute clarity and the complete absence of all ambiguity and secrecy.

The government abolishes secret diplomacy, and, for its part, announces its firm intention to conduct all negotiations quite openly in full view of the whole people. It will proceed immediately with the full publication of the secret treaties endorsed or concluded by the government of landowners and capitalists from February to October 25, 1917. The government proclaims the unconditional and immediate annulment of everything contained in these secret treaties insofar as it is aimed, as is mostly the case, at securing advantages and privileges for the Russian landowners and capitalists and at the retention, or extension, of the annexations made by the Great Russians.

Proposing to the governments and peoples of all countries immediately to begin open negotiations for peace, the government, for its part, expresses its readiness to conduct these negotiations in writing, by telegraph, and by negotiations between representatives of the various countries, or at a conference of such representatives. In order to facilitate such negotiations, the government is appointing its plenipotentiary representative to neutral countries.

The government proposes an immediate armistice to the governments and peoples of all the belligerent countries, and, for its part, considers it desirable that this armistice should be concluded for a period of not less than three months, i.e., a period long enough to permit the completion of negotiations for peace with the participation of the representatives of all peoples or nations, without exception, involved in or compelled to take part in the war, and the summoning of authoritative assemblies of the representatives of the peoples of all countries for the final ratification of the peace terms.

While addressing this proposal for peace to the governments and peoples of all the belligerent countries, the Provisional Workers' and Peasants' Government of Russia appeals in particular also to the class-conscious workers of the three

most advanced nations of mankind and the largest states participating in the present war, namely, Great Britain, France and Germany. The workers of these countries have made the greatest contributions to the cause of progress and socialism; they have furnished the great examples of the Chartist movement in England,⁷⁵ a number of revolutions of historic importance effected by the French proletariat, and, finally, the heroic struggle against the Anti-Socialist Law in Germany⁷⁶ and the prolonged, persistent and disciplined work of creating mass proletarian organisations in Germany, a work which serves as a model to the workers of the whole world. All these examples of proletarian heroism and historical creative work are a pledge that the workers of the countries mentioned will understand the duty that now faces them of saving mankind from the horrors of war and its consequences, that these workers, by comprehensive, determined, and supremely vigorous action, will help us to conclude peace successfully, and at the same time emancipate the labouring and exploited masses of our population from all forms of slavery and all forms of exploitation.

The workers' and peasants' government, created by the Revolution of October 24-25 and basing itself on the support of the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies, must start immediate negotiations for peace. Our appeal must be addressed both to the governments and to the peoples. We cannot ignore the governments, for that would delay the possibility of concluding peace, and the people's government dare not do that; but we have no right not to appeal to the peoples at the same time. Everywhere there are differences between the governments and the peoples, and we must therefore help the peoples to intervene in questions of war and peace. We will, of course, insist upon the whole of our programme for a peace without annexations and indemnities. We shall not retreat from it; but we must not give our enemies an opportunity to say that

their conditions are different from ours and that therefore it is useless to start negotiations with us. No, we must deprive them of that advantageous position and not present our terms in the form of an ultimatum. Therefore the point is included that we are willing to consider any peace terms and all proposals. We shall consider them, but that does not necessarily mean that we shall accept them. We shall submit them for consideration to the Constituent Assembly which will have the power to decide what concessions can and what cannot be made. We are combating the deception practised by governments which pay lip-service to peace and justice, but in fact wage annexationist and predatory wars. No government will say all it thinks. We, however, are opposed to secret diplomacy and will act openly in full view of the whole people. We do not close our eyes to difficulties and never have done. War cannot be ended by refusal, it cannot be ended by one side. We are proposing an armistice for three months, but shall not reject a shorter period, so that the exhausted army may breathe freely, even if only for a little while; moreover, in all the civilised countries national assemblies must be summoned for the discussion of the terms.

In proposing an immediate armistice, we appeal to the class-conscious workers of the countries that have done so much for the development of the proletarian movement. We appeal to the workers of Britain, where there was the Chartist movement, to the workers of France, who have in repeated uprisings displayed the strength of their class-consciousness, and to the workers of Germany, who waged the fight against the Anti-Socialist Law and have created powerful organisations.

In the Manifesto of March 14,⁷⁷ we called for the overthrow of the bankers, but, far from overthrowing our own bankers, we entered into an alliance with them. Now we have overthrown the government of the bankers.

The governments and the bourgeoisie will make every effort to unite their forces and drown the workers' and

peasants' revolution in blood. But the three years of war have been a good lesson to the masses—the Soviet movement in other countries and the mutiny in the German navy, which was crushed by the officer cadets of Wilhelm the hangman.⁷⁸ Finally, we must remember that we are not living in the depths of Africa, but in Europe, where news can spread quickly.

The workers' movement will triumph and will pave the way to peace and socialism. (*Prolonged applause.*)

Pravda No. 171, and
Izvestia No. 209,
November 10 (October 28),
1917

Collected Works, Vol 26,
pp. 249-53

From THE SPEECHES ON WAR AND PEACE
DELIVERED AT A MEETING OF THE C.C.
OF THE R.S.D.L.P.(B.)
JANUARY 11 (24), 1918

Minutes

I

Comrade Lenin speaks first and points out that at the meeting on January 8 (21) three standpoints were brought out on this question, and asks whether the question should be discussed point by point on the theses he put forward, or whether a general discussion should be opened. The second alternative is adopted, and Comrade Lenin has the floor.

He begins by setting forth the three standpoints brought out at the previous meeting (1) signing a separate annexationist peace, (2) waging a revolutionary war, and (3) proclaiming the war ended, demobilising the army, but not signing a peace treaty. At the previous meeting, the first standpoint received 15 votes, the second 32 and the third 16.

Comrade Lenin points out that the Bolsheviks have never renounced defence, but this defence and protection of the fatherland must have a definite, concrete context, which exists at the present time, namely, defence of the Socialist Republic against an extremely strong international imperialism. The question is only one of how we should defend our fatherland, the Socialist Republic. The army is excessively fatigued by the war; the horses are in such a state that in the event of an offensive we shall not be able to move the artillery; the Germans are holding such favourable positions on the islands in the Baltic that if they start an offensive they could take Revel and Petrograd with their bare hands. By continuing the war in such conditions, we

shall greatly strengthen German imperialism, peace will have to be concluded just the same, but then the peace will be still worse because it is not we who will be concluding it. The peace we are now forced to conclude is undoubtedly an ignominious one, but if war begins, our government will be swept away and peace will be concluded by a different government. At present, we are relying not only on the proletariat but also on the poor peasantry, which will abandon us if the war continues. Drawing out the war is in the interest of French, British and American imperialism, and proof of this, for example, is the offer made at Krylenko's headquarters by the Americans to pay 100 rubles for every Russian soldier. Those who take the standpoint of revolutionary war stress that we shall then be engaged in a civil war with German imperialism, and shall thereby awaken revolution in Germany. But Germany, after all, is still only pregnant with revolution, whereas we have already given birth to a quite healthy infant, the Socialist Republic, which we may kill if we start the war. We are in possession of a circular letter of the German Social-Democrats, there is information about the attitude to us of two trends in the Centre, of which one considers that we have been bought, and that the current events in Brest are a farce, with the actors playing out their parts. This section is attacking us for the armistice. The other section of the Kautskijites says that the personal honesty of the leaders of the Bolsheviki is beyond all doubt, but that the Bolsheviki's behaviour is a psychological riddle. We don't know the opinion of the Left-wing Social-Democrats. The British workers are supporting our efforts for peace. Of course, the peace we conclude will be an ignominious one, but we need a breathing space in order to carry out social reforms (take transport alone); we need to consolidate ourselves, and this takes time. We need to complete the crushing of the bourgeoisie, but for this we need to have both our hands free. Once we have done this, we shall free both our hands, and then we should be able to carry on a revolutionary war against international imperialism. The

echelons of the revolutionary volunteer army which have now been formed are the officers of our future army.

What Comrade Trotsky is proposing—an end to the war, refusal to sign a peace treaty and demobilisation of the army—is an international political demonstration. The only thing we achieve by withdrawing our troops is handing over the Estonian Socialist Republic to the Germans. It is said that by concluding peace we are giving a free hand to the Japanese and Americans, who will immediately occupy Vladivostok. By the time they have even reached Irkutsk, we shall have been able to strengthen our Socialist Republic. By signing a peace treaty we of course betray self-determined Poland, but we retain the Estonian Socialist Republic and win a chance to consolidate our gains. Of course, we make a turn to the right, which leads through a very dirty stable, but we must do it. If the Germans start an offensive, we shall be forced to sign any peace treaty, and then, of course, it will be worse. An indemnity of three thousand million is not too high a price for saving the Socialist Republic. By signing peace now, we give the broad masses a visual demonstration that the imperialists (of Germany, Britain and France), having taken Riga and Baghdad, are continuing to fight, whereas we are developing, the Socialist Republic is developing.

First published in 1922
in N. Lenin (V. Ulyanov),
Sobraniye Sochinenii
(Collected Works), Vol. XV

Collected Works, Vol. 36,
pp. 467-69

THE CHIEF TASK OF OUR DAY

*Thou art wretched, thou art abundant,
Thou art mighty, thou art impotent
—Mother Russia!**

Human history these days is making a momentous and most difficult turn, a turn, one might say without the least exaggeration, of immense significance for the emancipation of the world. A turn from war to peace; a turn from a war between plunderers who are sending to the shambles millions of the working and exploited people for the sake of establishing a new system of dividing the spoils looted by the strongest of them, to a war of the oppressed against the oppressors for liberation from the yoke of capital; a turn from an abyss of suffering, anguish, starvation and degradation to the bright future of communist society, universal prosperity and enduring peace. No wonder that at the sharpest points of this sharp turn, when all around the old order is breaking down and collapsing with a terrible grinding crash, and the new order is being born amid indescribable suffering, there are some whose heads grow dizzy, some who are seized by despair, some who seek salvation from the at times too bitter reality in fine-sounding and alluring phrases.

It has been Russia's lot to see most clearly, and experience most keenly and painfully the sharpest of sharp turning-points in history as it swings round from imperialism towards the communist revolution. In the space of a few days we destroyed one of the oldest, most powerful, barbarous and

* The epigraph is taken from Nekrasov's poem *Who Lives Well in Russia*.—Ed.

brutal of monarchies. In the space of a few months we passed through a number of stages of collaboration with the bourgeoisie and of shaking off petty-bourgeois illusions, for which other countries have required decades. In the course of a few weeks, having overthrown the bourgeoisie, we crushed its open resistance in civil war. We passed in a victorious triumphal march of Bolshevism from one end of a vast country to the other. We raised the lowest strata of the working people oppressed by tsarism and the bourgeoisie to liberty and independent life. We established and consolidated a Soviet Republic, a new type of state, which is infinitely superior to, and more democratic than, the best of the bourgeois-parliamentary republics. We established the dictatorship of the proletariat supported by the poor peasantry, and began a broadly conceived system of socialist reforms. We awakened the faith of the millions upon millions of workers of all countries in their own strength and kindled the fires of enthusiasm in them. Everywhere we issued the call for a world workers' revolution. We flung a challenge to the imperialist plunderers of all countries.

Then in a few days we were thrown to the ground by an imperialist plunderer, who fell upon the unarmed. He compelled us to sign an incredibly burdensome and humiliating peace—as tribute for having dared to tear ourselves, even for the shortest space of time, from the iron clutches of an imperialist war. The more ominously the shadow of a workers' revolution in his own country rises before the plunderer, the greater his ferocity in crushing and stifling Russia and tearing her to pieces.

We were compelled to sign a "Tilsit" peace. We need no self-deception. We must courageously look the bitter, unadorned truth straight in the face. We must measure fully, to the very bottom, that abyss of defeat, dismemberment, enslavement, and humiliation into which we have now been pushed. The more clearly we understand this, the firmer, the more steeled and tempered will be our will to liberation, our aspiration to rise again from enslavement to independence,

and our unbending determination to ensure that at any price Russia ceases to be wretched and impotent and becomes mighty and abundant in the full meaning of these words.

And mighty and abundant she can become, for, after all, we still have sufficient territory and natural wealth left to us to supply each and all, if not with abundant, at least with adequate means of life. Our natural wealth, our manpower and the splendid impetus which the great revolution has given to the creative powers of the people are ample material to build a truly mighty and abundant Russia.

Russia will become mighty and abundant if she abandons all dejection and all phrase-making, if, with clenched teeth, she musters all her forces and strains every nerve and muscle, if she realises that salvation lies *only* along that road of world socialist revolution upon which we have set out. March forward along that road, undismayed by defeats, lay the firm foundation of socialist society stone by stone, work with might and main to establish discipline and self-discipline, consolidate everywhere organisation, order, efficiency, and the harmonious co-operation of all the forces of the people, introduce comprehensive accounting of and control over production and distribution—such is the way to build up military might and socialist might.

It would be unworthy of a genuine socialist who has suffered grave defeat either to bluster or to give way to despair. It is not true that our position is hopeless and that all that remains for us is to choose between an "inglorious" death (inglorious from the point of view of the *szlachcic*), such as this harsh peace represents, and a "gallant" death in a hopeless fight. It is not true that by signing a "Tilsit" peace we have betrayed our ideals or our friends. We have betrayed nothing and nobody, we have not sanctified or covered up any lie, we have not refused to help a single friend or comrade in misfortune in every way we could and with everything at our disposal. A general who withdraws the remnants of his army into the heart of the country when it has been beaten or is in panic-stricken flight, or who, in ex-

tremity, shields this retreat by a harsh and humiliating peace, is not guilty of treachery towards that part of his army which he is powerless to help and which has been cut off by the enemy. Such a general performs his duty by choosing the only way of saving what can still be saved, by refusing to gamble recklessly, by not embellishing the bitter truth for the people, by "surrendering space in order to gain time", by taking advantage of *any and every* respite, even the briefest, in which to muster his forces and to allow his army to rest or recover, if it is affected by disintegration and demoralisation.

We have signed a "Tilsit" peace. When Napoleon I, in 1807, compelled Prussia to sign the Peace of Tilsit, the conqueror smashed the Germans' entire army, occupied their capital and all their big cities, brought in his own police, compelled the vanquished to supply him, the conqueror, with auxiliary corps for fresh predatory wars, and partitioned Germany, concluding alliances with some German states against others. Nevertheless, the German people survived even *such* a peace, proved able to muster their forces, to rise and to win the right to liberty and independence.

To all those who are able and willing to think, the example of the Peace of Tilsit (which was only one of many harsh and humiliating treaties forced upon the Germans at that period) clearly shows how childishly naïve is the idea that under all conditions a harsh peace means the bottomless pit of ruin, while war is the path of valour and salvation. Periods of war teach us that peace has not infrequently in history served as a respite and a means of mustering forces for new battles. The Peace of Tilsit was a supreme humiliation for Germany, but at the same time it marked a turn towards a supreme national resurgence. At that time historical conditions were such that this resurgence could be channelled only in the direction of a *bourgeois* state. At that time, more than a hundred years ago, history was made by handfuls of nobles and a sprinkling of bourgeois intellectuals, while the worker and peasant masses were somno-

lent and dormant. As a result history at that time could only crawl along at a terribly slow pace.

But now capitalism has raised culture in general, and the culture of the masses in particular, to a much higher level. War has shaken up the masses, its untold horrors and suffering have awakened them. War has given history momentum and it is now flying with locomotive speed. History is now being independently made by millions and tens of millions of people. Capitalism has now matured for socialism.

Consequently, if Russia is now passing—as she undeniably is—from a “Tilsit” peace to a national resurgence, to a great patriotic war, the outlet for it is not in the direction of a bourgeois state, but in the direction of a world socialist revolution. Since October 25, 1917, we have been defencists. We are for “defence of the fatherland”; but that patriotic war towards which we are moving is a war for a socialist fatherland, for socialism as a fatherland, for the Soviet Republic as a *contingent* of the world army of socialism.

“Hate the Germans, kill the Germans”—such was, and is, the slogan of common, i.e., bourgeois, patriotism. But we will say “Hate the imperialist plunderers, hate capitalism, death to capitalism” and at the same time “Learn from the Germans! Remain true to the brotherly alliance with the German workers. They are late in coming to our aid. We shall gain time, we shall live to see them coming, and they *will come*, to our aid.”

Yes, learn from the Germans! History is moving in zig-zags and by roundabout ways. It so happens that it is the Germans who now personify, besides a brutal imperialism, the principle of discipline, organisation, harmonious co-operation on the basis of modern machine industry, and strict accounting and control.

And that is just what we are lacking. That is just what we must learn. That is just what our great revolution needs in order to pass from a triumphant beginning, through a succession of severe trials, to its triumphant goal. That is just what the Russian Soviet Socialist Republic requires in

order to cease being wretched and impotent and become mighty and abundant for all time.

March 11, 1918

Izvestia VTsIK No. 46,
March 12, 1918

Collected Works, Vol. 27,
pp. 159-63

PROPHETIC WORDS

Nobody, thank God, believes in miracles nowadays. Miraculous prophecy is a fairy-tale. But scientific prophecy is a fact. And in these days, when we so very often encounter shameful despondency and even despair around us, it is useful to recall one scientific prophecy which has come true.

