

Lenin

SOCIALISM AND WAR



Workers of All Countries, Unite!

Michael Harrison

1969

V. I. Lenin

Socialism and War

[The Attitude of the R.S.D.L.P. Towards the War]¹



PROGRESS PUBLISHERS
Moscow 1967

Publishers' Note

This translation of V. I. Lenin's *Socialism and War* has been made from the text given in the *Collected Works* of V. I. Lenin, Vol. 21, Fourth Russian Edition, prepared by the Institute of Marxism-Leninism of the C.C. of the C.P.S.U.

First printing 1950
Second printing 1952
Third revised edition 1962
Fourth printing 1967

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

CONTENTS

Preface to the First (Foreign) Edition	5
Preface to the Second Edition	6
Chapter I. <i>The Principles of Socialism and the War of 1914-15</i>	7
The Attitude of Socialists Towards Wars	7
The Historical Types of Wars in Modern Times	8
The Difference Between Wars of Aggression and of Defence	8
The War of Today Is an Imperialist War	9
A War Between the Biggest Slave-holders for the Maintenance and Consolidation of Slavery	10
"War Is the Continuation of Politics by Other" (i.e.: Violent "Means")	12
The Case of Belgium	13
What Russia Is Fighting For	14
What Social-Chauvinism Is	15
The Basle Manifesto	15
False References to Marx and Engels	16
The Collapse of the Second International	17
Social-Chauvinism Is the Acme of Opportunism	18
Unity with the Opportunists Means an Alliance Between the Workers and Their "Own" National Bourgeoisie, and Splitting the International Revolutionary Working Class	19
"Kautskyism"	20
The Marxists' Slogan Is a Slogan of Revolutionary Social- Democracy	21
The Example Set by the Fraternisation in the Trenches	22
The Importance of an Underground Organisation	22
On the Defeat of One's "Own" Government in the Imperialist War	23
Pacifism and the Peace Slogan	24
The Right of Nations to Self-Determination	24
Chapter II. <i>Classes and Parties in Russia</i>	25
The Bourgeoisie and the War	25
The Working Class and the War	27
The Russian Social-Democratic Labour Group in the Duma, and the War	29

Chapter III. <i>The Restoration of the International</i>	32
The Method of the Social-Chauvinists and of the "Centre"	32
The State of Affairs Among the Opposition	34
The Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party and the Third International	37
Chapter IV. <i>The History of the Split, and the Present State of Social-Democracy in Russia</i>	39
The Economists and the Old <i>Iskra</i> (1894-1903)	40
Menshevism and Bolshevism (1903-1908)	40
Marxism and Liquidationism (1908-1914)	41
Marxism and Social-Chauvinism (1914-1915)	43
The Present State of Affairs in the Ranks of the Russian Social-Democrats	44
Our Party's Tasks	46
Notes	47

PREFACE TO THE FIRST (FOREIGN) EDITION

The war has been in progress for already a year. At the very outset of the war, our Party's attitude towards it was defined in the Central Committee's manifesto drawn up in September 1914 and (after it had been sent to the members of the C.C. and to our Party's responsible representatives in Russia; and had received their consent) published on November 1, 1914, in No. 33 of *Sotsial-Demokrat*,* our Party's Central Organ. Later, in No. 40 (March 29, 1915) the resolutions of the Berne Conference**² were published, in which our principles and tactics were set forth more precisely.

At present there is an obvious growth of revolutionary temper among the masses. In other countries, symptoms of the same phenomenon are to be seen on all sides, despite the suppression of the revolutionary aspirations of the proletariat by most of the official Social-Democratic parties, which have taken sides with their governments and their bourgeoisie. This state of affairs makes particularly urgent the publication of a pamphlet that sums up Social-Democratic tactics in relation to the war. In reprinting in full the above-mentioned Party documents, we have provided them with brief comment, endeavouring to take due stock of all the main arguments in favour of bourgeois and of proletarian tactics that have been expressed in the appropriate literature and at Party meetings.

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, pp. 25-34.—Ed.

** *Ibid.*, pp. 158-64.—Ed.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION

This pamphlet was written in the summer of 1915, just before the Zimmerwald Conference.³ It also appeared in German and French, and was reprinted in full in Norwegian in the organ of the Norwegian Social-Democratic Youth League. The German edition of the pamphlet was secretly brought to Germany—Berlin, Leipzig, Bremen and other cities, where it was secretly distributed by supporters of the Zimmerwald Left and by the Karl Liebknecht group. The French edition was secretly printed in Paris and distributed there by the French Zimmerwaldists. The Russian-language edition reached Russia in a very limited number of copies, and in Moscow was copied out in handwriting by workers.

We are now reprinting this pamphlet in full, as a document. The reader should all the time remember that the pamphlet was written in August 1915. This must be kept in view particularly in connection with those passages which refer to Russia: Russia at that time was still tsarist, Romanov Russia.

Published in the 1918 edition
of the pamphlet

CHAPTER I

THE PRINCIPLES OF SOCIALISM AND THE WAR OF 1914-15

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 slave-holders, 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 way).⁴

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 degree 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 Table on p. 11.)

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 conquered with fire and sword, that the populations 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, submission 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 colonies they have grabbed and robbed. The

Partition of the World Among the "Great" Slave-holding Powers

"Great" Powers	Colonies				Metro- polis 1914		Total			
	1876		1914		Square kilo- metres	Population	Square kilo- metres	Population		
	Square kilo- metres	Population	Square kilo- metres	Population						
	millions	millions	millions	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		
<hr/>										
Total for the six "Great" Powers	40.4	273.8	65.0	523.4	16.5	437.2	81.5	960.6		
<hr/>										
Colonies belonging to other than Great Powers (Belgium, Hol- land and other states)			9.9	45.3			9.9	45.3		
Three "semi-colonial" countries (Turkey, China and Persia)							14.5	361.2		
<hr/>							Total	105.9	1,367.1	
<hr/>										
Other states and countries							28.0	289.9		
<hr/>										
Entire globe (exclusive of Arctic and Antarctic regions)								Grand Total	133.9	1,657.0

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"**

This famous dictum was uttered by Clausewitz,⁵ 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) Entente⁶ (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 has a profoundly reactionary character, is hostile 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 Basle⁷ 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 1905,⁸ i.e., *to the examples of revolution and civil war*. Thus, the Basle Mani-

festo 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 resolution⁹ 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' war-time 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 plundering 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),¹⁰ 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.¹¹

"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"¹² or into "Brentanoism".¹³ 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 Lefts—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*¹⁴ 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 legit-

imacy 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 revolutionary 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 revolutionary 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 anarchism and opportunism.

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 present 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 revolutiona-

ry 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 unflinchingly fight for complete unity of the *workers* of the oppressed and oppressor nationalities (this including organisational unity). The idea of the juridical separation of one nation 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.

CHAPTER II

CLASSES AND PARTIES IN RUSSIA

THE BOURGEOISIE AND THE WAR

In one respect, the Russian Government has not lagged behind its European *confrères*; like them, it has succeeded in deceiving its "own" people on a grand scale. A huge and monstrous machine of falsehood and cunning has been set going in Russia as well, to infect the masses with chauvinism, and create the impression that the tsarist government is waging a "just" war, and is disinterestedly defending its Slav "brothers", etc.

The landowning class and the upper stratum of the commercial and industrial bourgeoisie have ardently supported

the tsarist government's bellicose policy. They are rightly expecting enormous material gains and privileges for themselves from the carving up of the Turkish and the Austrian legacy. A series of their congresses have already voiced anticipation of the profits that will flow into their pockets should the tsarist army be victorious. Moreover, the reactionaries are very well aware that if anything can stave off the downfall of the Romanov monarchy and delay the new revolution in Russia, it can only be a foreign war ending in victory for the tsar.