Frederick Engels had occasion in 1887 to write of the coming world war in a preface to a pamphlet by Sigismund Borkheim, *In Memory of the German Arch-Patriots of 1806-1807 (Zur Erinnerung für die deutschen Mordspatrioten 1806-1807)*. (This pamphlet is No. XXIV of the *Social-Democratic Library* published in Göttingen-Zürich in 1888.)

This is how Frederick Engels spoke over thirty years ago of the future world war:

“...No war is any longer possible for Prussia-Germany except a world war and a world war indeed of an extent and violence hitherto undreamt of. Eight to ten millions of soldiers will massacre one another and in doing so devour the whole of Europe until they have stripped it barer than any swarm of locusts has ever done. The devastations of the Thirty Years' War compressed into three or four years, and spread over the whole Continent; famine, pestilence, general demoralisation both of the armies and of the mass of the people produced by acute distress; hopeless confusion of our artificial machinery in trade, industry and credit,

ending in general bankruptcy; collapse of the old states and their traditional state wisdom to such an extent that crowns will roll by dozens on the pavement and there will be nobody to pick them up; absolute impossibility of foreseeing how it will all end and who will come out of the struggle as victor; only one result is absolutely certain: general exhaustion and the establishment of the conditions for the ultimate victory of the working class.

"This is the prospect when the system of mutual out-bidding in armaments, taken to the final extreme, at last bears its inevitable fruits. This, my lords, princes and statesmen, is where in your wisdom you have brought old Europe. And when nothing more remains to you but to open the last great war dance—that will suit us all right (*uns kann es recht sein*). The war may perhaps push us temporarily into the background, may wrench from us many a position already conquered. But when you have unfettered forces which you will then no longer be able again to control, things may go as they will: at the end of the tragedy you will be ruined and the victory of the proletariat will either be already achieved or at any rate (*doch*) inevitable.

"London, December 15, 1887

Frederick Engels"

What genius is displayed in this prophecy! And how infinitely rich in ideas is every sentence of this exact, clear, brief and scientific class analysis! How much could be learnt from it by those who are now shamefully succumbing to lack of faith, despondency and despair, if . . . if people who are accustomed to kowtow to the bourgeoisie, or who allow themselves to be frightened by it, could but think, were but capable of thinking!

Some of Engels's predictions have turned out differently; and one could not expect the world and capitalism to have remained unchanged during thirty years of frenzied impe-

rialist development. But what is most astonishing is that so many of Engels's predictions are turning out "to the letter". For Engels gave a perfectly exact class analysis, and classes and the relations between them have remained unchanged.

"...The war may perhaps push us temporarily into the background..." Developments have proceeded exactly along these lines, but have gone even further and even worse: some of the social-chauvinists who have been "pushed back", and their spineless "semi-opponents", the Kautskyites, have begun to extol their backward movement and have become direct traitors to and betrayers of socialism.

"...The war may perhaps wrench from us many a position already conquered..." A number of "legal" positions have been wrenched from the working class. But on the other hand it has been steeled by trials and is receiving severe but salutary lessons in illegal organisation, in illegal struggle and in preparing its forces for a revolutionary attack.

"...Crowns will roll by dozens..." Several crowns have already fallen. And one of them is worth dozens of others—the crown of the autocrat of all the Russias, Nicholas Romanov.

"...Absolute impossibility of foreseeing how it will all end..." After four years of war this absolute impossibility has, if one may say so, become even more absolute.

"...Hopeless confusion of our artificial machinery in trade, industry and credit..." At the end of the fourth year of war this has been fully borne out in the case of one of the biggest and most backward of the states drawn into the war by the capitalists—Russia. But do not the growing starvation in Germany and Austria, the shortage of clothing and raw material and the wearing out of the means of production show that a similar state of affairs is very rapidly overtaking other countries as well?

Engels depicts the consequences brought about only by "foreign" war; he does not deal with internal, i.e., civil war,

without which not one of the great revolutions of history has taken place, and without which not a single serious Marxist has conceived the transition from capitalism to socialism. And while a foreign war may drag on for a certain time without causing "hopeless confusion" in the "artificial machinery" of capitalism, it is obvious that a civil war without such a consequence is quite inconceivable.

What stupidity, what spinelessness—not to say mercenary service to the bourgeoisie—is displayed by those who, like our *Novaya Zhizn* group, Mensheviks, Right Socialist-Revolutionaries, etc., while continuing to call themselves "socialists", maliciously point to the manifestation of this "hopeless confusion" and lay the blame for everything on the revolutionary proletariat, the Soviet power, the "utopia" of the transition to socialism. The "confusion", or *razrukha*,* to use the excellent Russian word, has been brought about by the war. There can be no severe war without disruption. There can be no civil war—the inevitable condition and concomitant of socialist revolution—without disruption. To renounce revolution and socialism "in view of" the disruption, only means to display one's lack of principle and in practice to desert to the bourgeoisie.

"...Famine, pestilence, general demoralisation both of the armies and of the mass of the people produced by acute distress..."

How simply and clearly Engels draws this indisputable conclusion, which must be obvious to everyone who is at all capable of reflecting on the objective consequences of many years of severe and agonising war. And how astonishingly stupid are those numerous "Social-Democrats" and pseudo-Socialists who will not or cannot realise this most simple idea.

Is it conceivable that a war can last many years without both the armies and the mass of the people becoming *demoralised*? Of course not. Such a consequence of a long war

* Dislocation, disruption.—Ed.

is absolutely inevitable over a period of several years, if not a whole generation. And our "men in mufflers", the bourgeois intellectual snivellers who call themselves "Social-Democrats" and "Socialists", second the bourgeoisie in blaming the revolution for the manifestations of demoralisation or for the inevitable severity of the measures taken to combat particularly acute cases of demoralisation—although it is as clear as noonday that this demoralisation has been produced by the imperialist war, and that no revolution can rid itself of *such* consequences of war without a long struggle and without a number of stern measures of repression.

Our sugary writers in *Novaya Zhizn*, *Vperyod* or *Dyelo Naroda* are prepared to grant a revolution of the proletariat and other oppressed classes "theoretically", provided only that the revolution drops from heaven and is not born and bred on earth soaked in the blood of four years of imperialist butchery of the peoples, with millions upon millions of people exhausted, tormented and demoralised by this butchery.

They had heard and admitted "in theory" that a revolution should be compared to an act of childbirth; but when it came to the point, they disgracefully took fright and their fainthearted whimperings echoed the malicious outbursts of the bourgeoisie against the insurrection of the proletariat. Consider the descriptions of childbirth given in literature, when the authors aim at presenting a truthful picture of the severity, pain and horror of the act of travail, as in Emile Zola's *La joie de vivre* (The Joy of Life), for instance, or in Veresayev's *Notes of a Doctor*. Human childbirth is an act which transforms the woman into an almost lifeless, bloodstained heap of flesh, tortured, tormented and driven frantic by pain. But can the "individual" that sees *only* this in love and its sequel, in the transformation of the woman into a mother, be regarded as a human being? Who would renounce love and procreation for *this* reason?

Travail may be light or severe. Marx and Engels, the founders of scientific socialism, always said that the transi-

tion from capitalism to socialism would be inevitably accompanied by *prolonged birth pangs*. And analysing the consequences of a world war, Engels outlines simply and clearly the indisputable and obvious fact that a revolution that follows and is connected with a war (and still more—let us add for our part—a revolution which breaks out during a war, and which is obliged to grow and maintain itself in the midst of a world war) is a *particularly severe* case of childbirth.

Clearly realising this, Engels speaks with great caution of socialism being brought to birth by a capitalist society which is perishing in a world war. "Only one result [of a world war]," he says, "is absolutely certain: general exhaustion and the *establishment* of the conditions for the ultimate victory of the working class."

This thought is expressed even more clearly at the end of the preface we are examining.

"...At the end of the tragedy you [the capitalists and landowners, the kings and statesmen of the bourgeoisie] will be ruined and the victory of the proletariat will either be already achieved or at any rate inevitable."

Severe travail greatly increases the danger of grave illness or of a fatal issue. But while individuals may die in the act of childbirth, the new society to which the old system gives birth cannot die; all that may happen is that the birth may be more painful, more prolonged, and growth and development slower.

The war has not yet ended. General exhaustion has already set in. As regards the two *direct* results of war predicted by Engels conditionally (either the victory of the working class already achieved, or the establishment of conditions which will make this inevitable, *despite all difficulties*), as regards these two conditions, now, in the middle of 1918, we find *both* in evidence.

In one, the least developed, of the capitalist countries, the victory of the working class *is already achieved*. In the others, with unparalleled pain and effort, the conditions are

being established which will make this victory "at any rate inevitable".

Let the "socialist" snivellers croak, let the bourgeoisie rage and fume, but only people who shut their eyes so as not to see, and stuff their ears so as not to hear, can fail to notice that all over the world the birth pangs of the old, capitalist society, which is pregnant with socialism, have begun. Our country, which has temporarily been advanced by the march of events to the van of the socialist revolution, is undergoing the particularly severe pains of the first period of travail. We have every reason to face the future with complete assurance and absolute confidence, for it is preparing for us new allies and new victories of the socialist revolution in a number of the more advanced countries. We are entitled to be proud and to consider ourselves fortunate that it has come to our lot to be the first to fell in one part of the globe that wild beast, capitalism, which has drenched the earth in blood, which has reduced humanity to starvation and demoralisation, and which will assuredly perish soon, no matter how monstrous and savage its frenzy in the face of death.

June 29, 1918

Pravda No. 133,
July 2, 1918

Collected Works, Vol. 27,
pp. 494-99

From LETTER TO AMERICAN WORKERS⁷⁹

Comrades! A Russian Bolshevik who took part in the 1905 Revolution, and who lived in your country for many years afterwards, has offered to convey my letter to you. I have accepted his proposal all the more gladly because just at the present time the American revolutionary workers have to play an exceptionally important role as uncompromising enemies of American imperialism—the freshest, strongest and latest in joining in the world-wide slaughter of nations for the division of capitalist profits. At this very moment, the American multimillionaires, these modern slaveowners, have turned an exceptionally tragic page in the bloody history of bloody imperialism by giving their approval—whether direct or indirect, open or hypocritically concealed, makes no difference—to the armed expedition launched by the brutal Anglo-Japanese imperialist for the purpose of throttling the first socialist republic.

The history of modern, civilised America opened with one of those great, really liberating, really revolutionary wars of which there have been so few compared to the vast number of wars of conquest which, like the present imperialist war, were caused by squabbles among kings, landowners or capitalists over the division of usurped lands or ill-gotten gains. That was the war the American people waged against the British robbers who oppressed America and held her in colonial slavery, in the same ways as these “civilised” blood-suckers are still oppressing and holding in colonial slavery

hundreds of millions of people in India, Egypt, and all parts of the world.

About 150 years have passed since then. Bourgeois civilisation has borne all its luxurious fruits. America has taken first place among the free and educated nations in level of development of the productive forces of collective human endeavour, in the utilisation of machinery and of all the wonders of modern engineering. At the same time, America has become one of the foremost countries in regard to the depth of the abyss which lies between the handful of arrogant multimillionaires who wallow in filth and luxury, and the millions of working people who constantly live on the verge of pauperism. The American people, who set the world an example in waging a revolutionary war against feudal slavery, now find themselves in the latest, capitalist stage of wage-slavery to a handful of multimillionaires, and find themselves playing the role of hired thugs who, for the benefit of wealthy scoundrels, throttled the Philippines in 1898 on the pretext of "liberating" them,⁸⁰ and are throttling the Russian Socialist Republic in 1918 on the pretext of "protecting" it from the Germans.

The four years of the imperialist slaughter of nations, however, have not passed in vain. The deception of the people by the scoundrels of both robber groups, the British and the German, has been utterly exposed by indisputable and obvious facts. The results of the four years of war have revealed the general law of capitalism as applied to war between robbers for the division of spoils: the richest and strongest profited and grabbed most, while the weakest were utterly robbed, tormented, crushed and strangled.

The British imperialist robbers were the strongest in number of "colonial slaves". The British capitalist have not lost an inch of "their" territory (i.e., territory they have grabbed over the centuries), but they have grabbed all the German colonies in Africa, they have grabbed Mesopotamia and Palestine, they have throttled Greece, and have begun to plunder Russia.

The German imperialist robbers were the strongest in organisation and discipline of "their" armies, but weaker in regard to colonies. They have lost all their colonies, but plundered half of Europe and throttled the largest number of small countries and weak nations. What a great war of "liberation" on both sides! How well the robbers of both groups, the Anglo-French and the German capitalists, together with their lackeys, the social-chauvinists, i.e., the socialists who went over to the side of "their own" bourgeoisie, have "defended their country"!

The American multimillionaires were, perhaps, richest of all, and geographically the most secure. They have profited more than all the rest. They have converted all, even the richest, countries into their tributaries. They have grabbed hundreds of billions of dollars. And every dollar is sullied with filth: the filth of the secret treaties between Britain and her "allies", between Germany and her vassals, treaties for the division of the spoils, treaties of mutual "aid" for oppressing the workers and persecuting the internationalist socialists. Every dollar is sullied with the filth of "profitable" war contracts, which in every country made the rich richer and the poor poorer. And every dollar is stained with blood—from that ocean of blood that has been shed by the ten million killed and twenty million maimed in the great, noble, liberating and holy war to decide whether the British or the German robbers are to get most of the spoils, whether the British or the German thugs are to be *foremost* in throttling the weak nations all over the world.

While the German robbers broke all records in war atrocities, the British have broken all records not only in the number of colonies they have grabbed, but also in the subtlety of their disgusting hypocrisy. This very day, the Anglo-French and American bourgeois newspapers are spreading, in millions and millions of copies, lies and slander about Russia, and are hypocritically justifying their predatory expedition against her on the plea that they want to "protect" Russia from the Germans!

It does not require many words to refute this despicable and hideous lie; it is sufficient to point to one well-known fact. In October 1917, after the Russian workers had overthrown their imperialist government, the Soviet government, the government of the revolutionary workers and peasants, openly proposed a just peace, a peace without annexations or indemnities, a peace that fully guaranteed equal rights to all nations—and it proposed such a peace to *all* the belligerent countries.

It was the Anglo-French and the American bourgeoisie who refused to accept our proposal; it was they who even refused to talk to us about a general peace! It was *they* who betrayed the interests of all nations; it was they who prolonged the imperialist slaughter!

It was they who, banking on the possibility of dragging Russia back into the imperialist war, refused to take part in the peace negotiations and thereby gave a free hand to the no less predatory German capitalists who imposed the annexationist and harsh Brest Peace upon Russia!

It is difficult to imagine anything more disgusting than the hypocrisy with which the Anglo-French and American bourgeoisie are now "blaming" us for the Brest Peace Treaty. The very capitalists of those countries which could have turned the Brest negotiations into general negotiations for a general peace are now our "accusers"! The Anglo-French imperialist vultures, who have profited from the plunder of colonies and the slaughter of nations, have prolonged the war for nearly a whole year after Brest, and yet they "accuse" *us*, the Bolsheviks, who proposed a just peace to all countries, they accuse *us*, who tore up, published and exposed to public disgrace the secret, criminal treaties concluded between the ex-tsar and the Anglo-French capitalists.

The workers of the whole world, no matter in what country they live, greet us, sympathise with us, applaud us for breaking the iron ring of imperialist ties, of sordid imperialist treaties, of imperialist chains—for breaking through to freedom, and making the heaviest sacrifices in

doing so—for, as a socialist republic, although torn and plundered by the imperialists, keeping *out* of the imperialist war and raising the banner of peace, the banner of socialism for the whole world to see.

Small wonder that the international imperialist gang hates us for this, that it “accuses” us, that all the lackeys of the imperialists, including our Right Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, also “accuse” us. The hatred these watchdogs of imperialism express for the Bolsheviks, and the sympathy of the class-conscious workers of the world, convince us more than ever of the justice of our cause.

A real socialist would not fail to understand that for the sake of achieving victory over the bourgeoisie, for the sake of power passing to the workers, for the sake of *starting* the world proletarian revolution, we *cannot* and must *not* hesitate to make the heaviest sacrifices, including the sacrifice of part of our territory, the sacrifice of heavy defeats at the hands of imperialism. A real socialist would have proved by *deeds* his willingness for “his” country to make the greatest sacrifice to give a real push forward to the cause of the socialist revolution.

For the sake of “their” cause, that is, for the sake of winning world hegemony, the imperialists of Britain and Germany have not hesitated to utterly ruin and throttle a whole number of countries, from Belgium and Serbia to Palestine and Mesopotamia. But must socialists wait with “their” cause, the cause of liberating the working people of the whole world from the yoke of capital, of winning universal and lasting peace, until a path without sacrifice is found? Must they fear to open the battle until an easy victory is “guaranteed”? Must they place the integrity and security of “their” bourgeois-created “fatherland” above the interests of the world socialist revolution? The scoundrels in the international socialist movement who think this way, those lackeys who grovel to bourgeois morality, thrice stand condemned.

The Anglo-French and American imperialist vultures "accuse" us of concluding an "agreement" with German imperialism. What hypocrites, what scoundrels they are to slander the workers' government while trembling because of the sympathy displayed towards us by the workers of "their own" countries! But their hypocrisy will be exposed. They pretend not to see the difference between an agreement entered into by "socialists" with the bourgeoisie (their own or foreign) *against the workers*, against the working people, and an agreement entered into *for the protection* of the workers who have defeated their bourgeoisie, with the bourgeoisie of one national colour *against the bourgeoisie* of another colour in order that the proletariat may take advantage of the antagonisms between the different groups of bourgeoisie.

In actual fact, every European sees this difference very well, and, as I shall show in a moment, the American people have had a particularly striking "illustration" of it in their own history. There are agreements and agreements, there are *façots et façots*, as the French say.

When in February 1918 the German imperialist vultures hurled their forces against unarmed, demobilised Russia, who had relied on the international solidarity of the proletariat before the world revolution had fully matured, I did not hesitate for a moment to enter into an "agreement" with the French monarchists. Captain Sadoul, a French army officer who, in words, sympathised with the Bolsheviki, but was in deeds a loyal and faithful servant of French imperialism, brought the French officer de Lubersac to see me. "I am a monarchist. My only aim is to secure the defeat of Germany," de Lubersac declared to me. "That goes without saying (*cela va sans dire*)," I replied. But this did not in the least prevent me from entering into an "agreement" with de Lubersac concerning certain services that French army officers, experts in explosives, were ready to render us by blowing up railway lines in order to hinder the German invasion. This is an example of an "agreement" of which

every class-conscious worker will approve, an agreement in the interests of socialism. The French monarchist and I shook hands, although we knew that each of us would willingly hang his "partner". But for a time our interests coincided. Against the advancing rapacious Germans, *we*, in the interests of the Russian and the world socialist revolution, utilised the equally rapacious counter-interests of *other* imperialists. In this way we served the interests of the working class of Russia and of other countries, we strengthened the proletariat and weakened the bourgeoisie of the whole world, we resorted to the methods, most legitimate and essential in *every* war, of manoeuvre, stratagem, retreat, in anticipation of the moment when the rapidly maturing proletarian revolution in a number of advanced countries *completely matured*.

However much the Anglo-French and American imperialist sharks fume with rage, however much they slander us, no matter how many millions they spend on bribing the Right Socialist-Revolutionary, Menshevik and other social-patriotic newspapers, *I shall not hesitate one second* to enter into a *similar "agreement"* with the German imperialist vultures if an attack upon Russia by Anglo-French troops calls for it. And I know perfectly well that my tactics will be approved by the class-conscious proletariat of Russia, Germany, France, Britain, America—in short, of the whole civilised world. Such tactics will ease the task of the socialist revolution, will hasten it, will weaken the international bourgeoisie, will strengthen the position of the working class which is defeating the bourgeoisie.

Written on August 20, 1918

Collected Works, Vol. 28,
pp. 62-68

SPEECH IN POLYTECHNICAL MUSEUM
AUGUST 23, 1918

(Stormy applause.) What is the essence of our programme? Winning socialism. There is no way out of the world war at this moment except by the victory of socialism. But many do not realise this. Most people all over the world now oppose this bloody slaughter, but they cannot see its direct connection with the capitalist system. The horrors of this war are obvious even to the bourgeoisie, but you cannot expect them to associate the end of the war with the end of capitalism. . . . This, however, is the fundamental idea which has always distinguished the Bolsheviks, and the revolutionary socialists of all other countries, from those who would like to bring peace on earth while leaving the capitalist system intact.

What are wars fought for? We know the majority of wars were fought in the interests of dynasties, and were called dynastic wars. But some wars were fought in the interests of the oppressed. Spartacus set off a war in defence of the enslaved class. Wars of this nature were waged in the period of colonial oppression continuing to this day, in the period of slavery, etc. These wars were just wars and must not be condemned.

But when we talk about the present European war and condemn it, we do so only because it is being waged by the oppressor class.

What is the aim of the present war? If we are to believe the diplomats of all countries, it is being fought by France and Britain to defend the small nations from the barbarians, the German Huns. Germany, for her part, is fighting the

Cossack barbarians who are menacing the civilised German people, and is defending the fatherland from the enemy attack.

But we know this war was carefully prepared, it matured and became inevitable. It was just as inevitable as war is between America and Japan. Why?

Because capitalism has concentrated the earth's wealth in the hands of a few states and divided the world up to the last little bit. Any further division, any further enrichment could take place only at the expense of others, as the enrichment of one state at the expense of another. The issue could only be settled by force—and, accordingly, war between the world marauders became inevitable.

This war has up to now been headed by two principal firms—Britain and Germany. Britain was the strongest of the colonialist countries. Although her population is not more than 40,000,000, that of her colonies exceeds 400,000,000. Long ago she took by force the colonies of others; she seized vast territories and exploited them. But economically she fell behind Germany during the last fifty years. German industry overhauled British industry. Germany's large-scale state capitalism combined with the bureaucracy—and Germany beat all records.

The rivalry for supremacy between these two giants could only be settled by force.

There was a time when Britain, by dint of her might, seized territory from Holland, Portugal and other countries. Then Germany appeared on the scene and declared that it was now her turn to enrich herself at the expense of others.

That is the root of the matter—the struggle between the strongest powers for the division of the world. And as both sides possess hundreds of millions of capital, their struggle has become world-wide.

We know how many secret crimes have been committed in connection with this war. The secret treaties we have published show that the lofty reasons given for the war are just a lot of empty talk, and that, just like Russia, all the states

were involved in sordid treaties for getting rich at the expense of small and weak nations. The result was that those who were strong grew richer still, while those who were weak were crushed.

Individuals cannot be blamed for starting the war; it would be wrong to blame kings and tsars for having brought about this holocaust—it was brought about by capital. Capitalism has turned into a blind alley. This blind alley is imperialism, which dictated war among the rivals for world supremacy.

The claim that the war is being waged for the liberation of small nations is a monstrous lie. Both sets of marauders continue to stand glaring bloodthirstily at each other, while about them many a small nation lies crushed.

And we say there is no way out of the imperialist holocaust except by civil war.

When we said this in 1914 we were told it was like a straight line extending into space; but our analysis has been corroborated by the whole subsequent course of events. To-day we find chauvinism's generals being left without an army. In France, which suffered most from the war and was most responsive to the call to defend the fatherland—for the enemy stood at the gates of Paris—the defence advocates have recently suffered a fiasco. True enough, it was at the hands of people like Longuet, who do not know whether they are coming or going, but that is not important.

We know that in the early days of the revolution in Russia power fell into the hands of people who spouted all sorts of words but kept the old tsarist treaties in their pockets. And if in Russia parties veered to the left more rapidly, this was due to the accursed regime that existed before the revolution and to our Revolution of 1905.

In Europe, though, where a shrewd and calculating capitalism rules, where it possesses a powerful and well-knit organisation, the fumes of nationalism are wearing off more slowly. Nevertheless, we can unmistakably see that the imperialist war is dying a slow and painful death.

There is quite reliable information to show that the German army is becoming demoralised, and has taken to profiteering. It could hardly be otherwise. The moment the soldier wakes up and begins to understand that he is being maimed and killed solely in the interests of the bourgeoisie, demoralisation is bound to spread among the mass of soldiers.

The French army, which kept its morale longer and more persistently than any of the others, likewise shows that it is not immune to demoralisation. The Malvy trial has somewhat lifted the curtain over the scene in France, too, and has revealed that thousands of soldiers have refused to go to the front.

All this is but the herald of events similar to those in Russia, except that in the civilised countries the civil war will be far more brutal than in Russia. We can see that in the case of Finland, the most democratic country in Europe, the first country, to give women the vote. Yet this country took savage and ruthless reprisals on the Red Army men; and the latter did not surrender easily. This shows what a terrible fate awaits these civilised countries.

You can see for yourselves how absurd it was to accuse the Bolsheviki of demoralising the Russian army.

We represent only one detachment, a detachment which has advanced some way ahead of the other workers' detachments—not because it is any better than the others, but because the stupid policy of our bourgeoisie enabled the working class of Russia to throw off its chains sooner. Today, in fighting for a socialist system in Russia, we are fighting for socialism all over the world. Today, the Bolsheviki are the sole subject of discussion at all workers' meetings and gatherings in all countries. They know us; they know that what we are now doing is furthering the cause of the whole world, that we are working for them.

When we abolish private ownership of land, nationalise the factories and the banks, which are now engaged in organising industry, cries are raised on all sides that we are

committing hosts of mistakes. That may be true, but the workers are creating socialism themselves, and no matter what mistakes we make we are learning from experience and paving the way for the art of making revolution without mistakes.

That is why we are the objects of such savage hatred. That is why the French imperialists do not begrudge hundreds of millions to support counter-revolution, since this would bring the repayment to France of the Russian debts, running into billions, which the workers and peasants have annulled.

Today the whole bourgeois press is amusing itself by filling its columns with such lies as that the Council of People's Commissars has moved to Tula, that it was seen ten days ago in Kronstadt, and so on, that Moscow is about to fall and that the Soviet Government has fled.

The whole bourgeoisie, all the Romanovs, all the capitalists and landowners support the Czechs, whose revolt they associate with the possible fall of the Soviet government. The Allies know this, and they are launching one of their fiercest attacks. What they lacked in Russia was a nucleus, and now they have found it in the Czechs. The Czech revolt therefore must not be treated lightly. This revolt was the signal for a number of counter-revolutionary risings; our revolutionary history has recently been marked by many kulak and whiteguard revolts.

The position of the Soviet government is grave, and we must not close our eyes to the fact. But you have only to look around you to be filled with confidence in our victory.

Germany has suffered a number of defeats, and it is no secret that these defeats are the result of "treason" on the part of German soldiers; French soldiers refused to go to the front⁸¹ at a very critical moment because of the arrest of Comrade Andrieux whom the government was compelled to release to get the troops to move, and so on and so forth.

We have made many sacrifices. The Brest-Litovsk Peace was one painful wound; we expected a revolution in Ger-

many, but the time for it was not yet ripe. It is ripening now; revolution is undoubtedly brewing and is inevitable. But only a fool can ask when revolution will break out in the West. Revolution can never be forecast; it cannot be foretold; it comes of itself. Revolution is brewing and is bound to flare up. Did anybody know a week before the February revolution it was about to break out? When the mad priest led the people to the palace,⁸² did anybody think the Revolution of 1905 was about to break out? But revolution is brewing and is bound to come.

And we must keep the Soviet government intact until it begins. Our mistakes must serve as a lesson to the proletariat in the West, to the world socialist movement. The salvation of the world revolution as well as of the Russian revolution lies on the Czech front. And we already have news that the army which time and again was betrayed by the generals, which is terribly exhausted, that this army, with the coming of our comrades, the Communists, the workers, is beginning to win victories, is beginning to display revolutionary enthusiasm in the struggle against the world bourgeoisie.

We believe that victory will be ours and that by our victory we shall save the cause of socialism. (*Stormy applause.*)

Short report published
in *Izvestia* No. 182,
August 24, 1918

Collected Works, Vol. 28,
pp. 79-84

**From THE REPLY TO QUESTIONS
PUT BY KARL WIEGAND, BERLIN
CORRESPONDENT
OF UNIVERSAL SERVICE⁸³**

1. Do we intend to attack Poland and Rumania?

No. We have declared most emphatically and officially, in the name of the Council of People's Commissars and the All-Russia Central Executive Committee, our peaceful intentions. It is very much to be regretted that the French capitalist government is instigating Poland (and presumably Rumania, too) to attack us. This is even mentioned by a number of American radios from Lyons.

2. What are our plans in Asia?

They are the same as in Europe: peaceful coexistence with all peoples; with the workers and peasants of all nations awakening to a new life—a life without exploiters, without landowners, without capitalists, without merchants. The imperialist war of 1914-18, the war of the capitalists of the Anglo-French (and Russian) group against the German-Austrian capitalist group for the partition of the world, has awakened Asia and has strengthened there, as everywhere else, the urge towards freedom, towards peaceful labour and against possible future wars.

**From THE REPORT
ON THE INTERNATIONAL SITUATION
AND THE FUNDAMENTAL TASKS
OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL
DELIVERED AT THE SECOND CONGRESS
OF THE COMMUNIST INTERNATIONAL
JULY 19, 1920**

Imperialism's economic relations constitute the core of the entire international situation as it now exists. Throughout the twentieth century, this new, highest and final stage of capitalism has fully taken shape. Of course, you all know that the enormous dimensions that capital has reached are the most characteristic and essential feature of imperialism. The place of free competition has been taken by huge monopolies. An insignificant number of capitalists have, in some cases, been able to concentrate in their hands entire branches of industry; these have passed into the hands of combines, cartels, syndicates and trusts, not infrequently of an international nature. Thus, entire branches of industry, not only in single countries, but all over the world, have been taken over by monopolists in the field of finance, property rights, and partly of production. This has formed the basis for the unprecedented domination exercised by an insignificant number of very big banks, financial tycoons, financial magnates who have, in fact, transformed even the freest republics into financial monarchies. Before the war this was publicly recognised by such far from revolutionary writers as, for example, Lysis in France.

This domination by a handful of capitalists achieved full development when the whole world had been partitioned, not only in the sense that the various sources of raw materials and means of production had been seized by the biggest capitalists, but also in the sense that the preliminary partition

of the colonies had been completed. Some forty years ago, the population of the colonies stood at somewhat over 250,000,000 who were subordinated to six capitalist powers. Before the war of 1914, the population of the colonies was estimated at about 600,000,000, and if we add countries like Persia, Turkey, and China, which were already semi-colonies, we shall get, in round figures, a population of a thousand million people oppressed through colonial dependence by the richest, most civilised and freest countries. And you know that, apart from direct political and juridical dependence, colonial dependence presumes a number of relations of financial and economic dependence, a number of wars, which were not regarded as wars because very often they amounted to sheer massacres, when European and American imperialist troops, armed with the most up-to-date weapons of destruction, slaughtered the unarmed and defenceless inhabitants of colonial countries.

The first imperialist war of 1914-18 was the inevitable outcome of this partition of the whole world, of this domination by the capitalist monopolies, of this great power wielded by an insignificant number of very big banks—two, three, four or five in each country. This war was waged for the repartitioning of the whole world. It was waged in order to decide which of the small groups of the biggest states—the British or the German—was to obtain the opportunity and the right to rob, strangle and exploit the whole world. You know that the war settled this question in favour of the British group. And, as a result of this war, all capitalist contradictions have become immeasurably more acute. At a single stroke the war relegated about 250,000,000 of the world's inhabitants to what is equivalent to colonial status, viz., Russia, whose population can be taken at about 130,000,000 and Austria-Hungary, Germany and Bulgaria, with a total population of not less than 120,000,000. That means 250,000,000 people living in countries, of which some, like Germany, are among the most advanced, most enlightened, most cultured, and on a level with modern technical

progress. By means of the Treaty of Versailles, the war imposed such terms upon these countries that advanced peoples have been reduced to a state of colonial dependence, poverty, starvation, ruin, and loss of rights: this treaty binds them for many generations, placing them in conditions that no civilised nation has ever lived in. The following is the post-war picture of the world: at least *1,250 million* people are at once brought under the colonial yoke, exploited by a brutal capitalism, which once boasted of its love for peace, and had some right to do so some fifty years ago, when the world was not yet partitioned, the monopolies did not as yet rule, and capitalism could still develop in a relatively peaceful way, without tremendous military conflicts.

Today, after this "peaceful" period, we see a monstrous intensification of oppression, the reversion to a colonial and military oppression that is far worse than before. The Treaty of Versailles has placed Germany and the other defeated countries in a position that makes their economic existence physically impossible, deprives them of all rights, and humiliates them.

How many nations are the beneficiaries? To answer this question we must recall that the population of the United States—the only full beneficiary from the war, a country which, from a heavy debtor, has become a general creditor—is no more than 100,000,000. The population of Japan—which gained a great deal by keeping out of the European-American conflict and by seizing the enormous Asian continent—is 50,000,000. The population of Britain, which next to the above-mentioned countries gained most, is about 50,000,000. If we add the neutral countries with their very small populations, countries which were enriched by the war, we shall get, in round figures, some 250,000,000 people.

Thus you get the broad outlines of the picture of the world as it appeared after the imperialist war. In the oppressed colonies—countries which are being dismembered, such as Persia, Turkey and China, and in countries that were defeated and have been relegated to the position of colonies—there

are 1,250 million inhabitants. Not more than 250,000,000 inhabit countries that have retained their old positions, but have become economically dependent upon America, and all of which, during the war, were militarily dependent, once the war involved the whole world and did not permit a single state to remain really neutral. And, finally, we have not more than 250,000,000 inhabitants in countries whose top stratum, the capitalists alone, benefited from the partition of the world. We thus get a total of about 1,750 million comprising the entire population of the world. I would like to remind you of this picture of the world, for all the basic contradictions of capitalism, of imperialism, which are leading up to revolution, all the basic contradictions in the working-class movement that have led up to the furious struggle against the Second International, facts our chairman has referred to, are all connected with this partitioning of the world's population.