Broad strata of the urban "middle" bourgeoisie, of the bourgeois intelligentsia, professional people, etc., have also been infected with chauvinism—at all events at the beginning of the war. The Cadets—the party of the Russian liberal bourgeoisie—have given the tsar's government full and unconditional support. In the sphere of foreign policy, the Cadets have long been a government party. Pan-Slavism¹⁵—with the aid of which tsarist diplomacy has more than once carried out its grand political swindles—has become the official ideology of the Cadets. Russian liberalism has degenerated into *national* liberalism. It is vying in "patriotism" with the Black Hundreds¹⁶; it always willingly votes for militarism on land and at sea, etc. Approximately the same thing is to be seen in the camp of Russian liberalism as in Germany in the seventies of the last century, when "free-thinking" liberalism decayed and from it arose a national-liberal party. The Russian liberal bourgeoisie has definitely taken to the path of counter-revolution. The R.S.D.L.P.'s point of view on this question has been fully confirmed. The facts have shattered the view held by our opportunists that Russian liberalism is still a motive force of a revolution in Russia.

The ruling clique has also succeeded, with the aid of the bourgeois press, the clergy, etc., in rousing chauvinist sentiments among the peasantry. With the return of the soldiers from the field of slaughter, however, sentiment in the rural areas will undoubtedly turn against the tsarist monarchy. The bourgeois-democratic parties that come into contact with the peasantry have failed to withstand the chauvinist wave. The Trudovik¹⁷ party in the Duma¹⁸ refused to vote for war credits, but through its leader Kerensky it made a "patriotic" declaration which played into the

hands of the monarchy. In general, the entire legally published Narodnik press followed the liberals' lead. Even the Left wing of bourgeois democracy—the so-called Socialist-Revolutionary Party, which is affiliated to the International Socialist Bureau¹⁹—is swimming with the same tide. Mr. Rubanovich, that party's representative on the I.S.B., has come out as a self-confessed social-chauvinist. Half of the number of this party's delegates to the London Conference of Socialists of the Entente countries²⁰ voted for a chauvinist resolution (while the other half abstained from voting). Chauvinists predominate in the illegally published press of the Socialist-Revolutionaries (the newspaper *Novosti*²¹ and others). The revolutionaries from "bourgeois circles", i.e., bourgeois revolutionaries who are not connected with the working class, have come to a dead end in this war. The sad fate of Kropotkin, Burtsev and Rubanovich is highly significant.

THE WORKING CLASS AND THE WAR

The proletariat is the only class in Russia that nobody has been able to infect with chauvinism. Only the most ignorant strata of the workers were involved in the few excesses that occurred in the early days of the war. The part played by workers in the Moscow anti-German riots has been greatly exaggerated. By and large, the working class of Russia has proved immune to chauvinism.

The explanation lies in the revolutionary situation in the country and in the Russian proletariat's general conditions of life.

The years 1912-14 marked the beginning of a great new revolutionary upswing in Russia. We again witnessed a great strike movement, the like of which the world has never known. The number involved in the mass revolutionary strike in 1913 was, at the very lowest estimate, one and a half million, and in 1914 it rose to over two million, approaching the 1905 level. The first barricade battles took place in St. Petersburg, on the eve of the war.

The underground Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party has performed its duty to the International. The banner of internationalism has not wavered in its hands. Our

Party long ago severed all organisational ties with the opportunist groups and elements; its feet were not weighed down with the fetters of opportunism and of "legalism at any price", this circumstance helping it perform its revolutionary duty—just as the break with Bissolati's opportunist party has helped the Italian comrades.

The general situation in our country does not favour any efflorescence of "socialist" opportunism among the masses of the workers. In Russia we see a series of shades of opportunism and reformism among the intelligentsia, the petty bourgeois, etc., but it has affected an insignificant minority among the politically active sections of the workers. The privileged stratum of factory workers and clerical staff is very thin in our country. The fetishism of legality could not appear here. Before the war, the liquidators²² (the party of the opportunists led by Axelrod, Potresov, Cherevanin, Maslov, and others) found no serious support among the masses of the workers. The elections to the Fourth Duma resulted in the return of *all* six of the anti-liquidationist working-class candidates. The circulation of the legally published workers' press in Petrograd and Moscow and the collection of funds for it have incontrovertibly proved that four-fifths of the class-conscious workers are opposed to opportunism and liquidationism.

Since the beginning of the war, the tsar's government has arrested and exiled thousands and thousands of advanced workers, members of our underground R.S.D.L.P. This circumstance, together with the establishment of martial law in the country, the suppression of our newspapers, and so forth, has retarded the movement. But for all that, our Party is continuing its underground revolutionary activities. In Petrograd, our Party Committee is publishing the underground newspaper *Proletarsky Golos*.²³

Articles from *Sotsial-Demokrat*,²⁴ the Central Organ published abroad, are reprinted in Petrograd and sent out to the provinces. Leaflets are secretly printed, and are circulated even in army barracks. In various secluded places outside the city, secret workers' meetings are held. Of late, big strikes of metalworkers have begun in Petrograd. In connection with these strikes, our Petrograd Committee has issued several appeals to the workers.

THE RUSSIAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC LABOUR GROUP IN THE DUMA, AND THE WAR

In 1913 a split took place among the Social-Democratic deputies to the Duma. On one side were the seven supporters of opportunism, led by Chkheidze; they had been returned by seven non-proletarian gubernias, where the workers totalled 214,000. On the other side were six deputies, *all* from the workers' curia, elected for the most industrialised centres in Russia, in which the workers number 1,008,000.

The chief issue in the split was the *alternative* between the tactics of revolutionary Marxism and the tactics of opportunist reformism. In practice, the disagreement manifested itself mainly in the sphere of *extra-parliamentary* work among the masses. In Russia this work had to be conducted secretly, if those conducting it wished to remain on a revolutionary basis. The Chkheidze group remained a faithful ally of the liquidators (who repudiated underground work) and defended them in all talks with workers and at all meetings. Hence the split. The six deputies formed the R.S.D.L. Duma group, which as a year's work has incontrovertibly shown, has the support of the vast majority of Russian workers.

On the outbreak of the war the disagreement stood out in glaring relief. The Chkheidze group confined itself to parliamentary action. It did not vote for war credits, for that would have roused a storm of indignation among the workers (we have seen that in Russia even the petty-bourgeois Trudoviks did not vote for war credits); neither did it utter any protest against social-chauvinism.

Expressing the political line of our Party, the R.S.D.L. Duma group acted quite differently. It carried into the midst of the working class a protest against the war, and conducted anti-imperialist propaganda among the masses of the Russian proletarians.

It met with a very sympathetic response from the workers—which frightened the government, compelling it, in flagrant violation of its own laws, to arrest our deputy comrades and exile them to Siberia for life. In its very first official announcement of the arrest of our comrades, the tsarist government wrote:

"An entirely exceptional position in this respect was taken by some members of Social-Democratic societies, the object of whose activities was to shake the military might of Russia by agitating against the war, by means of underground appeals and verbal propaganda."

Only our Party, through its Central Committee, gave a negative reply to Vandervelde's well-known appeal for a "temporary" cessation of the struggle against tsarism. Moreover, it has now become known, from the testimony of Prince Kudashev, the tsar's envoy to Belgium, that Vandervelde did not draw up this appeal alone, but in collaboration with the above-mentioned envoy. The guiding centre of the liquidators agreed with Vandervelde and officially stated in the press that "in its activities *it does not oppose the war*".