Pravda No. 162,
July 24, 1920

Collected Works, Vol. 31,
pp. 215-18

THE HOME AND FOREIGN POLICY OF THE REPUBLIC

From the Report
of the All-Russia Central Executive Committee
and the Council of People's Commissars
at the Ninth All-Russia Congress of Soviets,
December 23, 1921⁸⁴

We see, nevertheless, that a certain equilibrium has been created. This is the objective political situation, quite independent of our victories, which proves that we have fathomed the depth of the contradictions connected with the imperialist war, and that we are gauging them more correctly than ever before and more correctly than other powers, who, despite all their victories, despite all their strength, have not yet found a way out, nor see any. That is the substance of the international situation which accounts for what we now see. We have before us a highly unstable equilibrium but one that is, nevertheless, certain, obvious, indisputable. I do not know whether this is for long, and I do not think that anyone can know. That is why, for our part, we must display the utmost caution. And the first precept of our policy, the first lesson that emerges from our governmental activities for the past year, the lesson which must be learned by all workers and peasants, is to be on the alert, to remember that we are surrounded by people, classes, governments who openly express the utmost hatred for us. We must remember that we are always a hair's breadth away from invasion. We shall do all in our power to prevent this misfortune. It is doubtful that any nation has experienced such a burden of the imperialist war as we have. Then we bore the burden of the Civil War forced on us by the ruling classes, who fought for the Russia of the émigrés, the Russia of the landowners, the Russia of the capitalists. We know, we know only too

well, the incredible misfortunes that war brings to the workers and peasants. For that reason our attitude to this question must be most cautious and circumspect. We are ready to make the greatest concessions and sacrifices in order to preserve the peace for which we have paid such a high price. We are ready to make huge concessions and sacrifices, but not any kind and not for ever. Let those, fortunately not numerous, representatives of the war parties and aggressive cliques of Finland, Poland and Rumania who make great play of this—let them mark it well.

Published in the bulletin
*Devyat' Vserossiiskiy syezhd
sovetov* (Ninth All-Russia
Congress of Soviets).
Verbatim Report No. 1,
December 23, 1921

Collected Works, Vol. 33,
pp. 147-48

TO THE *CLARTÉ* GROUP⁸⁵

November 15, 1922

Dear Friends,

I take this opportunity to send you best greetings. I have been seriously ill, and for over a year I have not been able to see a single one of the productions of your group. I hope that your organisation "*des anciens combattants*"* still exists and is growing stronger not only numerically, but also spiritually, in the sense of intensifying and spreading the struggle against imperialist war. It is worth devoting one's whole life to the struggle against this kind of war; it is a struggle in which one must be ruthless and chase to the furthest corners of the earth all the sophistry that is uttered in its defence.

Best greetings.

Yours,

Lenin

First published in 1925
in French in *Clarté* No. 71

Collected Works, Vol. 33,
p. 434

* Ex-servicemen.—Ed.

NOTES

¹ This congress, the 7th Congress of the Second International, was held from August 18 to 24, 1907, and was attended by 886 delegates representing the socialist parties and trade unions of Britain, France, Germany, Russia, the U.S.A. and other countries. The Congress considered the following questions: 1) militarism and international conflicts; 2) relations between political parties and trade unions; 3) colonial question; 4) immigration and emigration of workers, and 5) women's suffrage.

During the discussion of the resolution on "Militarism and International Conflicts", Lenin and his followers succeeded in having the following amendment adopted: "Should the war break out, they [the working class of different countries and its parliamentary representatives—*Ed.*] must... by all means take advantage of the economic and political crisis caused by the war to stir up the masses and accelerate the downfall of capitalist class domination."

The colonial question, too, gave rise to a sharp struggle. Van Kol, a spokesman of the Dutch opportunists, tabled a draft resolution to the effect that the Congress should not condemn as a matter of principle the colonialist policy, which could play a civilising role under socialism. The resolution was rejected as a result of opposition on the part of the Russian and Polish delegates, a small section of the German, French and British socialists, and the socialists of those small countries which had no colonies. The resolution adopted by the Congress condemned the colonialist policy without reservations.

Appraising the resolutions of the Stuttgart Congress, Lenin wrote the following: "On the whole, the Stuttgart Congress brought into sharp contrast the opportunist and revolutionary wings of the international Social-Democratic movement on a number of cardinal issues and decided these issues in the spirit of revolutionary Marxism." (*Collected Works*, Vol. 13, p. 81.)

² The question of militarism was discussed at all these congresses.

The Paris Congress adopted a resolution on the replacement of standing armies by a universal arming of the people. The resolution called for the strengthening of peace among nations and pledged socialists to vote against war credits, linking the struggle for peace with the struggle for socialism.

At the Brussels Congress Wilhelm Liebknecht and Edouard Vaillant spoke on the attitude of the working class towards militarism. The resolution, passed following Liebknecht's report, urged everybody to protest against any preparation for war and stressed that only the establishment of a socialist society putting an end to the exploitation of man by man would do away with militarism and bring peace to the nations.

The Zurich Congress resolution adopted on Plekhanov's report reaffirmed the main propositions of the Brussels resolution on war. One of its points pledged the socialist parties to vote against war credits. p. 22

³ Lenin wrote this article in connection with a workers' meeting held in Berlin on September 7 (20), 1908, in protest against the growing war menace. Lenin wrote it for *Proletary* No. 36, but it was not published. p. 31

⁴ The Address was published in the central organ of the German Social-Democratic Party, *Vorwärts* No. 222 on September 22, 1908, under the title "Die Arbeiter Britanniens an die Arbeiter Deutschlands". p. 32

⁵ These words are from the article "Die Verteidigung von Berlin!" (Defence of Berlin!) published in *Vorwärts* No. 222, on September 22, 1908. p. 33

⁶ *The Berlin Treaty* was concluded at the Berlin Congress which met from June 13 to July 13, 1878. It was called because Austria-Hungary and Britain, unofficially supported by Germany, demanded the revision of the San-Stefano Treaty concluded between Russia and Turkey in March 1878. The Congress ended with the signing of a treaty by the plenipotentiaries of Russia, Britain, Austria-Hungary, Germany, France, Italy and Turkey. Under the treaty Britain received Cyprus, and Russia obtained Bessarabia, Batum and also Kars and Ardagan and their districts. Austria-Hungary was given the right to occupy Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Berlin Treaty intensified and aggravated the contradictions in the Balkans and set the scene for further diplomatic conflicts and wars. p. 38

- ⁷ *Cadets*—members of the Constitutional-Democratic Party, the leading party of the liberal monarchist bourgeoisie in Russia. Founded in 1905, the party represented the bourgeoisie, landowner leaders of the Zemstvos and bourgeois intellectuals.
- During the First World War the Cadets gave full support to the tsarist government's imperialist policy. When, in 1915, the tsarist army suffered a defeat at the front, which led to the aggravation of the revolutionary crisis, the Cadet members of the Duma, headed by Milyukov, and other representatives of the bourgeoisie and the landowners formed a "Progressist" bloc aimed at checking the revolution and bringing the war to a "victorious end". p. 39
- ⁸ *Sozialistische Monatshette* (Socialist Monthly)—the chief organ of German opportunist Social-Democrats and one of the organs of international revisionism. It was published in Berlin from 1897 to 1933. During the First World War it occupied a social-chauvinist stand. p. 40
- ⁹ *Novoye Vremya* (New Times)—a monarchist newspaper, mouthpiece of the reactionary nobility and tsarist officials, appeared in St. Petersburg from 1868 to 1917. p. 41
- ¹⁰ *The International Socialist Bureau*—the permanent executive and information body of the Second International, consisting of representatives of the socialist parties of all countries and established by decision of the Paris Congress of the Second International in September 1900. From 1905 onwards Lenin was a member of the Bureau as representative of the R.S.D.L.P. He waged a determined fight within the Bureau against the opportunist leaders of the Second International. The I.S.B. ceased to function in 1914. p. 47
- ¹¹ *The Socialist-Revolutionary Party*—a party of petty-bourgeois democrats, formed in 1901-02 as a result of the merger of various Narodnik groups. The Socialist-Revolutionaries demanded the abolition of landed estates and put forward the slogan of "equal land tenure on the labour principle", i.e., each peasant family to receive as much land as it could till. In their struggle against tsarism they resorted to the tactics of individual terrorism. Following the defeat of the revolution of 1905-07 a large section of the S.R.s and the party leadership adopted a bourgeois liberal stand. After the bourgeois-democratic revolution of February 1917 Socialist-Revolutionary leaders joined the bourgeois Provisional Government, in which they pursued a policy of suppressing the peasant movement and gave full support to the bourgeoisie and the landowners in their

struggle against the working class and its preparations for the socialist revolution.

After the October Socialist Revolution they joined forces with the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie and landowners to fight the Soviet Republic. p. 47

- ¹² *The Central Committee Bureau Abroad* was set up in August 1908 as the Party's agency abroad by a decision of the plenary meeting of the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee; it consisted of three members. In January 1912 it discontinued its activities. p. 48

- ¹³ See Engels' letter to F. A. Sorge of November 29, 1886 (Marx and Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Moscow, 1965, p. 395). p. 53

- ¹⁴ *Zionist socialists*—members of the Zionist Socialist Workers' Party, a Jewish petty-bourgeois nationalist organisation, founded in 1904, which was under the influence of Jewish bourgeois nationalists. The Zionist socialists preached class collaboration with the Jewish bourgeoisie and tried to isolate the Jewish workers from the revolutionary movement of the Russian and international proletariat. Their nationalist propaganda befuddled the minds of the Jewish workers and did great harm to the working-class movement. p. 59

- ¹⁵ *The Socialist Jewish Labour Party*—a petty-bourgeois nationalist organisation founded in 1906. The programme of the party was based on a demand for national autonomy for the Jews—the establishment of extra-territorial Jewish parliaments with powers to decide questions relating to the political organisation of the Jews in Russia. The party stood close to the S.R.s and together with them fought against the R.S.D.L.P. p. 60

- ¹⁶ This document, known as the "Theses on the War", was the first document to define the position of the Bolshevik Party and the international revolutionary Social-Democracy in regard to the imperialist world war. Lenin planned the theses in the early days of the war and wrote them at the beginning of September 1914.

The theses were discussed in detail at the Bolsheviks' meeting in Berne on September 6, 1914 and transported to Russia for discussion by the Central Committee Bureau in Russia, the Bolshevik group in the Fourth Duma and local Party organisations.

Through Swiss Social-Democrats the theses were submitted to the conference of the Swiss and Italian socialists held in Lugano on September 27, 1914. Some of the points contained in the theses were incorporated in the conference's resolution. p. 64

¹⁷ On August 4, 1914, the Social-Democratic group in the Reichstag voted together with the bourgeois deputies to grant the Kaiser's government a 5,000 million war loan, thereby approving of the imperialist policy of Wilhelm II. It later transpired that the Left Social-Democrats had opposed the granting of war credits at a discussion on the question in the Social-Democratic Reichstag group on the eve of the Reichstag session, but submitted to the decision of the opportunist majority and voted for the credits. p. 65

¹⁸ On August 2, 1914, the General Council of the Belgian Workers' Party instructed its deputies to vote for war credits. On the next day the party leadership addressed a chauvinistic appeal to the people calling on them to support the war. Vandervelde, the leader of the Belgian socialists and Chairman of the International Socialist Bureau of the Second International, entered the Belgian Government as Minister of Justice.

On August 4, 1914, the leaders of the French Socialist Party unanimously voted for war credits, the introduction of martial law and military censorship, which meant the banning of strikes, meetings, etc. Late in August the socialists Jules Guesde and Marcel Sembat and then Albert Thomas joined the French imperialist government (the Ministry of "National Defence"). As members of ministries and municipalities, socialists and trade union leaders actively assisted the bourgeoisie to wage the war. p. 65

¹⁹ This refers to the Socialist-Revolutionary and Popular Socialist parties and the Trudovik group.

Socialist-Revolutionaries—see Note 11.

Popular Socialists—members of the Popular Socialist Party formed by the Right-wing Socialist-Revolutionaries in 1906. The Popular Socialists advocated forming a bloc with the Cadets.

The Trudovik group—a group of petty-bourgeois democrats in the Duma formed in April 1906. In their policy the Trudoviks vacillated between the Cadets and the Social-Democrats.

During the First World War the majority of the Socialist-Revolutionaries, Popular Socialists and Trudoviks took social-chauvinist positions. p. 67

²⁰ This manifesto was published as a leading article in *Sotsial-Demokrat*, the R.S.D.L.P. central organ, on November 1, 1914. This issue of the newspaper was circulated among the Bolshevik groups abroad and in Russia; it was a great help to local Party organisations and served as a guide in their activities. The manifesto was sent to the International Socialist Bureau and to several socialist newspapers in Britain, Germany, France, Sweden and Switzerland,

as the official document defining the R.S.D.L.P.'s attitude towards the war. On November 13, 1914, it appeared in a slightly abridged form in the Swiss socialist newspaper *La Sentinelle* which was internationalist in trend. p. 69

²¹ On the outbreak of the war the Bolshevik deputies to the Fourth Duma A. Y. Badayev, M. K. Muranov, G. I. Petrovsky, F. N. Samoilov and N. R. Shagov refused to vote for war credits, exposed the imperialist, anti-popular character of the war. For their revolutionary activity directed against the war the Bolshevik deputies were tried and sentenced to exile in Siberia. p. 73

²² Shortly after the outbreak of war the St. Petersburg Bolshevik Committee published a leaflet calling on the workers and soldiers to organise for the struggle against the war and the autocracy under the slogans "Down with the autocratic monarchy!", "Long live the democratic republic!", "Long live socialism!". In August the Committee issued another illegal appeal against the war. p. 73

²³ *The International Socialist Congress in Stuttgart*—see Note 1.

The International Socialist Congress in Copenhagen (the 8th Congress of the Second International) met from August 28 to September 3, 1910. The Congress resolution confirmed the Stuttgart resolution on "Militarism and International Conflicts" which demanded that socialists should take advantage of the economic and political crisis caused by the war to overthrow the power of the bourgeoisie.

The Extraordinary International Socialist Congress in Basle met on November 24 and 25, 1912. It was called to discuss the question of combating the mounting danger of world imperialist war. A huge anti-war demonstration was organised, and an international protest meeting was held on the day the Congress opened. The Congress unanimously adopted the Manifesto on War. "The great nations of Europe," the Manifesto said, "are always on the point of being driven at each other without the slightest reason of real national interests for such attempts on reason and humanity... It would be madness if the governments did not comprehend that the mere notion of a world war is bound to arouse indignation and passion among the workers. The proletarians consider it a crime to shoot each other down for the sake of the profits of the capitalists, the ambitions of the dynasties, and the diplomatic secret treaties."

The manifesto exposed the predatory aims of the war that was being prepared by the imperialists and called on the workers of all countries to wage a determined struggle for peace against the

war danger, "to pit the might of the international solidarity of the proletariat against capitalist imperialism". In the event of the outbreak of the imperialist war the manifesto recommended that socialists should take advantage of the economic and political crisis caused by the war to fight for the socialist revolution.

The leaders of the Second International (Kautsky, Vandervelde and others) voted for the manifesto at the Congress. When the war broke out, however, they pigeonholed the Basle Manifesto and other decisions of international socialist congresses on the struggle against war and sided with their imperialist governments. p. 74

- ²⁴ Lenin delivered this lecture in Lausanne on October 14, 1914, two days after Plekhanov had made a report in defence of the social-chauvinist stand taken by the Social-Democratic leaders of the Anglo-French alliance. p. 78
- ²⁵ The quotation is taken from Engels's article "Der Socialismus in Deutschland" (Socialism in Germany), Ch. I. p. 81
- ²⁶ On September 27, 1914, *Vorwärts*, the central organ of the German Social-Democratic Party, published the article "Germany and the Outside World" which said timidly that the French and German workers had been drawn into the war against their will. General von Kessel, the commander of the Brandenburg region, banned the publication of the newspaper. The editors Haase and Fischer asked him to lift the ban, to which he acceded on the condition that the newspaper should not "touch upon the subject of class hatred and the struggle between classes". The editors accepted the proposed terms. On October 1 it was published with the general's order lifting the ban on the front page. p. 82
- ²⁷ Lenin wrote the draft after he learned about the convocation of a conference of socialists of the Triple Entente in London. The conference, held on February 14, 1915, was attended by delegates representing the social-chauvinist and pacifist groups of Britain, France, Belgium and Russia. The Bolsheviki, who held internationalist positions, were not invited to the conference, but, on Lenin's instructions, Litvinov attended and read the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee's declaration to the conference. The declaration was based on the draft prepared by Lenin. As Litvinov was announcing the declaration, he was interrupted and deprived of the right to speak. Litvinov handed over the declaration to the presidium and left the conference. p. 85

- ²⁸ The conference was held in Berne between February 27 and March 4, 1915. It was called on Lenin's initiative and was in fact a general Party conference.

The agenda included the following questions: 1) reports from the localities; 2) the war and the tasks of the Party (attitude to be taken towards other political groups); 3) the tasks before Bolshevik organisations abroad (attitude towards the general statements and actions of different groups); 4) the central organ and a new newspaper; 5) attitude towards "colonial" affairs (questions relating to the émigré "colonies"); 6) elections of the Committee of organisations abroad and 7) miscellaneous. The chief point on the agenda was that of the war and the tasks of the Party, which was reported by Lenin.

The conference adopted resolutions on Lenin's report defining the tasks and the tactics of the Bolshevik Party in the imperialist war.
p. 87

- ²⁹ The trial of the Bolshevik deputies to the Fourth Duma—A. Y. Baidayev, M. K. Muranov, G. I. Petrovsky, F. N. Samoilov, N. R. Shagov—took place on February 10 (23), 1915. The case was tried by the special Court in Petrograd. They were charged under Article 102, i.e., accused of participation in an organisation aiming at the overthrow of the existing state order. The main evidence against the Bolshevik deputies was Lenin's theses "The Tasks of Revolutionary Social-Democracy in the European War" and the Manifesto of the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee, "The War and Russian Social-Democracy", which was published in *Sotsial-Demokrat*. The five Bolshevik deputies were exiled for life to Turukhansk Territory (Eastern Siberia).
p. 93

- ³⁰ *Dyen* (The Day)—a daily liberal bourgeois paper published in St. Petersburg from 1912 to 1917. Among its contributors were Menshevik liquidators.
p. 94

- ³¹ *Rech* (Speech)—a daily newspaper, the central organ of the Constitutional-Democratic Party; appeared in St. Petersburg from 1906 to 1918.
p. 94

- ³² *Tägliche Rundschau* (Daily Review)—a bourgeois nationalist daily newspaper, published in Berlin from October 1880 till 1933.
p. 100

- ³³ Lenin refers to Kautsky's article "Die Sozialdemokratie im Kriege" (Social-Democracy in the War) published in *Die Neue Zeit* No. 1, October 2, 1914.
p. 100

³⁴ *The International Socialist Women's Conference* met in Berne between March 26 and 28, 1915. It was called on the initiative of the foreign organisation of the magazine *Rabotnitsa* (Working Woman) and with the closest participation of Clara Zetkin, who was at the time Chairman of the International Bureau of Socialist Women. The delegates to the Conference had to overcome numerous difficulties to attend the conference. The authorities refused to grant them visas and the opportunist leaders of the socialist parties threatened to expel them from the party. The Conference was attended by 29 delegates from women's organisations of Britain, Germany, Holland, France, Poland, Russia and Switzerland. The Russian delegation included I. F. Armand, N. K. Krupskaya and others.

The majority of the delegates were under the influence of the Centrists. The Conference discussed Clara Zetkin's report "On International Action by Socialist Women in Support of Peace". The resolution drawn up by Clara Zetkin with the participation of the British and Dutch delegates was Centrist in character. The delegates of the R.S.D.L.P. Central Committee submitted a draft resolution drawn up by Lenin and indicating a revolutionary ways of struggle for socialist women against the war and against international opportunism. The case for the draft was presented by Inessa Armand. The Conference, however, passed the resolution tabled by Clara Zetkin. p. 102

³⁵ The resolution in question was adopted on September 20, 1912. It denounced imperialist policies and emphasised the importance of the struggle for peace: "The Party Congress demands that by way of international agreements an end be put to the frantic armaments race that jeopardises peace and is leading humanity to the most frighful catastrophe at a fast pace. . . . The Party Congress expects all Party members to exert unremitting efforts. . . and to fight with redoubled energy against imperialism until it is completely destroyed." p. 110

³⁶ *Nashe Slovo* (Our Word)—a Menshevik newspaper published in Paris in 1915 and 1916. p. 111

³⁷ Reference is to E. David's pamphlet "Die Sozialdemokratie und Vaterlandsverteidigung" (Social-Democracy and Defence of the Fatherland) published in Berlin in 1915. p. 112

³⁸ Lenin refers to David's book *Der Sozialismus und Landwirtschaft* (Socialism and Agriculture) published in Berlin in 1903. Lenin called it "the principal work of revisionism on the agrarian question" and sharply criticised it in his writings. p. 121

- ³⁹ This refers to the manifesto issued by Tsar Nicholas II on October 17 (30), 1905. Frightened by the revolution that was under way in Russia, the tsar promised to grant civil liberties and to convene a legislative Duma. The news about the tsar's concessions and his manifesto, with its promise of "liberties", gave rise to powerful demonstrations in Vienna and other industrial centres of Austria-Hungary. In Prague barricades were erected. As a result, universal suffrage was introduced in Austria. p. 127
- ⁴⁰ Lenin refers to Wilhelm Liebknecht's speech at the Erfurt Congress of the German Social-Democratic Party in 1891. p. 137
- ⁴¹ See Karl von Clausewitz, *Vom Kriege* (On War), Bd. I, S. 28, Berlin, 1902. p. 141
- ⁴² *The Quadruple Entente*—an imperialist alliance of Britain, France, Russia and Italy. p. 142
- ⁴³ On March 11, 1915, the French Socialist Paul Golay delivered a report in Lausanne entitled "Le socialisme qui meurt et le socialisme qui doit renaître" (The Socialism That Is Dying and the Socialism That Must Be Reborn). In the same year he published a pamphlet under the same title. p. 149
- ⁴⁴ *Brentanoism*—a bourgeois-reformist trend originated by the German economist Lujo Brentano. Brentano preached "social peace" in capitalist society and maintained that it was possible to solve the labour question and reconcile the interests of the workers and the capitalists by setting up reformist trade unions and introducing factory legislation. p. 149
- ⁴⁵ *The Stuttgart resolution*—the resolution on "Militarism and International Conflicts" adopted by the International Socialist Congress in Stuttgart (the 7th Congress of the Second International) which took place between August 18 and 24, 1907. (See also Note 1.)
The Basle resolution—a manifesto on war adopted by the Extraordinary International Socialist Congress held in Basle on November 24 and 25, 1912. (See also Note 23.) p. 162
- ⁴⁶ *The International Socialist Conference in Zimmerwald* was attended by socialists from eleven countries in Europe, including Russia, Germany, France, Italy. The Conference adopted a manifesto denouncing the imperialist governments which had unleashed the

world war and condemning social-chauvinists, though not strongly enough. The manifesto formed the basis of the so-called Zimmerwald group. p. 170

⁴⁷ *The International Socialist Bureau*—the executive body of the Second International. p. 172

⁴⁸ The Zimmerwald Lefts made the following statement at the Zimmerwald Conference:

“The undersigned declare that:

“The Manifesto adopted by the Conference does not fully satisfy us. It does not give a characterisation either of overt opportunism or of opportunism under cover of radical phrases which was mainly responsible for the collapse of the International, and wants to perpetuate this collapse. The Manifesto does not mention concretely the means of struggle against war.

“As hitherto, we shall maintain a firm Marxist stand on the tasks of the proletariat in the epoch of imperialism, in the socialist press and at meetings of the International.

“We vote for the Manifesto because we regard it as a call for struggle and in this struggle we want to march in step with the other sections of the International.

“We request that this statement be filed in the official records of the proceedings.”

The statement was signed by Lenin and other members of the Left group. p. 174

⁴⁹ *The Conference of the Popular Socialists and the Socialist-Revolutionaries* in Russia met in July 1915 in Petrograd. The Conference adopted a resolution which called the masses for active participation in the “defence of the fatherland” in the imperialist war. p. 175

⁵⁰ *The old “Iskra”*—the first all-Russia illegal Marxist newspaper, founded by Lenin in 1900, which played a decisive role in the establishment of a revolutionary Marxist Party of the working class in Russia. The first issue of *Iskra* dated December 1900 appeared in Leipzig and subsequent issues were published first in Munich, then in London (from July 1902) and in Geneva (from the spring of 1903 on). On Lenin’s initiative and with his direct participation the editorial board of *Iskra* drew up a draft programme for the Party, which was published in *Iskra* No. 21, and set the stage for the Second Congress of the Party.

Shortly after the Second Congress the Mensheviks came to control the newspaper and, beginning with issue No. 52, *Iskra* became Menshevik newspaper. To distinguish it from the old *Iskra*, it was called the new *Iskra*. p. 178

- ⁵¹ *The French General Confederation of Labour* (Confédération Générale du Travail) was founded in 1895 and was strongly influenced by anarcho-syndicalists and reformists. Its leaders recognised only the economic struggle, and denied the proletarian party's leadership of the trade union movement. During the First World War its leaders sided with the imperialist bourgeoisie. p. 179
- ⁵² F. Engels, "Zur Kritik des sozialdemokratischen Programmwurfes von 1891" (Criticism of the Social-Democratic Draft Programme of 1891), published in *Die Neue Zeit*, Jg. XX, 1901, Bd. II, No. 1. p. 189
- ⁵³ This international meeting was held in the People's House in Berne simultaneously with the sitting of the International Socialist Commission. Besides Lenin, J. E. Modigliani (Italy), H. Rakovsky (Rumania) and R. Grimm (Switzerland) spoke at the meeting. p. 196
- ⁵⁴ *Appeal to Reason*—an American socialist newspaper founded in Girard, Kansas, in 1895. While not officially connected with the American Socialist Party, the newspaper spread socialist ideas and was very popular among the workers. One of its contributors was the well-known American Socialist Eugene Debs. p. 198
- ⁵⁵ This article was written in reply to one by G. L. Pyatakow (P. Kievsky), "The Proletariat and the Right of Nations to Self-Determination in the Era of Finance Capital" (August 1916). Both articles were meant for No. 3 of *Sbornik Sotsial-Demokrata*, but due to financial difficulties it was not published. p. 202
- ⁵⁶ Lenin is alluding to the article "Miliz oder Abrüstung?" ("Militia or Disarmament?") by Henriette Roland-Holst, a Dutch Left-wing Social-Democrat, in the Swiss Social-Democratic journal *Neues Leben* (New Life) No. 10-11 (October-November) and No. 12 (December), 1915.

In referring to the Swiss Young Social-Democrats, Lenin has in mind chiefly the magazine *Jugend-Internationale* (The Youth International), organ of the International League of Socialist Youth Organisations, published in Switzerland; it spoke for the Left forces in the Swiss Social-Democratic Party. Issue No. 3 of the magazine carried an editorial "Volksheer oder Entwaffnung?" ("A People's Army or Disarmament?").

The attitude of the Scandinavian (Swedish and Norwegian) Left Social-Democrats on this issue was set out in articles by Karl Kilbom, "Swedish Social-Democracy and the World War", and Arvid Hansen, "Certain Aspects of the Present-Day Norwegian Labour Movement", both of which appeared in *Sbornik Sotsial-Demokrata* No. 2. p. 204

⁵⁷ Reference is to the article "Marxism and Revisionism" published in 1908 in the collection *Karl Marx, 1818-1883*. p. 216

⁵⁸ See Engels's article "Der Sozialismus in Deutschland" (Socialism in Germany). p. 217

⁵⁹ The first news of the February bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia reached Lenin on March 2 (15), 1917. Reports of the deposition of the tsar and the coming to power of the Octobrist-Cadet government of the capitalists and landowners were published in the Zurich newspapers.

By the evening of March 4 (17) Lenin had drawn up a rough draft of theses on the tasks of the proletariat in the Russian revolution. On the same day the theses were sent via Stockholm to Oslo for the Bolsheviks leaving for Russia. p. 218

⁶⁰ This appeal was published in *Pravda* No. 37 on April 21 (May 4), 1917 with the following introductory note by the editors: "*Fraternisation*. Fraternisation at the front has begun. The Minsk Front Congress resolution, published in our issue of April 15, calls for the publication in *German* and distribution in the enemy trenches of the Congress resolution on war and peace. We are publishing an appeal to the soldiers of *all* belligerent countries, adopted by our Party, which is to be published in Russian, German and other languages and circulated at the front." p. 229

⁶¹ This conference met in Petrograd on April 24-29 (May 7-12), 1917.

The conference was attended by 131 delegates with a vote and 18 delegates with voice but no vote from 78 Party organisations. There were also delegates from army organisations at the front and in the rear and the national organisations of Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Finland and Estonia. The conference fulfilled the functions of a Party congress; it worked out a political course for the Party and elected leading Party bodies.

The conference discussed the following questions: the current situation (the war and the Provisional Government, etc.); the peace conference; the attitude to the Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies; revision of the Party programme; the situation in the International and the tasks of the Party; unity of the Social-Democratic internationalist organisations; the agrarian question; the national question; the Constituent Assembly; the organisational question; reports from the regions; election of the Central Committee.

The conference was of historic significance: it adopted Lenin's plan for the transition to the second stage of the revolution in Russia, mapped out the programme of struggle for the growth of

the bourgeois-democratic revolution into a socialist revolution and advanced the demand for the transfer of all power to the Soviets. This slogan helped the Bolsheviks to prepare the masses for the proletarian revolution.

The conference elected the Central Committee with Lenin at the head. p. 244

- ⁶² Lenin delivered this lecture in the assembly hall of the Naval Officers' Training School in Petrograd. Over 2,000 people were present. The Bolshevik A. A. Antonov, former Commissar at the Obukhov Steel Works, wrote in his reminiscences: "The public was most varied. Though very few tickets were sent to the district and distributed, as far as I can remember, only among Party members, the number of those wishing to attend the lecture by far exceeded the capacity of the hall. Among those attending it there were many intellectuals, students, soldiers and officers. There being nothing to sit on, the audience remained standing. The listeners stood in a solid mass, the speaker's platform was rigged up at the other end of the hall, opposite the entrance. N. K. Krupskaya and M. I. Ulyanova were standing near the platform and N. I. Podvoisky was standing on the steps leading up to the platform.

"The lecture lasted for more than two hours. Lenin's appearance was greeted with stormy applause. The intentness with which people listened to the lecture was extraordinary."

The text of the lecture was long considered to be lost. Only many years later a transcript of the lecture in an unknown hand was found and forwarded to M. I. Ulyanova in the Lenin Institute. It was published in *Pravda* on April 23, 1929. p. 255

- ⁶³ See Karl von Clausewitz, *Vom Kriege* (On War), Bd. I, S. 28, Berlin, 1902. p. 256

- ⁶⁴ On the outbreak of the First World War Germany violated Belgium's neutrality and occupied the country in order to use her territory as a springboard for dealing a decisive blow to France. Belgium was occupied throughout the war. The country's economy was reduced to a pitiable plight and industry was dislocated. p. 262

- ⁶⁵ *Zemlya i Volya* (Land and Freedom)—a daily published by the Petrograd Regional Committee of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party from March 21 (April 3) to October 13 (26), 1917. p. 265

- ⁶⁶ *Civil list*—a part of state budget allocated in the constitutional monarchies for the personal needs of the monarch and the maintenance of his court. p. 270

- ⁶⁷ Reference is to the "Resolution on the Current Situation" adopted by the Seventh (April) All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.(B.). It was drawn up by Lenin. p. 273
- ⁶⁸ This refers to the replies of the French and British Governments to the Provisional Government's declaration of March 27 (April 9), 1917, published in the newspapers on May 28 (June 10). Both Notes expressed the hope of Russia's continued co-operation in the imperialist war until "victory is achieved". p. 281
- ⁶⁹ The Congress, held in Petrograd from June 3 to 24 (June 16-July 7), 1917, was attended by 1,090 delegates. The Menshevik-Socialist-Revolutionary bloc was in overwhelming majority. There were twelve items on the agenda, among them revolutionary democracy and state power, attitude towards the war, preparations for the convocation of the Constituent Assembly, the national question, the land question and others. Lenin spoke on the attitude towards the Provisional Government and on the war. The Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries in their speeches and resolutions advocated the continuation of the imperialist war and vigorously opposed the transfer of power to the Soviets. When the Menshevik Tsereteli said that there was no political party in Russia that would take over full power, Lenin retorted from his seat: "There is such a party!" In his speech from the platform he said that the Bolshevik Party "was prepared to take full power".

The Bolsheviks used the Congress to expose the imperialist policy of the Provisional Government and the compromising tactics of the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries. They laid bare the anti-popular, counter-revolutionary foreign policy of the Provisional Government and the imperialist character of the war and showed that the Provisional Government was unable to save the country from ruin. The Bolsheviks showed up the failure of the policy of compromise with the bourgeoisie and offered in their resolution that the transfer of full state power to the All-Russia Soviet of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies should be recognised as the only way out. In their resolutions the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries took a stand in support of the Provisional Government, approved of the offensive at the front which it was preparing and voted against transferring power to the Soviets.

p. 284

- ⁷⁰ This refers to the prohibition of the All-Ukraine Army Congress by Kerensky, the Provisional Government's War Minister. Despite the ban, the Congress met in Kiev from June 5 to 12 (18-25), 1917. p. 293
- ⁷¹ The term "gentlemen of June 3" applied to members of the Fourth Duma. It was elected in 1912 under the electoral law passed by the

tsarist government following the coup d'état on June 3 (16), 1907. The law gave the capitalist and landowner supporters of the monarchy an overwhelming majority in the Duma.

After the February 1917 revolution the members of the Fourth Duma periodically held so-called private meetings. One of these meetings took place on June 3 (16), 1917, that is, the day the All-Russia Congress of Soviets of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies was convened.