The principal accusation levelled by the tsar's government against our deputy comrades was that they distributed this negative reply to Vandervelde among the workers.

At the trial,²⁵ the Prosecutor for the Crown, Mr. Nenarokomov, set up the German and French socialists as examples to our comrades. "The German Social Democrats," he said, "voted for war credits and proved to be friends of the government. That is how the German Social-Democrats acted, but the dismal knights of Russian Social-Democracy did not act in this way.... The socialists of Belgium and France unanimously forgot their quarrels with the other classes, forgot party strife, and unhesitatingly rallied about the flag." But the members of the R.S.D.L. group, on instructions from the Party's Central Committee, did not act in this way, he complained. . . .

The trial revealed an imposing picture of the extensive underground anti-war agitation our Party was conducting among the masses of the proletariat. It goes without saying, that the tsar's court "uncovered" only a fraction of the activities our comrades were conducting in this field, but even what was revealed showed how much had been done within the brief span of a few months.

At the trial the underground manifestos issued by our groups and committees, against the war and for international tactics, were read out. The members of the R.S.D.L. group were in touch with the class-conscious workers all

over Russia and did everything in their power to help the workers appraise the war from the Marxist standpoint.

Comrade Muranov, the deputy of the workers of Khar'kov Gubernia, stated at the trial:

"Realising that the people did not return me to the Duma just to warm my seat there, I travelled about the country to ascertain the mood of the working class." He admitted that he had undertaken the functions of a secret agitator of our Party, that in the Urals he had organised workers' committees at the Verkhneisetsky Works and elsewhere. The trial showed that, after the outbreak of war, members of the R.S.D.L. Duma group travelled for propaganda purposes, throughout almost the whole of Russia and that Muranov, Petrovsky, Badayev and others arranged numerous workers' meetings, at which anti-war resolutions were passed, and so on.

The tsar's government threatened the accused with capital punishment. That was why they did not all behave at the trial as courageously as Comrade Muranov. They tried to make it difficult for the Prosecutors to secure convictions. This is being unworthily utilised by the Russian social-chauvinists so as to obscure the crux of the issue, viz., the kind of parliamentarism the working class needs.

Parliamentarianism is recognised by Südekum and Heine, Sembat and Vaillant, Bissolati and Mussolini, Chkheidze and Plekhanov; it is also recognised by our comrades in the R.S.D.L. group, as well as by the Bulgarian and Italian comrades who have broken with the chauvinists. There are different kinds of parliamentarianism. Some utilise the parliamentary arena in order to curry favour with their governments, or, at best, to wash their hands of everything, as the Chkheidze group has done. Others utilise parliamentarianism in order to remain revolutionary to the end, to perform their duty as socialists and internationalists even under the most difficult circumstances. The parliamentary activities of some give them ministerial posts; the parliamentary activities of others take them to prison, exile, and penal servitude. Some serve the bourgeoisie, others—the proletariat. Some are social-imperialists. Others are revolutionary Marxists.

THE RESTORATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL

How should the International be restored? But first, a few words about how the International *should not* be restored.

THE METHOD OF THE SOCIAL-CHAUVINISTS AND OF THE "CENTRE"

Of course, the social-chauvinists of all countries are great "internationalists"! Since the very beginning of the war they have been weighed down with concern over the International. On the one hand, they assure us that the talk about the *collapse* of the International is "exaggerated". Actually, nothing out of the common has happened. Listen to Kautsky: the International is simply a "peace-time instrument"; naturally, this instrument has not proved quite up to the mark in wartime. On the other hand, the social-chauvinists of all countries have found a very simple, and, what is most important, an international way out of the situation that has arisen. The solution is simple: it is only necessary to wait till the war ends, but until then the socialists of each country must defend their "fatherland" and support their "own" government. When the war ends, there will be a mutual "amnesty", the admission that *everybody* was right and that in peacetime we live like brothers; in wartime, however, we stick to such-and-such resolutions, and call upon the German workers to exterminate their French brothers, and vice versa.

Kautsky, Plekhanov, Victor Adler and Heine are all equally agreed on this. Victor Adler writes that "when we have passed through this difficult time, our first duty will be to refrain from pointing to the mote in each other's eye". Kautsky asserts that "till now no serious socialists from any side have spoken in a way to arouse apprehension" concerning the fate of the International. "It is unpleasant to grasp hands [of the German Social-Democrats] that reek of the blood of the innocently slaughtered," Plekhanov says, but at once goes on to propose an "amnesty". "It will here be quite appropriate," he writes, "to subor-

dinate *the heart to the mind*. For the sake of the great cause, the International will have to take into consideration even belated remorse." In *Sozialistische Monatshefte*²⁶ Heine describes Vandervelde's behaviour as "courageous and dignified", and sets him up as an example to the German Lefts.

In short, when the war ends, appoint a commission consisting of Kautsky and Plekhanov, Vandervelde and Adler, and a "unanimous" resolution in the spirit of a mutual amnesty will be drawn up in a trice. The dispute will be nicely hushed up. Instead of being helped to understand what has taken place, the workers will be deceived with a sham and paper "unity". A union of the social-chauvinists and hypocrites of all countries will be described as restoration of the International.

We must not close our eyes to the great danger inherent in such a "restoration". The social-chauvinists of all countries are equally interested in that outcome. All of them are equally unwilling that the masses of the workers of their respective countries should themselves try to understand the issue: socialism or nationalism? All of them are equally interested in concealing one other's sins. None of them are able to propose anything except what has already been proposed by Kautsky, that past master of "international" hypocrisy.

Yet this danger has scarcely been realised. During a year of war, we have seen a number of attempts to restore international ties. We shall not speak of the London and Vienna²⁷ conferences, at which outspoken chauvinists got together to help the General Staffs and the bourgeoisie of their "fatherlands". We are referring to the Lugano²⁸ and Copenhagen²⁹ conferences, the International Women's Conference,³⁰ and the International Youth Conference.³¹ These assemblies were animated by the best intentions, but they wholly failed to discern the above-mentioned danger. They neither laid down a militant internationalist line, nor indicated to the proletariat the danger threatening it from the social-chauvinists' method of "restoring" the International. At best, they confined themselves to repeating the old resolutions, without telling the workers that the cause of socialism is lost unless a struggle is waged against the social-chauvinists. At best they were *marking time*.

THE STATE OF AFFAIRS AMONG THE OPPOSITION

There cannot be the least doubt that what interests all internationalists most is the state of affairs among the German Social-Democratic opposition. The official German Social-Democratic Party, the strongest and the foremost in the Second International, has dealt the international workers' organisation the most telling blow. At the same time, however, it was among the German Social-Democrats that the strongest opposition arose. Of all the big European parties, it is in the German party that a loud voice of protest was first raised by comrades who have remained loyal to the banner of socialism. We were delighted to read the journals *Lichtstrahlen*³² and *Die Internationale*.³³ It gave us still greater pleasure to learn of the distribution in Germany of secretly printed revolutionary manifestos, as for example the one entitled: "The Main Enemy Is Within the Country". This showed that the spirit of socialism is alive among the German workers, and that there are still people in Germany capable of upholding revolutionary Marxism.

The split in the present-day socialist movement has most strikingly revealed itself within the German Social-Democratic movement. Three trends can be clearly distinguished here: the opportunist chauvinists, who have nowhere sunk to such foul apostasy as in Germany; the Kautskian "Centre", which have here proved totally incapable of playing any other role than that of menials to the opportunists; the Lefts, who are the only Social-Democrats in Germany.