The meeting discussed foreign policy matters. V. A. Maklakov, P. N. Milyukov, V. V. Shulgin and other leaders of the counter-revolutionary parties insisted on the observance of the treaties with the Allies concluded by the tsar and continuation of the imperialist war until victory is achieved. The resolution adopted by the meeting said as much.

p. 299

⁷² This refers to the offensive at the front launched by the Provisional Government in June 1917 on the insistence of the Russian and Anglo-French imperialists, in defiance of the will of the workers and peasants who demanded an end to the war. Kerensky, the War Minister, ordered the offensive on June 16 (29). On June 18 (July 1) the Russian troops took the offensive on the South-Western Front, but suffered a crushing defeat, losing 60,000 officers and men in ten days.

p. 307

⁷³ This Congress was held in Petrograd on October 25 and 26 (November 7 and 8), 1917.

The Congress opened at 10.40 p.m. on October 25, while the Red Guard detachments, the sailors and revolutionary units of the Petrograd garrison were still storming the Winter Palace, where the Provisional Government had taken refuge under the protection of its shock troops and officer Cadets.

Shortly after 3.00 a.m., October 26 (November 8), the Congress heard a report on the capture of the Winter Palace and the arrest of the Provisional Government, and adopted an appeal "To Workers, Soldiers and Peasants!". It was written by Lenin, and proclaimed the transfer of power to the Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies. The sitting closed after 5.00 a.m.

The second sitting of the Congress, which opened at 9.00 p. m. the same day, heard Lenin's reports, and adopted the historic decrees on peace and land. It formed the workers' and peasants' government—the Council of People's Commissars—headed by Lenin.

p. 315

⁷⁴ The reference is to the belligerents in the First World War: the Entente (France, Britain, Russia, Italy, and the U.S.A. which joined them) and also Belgium, Serbia, Rumania, Japan and China; and

the Quadruple Alliance (Germany, Austria-Hungary, Turkey and Bulgaria). p. 315

⁷⁵ *The Chartist movement* in England—the mass revolutionary movement of the English workers in the 1830s and 1840s. The London Workingmen's Association was the guiding centre of the movement. In 1838 the leaders of the Association drew up a petition to Parliament (People's Charter) which demanded universal suffrage for men of 21 years of age, secret ballot, abolition of property qualifications for contestants, annual elections of Parliament, etc.

In 1840 the National Charter Association was founded, which was the first mass workers' party in the history of labour movement. On May 2, 1842, the Chartists submitted their second petition to Parliament with demands for shorter working hours, increase in wages, etc. Parliament declined the petition and the Chartists staged a general strike. The Chartists planned a mass march to Parliament in 1848 in order to submit the third petition, but government troops prevented it. It was many months before Parliament considered the petition, which it also declined.

After 1848 the Chartist movement began to decline. The Chartist movement exerted a tremendous influence on the international labour movement. Lenin described the movement as "the first broad, truly mass and politically organised proletarian revolutionary movement". p. 318

⁷⁶ *The Anti-Socialist Law* was introduced in Germany in 1878 by the Bismarck government to fight the working-class and socialist movement. The law banned all Social-Democratic organisations, mass working-class associations and the working-class press. However, these reprisals failed to break the Social-Democratic Party, which adapted itself to underground activity. Its influence over the masses grew steadily: from 1878 to 1890, the number of votes it polled in the Reichstag elections more than tripled. In 1890, the Anti-Socialist Law was abolished. p. 318

⁷⁷ The reference is to a manifesto issued by the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies to the peoples of the world; it was carried by the newspaper *Izvestia* No. 15, of the Petrograd Soviet, on March 15, 1917. p. 319

⁷⁸ The reference is to the revolutionary action by German sailors in August 1917. They were led by a revolutionary sailors' organisation numbering 4,000 members (late July 1917). The organisation decided to fight for a democratic peace and prepare for an uprising. Manifestations broke out in early August. Sailors of the warship

Prinzregent Luitpold, which was at Wilhelmshaven, took absence without leave to fight for the release of their comrades who had been arrested for striking. On August 16, the firemen of the *Westphalia* refused to work; at the same time the crew of the cruiser *Nürnberg*, which was out at sea, staged an uprising. The sailors' movement spread to the ships of several squadrons at Wilhelmshaven. The uprising was put down with great severity. Reichpietsch and Köbis, the leaders of the movement, were shot and active participants were sentenced to long terms of hard labour.

p. 320

- ⁷⁹ The English translation of the letter in a slightly abridged form appeared in December 1918 in the New York magazine *The Class Struggle* and the Boston weekly *The Revolutionary Age*, the organs of the Left wing of the American Socialist Party. John Reed and Sen Katayama were among the publishers of *The Revolutionary Age*. The letter evoked keen interest among readers and it was published as a pamphlet in a large number of copies. In the present edition it is published in full and contains the passages omitted in earlier publications.

The letter played an outstanding role in the development of the labour and communist movement in the U.S. and Europe. It helped advanced workers to appreciate the nature of imperialism and the great revolutionary changes effected by the Soviet government. Lenin's letter helped strengthen the protest movement in the U.S. against the armed intervention in Soviet Russia.

p. 337

- ⁸⁰ In 1898 the American imperialists landed their troops in the Philippines under cover of aid to the people who had overthrown the power of the Spanish colonialists and proclaimed an independent republic. Under the peace treaty signed in Paris on December 10, 1898, Spain ceded the Philippines to the U.S.A. In February 1899 the American imperialists opened hostilities against the Philippine Republic. Guerilla movement spread in the country. In 1901 the national liberation movement was suppressed and the Philippines became a colony of the U.S.A.

p. 338

- ⁸¹ In the spring and summer of 1917, under the impact of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia in February 1917, there was a mounting movement of protest in the French army against the continuation of the imperialist war. In mid-May, after the French offensive had failed and many thousands of French soldiers had been killed, a revolutionary movement began in the army. War-weary soldiers did not want to stay in the trenches and organised rallies demanding better conditions and cessation of the imperia-

list war. According to official data, the movement involved 75 infantry regiments, 23 rifle battalions and 12 artillery regiments. However, the soldiers were not prepared for consistent revolutionary action, one reason being the absence of a revolutionary working-class party in France at that time. The French Government quelled the revolutionary movement in the army with the help of the social-chauvinists and the anarchosyndicalist leaders.

Following this, Malvy, Minister of the Interior, was brought for trial on the charge of failure to deal firmly enough with the "defeatists".

p. 348

⁸² Lenin refers to the priest Gapon who organised a march of workers to the Winter Palace to submit a petition to the tsar on January 9, 1905. The tsar gave the order to open fire on the unarmed workers, their wives and children. Over 1,000 were killed and some 5,000 wounded. On the same day barricades were thrown up in Petrograd and there were skirmishes between workers, and the police and troops. January 9 marked the beginning of the first Russian revolution of 1905-07.

p. 349

⁸³ After the Red Army had defeated Kolchak and Denikin, the American press, expressing the mood of the business circles, twice asked Lenin for an interview. On February 18, 1920, Lenin gave an interview to Karl Wiegand, the Berlin correspondent of the American Universal Service agency. Lenin's replies were sent by radio to Berlin and from there transmitted to New York on February 21, 1920. On the same day Lenin's replies were published in *New York Evening Journal* under the title "Peace and More Trade—Bolshevist Aims, Lenin Says". Lenin's replies were reprinted in the German communist and socialist press.

p. 350

⁸⁴ This Congress, held in Moscow from December 23 to 28, 1921, was attended by 1,993 delegates.

The Congress summed up the first results of the New Economic Policy and approved the home and foreign policy of the workers' and peasants' government. The Declaration on the international position of the R.S.F.S.R. appealed to the governments of the other countries to proceed in their foreign policy from the principle of peaceful coexistence, "peaceful friendly existence side by side with the Soviet Republics".

The Congress focused its attention on the speedy rehabilitation of agriculture as a necessary condition for the development of the entire economy. It dwelt on the question of combating famine and urged the workers and peasants to do their utmost to help the starving population of the Volga area. The Congress expressed

"heartfelt gratitude to the workers of all countries who have come to the aid of the famine-stricken gubernias of Soviet Russia".

The Congress emphasised in its decisions that the rehabilitation and development of large-scale industry was, "alongside with agricultural rehabilitation, the basic task of the Republic". p. 355

⁸⁵ *Clarté* (Light)—a group of progressive writers and workers of culture formed by Henri Barbusse in 1919. It united the Association Republicaine des Anciens Combattants (Republican Association of Ex-Soldiers) and similar groups in other countries which later affiliated to it to form the Ex-Servicemen's International. The *Clarté* group included supporters of the Third International Henri Barbusse, Anatole France and Vaillant-Couturier and the pacifist writers Romain Rolland, Stefan Zweig, Herbert Wells, Thomas Hardy, Upton Sinclair, Jean Romain. The group published a monthly journal of the same name in Paris from October 1919 to January 1929.

Lenin's private library contains the manifesto of the group drawn up by Barbusse—the book *Light from Abyss. What the Clarté Group Wants to Achieve*, with the following presentation inscription: "To Lenin, the first to write the great unwritten laws, with profound respect, Henri Barbusse." p. 357

NAME INDEX

A

Abdul Hamid II (1842-1918)—Sultan of Turkey (1876-1909).—56, 61

Adler, Friedrich (1879-1960)—Austrian Social-Democrat. On October 21, 1916 assassinated Count Carl von Stürgkh, Prime Minister of Austria; was an organiser of the Centrist Two-and-a-Half International (1921-23), and subsequently a leader of the opportunist Socialist International.—275-76

Adler, Victor (1852-1918)—an organiser and leader of the Austrian Social-Democratic Party. During the First World War (1914-18) adopted a Centrist stand, preached "peace between classes" and opposed working-class revolutionary actions.—51-52, 60

Aehrenthal, Alois Lexa von (1854-1912)—Minister of Foreign Affairs of Austria-Hungary (1906-12); pursued an expansionist policy in the Balkans. Prepared and carried out the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina (1908), which worsened the relations be-

tween Austria-Hungary and Russia and brought about a crisis in international relations.—38

Alexander III (1845-1894)—Russian Emperor (1881-94).—217

Alexinsky, Grigory Alexeyevich (b. 1879)—Social-Democrat in the early period of his political career; during the First World War took a social-chauvinist stand and contributed to a number of bourgeois newspapers. In July 1917 worked with the military counter-intelligence and faked documents slandering Lenin and the Bolsheviks.—156

Andrieux—French worker, Secretary of the Metalworkers' Trade Union in the Loire Department; was active in the revolutionary trade union movement; late in 1917 was arrested by the French Government for propagating "defeatism" in the war and sent to the army in the field; in September 1919 was delegated to the Congress of the Metalworkers' Federation, which adopted a resolution protest-

ing against the foreign military intervention in Russia.—348

Armand, Inessa (1874-1920)—Russian Bolshevik and prominent figure in the world communist movement. During the First World War attended the International Socialist Women's Conference in 1915, the International Youth Conference held the same year, and the Zimmerwald and Kienthal conferences of internationalists.—215-16

Avramov, Stephan—Bulgarian Social-Democrat; in 1908 was a delegate from the Bulgarian Social-Democratic Party (Tesnyaki) at the session of the International Socialist Bureau.—51, 53, 56

Axelrod, Pavel Borisovich (1850-1928)—a leader of the Mensheviks. During the First World War adopted a social-chauvinist stand.—105, 112, 114, 120, 175, 186, 191-93

B

Badayev, Alexei Yegorovich (1883-1951)—Bolshevik; was a deputy to the Fourth Duma from the worker curia of St. Petersburg Gubernia. In 1914 was arrested, together with the other Bolshevik deputies in the Duma, and put on trial for revolutionary work directed against the imperialist war; in 1915 was exiled to Siberia.—158, 198

Bauer, Otto (1882-1938)—a

leader of the Austrian Social-Democratic Party and the Second International; ideologist of "Austro-Marxism" which rejected revolutionary Marxism behind a screen of Marxist terminology; evolved the bourgeois nationalist theory of "cultural-national autonomy"; Minister of Foreign Affairs (1918-19) in the Austrian bourgeois republic.—154

Bebel, August (1840-1913)—a prominent leader of the German Social-Democratic Party and international working-class movement. In 1890s and the early 1900s opposed reformism and revisionism in the German Social-Democratic movement.—12, 14-15, 24, 146, 198, 278

Bernstein, Eduard (1850-1932)—German Social-Democrat, ideologist of revisionism.—164

Bismarck, Otto Eduard, Prince (1815-1898)—statesman in Prussia and Germany; in 1871 forcibly united German lands into the German Empire under Prussian domination. Author of the Anti-Socialist Law (1878).—29, 72, 79

Bissolati, Leonida (1857-1920)—a founder of the Italian Socialist Party, headed its Right, reformist wing; in 1912 was expelled from the party and formed the Social-Reformist Party; during the First World War adopted a social-chauvinist stand and demanded that Italy enter the war on the

- side of the Entente; Minister without portfolio (1916-18).—187
- Borkheim, Sigismund Ludwig* (1825-1885)—German publicist, democrat; participant of the 1848-49 Revolution in Germany.—330
- Borodin, Mikhail Markovich* (1884-1951)—Russian Social-Democrat, Bolshevik; from 1907 to 1918 lived in America as a political émigré.—321
- Boulanger, Georges Ernest* (1837-1891)—General of the French Army, monarchist; War Minister (1886-87), worked to prepare a coup d'état in order to restore the monarchy in France, but was exposed and fled abroad.—217
- Branting, Karl Hjalmar* (1860-1925)—leader of the Social-Democratic Party of Sweden, one of the leaders of the Second International; during the First World War adopted a social-chauvinist stand.—61, 187
- Briand, Aristide* (1862-1932)—French statesman and diplomat; belonged to the Left wing of the Socialist Party but in 1902, after he was elected to Parliament, became a reactionary bourgeois politician, who was openly hostile to the working class.—22, 191
- Brouckère, Louis de* (1870-1951)—a leader and theoretician of the Belgian Workers' Party, who headed its Left wing prior to the First World War. Took a social-chauvinist stand during the First World War. Subsequently entered the government; was a Senator and Belgium's representative in the League of Nations.—60
- Bülow, Bernhard* (1849-1929)—German diplomat and statesman; came out with a programme of colonial expansion, which reflected the German imperialists' striving for world domination. At the outbreak of the First World War was Ambassador Extraordinary to Italy.—22
- Burns, John* (1858-1943)—British politician. In 1880s was a trade-union leader; participated in a number of strikes, including the big strike of dockers in 1889. In 1892 was elected to Parliament, where he opposed the interests of the working class and preached collaboration with the capitalists. From 1905 to 1914, President of the Local Government Board and Minister of Trade in 1914; in August 1914 resigned on account of his disagreement with the government's decision to enter the First World War.—53, 56

C

Chernov, Viktor Mikhailovich (*Gardenin, Y.*) (1876-1952)—one of the Socialist-Revolutionary leaders. During the First World War preached social-chauvinism behind Left phrases. In 1917 he was Mi-

nister of Agriculture in the bourgeois Provisional Government, pursued a policy of severe repressions against peasants who seized landed estates. After the October Socialist Revolution was one of the organisers of anti-Soviet revolts.—240, 299, 301, 304, 307-09

Chkheidze, Nikolai Semyonovich (1864-1926)—a Menshevik leader, deputy to the Third and Fourth Dumas; a Centrist during the First World War. After the bourgeois-democratic revolution of February 1917 actively supported the bourgeois Provisional Government as a leader of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies. Emigrated in 1921, after Soviet rule was established in Georgia.—94, 126, 156, 175, 187, 233, 240-41, 245

Cicero, Marcus Tullius (106-43 B.C.)—great Roman orator, statesman, lawyer and writer.—82

Clausewitz, Karl (1780-1831)—Prussian general, a distinguished military theoretician; took part in wars against Napoleon as a staff officer of the Prussian army (1806, 1814, 1815) and of the Russian army (1812-14). Wrote books on the history of the Napoleonic and other wars.—141, 256, 260

Clemenceau, Georges Benjamin (1841-1929)—French politician and statesman, leader of the Radical Party for many years;

an ideologist of French imperialism. Upon his return to the post of Prime Minister in November 1917, established a military dictatorship, was one of the instigators and organisers of armed intervention against Soviet Russia.—22, 38, 42

Cromer, Evelyn Baring, Earl (1841-1917)—British reactionary statesman; British Resident in Egypt after that country was occupied by the British in 1882. While making out that power was in the hands of the local authorities, established a despotic colonial regime. That system became known as the "Cromer regime".—21

Cunow, Heinrich (1862-1936)—German Right-wing Social-Democrat, historian, sociologist and ethnographer. During the First World War was a theoretician of social-imperialism.—114-15, 117, 119

D

David, Eduard (1863-1930)—a Right-wing revisionist leader of the German Social-Democratic Party. During the First World War took a social-chauvinist stand. In 1915, in *Social-Democracy in the World War* came out in defence of the opportunist policy of the Right wing of German Social-Democracy.—111, 121-25, 145, 188, 191-94