Naturally, the state of affairs among the German Lefts is what interests us most. In them we see our comrades, the hope of all the internationalist elements.

What is the state of affairs among them?

The journal *Die Internationale* was quite right in writing that the German Lefts are still in a state of ferment, that considerable regroupings still await them, and that within them some elements are more resolute and others less resolute.

Of course, we Russian internationalists do not in the least claim the right to interfere in the internal affairs of our comrades, the German Lefts. We understand that they

alone are fully competent to determine their methods of combating the opportunists, according to the conditions of time and place. Only we consider it our right and our duty to express our frank opinion on the state of affairs.

We are convinced that the author of the leading article in the journal *Die Internationale* was perfectly right in stating that the Kautskian "Centre" is doing more harm to Marxism than avowed social-chauvinism. Anyone who plays down differences, or, in the guise of Marxism, now teaches the workers that which Kautskyism is preaching, is in fact lulling the workers, and doing more harm than the Südekums and Heines, who are putting the issue squarely and are compelling the workers to try to make up their own minds.

The Fronde against the "official bodies"³⁴ which Kautsky and Haase have of late been permitting themselves should mislead nobody. The disagreements between them and the Scheidemanns are not on fundamentals. The former believe that Hindenburg and Mackensen are *already* victorious and that they can already permit themselves the luxury of protesting against annexations. The latter believe that Hindenburg and Mackensen are not *yet* victorious and that, therefore, it is necessary "to hold out to the end".

Kautskyism is waging only a sham struggle against the "official bodies" just to be able, after the war, to conceal from the workers the clash of principles and to paper over the issue with a thousand and one padded resolutions drawn up in a vaguely "Leftist" spirit, in the drafting of which the diplomats of the Second International are such experts.

It is quite understandable that, in their difficult struggle against the "official bodies", the German opposition should also make use of this unprincipled Fronde raised by Kautskyism. However, to any internationalist, hostility towards neo-Kautskyism must remain the touchstone. Only he is a genuine internationalist who combats Kautskyism, and understands that, *even after* its leaders' pretended change of intention, the "Centre" remains, on all fundamental issues, an *ally of the chauvinists and the opportunists*.

In general, our attitude towards wavering elements in the International is of tremendous importance. These elements

—mainly socialists of a *pacifist* shade—are to be found both in the neutral countries and in some of the belligerent countries (in Britain, for example, the Independent Labour Party³⁵). Such elements can be our fellow-travellers. Ties with them for a struggle against the social-chauvinists are necessary. It should, however, be remembered that they are *merely* fellow-travellers, and that on all main and fundamental issues, these elements will march against us, not with us, when the International is being restored; they will side with Kautsky, Scheidemann, Vandervelde, and Sembat. At international conferences we must not restrict our programme to what is acceptable to these elements. If we do, we shall fall captive to the wavering pacifists. This is what happened, for example, at the International Women's Conference in Berne. There the German delegation, which supported Comrade Clara Zetkin's point of view, actually played the part of the "Centre". The Women's Conference said only that which was acceptable to the delegates of the opportunist Dutch party led by Troelstra, and to the delegates of the Independent Labour Party; we shall always remember that, at the London conference of "Entente" chauvinists, the I.L.P. voted in favour of Vandervelde's resolution. We would like to express our greatest esteem for the I.L.P. for the courageous struggle it has been waging against the British Government during the war. We know, however, that this party has never taken a Marxist stand. For our part, we hold that today it is the main task of the Social-Democratic opposition to raise the banner of revolutionary Marxism, to tell the workers firmly and definitely how we regard imperialist wars, and to advance a call for mass revolutionary action, i.e., convert the period of imperialist wars into the beginning of a period of civil wars.

Despite everything, revolutionary Social-Democratic elements exist in many countries. They are to be found in Germany, Russia, Scandinavia (where Comrade Höglund represents an influential trend), the Balkans (the party of the Bulgarian "Tesnyaki"³⁶), Italy, Britain (part of the British Socialist Party³⁷), France (Vaillant himself has admitted in *l'Humanité*³⁸ that he has received letters of protest from internationalists, but he has not published any one of them in full), Holland (the Tribunists³⁹), and so on.

To rally these Marxist elements, however small their numbers may be at the outset; to reanimate, in their name, the now forgotten ideals of genuine socialism, and to call upon the workers of all lands to break with the chauvinists and rally about the old banner of Marxism—such is the task of the day.

Conferences with so-called programmes of "action" have till now confined themselves to announcing a more or less outspoken programme of sheer pacifism. Marxism is not pacifism. Of course, the speediest possible termination of the war must be striven for. However, the "peace" demand acquires a proletarian significance only if a *revolutionary* struggle is called for. Without a series of revolutions, what is called a democratic peace is a philistine Utopia. The purpose of a real programme of action can be served only by a *Marxist* programme which gives the masses a full and clear explanation of what has taken place, explains what imperialism is and how it should be combated, declares openly that the collapse of the Second International was brought about by opportunism, and openly calls for a Marxist International to be built up without and *against* the opportunists. Only a programme that shows that we have faith in ourselves and in Marxism and that we have proclaimed a life-and-death struggle against opportunism will sooner or later win us the sympathy of the genuinely proletarian masses.

THE RUSSIAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATIC LABOUR PARTY AND THE THIRD INTERNATIONAL

The Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party has long parted company with its opportunists. Besides, the Russian opportunists have now become chauvinists. This only fortifies us in our opinion that a split with them is essential in the interests of socialism. We are convinced that the Social-Democrats' present differences with the social-chauvinists are in no way less marked than the socialists' differences with the anarchists when the Social-Democrats parted company with the latter. The opportunist Monitor was right when he wrote, in *Preussische Jahrbücher*,⁴⁰ that the unity

of today is to the advantage of the opportunists and the bourgeoisie, because it has compelled the Lefts to submit to the chauvinists and prevents the workers from understanding the controversy and forming their own genuinely working-class and genuinely socialist party. We are firmly convinced that, in the present state of affairs, a split with the opportunists and chauvinists is the prime duty of revolutionaries, just as a split with the yellow⁴¹ trade unions, the anti-Semites, the liberal workers' unions, etc., was essential in helping speed up the enlightenment of backward workers and draw them into the ranks of the Social-Democratic Party.

In our opinion, the Third International should be built up on that kind of revolutionary basis. To our Party, the question of the expediency of a break with the social-chauvinists does not exist, it has been answered with finality. The only question that exists for our Party is whether this can be achieved on an international scale in the immediate future.

It is perfectly obvious that to create an *international* Marxist organisation, there must be a readiness to form independent Marxist parties in the *various* countries. As a country with the oldest and strongest working-class movement, Germany is of decisive importance. The immediate future will show whether the conditions are mature for the formation of a new and Marxist International. If they are, our Party will gladly join such a Third International, purged of opportunism and chauvinism. If they are not, then that will show that a more or less protracted period of evolution is needed for that purging to be effected. Our Party will then form the extreme opposition within the old International, pending the time when the conditions in the various countries make possible the formation of an international workingmen's association standing on the basis of revolutionary Marxism.

We do not and cannot know what road world developments will take in the next few years. What we do know for certain and are unshakably convinced of is that *our* Party will work indefatigably in the above-mentioned direction, in *our* country and among *our* proletariat, and through its day-by-day activities will build up the Russian section of the *Marxist* International.

In Russia too there is no lack of avowed social-chauvinists and Centrist groups. These people will fight against the formation of a Marxist International. We know that, in principle, Plekhanov shares the standpoint of Südekum and is already holding out a hand to the latter. We know that, under Axelrod's leadership, the so-called Organising Committee⁴² is preaching Kautskyism on Russian soil. Under a cloak of working-class unity, these people are calling for unity with the opportunists and, through the latter, with the bourgeoisie. Everything we know about the present-day working-class movement in Russia, however, gives us full assurance that the class-conscious proletariat of Russia, will, as hitherto, remain *with our Party*.

CHAPTER IV

THE HISTORY OF THE SPLIT, AND THE PRESENT STATE OF SOCIAL-DEMOCRACY IN RUSSIA

The tactics of the R.S.D.L.P. in relation to the war, as outlined above, are the inevitable outcome of the thirty years' development of Social-Democracy in Russia. These tactics, as well as the present state of Social-Democracy in our country, cannot be properly understood without going deeper into the history of our Party. That is why here, too, we must remind the reader of the major facts in that history.

As an ideological trend, the Social-Democratic movement arose in 1883, when Social Democratic views, as applied to Russia, were for the first time systematically expounded abroad by the Emancipation of Labour⁴³ group. Until the early nineties, Social-Democracy was an ideological trend without links with the mass working-class movement in Russia. At the beginning of the nineties, the growth of public consciousness and the unrest and strike movement among the workers, turned Social-Democracy into an active political force inseparably connected with the struggle (both economic and political) of the working class. It was from that time too that the split into Economists and Iskristists began in the Social-Democratic movement.

THE ECONOMISTS AND THE OLD ISKRA (1894-1903)

Economism was an opportunist trend in Russian Social-Democracy. Its political essence was summed up in the programme: "for the workers—the economic struggle; for the liberals—the political struggle". Its theoretical mainstay was so-called "legal Marxism" or "Struivism", which "recognised" a "Marxism" that was completely devoid of any revolutionary spirit and adapted to the needs of the liberal bourgeoisie. Pleading the backwardness of the mass of workers in Russia, and wishing to "march with the masses", the Economists restricted the tasks and scope of the working-class movement to the economic struggle and to political support for liberalism; they set themselves no independent political or revolutionary tasks.

The old *Iskra*⁴⁴ (1900-03) waged a victorious struggle against Economism, for the principles of revolutionary Social-Democracy. The finest elements in the class-conscious proletariat sided with *Iskra*. Several years before the revolution, the Social-Democrats came out with a most consistent and uncompromising programme, whose correctness was borne out by the class struggle and by the action of the masses during the 1905 Revolution. Whereas the Economists adapted themselves to the backwardness of the masses, *Iskra* was educating the workers' vanguard that was capable of leading the masses onward. The present-day arguments of the social-chauvinists (i.e., the need to reckon with the masses; the progressiveness of imperialism; the "illusions" harboured by the revolutionaries, etc.), were *all* advanced by the Economists. It was twenty years ago that the Russian Social-Democrats made their first acquaintance with the opportunist modification of Marxism into Struivism.

MENSHEVISM AND BOLSHEVISM (1903-1908)

The period of bourgeois-democratic revolution gave rise to a fresh struggle between Social-Democratic trends; this was a direct continuation of the previous struggle. Economism developed into Menshevism. The defence of the old *Iskra* revolutionary tactics gave rise to Bolshevism.

In the turbulent years of 1905-07, Menshevism was an opportunist trend backed by the bourgeois liberals, which brought liberal-bourgeois tendencies into the working-class movement. Its essence lay in an adaptation of the working-class struggle to suit liberalism. Bolshevism, on the contrary, set the Social-Democratic workers the task of rousing the democratic peasantry for the revolutionary struggle, despite the vacillation and treachery of the liberals. As the Mensheviks themselves admitted on more than one occasion, the mass of workers followed the Bolshevik lead in all the most important actions of the revolution.

The 1905 Revolution tested, developed and steeled the uncompromisingly revolutionary Social-Democratic tactics in Russia. The direct action of classes and parties repeatedly revealed the link between Social-Democratic opportunism (Menshevism) and liberalism.

MARXISM AND LIQUIDATIONISM (1908-1914)

The period of counter-revolution again placed on the order of the day—this time in an entirely new form—the question of the opportunist and revolutionary tactics of the Social-Democrats. The mainstream in Menshevism, regardless of protests from many of its finest representatives, brought forth the liquidationist trend, a renunciation of the struggle for another revolution in Russia, a renunciation of underground organisation and activities, contempt for and ridicule of the "underground", of the slogan for a republic, etc. The group of legal contributors to the journal *Nasha Zarya* (Messrs. Potresov, Cherevanin, and others) formed a core—independent of the old Social-Democratic Party—which in a thousand ways has been supported, publicised and nurtured by the liberal bourgeoisie of Russia, who are out to win the workers away from the revolutionary struggle.

This group of opportunists was expelled from the Party by the January 1912 Conference of the R.S.D.L.P.,⁴⁵ which restored the Party, in the teeth of furious resistance from a number of groups and coteries abroad. For over two years (the beginning of 1912 until mid-1914) a stubborn struggle was in progress between the two Social-Democrat-

ic parties: the Central Committee, which was elected in January 1912, and the Organising Committee, which refused to recognise the January Conference and wanted to restore the Party in a different way, by maintaining unity with the *Nasha Zarya* group. A stubborn struggle raged between the two workers' dailies (*Pravda*,⁴⁶ and *Luch*⁴⁷ and their successors), and between the two Social-Democratic groups in the Fourth Duma (the R.S.D.L. group of Pravdists or Marxists, and the "Social-Democratic group" of the liquidators led by Chkheidze).

The Pravdists, who championed loyalty to the Party's revolutionary principles, encouraged the incipient revival of the working-class movement (especially after the spring of 1912), combined underground and legal organisation, the press and agitation, and rallied about themselves the overwhelming majority of the class-conscious workers, whereas the liquidators—who as a political force operated exclusively through the *Nasha Zarya* group—banked on the all-round support of the liberal-bourgeois elements.

The open money contributions made by workers' groups to the newspapers of the two parties—a form of payment of S.D. *membership dues* adapted to the Russian conditions of the time (and the only one legally possible and easily verifiable by the public)—strikingly confirmed the proletarian source of the strength and influence of the Pravdists (Marxists), and the bourgeois-liberal source of the liquidators (and their O.C.). Here are the brief figures of these contributions, which are given in full in the book *Marxism and Liquidationism*⁴⁸ and summarised in the German Social-Democratic *Leipziger Volkszeitung*⁴⁹ of July 21, 1914.

The number and sums of contributions to the St. Petersburg daily newspapers, Marxist (Pravdist) and liquidationist, from January 1 to May 13, 1914 were the following:

	Pravdists		Liquidators	
	Number of contributions	Sum in rubles	Number of contributions	Sum in rubles
From workers' groups . . .	2,873	18,934	671	5,296
From non-workers' groups	713	2,650	453	6,760

Thus by 1914 our Party had united four-fifths of the class-conscious workers of Russia around revolutionary Social-Democratic tactics. For the whole of 1913 the Pravdists received contributions from 2,181 workers' groups, the liquidators from 661. The figures from January 1, 1913 to May 13, 1914 were: 5,054 contributions from workers' groups for the Pravdists (i.e., for our Party), and 1,332, i.e., 20.8 per cent, for the liquidators.