Debs, Eugene Victor (1855-1926)—prominent figure in the

- American working-class movement; one of the organisers of the Socialist Party. During the First World War championed internationalism; sharply condemned the treachery of the social-chauvinists; came out against U.S. participation in the war. Welcomed the victory of the October Socialist Revolution. In 1918 was sentenced to ten years' imprisonment for anti-imperialist propaganda, but was pardoned in 1921.—198, 278
- Delaisi, Francis* (b. 1873)—French economist, Syndicalist, pacifist. In his works he exposed the domination of the financial oligarchy and the predatory nature of the First World War. At the same time, opposed the class struggle and revolutionary internationalism, and advocated the theory of "social solidarity". He advanced a utopian programme of class collaboration between the trade unions and the capitalists' syndicates, and the creation on this basis of a "United States of the World" as a guarantee against competition, crisis and war.—113
- Deutsch, L. G.* (1855-1941)—Russian Social-Democrat. After the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. a Menshevik, and during the years of reaction became a liquidator. Was a social-chauvinist during the First World War.—242
- Dumas, Charles* (1883-1914)—journalist and publicist, member of the Socialist Party of France. During the First World War was a social-chauvinist.—111
- E
- Edward VII* (1841-1910)—King of Great Britain (1901-10)—38, 56
- Engels, Frederick* (1820-1895)—29, 53, 81, 122, 141, 145-46, 152, 155, 178, 189-90, 217, 330-35
- F
- Ferdinand I (Coburg)* (1861-1948)—Tsar of Bulgaria (1908-18), a scion of German princes. His policy led to the outbreak of the Second Balkan War (1913) and drove Bulgaria into the First World War as an ally of Germany. In 1918, abdicated following a mutiny in the Bulgarian army, and fled to Germany.—38
- Fischer, Richard* (1855-1926)—German Social-Democrat, publisher and manager of *Vorwärts*, the Party central organ.—33
- Franz-Joseph I* (1830-1916)—Austrian Emperor (1848-1916).—37-38, 56
- G
- Glazier, John Bruce* (1859-1920)—British socialist, a founder of the Labour Party; Chairman of the National Council of the Independent Labour Party (1899-1900).—50, 54-55, 57

- Golay, Paul*—Swiss Social-Democrat. At the outbreak of the First World War opposed the opportunists and social-chauvinists of the Second International, but subsequently became a Centrist and pacifist.—149, 161-69
- Gorky, Maxim (Peshkov, Alexei Maximovich)* (1868-1936)—Russian writer, initiator of Soviet literature.—219-20
- Gorter, Herman* (1864-1927)—Dutch Left Social-Democrat, one of the founders of the newspaper *De Tribune*, organ of the Left wing of the Social-Democratic Labour Party of Holland. During the First World War adopted an internationalist stand, supported the Zimmerwald Left group.—150
- Greulich, Hermann* (1842-1925)—a founder of the Swiss Social-Democratic Party, leader of its Right wing, journalist; during the First World War was a social-chauvinist.—187
- Grey, Edward* (1862-1933)—British diplomat and statesman, helped to prepare the First World War; concluded a number of secret agreements with Britain's allies on a re-division of the world.—84
- Grimm, Robert* (1881-1958)—a leader of the Swiss Social-Democratic Party; was a Centrist during the First World War; participated in the work of the Zimmerwald and Kienthal conferences, was Chairman of the International Socialist Commission.—181, 200-01
- Guchkov, Alexander Ivanovich* (1862-1936)—big Russian capitalist, leader of the Octobrist Party; during the First World War was Chairman of the Central War Industry Committee and member of the Special Conference on Defence. After the bourgeois-democratic revolution of February 1917 was War and Navy Minister in the first bourgeois Provisional Government. After the October Socialist Revolution fought against Soviet power.—220-23, 233-35, 237, 239, 241, 243, 308
- Guesde, Jules* (1845-1922)—one of the organisers and leaders of the French socialist movement and the Second International. When the First World War broke out, he took a social-chauvinist stand and became a member of the bourgeois government of France.—12, 14, 51, 60, 101, 105, 110-11, 172-73, 180, 185-86, 213
- Guillaume, James* (1844-1916)—anarchist, associate of Bakunin, one of the organisers and leaders of the Bakuninist underground Alliance of Socialist Democracy, promoted the latter's activities aimed at splitting and disrupting the First International and slandering its leaders, Marx and Engels. At the outbreak of the First World War adopted a social-chauvinist stand.—145
- Gurevich, Emmanuil Lvovich* (b. 1865)—Russian Social-De-

mocrat, Menshevik; a liquidator in the period of tsarist reaction and the years of the revolutionary revival (1907-12). During the First World War adopted a social-chauvinist stand.—75

H

Haase, Hugo (1863-1919)—one of the leaders of the German Social-Democratic Party; from 1912 Chairman of the Social-Democratic group in the Reichstag; during the First World War was a Centrist. In 1917, together with Karl Kautsky founded the Independent Social-Democratic Party of Germany.—105

Hardie, James Keir (1856-1915)—prominent figure in the British labour movement, a reformist leader of the Independent Labour Party and a founder of the Labour Party. When the First World War broke out adopted a Centrist stand, but subsequently joined the social-chauvinists.—84

Hervé, Gustave (1871-1944)—French socialist; in 1906 founded the newspaper *La Guerre Sociale*, in which he advocated a semi-anarchist programme of struggle against militarism. Was a social-chauvinist during the First World War. In 1918 was expelled from the Socialist Party of France.—11, 14-15, 24-27, 124

Hindenburg, Paul (1847-1934)—German military and political

figure; Field Marshal, Commander-in-Chief of the German army on the Eastern front during the First World War; President of the Weimar Republic (1925-34); in 1933 authorised Hitler to form a government.—129, 134

Huysmans, Camille (1871-1968)—a veteran of the labour movement in Belgium, Secretary of the International Socialist Bureau of the Second International (1904-19). In the First World War adopted a Centrist stand. Subsequently was a leader in the restored Second International and held ministerial posts in the Belgian Government; Prime Minister (1946-47); came out repeatedly for the establishment of contacts between socialist parties and the C.P.S.U. and the restoration of unity in the international working-class movement.—48

Hyndman, Henry Mayers (1842-1921)—British reformist socialist, an organiser of the British Socialist Party. In 1916 withdrew from the party, after the Party Conference in Salford condemned his social-chauvinist stand with regard to the imperialist war.—50, 53, 55-56, 101, 105, 110-11, 113, 172, 188, 192

I

Iordansky, Nikolai Ivanovich (1876-1928)—Russian Social-Democrat, Menshevik; a chauvinist during the First World

War. After the October Socialist Revolution joined the R.C.P.(B.).-93

Izvol'sky, Alexander Petrovich (1856-1919)-Russian diplomat, Foreign Minister (1906-10); subsequently Ambassador to Paris. After the October Socialist Revolution came out in support of the armed intervention against Soviet Russia.-38, 42-43

J

Jaurès, Auguste Marie Joseph Jean (1859-1914)-outstanding figure in the French and international socialist movement, historian, founder of the French Socialist Party. Founded and edited *L'Humanité* (from 1904 to the end of his life). Tirelessly championed democratic rights and liberties, peace; opposed imperialist oppression and wars of conquest. At the same time adopted a reformist stand on a number of important issues, for which he was sharply criticised by Lenin.

The imperialist bourgeoisie hated him for his struggle for peace, against the threat of war. On the eve of the First World War he was assassinated by a hireling of the reactionaries.-12, 29, 32, 60

Joffre, Joseph-Jacques Césaire (1852-1931)-Marshal, represented French imperialist circles. At the beginning of the First World War he was Com-

mander-in-Chief of the French army; was one of the organisers of the armed intervention against Soviet Russia.-129, 134

Jouhaux, Léon (1879-1954)-reformist leader in the French and international trade union movement; a chauvinist during the First World War.-179
Junius-see Luxemburg, Rosa.

K

Kamenev (Rosenteld), Lev Borisovich (1883-1936)-joined the R.S.D.L.P. in 1901. Following the bourgeois-democratic revolution of February 1917 opposed the Party's Leninist course towards the socialist revolution. In 1926 was one of the leaders of the anti-Party Trotsky-Zinoviev bloc, and in 1934 was expelled from the Party for anti-Party activity.-93

Kautsky, Karl (1854-1938)-one of the leaders of the German Social-Democratic Party and of the Second International. During the First World War he advocated Centristism, covering up his social-chauvinism with internationalist phrases. Advanced the reactionary theory of ultra-imperialism.-27, 29-30, 50-52, 54-56, 62-63, 81, 91, 100-01, 104-05, 110-15, 117, 119-21, 127, 144-45, 149, 152, 164, 166-67, 172-73, 178, 181-82, 184-86, 189-93, 195

Koren'sky, Alexander Fyodorovich (1881-1970)-Socialist-Re-

volutionary, deputy to the Fourth Duma. After the bourgeois-democratic revolution of February 1917 he entered the bourgeois Provisional Government as Minister of Justice, later as Minister for War and Navy, finally becoming Prime Minister and Supreme Commander-in-Chief. After the October Socialist Revolution fought against the Soviet state; fled from the country in 1918.—303-04, 314

Kievsky, P.—see *Pyatakov, Georgi Leonidovich.*

Kitchener, Horatio Herbert (1850-1916)—Field Marshal, a representative of the British imperialist militarists. Secretary for War during the First World War.—129

Kolb, Wilhelm (1870-1918)—German Social-Democrat, opportunist and revisionist, editor of *Volkstreund*; social-chauvinist during the First World War.—192-93

Konovalov, Alexander Ivanovich (b. 1875)—big Russian textile industrialist, deputy to the Fourth Duma. After the bourgeois-democratic revolution of February 1917 was Minister of Trade and Industry, later Deputy Prime Minister in the bourgeois Provisional Government.—234, 270-71, 273

Krichevsky, Boris Naumovich (1866-1919)—Social-Democrat, a leader of the Economists at the end of the 1890s.—192

Krylenko, Nikolai Vasilyevich (1885-1938)—Russian Social-Democrat, Bolshevik. After the October Socialist Revolution, Commander-in-Chief of the Red Army. From 1918 he worked in the judiciary.—322

L

Latontaine, Henri (1854-1943)—Belgian socialist, professor in international law at Brussels University, senator. In 1921 attended the League of Nations as a delegate from Belgium.—61

Lassalle, Ferdinand (1825-1864)—German socialist, one of the founders of the General Association of German Workers (1863). The formation of the Association was a step forward in the working-class movement, but Lassalle, who was elected its president, led it along the road of opportunism.

The theoretical and political mistakes of the Lassalleans were severely criticised by Marx and Engels.—122

Ledebour, Georg (1850-1947)—German Social-Democrat, deputy to the Reichstag (1900 to 1918). Took part in the International Socialist Congress in Stuttgart, where he came out against colonialism. During the First World War participated in the Zimmerwald Conference; was one of the leaders of the Zimmerwald Rights.—62-63

- Legien, Carl von* (1861-1920)—German Right-wing Social-Democrat, a revisionist leader of the German trade union movement. During the First World War adopted a social-chauvinist stand.—32, 187-89, 191-92, 195
- Lensch, Paul* (1873-1926)—German Social-Democrat. Was a social-chauvinist during the First World War. After the war was Editor-in-Chief of *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung*, the mouthpiece of the Ruhr industrialists. In 1922 was expelled from the Social-Democratic Party.—117, 145
- Liebknecht, Karl* (1871-1919)—outstanding figure of the German and international working-class movement; one of the leaders of German Left-wing Social-Democracy. Resolutely opposed Kaiser Wilhelm's government in the First World War. On December 2, 1914, was the only deputy in the Reichstag to vote against war credits. In 1916 was sentenced to penal servitude for anti-war propaganda. One of the founders of the Communist Party of Germany and leader of the Berlin workers during the uprising in January 1919. Was murdered by reactionaries.—26, 109, 146, 190, 193, 275-76, 280
- Liebknecht, Wilhelm* (1826-1900)—prominent leader of the German and international working-class movement, one of the founders and leaders of the German Social-Democratic Party; was active in the work of the First International and took part in founding the Second International.—137
- Lloyd George, David* (1863-1945)—British statesman, Liberal Party leader, Prime Minister (1916-22). After the October Socialist Revolution was one of the organisers of the armed intervention and then of the economic blockade against Soviet Russia.—189, 191, 307-08
- Longuet, Jean* (1876-1938)—one of the leaders of the French Socialist Party and the Second International. During the First World War headed the Centrist pacifist minority in the French Socialist Party. In 1914 and 1924 was elected to the Chamber of Deputies; condemned the foreign military intervention against Soviet Russia.—346
- Lubersac, Jean de*—French officer, monarchist; member of the French military mission to Russia in 1917-18.—342
- Luxemburg, Rosa* (1871-1919)—prominent figure in the international working-class movement; Left-wing leader of the Second International; one of the founders of the Polish Social-Democratic Party, was active in the German Social-Democratic movement. On the outbreak of the First World War adopted an internationalist stand. During the German Revolution of November 1918 was one of the leaders of the

- revolutionary vanguard of the German workers: one of the founders of the German Communist Party and leader of the Berlin workers during the uprising in January 1919. After the suppression of the uprising was murdered by counter-revolutionaries.—12, 15, 113, 124, 200
- Luzzatti, Luigi* (1841-1927)—Italian statesman, lawyer and economist; one of the leaders of the Right "Liberal bloc" of industrial monopolists and big landowners in Italy. Supported Italian fascism.—82
- Lvov, Georgi Yevgenyevich* (1861-1925)—big Russian landowner, member of the Constitutional-Democratic Party. After the bourgeois-democratic revolution of February 1917 chairman of the Council of Ministers and Minister of the Interior in the bourgeois Provisional Government. After the October Socialist Revolution, took part in organising the foreign armed intervention against Soviet Russia.—221, 226, 239
- Lyakhov, Vladimir Platonovich* (1869-1919)—colonel of the tsarist army; when in Teheran in 1907, organised reprisals against Iranian revolutionaries. During the First World War was Governor-General of the zone of the Turkish Black Sea coast.—42-43, 271
- Lysis, Eugène*—French economist; author of several books on financial and political questions.—261
- M
- MacDonald, James Ramsay* (1866-1937)—British politician, one of the founders and leaders of the Labour Party; adopted a pacifist stand on the outbreak of the First World War, later openly supported the imperialist bourgeoisie. In 1924 became Prime Minister in the first Labour Government.—54
- Maddison, Fred* (1856-1937)—British socialist. In 1886 Chairman of the Congress of Trade Unions; MP.—32
- Maklakov, Vasily Alexeyevich* (b. 1870)—Russian landowner, member of the Constitutional-Democratic Party, deputy to the Duma. After the bourgeois-democratic revolution of February 1917, Ambassador of the Russian bourgeois Provisional Government in Paris.—285, 302-04
- Martov, L. (Tsederbaum, Yuli Osipovich)* (1873-1923)—Menshevik leader; during the First World War adopted a Centrist stand. After the February bourgeois-democratic revolution of 1917 headed a group of Menshevik internationalists.—15, 82
- Martynov (Picker), Alexander Samoilovich* (1865-1935)—one of the leaders of the Economists, later a Menshevik. During the First World War adopted

- a Centrist stand. After the October Socialist Revolution broke with the Mensheviks and joined the Communist Party.—192
- Marx, Karl* (1818-1883)—29, 78, 80, 112, 122, 133, 135, 141, 145-46, 151, 155, 178, 180, 191, 216-17, 334
- Maslov, Pyotr Pavlovich* (1867-1946)—Russian Social-Democrat, Menshevik; wrote a number of works on the agrarian question in which he tried to revise Marxism; was a social-chauvinist during the First World War.—75
- Mehring, Franz* (1846-1919)—outstanding figure in the German working-class movement; leader and theoretician of the Left wing in German Social-Democracy; historian, journalist and literary critic. He became one of the leaders of the revolutionary Spartacus League and played an important role in the foundation of the Communist Party of Germany.—113
- Merrheim, Alphonse* (1881-1925)—French trade-unionist, Syndicalist; when the First World War broke out, was a Left-wing leader of the Syndicalist movement in France; took part in the Zimmerwald Conference, but later became an open social-chauvinist and reformist.—179
- Millerand, Alexandre Etienne* (1859-1943)—French politician; in the 1890s joined the socialists. In 1899 entered the reactionary government of Waldeck-Rousseau and collaborated with General Galliffet, the hangman of the Paris Commune. In 1909-10, 1912-13, and 1914-15, was a member of the French Government.—180
- Milyukov, Pavel Nikolayevich* (1859-1943)—leader of the Cadet Party, ideologist of the Russian imperialist bourgeoisie, historian and publicist. After the bourgeois-democratic revolution of February 1917 was Foreign Minister in the bourgeois Provisional Government and pursued an imperialist policy of "war to a victorious end"; in August 1917 was one of the instigators of the counter-revolutionary Kornilov revolt. After the October Socialist Revolution resided abroad as an émigré and became one of the organisers of the armed intervention against Soviet Russia.—39, 191, 220-23, 233-35, 237, 239, 241, 243, 245, 260, 269-70, 285, 289, 302-03, 308
- Molkenbuhr, Hermann* (1851-1927)—German Social-Democrat, a chauvinist during the First World War; after the November 1918 Revolution in Germany was elected to the Berlin Executive Committee of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies where he pursued a policy of collaboration with the counter-revolutionary bourgeois government.—62
- Monitor*—pseudonym of an opportunist German Social-De-

mocrat who published an article in the conservative *Preussische Jahrbücher* in April 1915, in which he proposed that the Centrist stand of the Social-Democratic parties be maintained in the future as it enabled the opportunists to conceal their policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie under cover of "Left" phrases.—189-90