MARXISM AND SOCIAL-CHAUVINISM (1914-1915)

The great European war of 1914-15 has given all the European Social-Democrats, as well as the Russian, an opportunity of putting their tactics to the test of a crisis of a world-wide scale. The reactionary and predatory nature of this war between slave-holders stands out in far more striking relief in the case of tsarism than it does in the case of the other governments. Yet the liquidators' main group (the only one which, besides ours, exerts serious influence in Russia, thanks to its liberal connections) has turned towards social-chauvinism! With its fairly lengthy monopoly of legality, this *Nasha Zarya* group has conducted propaganda among the masses, in favour of "non-resistance to the war", and victory for the Triple (and now Quadruple) Entente; it has accused German imperialism of extraordinary sins, etc. Plekhanov, who, since 1903, has given numerous examples of his utter political spinelessness and his desertion to opportunism, has taken this stand even more emphatically (which has won him praise from the entire bourgeois press of Russia). Plekhanov has sunk so low as to declare that tsarism is waging a just war, and to grant interviews to Italian government newspapers, urging that country to enter the war!

The correctness of our appraisal of liquidationism and of the expulsion of the main group of liquidators from our Party has thus been fully confirmed. The liquidators' real programme and the real significance of their trend today consist, not only in opportunism in general, but in a defence of the dominant-nation privileges and advantages of the Great-Russian landowners and bourgeoisie. Liquidationism is a trend of *national liberal-labour* policy. It is an al-

liance of a section of the radical petty bourgeoisie and a tiny section of privileged workers, with their "own" national bourgeoisie, against the mass of the proletariat.

THE PRESENT STATE OF AFFAIRS IN THE RANKS OF THE RUSSIAN SOCIAL-DEMOCRATS

As we have already said, our January 1912 Conference has not been recognised by the liquidators, or by a number of groups abroad (those of Plekhanov, Alexinsky, Trotsky, and others), or by the so-called "national" (i.e., non-Great Russian) Social-Democrats. Among the numberless epithets hurled against us, "usurpers" and "splitters" have been most frequently repeated. We have replied by quoting precise and objectively verifiable figures showing that our Party has united four-fifths of the class-conscious workers in Russia. This is no small figure, considering the difficulties of underground activities in a period of counter-revolution.

If "unity" were possible in Russia on the basis of Social-Democratic tactics, without expelling the *Nasha Zarya* group, why have our numerous opponents not achieved it *even among themselves*? Three and a half years have elapsed since January 1912, and all this time our opponents, much as they have desired to do so, have failed to form a Social-Democratic party in opposition to us. This fact is our Party's best defence.

The entire history of the Social-Democratic groups that are fighting against our Party has been a history of collapse and disintegration. In March 1912, all of them, without exception, "united" in reviling us. But already in August 1912, when the so-called August bloc⁵⁰ was formed against us, disintegration set in among them. Some of the groups defected from them. They were unable to form a party and a Central Committee; what they set up was only an Organising Committee "for the purpose of restoring unity". Actually, this O.C. proved an ineffective cover for the liquidationist group in Russia. Throughout the tremendous upswing of the working-class movement in Russia and the mass strikes of 1912-14, the only group in the entire August bloc to conduct work among the masses was the

Nasha Zarya group, whose strength lay in its links with the liberals. Early in 1914, the Lettish Social-Democrats officially withdrew from the August bloc (the Polish Social-Democrats did not join it), while Trotsky, one of the leaders of the bloc, left it unofficially, again forming his own separate group. At the Brussels Conference of July 1914, at which the Executive Committee of the International Socialist Bureau, Kautsky and Vandervelde participated, the so-called Brussels bloc⁵¹ was formed against us, which the Letts did not join, and from which the Polish opposition Social-Democrats forthwith withdrew. On the outbreak of war, this bloc collapsed. *Nasha Zarya*, Plekhanov, Alexinsky and An,⁵² leader of the Caucasian Social-Democrats, became open social-chauvinists, who came out for the desirability of Germany's defeat. The O.C. and the Bund⁵³ defended the social-chauvinists and the principles of social-chauvinism. Although it voted against the war credits (in Russia, even the bourgeois democrats, the Trudoviks, voted against them), the Chkheidze Duma group remained *Nasha Zarya's* faithful ally. Plekhanov, Alexinsky and Co., our extreme social-chauvinists, were quite pleased with the Chkheidze group. In Paris, the newspaper *Nashe Slovo* (the former *Golos*⁵⁴) was launched, with the participation mainly of Martov and Trotsky, who wanted to combine a platonic defence of internationalism with an absolute demand for unity with *Nasha Zarya*, the O.C. or the Chkheidze group. After 250 issues, this newspaper was itself compelled to admit its disintegration: one section of the editorial board gravitated towards our Party, Martov remained faithful to the O.C. which publicly censured *Nashe Slovo* for its "anarchism" (just as the opportunists in Germany, David and Co., *Internationale Korrespondenz*⁵⁵ and Legien and Co. have accused Comrade Liebknecht of anarchism); Trotsky announced his rupture with the O.C., but wanted to stand with the Chkheidze group. Here are the programme and the tactics of the Chkheidze group, as formulated by one of its leaders. In No. 5, 1915, of *Sovremenny Mir*,⁵⁶ journal of the Plekhanov and Alexinsky trend, Chkhenkeli wrote: "To say that German Social-Democracy was in a position to prevent its country from going to war and failed to do so would mean either secretly wishing that it should not only have breathed its last at the barricades, but also

have the fatherland breathe its last, or looking at nearby things through an anarchist's telescope." *

These few lines express the sum and substance of social-chauvinism: both the justification, in principle, of the idea of "defence of the fatherland" in the present war, and mockery—with the permission of the military censors—of the preaching of and preparation for revolution. It is not at all a question of whether the German Social-Democrats were or were not in a position to prevent war, or whether, in general, revolutionaries can guarantee the success of a revolution. The question is: shall socialists behave like socialists or really breathe their last in the embrace of the imperialist bourgeoisie?

OUR PARTY'S TASKS

Social-Democracy in Russia arose before the bourgeois-democratic revolution (1905) in our country, and gained strength during the revolution and counter-revolution. The backwardness of Russia explains the extraordinary multiplicity of trends and shades of petty-bourgeois opportunism in our country; whereas the influence of Marxism in Europe and the stability of the legally existing Social-Democratic parties before the war converted our exemplary liberals into near-admirers of "reasonable", "European" (non-revolutionary), "legal" "Marxist" theory and Social-Democracy. The working class of Russia could not build up its party otherwise than in a resolute thirty-year struggle against all the varieties of opportunism. The experience of the world war, which has brought about the shameful collapse of European opportunism and has strengthened the alliance between our national-liberals and social-chauvinist liquidationism, has still further fortified our conviction that our Party must follow the same consistently revolutionary road.

Written in July-August 1915
Published in pamphlet form in
August 1915 by the newspaper
Sotsial-Demokrat in Geneva

* *S.M.* No. 5, 1915, p. 148. Trotsky recently announced that he deemed it his task to enhance the prestige of the Chkheidze group in the International. No doubt Chkhenkeli will with equal energy enhance Trotsky's prestige in the International....

NOTES

¹ Lenin decided to write the pamphlet *Socialism and War (The Attitude of the R.S.D.L.P. Towards the War)* in connection with preparations for the First International Socialist Conference. Zinoviev helped to write the pamphlet, though most of it was drawn up by Lenin, who also edited the entire text.

Lenin pointed out that in *Socialism and War* he provided a commentary to the resolutions of our Party, explaining them in a popular manner. Lenin did his best to have the pamphlet printed before the opening of the International Socialist Conference in Zimmerwald for he sought to utilise the conference for rallying the Left-wing elements of international Social-Democracy on a revolutionary platform.

The pamphlet was published in Russian and in German on the eve of the Zimmerwald Conference and distributed among its delegates. In 1916 it was published in French.

Title page

² *The Berne Conference*—a conference of the sections of the R.S.D.L.P. abroad held in Berne from February 27th to March 4th, 1915. The conference was called on Lenin's initiative and has the significance of a Bolshevik general Party conference, since it was impossible to convene an all-Russia conference during the war. Representatives present at the conference were from the Bolshevik sections in Paris, Zurich, Geneva, Berne, Lausanne and London, and also from the "Bauby" group. Lenin represented the Central Committee and the Central Organ (*Sotsial-Demokrat*), directed the proceedings of the conference and read the report on the main item of the agenda "The War and the Tasks of the Party". The conference adopted resolutions on the war that were drafted by Lenin.

p. 5

³ *The Zimmerwald Left group* was formed by Lenin in September 1915 at the International Socialist Conference in Zimmerwald. The group came out against the Centrist majority of the conference and submitted draft resolutions condemning the imperialist war, exposing the treachery of the social-chauvinists and stressing the necessity of waging a vigorous struggle against war. The Bolsheviks, led by Lenin, were the only group within the Zimmerwald Left to take a consistently correct and thoroughly internationalist stand. The Zimmerwald Left also included a number of inconsistent internationalists.

p. 6

⁴ The reference is to Wilhelm Liebknecht's speech at the Erfurt Congress of the German Social-Democrats, held in 1891.

p. 8

⁵ A quotation from Karl von Clausewitz. *Vom Kriege*. p. 12

⁶ *The Quadruple Entente*—an imperialist alliance of Britain, France, Russia and Italy, the last of which in 1915 withdrew from the Triple Alliance (Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy) and joined the Triple Entente already in existence since 1907. p. 13

⁷ *The Basle Congress of the Second International* was held on November 24th-25th, 1912. This was an extraordinary congress called in connection with the Balkan war and the imminent European war. The congress adopted a manifesto emphasising the imperialist nature of the impending world war and calling upon socialists of all countries to wage a vigorous struggle against war. p. 15

⁸ *October-December 1905*—the period of the most intense revolutionary activity in 1905-1907.

In October 1905 Russian workers, fighting for the overthrow of tsarism, called an all-Russia political strike; all the factories, mills and railways of the huge country stopped work. On October 17 the tsar was obliged to issue a manifesto promising to introduce a Constitution in Russia and "to grant" freedom of speech, assembly, press, etc. His promises, however, were a fraud. In December 1905 an armed uprising broke out in Moscow. For nine days the workers of Moscow fought gallantly on the barricades against troops and artillery. The government did not succeed in crushing the revolt until fresh forces arrived from St. Petersburg. p. 15

⁹ The reference is to the resolution of the Stuttgart Congress of the Second International.

The Stuttgart Congress of the Second International was held on August 18-24, 1907. The R.S.D.L.P. delegation consisted of 37 members, among the Bolshevik delegates were Lenin, Lunacharsky and Litvinov.

The Congress conducted its main work in committees set up to draft resolutions for the plenary meetings. Lenin worked on the committee which drafted a resolution on "Militarism and International Conflicts". Lenin and Rosa Luxemburg introduced into Bebel's draft an amendment on the duty of the socialists to make use of war-time conditions so as to rouse up the masses and to overthrow capitalism. The amendment was adopted by the Congress. p. 16

¹⁰ On August 4, 1914, the Social-Democratic group in the German Reichstag voted in favour of granting war credits to the government of Wilhelm II. p. 19

¹¹ On March 11, 1915, Paul Golay, a French Socialist, read a lecture in Lausanne entitled "Socialism That Is Dying and Regenerated Socialism" (*Le socialisme qui meurt et le socialisme qui doit renaitre*). The same year it was published in pamphlet form. p. 19

¹² *Struvism*—see p. 40 of this pamphlet. p. 20

¹³ *Brentanoism*—a bourgeois reformist teaching of the German economist Lujo Brentano. He advocated a "class truce" in capitalist so-

ciety, insisted on the possibility of the social contradictions of capitalism being overcome without resorting to class struggle and maintained that the answer to the plight of the working-class lay in the organisation of reformist trade unions and the introduction of factory legislation and that the interests of workers and capitalists could be reconciled. Under the guise of Marxist phrases, Brentano and his followers tried to subordinate the working-class movement to the interests of the bourgeoisie. p. 20

¹⁴ *Nasha Zarya* (Our Dawn)—a monthly magazine published legally in St. Petersburg by the liquidator Mensheviks from 1910 to 1914. The magazine served as the rallying centre for the liquidators in Russia. p. 20

¹⁵ *Pan-Slavism*—a reactionary political trend which sought to unite all the Slav countries under the aegis of tsarist Russia, and to turn to this end the struggle waged by the Slavs against Turkish and Austro-Hungarian rule. p. 26

¹⁶ *The Black Hundreds*—monarchist gangs formed by the tsarist police to combat the revolutionary movement. They murdered revolutionaries, assaulted progressive intellectuals and organised pogroms. p. 26

¹⁷ *Trudoviks*—a group of petty-bourgeois democrats in the State Duma consisting of peasants and intellectuals of Narodnik leanings. In April 1906 the Trudovik group in the First Duma consisted of peasant deputies.

In the Duma the Trudoviks vacillated between the Cadets and the Social-Democrats. During the First World War the Trudoviks took up a social-chauvinist stand. p. 26

¹⁸ *The Duma* was a representative assembly which the tsarist government was forced to convene as a result of the revolutionary events of 1905. Nominally it was a legislative body but it had no real power. Elections to the Duma were neither direct, equal, nor universal. For the working classes, as well as for the national minorities suffrage was greatly curtailed, a considerable section of the workers and peasants lacked any voting rights at all. Under the electoral law of December 11th (24th), 1905, one landlord vote was made equivalent to three votes cast by representatives of the urban bourgeoisie, 15 peasant votes and 45 votes cast by workers.

The First and Second Dumas (April-July 1906 and February-June 1907, respectively) were dissolved by the tsarist government. On June 3, 1907, the government carried out a coup d'état and issued a new electoral law which curtailed still further the rights of the workers, peasants and urban petty bourgeoisie thus guaranteeing the complete supremacy of the reactionary bloc consisting of landlords and big capitalists in the Third and Fourth Dumas (1907-12 and 1912-17). p. 26

¹⁹ *The International Socialist Bureau* (I.S.B.)—the executive body of the Second International, established by decision of the Paris Congress of 1900. From 1905 Lenin was a member of the I.S.B. as representative of the R.S.D.L.P. p. 27

²⁰ *The London Conference of Socialists of the Triple Entente* met on February 14th, 1915. It was attended by representatives of the social-chauvinist and pacifist groups of the Socialist parties of Britain, France, Belgium, as well as the Russian Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries.