Muranov, Matvei Konstantinovich (1873-1959)—Bolshevik, worker, deputy to the Fourth Duma. In 1914, together with other Bolshevik deputies was arrested for revolutionary activity directed against the imperialist war and exiled to Siberia in 1915.—95-96, 98, 158, 198

N

Napoleon I (Bonaparte) (1769-1821)—Emperor of France (1804-14 and 1815).—327

Napoleon III (Louis Napoleon) (1808-1873)—Emperor of France (1852-70), nephew of Napoleon I.—136, 145

Naumann, Friedrich (1860-1919)—German reactionary politician. During the First World War adopted an imperialist stand, advocating the setting up of a "Middle Europe" under the aegis of Germany, which implied the seizure of the countries of Central Europe.—191

Nicholas I (1796-1855)—Russian Emperor (1825-55).—42, 136

Nicholas II (1868-1918)—the last Russian Emperor (1894 to the bourgeois-democratic revolution of February 1917).—42, 72, 129, 221, 223, 230, 233, 237, 243-44, 246, 268, 270, 274-75, 287-89, 299, 302, 332

Noske, Gustav (1868-1946)—an opportunist leader of the German Social-Democratic Party; a social-chauvinist during the First World War; War Minister (1919-20). Organised reprisals against the Berlin workers and the assassination of Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg after the uprising of 1918.—24-25, 27

P

Pannekoek, Anton (A.P.) (1873-1960)—Dutch Social-Democrat; one of the founders of *De Tribune*, organ of the Left wing of the Dutch Social-Democratic Labour Party. During the First World War championed internationalism, took part in the publication of *Vorbote*, the theoretical journal of the Zimmerwald Left; was a member of the Communist Party of the Netherlands in 1918-21.—115, 124, 129-30, 150

Pernerstorfer, Engelbert (1850-1918)—Austrian Social-Democrat; a chauvinist during the First World War.—61

Petrovsky, Grigory Ivanovich (1878-1958)—Russian Social-Democrat, Bolshevik, a deputy to the Fourth Duma, later prominent figure of the C.P.S.U.

and of the Soviet state. In November 1914 was arrested together with other Bolshevik deputies for revolutionary activity directed against the imperialist war and exiled to Siberia in 1915.—94-96, 98, 158, 198

Plekhanov, Georgi Valentinovich (1856-1918)—outstanding leader of the Russian and international working-class movement, author of a number of works on the theory of Marxism, founder of the Emancipation of Labour group, the first Russian Marxist organisation; after the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. (1903) a Menshevik. During the First World War was a social-chauvinist. After the bourgeois-democratic revolution of February 1917 returned to Russia, led the *Yedinstvo* group of extreme Right-wing Mensheviks.—75, 82, 99, 101, 105, 110, 112-113, 117, 119-20, 142, 145, 149, 152, 166, 172-73, 178, 186, 188, 193, 241-42, 254, 310

Poincaré, Raymond (1860-1934)—French reactionary politician, Prime Minister (1912, 1922-24, 1926-29), President of the French Republic (1913-20); was one of the instigators of the imperialist war, of whom people said "*Poincaré c'est la guerre*". Was one of the organisers of the armed intervention against Soviet Russia.—72

Pugachov, Yemelyan Ivanovich (c. 1744-1775)—leader of the

peasant uprising in Russia in 1773-75.—41

Pyatakov, Georgi Leonidovich (1890-1937)—member of the Bolshevik Party from 1910. After the October Socialist Revolution held responsible posts. During the Brest peace negotiations, a "Left Communist". In 1936 was expelled from the Party for anti-Party activity.—202-06, 209-13

R

Radek, Karl (1885-1939)—joined the Social-Democratic movement in Galicia, Poland and Germany at the turn of the century; held internationalist views during the First World War. Joined the Bolshevik Party in 1917; was a "Left Communist" at the time of the peace talks at Brest. In 1923 joined the Trotsky opposition. In 1936 was expelled from the Party for anti-Party activity.—115, 124, 200

Rakovsky, Christian Georgiyevich (1873-1941)—participated in the Social-Democratic movement in Bulgaria, Rumania, Switzerland and France early in the 1890s; a Centrist during the First World War; joined the Bolshevik Party in 1917. After the October Socialist Revolution held responsible Party and Soviet posts. In 1938 was expelled from the Party for anti-Party activity.—150

Rasputin (Novykh), Grigory Yefimovich (1872-1916)—adven-

- turer, exercised great influence on state affairs under Nicholas II. He was a peasant from Tobolsk Gubernia, Siberia. Posing as a clairvoyant and healer, he became a favourite of the tsar's family in 1907. The Rasputin phenomenon was typical of the obscurantism, wild fanaticism and moral degradation of the ruling upper classes in tsarist Russia. Rasputin was assassinated in Petrograd by a group of monarchists, who tried in this way to save the autocracy and halt the growing revolution.—233, 275
- Reclus, Élisée* (1830-1905)—French geographer, ethnographer and politician.—41
- Renaudel, Pierre* (1871-1935)—one of the reformist leaders in the French Socialist Party; a social-chauvinist during the First World War.—189
- Renner, Karl* (1870-1950)—leader and theoretician of the Austrian Right-wing Social-Democrats, ideologist of so-called "Austro-Marxism", one of the authors of the theory of "cultural-national autonomy". During the First World War was a social-chauvinist; Chancellor (1919-20) and President of Austria (1945-50).—154
- Ribot, Alexandre Félix Joseph* (1842-1928)—French statesman, Prime Minister of France (1892-93, 1895 and 1917), held portfolios in several governments.—308
- Roland-Holst, Henriette* (1869-1952)—Dutch socialist, authoress. An internationalist during the First World War, took part in the publication of *Vorbote*, the theoretical journal of the Zimmerwald Left. Member of the Communist Party of the Netherlands in 1918-27; participated in the work of the Comintern.—150, 204
- Romanovs*—dynasty of Russian tsars and emperors who reigned from 1613 to 1917.—348
- Rosenteld, L.B.*—see *Kamenev, Lev Borisovich*.
- Roussel, Angèle*—French socialist, from 1907 to 1912 member of the administrative commission of the French Socialist Party.—50-53
- Rubanovich, Ilya Adol'tovich* (1860-1920)—a leader of the Socialist-Revolutionary Party; social-chauvinist during the First World War.—51, 53, 60, 175

S

- Sadoul, Jacques* (1881-1956)—officer of the French army; in 1917 was sent to Russia as a member of the French military mission. Under the influence of the October Socialist Revolution became a Communist, joined the French section of the R.C.P.(B.) and volunteered into the Red Army. Published ardent protests against the Entente imperialists' armed intervention

- against Soviet Russia. Took part in the work of the First Congress of the Comintern. For his revolutionary activity he was sentenced to death *in absentia* by a French court-martial, but upon his return to France (in 1924) was reinstated in his rights.—342
- Samoilov, Fyodor Nikitich* (1882-1952)—Bolshevik worker, deputy to the Fourth Duma. In 1914 was arrested together with other Bolshevik deputies for revolutionary activity directed against the imperialist war, and exiled to Siberia in 1915.—158, 198
- Sattar Khan* (c. 1870-1914)—leader of the democratic movement of Iranian Azerbaijan, active participant in the Iranian revolution of 1905-11; in 1908-09 headed the people's uprising in Tabriz against the Shah and Azerbaijan feudal lords.—41
- Scheidemann, Philipp* (1865-1939)—one of the leaders of the opportunist Right wing in the German Social-Democracy, social-chauvinist during the First World War. From February till June 1919 headed the Coalition Government of the Weimar Republic; from 1918 to 1921 brutally suppressed the German working-class movement.—105
- Schippel, Max* (1859-1929)—German Social-Democrat, revisionist. While a deputy to the Reichstag (1890-1905) upheld the expansionist policy of German imperialism; a social-chauvinist during the First World War.—40, 41
- Schmiidt, Robert* (1864-1943)—German Social-Democrat, repeatedly elected to the Reichstag.—164
- Schoen, Wilhelm Eduard, von* (1851-1933)—German diplomat, Ambassador to France in 1910-14.—38
- Sembat, Marcel* (1862-1922)—a reformist leader of the French Socialist Party; a social-chauvinist during the First World War; Minister of Public Works (August 1914-September 1917) in the French Government. In February 1915 attended the London conference of socialists of the Entente countries.—105, 189
- Semkovsky, (Bronstein) Semyon Yulyevich* (b. 1882)—Social-Democrat, Menshevik; a member of the editorial board of Trotsky's *Pravda* published in Vienna; contributed to Menshevik-liquidator periodicals and to foreign Social-Democratic publications. During the First World War advocated Centrist views.—125, 127
- Shagov, Nikolai Romanovich* (1882-1918)—Russian Social-Democrat, Bolshevik, deputy to the Fourth Duma. In November 1914 was arrested for revolutionary activity directed against the imperialist war, and exiled to Siberia in 1915.—158, 198
- Shingaryov, Andrei Ivanovich* (1869-1918)—a leader of the

Constitutional-Democratic Party, prominent Zemstvo figure, publicist. He was a deputy to the Second, Third and Fourth Dumas. After the bourgeois democratic revolution of February 1917 was Minister of Agriculture and later Minister of Finance in the bourgeois Provisional Government.—241

Shlyapnikov, Alexander Gavrilovich (1885-1937)—member of the R.S.D.L.P. from 1901; after the October Socialist Revolution held trade union and executive posts. Organised and led the anti-Party "Workers' Opposition" group in 1920-22; in 1933 was expelled from the Party during the purge.—156

Shulgin, Vasily Vitalyevich (b. 1878)—a leader of the monarchists, deputy to the Second, Third and Fourth Dumas. After the October Socialist Revolution was one of the organisers of the counter-revolutionary whiteguard Volunteer Army. Following its defeat emigrated abroad and continued to carry on the struggle against Soviet rule. In his letter to Russian Émigrés in 1960, exhorted them to give up the struggle against Soviet rule.—272

Skobelev, Matvei Ivanovich (1885-1939)—Russian Social-Democrat, Menshevik; deputy to the Fourth Duma; a Centrist during the First World War; after the bourgeois-democratic revolution of Februa-

ry 1917 Minister of Labour in the bourgeois Provisional Government. Following the October Socialist Revolution, broke with the Mensheviks; joined the R.C.P.(B.) in 1922 and occupied various managerial posts.—233, 272-73, 304

Smirnov, E.—see *Gurevich, Emmanuel Lvovich*.

Sonnino, Giorgio Sidney (1847-1924)—Italian statesman and diplomat, Prime Minister (1906, 1909-10), Foreign Minister (1914-19). Signed the London Treaty with the Entente in 1915, which provided for considerable territorial compensation to Italy, mainly at the expense of the South-Slav possessions of Austria-Hungary. In 1917 signed a treaty with Britain and France which sanctioned the annexation by Italy of considerable territories and the establishment of spheres of influence in Asia Minor.—308

Sorge, Friedrich Adolf (1828-1906)—German socialist, prominent figure in the international working-class and socialist movement, participant in the German Revolution of 1848-49. After the defeat of the revolution emigrated to the U.S.A. Organised sections of the First International in America; took an active part in the foundation of the American Socialist Workers' Party and of the International Workers' Union.—53, 190

Spartacus (d. 71 B.C.)—leader of one of the biggest slave uprisings in Rome in 74 (or 73)-71 B.C.—344

Steklov, Yuri Mikhailovich (1873-1941)—Russian Social-Democrat; became a Bolshevik after the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. (1903). Following the bourgeois-democratic revolution of February 1917 advocated "revolutionary defensism", later went over to the Bolsheviks. After the October Socialist Revolution was editor of the newspaper *Izvestia*.—233

Stolypin, Pyotr Arkadyevich (1862-1911)—reactionary statesman of tsarist Russia, Minister of the Interior and Chairman of the Council of Ministers from 1906 to 1911. His name is associated with a period of harsh political reaction, during which death penalty was widely resorted to with the aim of suppressing the revolutionary movement. He introduced an agrarian reform in order to form a mainstay of the autocracy in the Russian countryside in the person of the kulaks.—299, 302-03

Südekum, Albert (1871-1944)—revisionist, opportunist leader of the German Social-Democratic Party. During the First World War advocated social-chauvinism; Minister of Finance of Prussia (1918-20). His name epitomised extreme opportunism and social-chauvinism.—82, 117, 178, 192

T

Tereshchenko, Mikhail Ivanovich (b. 1888)—owner of big sugar refineries in Russia, millionaire; after the bourgeois-democratic revolution of February 1917 was Minister of Finance and then Foreign Minister in the bourgeois Provisional Government; pursued the imperialist policy of continuing the war "to a victorious end".—234, 269-71, 273

Tittoni, Tommaso (1855-1931)—Italian statesman and diplomat; Minister of Foreign Affairs, represented Italy in 1919 at the Paris Peace Conference.—38

Troelstra, Pieter Jelles (1860-1930)—a leader of the Dutch working-class movement, Right socialist, social-chauvinist of pro-German orientation during the First World War.—102, 104-05, 187

Trotsky (Bronstein), Lev Davidovich (1879-1940)—joined the R.S.D.L.P. in 1897, Menshevik; upheld Centrist views during the First World War. After the bourgeois-democratic revolution of February 1917 was admitted into the Bolshevik Party. After the October Socialist Revolution held the posts of People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs and Chairman of the Revolutionary Military Council of the Republic; in 1918 opposed the conclusion of peace at Brest-Litovsk. During the discussion

on the trade unions in 1920-21 led the opposition; from 1923 conducted a vigorous factional struggle against the general line of the Party, claiming that socialism could not triumph in the U.S.S.R. In 1927 was expelled from the Party and in 1929 banished from the U.S.S.R. for anti-Soviet activity.—150, 323

Tsereteli, Irakly Georgiyevich (1882-1959)—a Menshevik leader; a Centrist during the First World War; after the bourgeois-democratic revolution of February 1917 entered the bourgeois Provisional Government as Minister of Post and Telegraph and later as Minister of the Interior. After the October Socialist Revolution was one of the leaders of the counter-revolutionary Menshevik government in Georgia.—226, 240-41, 245, 299-302, 304, 307-09

V

Vaillant, Edouard Marie (1840-1915)—French socialist, member of the General Council of the First International and participant of the Paris Commune in 1871, subsequently one of the leaders of the Second International. During the First World War adopted a social-chauvinist stand.—50, 56, 60, 124

Van Kol, Henrik Hubert (1851-1925)—one of the founders (1894) and leaders of the So-

cial-Democratic Labour Party of Holland. At the Second International Congress in Amsterdam (1904) and Stuttgart (1907) championed the opportunist resolution on the colonial question, which justified the enslavement of the colonial peoples on the pretext that imperialism played a "civilising role".—57, 61-63

Vandervelde, Emile (1866-1938)—leader of the Belgian Workers' Party, Chairman of the International Socialist Bureau of the Second International. During the First World War adopted a social-chauvinist stand and entered the bourgeois government of Belgium where he held various portfolios.—101, 105, 113, 172, 182, 192

Vodovozov, V. V. (1864-1938)—Russian journalist of Liberal-Narodnik views.—268-70

Vollmar, Georg von (1850-1922)—leader of the opportunist wing in the Social-Democratic Party of Germany; held social-chauvinist views during the First World War.—12, 14, 24-25, 27-29

W

Webb, Sidney (1859-1947) and *Beatrice* (1858-1943)—prominent British civic leaders, founders of the Fabian Society and authors of books on the history and theory of the labour movement in Britain. During the First World War

preached social-chauvinism.—
188, 191

Wilhelm II (1859-1941)—Emperor of Germany and King of Prussia (1888-1918)—31, 34, 37, 66, 70, 191, 230, 234, 237, 242-43, 246, 305, 320

Wurm, Emmanuel (1857-1920)—German Social-Democrat, chemist. In 1890 was elected to the Reichstag; between 1902 and 1917 was an editor of *Die Neue Zeit*; was a Centrist during the First World War.—190

Z

Zasulich, Vera Ivanovna (1849-1919)—prominent figure in the Narodnik and, later, in the Social-Democratic movement in Russia. After the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. became a Menshevik leader. During the First World War advocated social-chauvinist views.—242

Zetkin, Clara (1857-1933)—outstanding leader of the German and international working-class movement; one of the founders of the Communist Party of Germany. During the First World War adopted a

revolutionary internationalist stand. Elected to the Executive Committee of the Comintern at the Third Congress of the Communist International; headed the international women's secretariat; from 1924 Chairman of the Executive Committee of the International Organisation of Aid to the Fighters for Revolution.—15, 159

Zhitlovsky, Kh. I. (1865-1943)—an ideologist of the Jewish petty-bourgeois nationalist movement, helped to found the Socialist Jewish Labour Party.—60

Zinoviev (Radomyslsky), Grigory Yevseyevich (1883-1936)—joined the R.S.D.L.P. in 1901. During the First World War advocated internationalism. When the October Socialist Revolution was being prepared, came out against an armed uprising. In 1926 was one of the leaders of the anti-Party Trotsky-Zinoviev bloc; in 1934 was expelled from the Party for anti-Party activity.—200, 211

Zola, Emile (1840-1902)—French writer.—334

Request to Readers

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send all your comments to 21, Zubovskiy Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.