Though the Bolsheviks were not invited to the Conference, on Lenin's instructions, Litvinov (Maximovich) attended in order to read the declaration of the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P., which was based on a draft drawn up by Lenin. The declaration demanded the withdrawal of socialists from bourgeois governments and a complete rupture with the imperialists; it called for an end to co-operation with the imperialist governments, a resolute struggle against them and condemned voting in support of war credits. The chairman interrupted Litvinov while he was reading the declaration, and deprived him of the right to speak. The latter handed the declaration over to the presidium and left the conference hall. p. 27

²¹ *Novosti* (News)—a Socialist-Revolutionary daily published in Paris between August 1914 and May 1915. p. 27

²² About liquidators and liquidationism see pp. 41-43 of this pamphlet. p. 28

²³ *Proletarsky Golos* (Proletarian Voice)—an illegal paper published by the St. Petersburg Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. between February 1915 and December 1916. Four issues appeared, the Manifesto of the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P., "The War and Russian Social-Democracy", being published in Issue No. 1. p. 28

²⁴ *Sotsial-Demokrat* (Social-Democrat)—Central Organ of the R.S.D.L.P., published illegally from February 1908 to January 1917. In all 58 issues appeared. The first issue was published in Russia, and the rest abroad, first in Paris and then in Geneva. In December 1911 Lenin became the editor of *Sotsial-Demokrat* which published over 80 articles and items by him. p. 28

²⁵ The trial of the Bolshevik deputies to the Fourth Duma (A. E. Badayev, M. K. Muranov, G. I. Petrovsky, F. N. Samoilov, N. R. Shagov) and other Social-Democrats, who took part in the illegal Party conference in Ozerki, took place on February 10 (23), 1915. The main circumstantial evidence against the Bolshevik deputies was Lenin's thesis "The Tasks of Revolutionary Social-Democracy in the European War" and the C.C. R.S.D.L.P. manifesto "The War and Russian Social-Democracy" (published in *Sotsial-Demokrat*), which were confiscated while they were being searched.

The five Bolshevik deputies were exiled for life to the Turukhansk Territory (Eastern Siberia). p. 30

²⁶ *Sozialistische Monatshefte* (Socialist Monthly)—the chief organ of the German Social-Democratic opportunists and an organ of international revisionism. During the First World War it took up a social-chauvinist stand; it was published in Berlin from 1897 to 1933. p. 33

²⁷ The reference is to the Conference of Socialists from Germany and Austria-Hungary, held in Vienna in April 1915, more or less in response to the London Conference of Socialists of the Triple Entente. The Vienna Conference approved the social-chauvinist slogan of "defence of the fatherland" in the imperialist war. p. 33

²⁸ This refers to a conference of Italian and Swiss socialists held in Lugano, Switzerland, on September 27th, 1914. It was the first meeting of socialists during the war, at which an attempt was made to restore international contacts. p. 33

²⁹ The reference is to the *Copenhagen Conference of Socialists of Neutral Countries* (Sweden, Denmark, Norway and Holland), which took place on January 17th-18th, 1915. It resolved to appeal, through the socialist parties' members of parliament in neutral countries, to their respective governments, urging them to act as mediators between the belligerent countries and attempt to bring about the termination of the war. p. 33

³⁰ *The International Conference of Socialist Women* held in Berne from March 26th to 28th, 1915, which dealt with the attitude to the war. It was convened on the initiative of the *Rabotnitsa* (Woman Worker) organisation abroad with the active participation of Clara Zetkin, leader of the international women's movement. Twenty-five delegates representing Britain, Germany, France, Holland, Switzerland, Italy, Russia and Poland attended the conference. p. 33

³¹ This refers to the *International Socialist Youth Conference* which discussed attitude towards the war and was held on April 4-6, 1915, in Berne. The conference was attended by representatives of youth organisations from ten countries: Russia, Norway, Holland, Switzerland, Bulgaria, Germany, Poland, Italy, Denmark, and Sweden. The conference passed a resolution to celebrate International Youth Day annually, and elected the International Bureau of Socialist Youth, which began publication of *Jugend-Internationale* (The Youth International) in compliance with the conference decisions. p. 33

³² *Lichtstrahlen* (Rays of Light)—a monthly magazine, organ of the Left-wing Social-Democrats of Germany (the International Socialists of Germany), edited by J. Borchard. It appeared in Berlin at irregular intervals from 1913 to 1921. p. 34

³³ *Die Internationale*—a magazine founded by Rosa Luxemburg and Franz Mehring. The first and the only issue of it appeared in April 1915. The publication was resumed in 1918 following the November Revolution in Germany. p. 34

³⁴ The leading centres of the German Social-Democratic Party, its Central Committee, the Reichstag group, etc. p. 35

³⁵ *The Independent Labour Party* (I.L.P.) was a reformist organisation founded in 1893, when the strike struggle revived and there was a mounting drive for a labour movement independent of the bourgeois parties. The Party's leader was James Keir Hardie.

From the outset the I.L.P. took a bourgeois-reformist stand, concentrating on parliamentary forms of struggle and parliamentary deals with the Liberal Party. Characterising this party, Lenin wrote that it was "actually an opportunist party that has always been dependent on the bourgeoisie" (see Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 494).

When the First World War broke out, the Party issued an anti-war manifesto, but shortly afterwards took up a social-chauvinist stand. p. 36

³⁶ *Tesnyaki*—a revolutionary trend in the Bulgarian Social-Democratic Party, which in 1903 took shape as an independent Bulgarian Workers' Social-Democratic Party. The founder and leader of *Tesnyaki* was D. Blagoyev, who was succeeded by his pupils Georgi Dimitrov, Vasil Kolarov and others. From 1914 to 1918 the *Tesnyaki* came out against the imperialist war. In 1919 they affiliated to the Communist International and formed the Communist Party of Bulgaria, which was subsequently reorganised into the Bulgarian Workers' Party (Communists). p. 36

³⁷ *The British Socialist Party* was founded in 1911, in Manchester, as a result of the Social-Democratic Federation merging with other socialist groups. The B.S.P. carried on its propaganda in the Marxist spirit, was "not opportunist, and... was really independent of the Liberals" (see Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 273). Its small membership, however, and its isolation from the masses gave it a somewhat sectarian character.

During the First World War, a sharp struggle flared up in the party between the internationalist trend (William Gallacher, Albert Inkpin, John Maclean, Thomas Rothstein and others) and the social-chauvinist trend led by Hyndman. On a number of questions a section of the internationalists held Centrist views. In February 1916 a group of party members founded the newspaper *The Call*, which was instrumental in uniting the internationalist elements. When, at its Salford Conference in April 1916, the party denounced the social-chauvinist stand of Hyndman and his followers, the latter broke away from the party.

The British Socialist Party acclaimed the October Socialist Revolution in Russia, its members playing a prominent role in the British working people's movement in support of Soviet Russia, and against foreign intervention. In 1919 the majority of the local party branches (98 against 4) came out in favour of affiliation to the Communist International.

The British Socialist Party and the Communist unity group played the leading part in founding the Communist Party of Great Britain. At the first Unity Congress of 1920 the overwhelming majority of the B.S.P. branches merged in the newly founded Communist Party. p. 36

³⁸ *L'Humanité*—a daily founded by Jean Jaurès in 1904 as the organ of the French Socialist Party. During the First World War the newspaper became a mouthpiece of the extreme Right wing of the French Socialist Party, and pursued a social-chauvinist policy. Shortly after the split in the Socialist Party at the Tours Congress in December 1920, and the formation of the Communist Party, it became the organ

of the Communist Party. It is still published in Paris at the present time as the Central Organ of the Communist Party. p. 36

³⁹ *The Tribunist*—members of the Social-Democratic Party of Holland whose mouthpiece was the newspaper *De Tribune*. Though not a consistent revolutionary party, the Tribunists formed the Left wing of the labour movement in Holland, and during the imperialist world war (1914-18) they adhered to internationalist principles. In 1918 the Tribunists founded the Dutch Communist Party. p. 36

⁴⁰ *Preussische Jahrbücher* (Prussian Yearbooks)—a German conservative monthly dealing with problems of politics, history and literature which was published in Berlin between 1858 and 1935. p. 37

⁴¹ The opportunists of the Second International. p. 38

⁴² *The Organising Committee* (O.C.)—the Menshevik organisational centre formed in 1912 at the August Conference of liquidators. During the imperialist world war it adopted a social-chauvinist stand, came out in defence of the war waged by the tsar and preached nationalist and chauvinist ideas. The O.C. existed until the election of the Central Committee of the Menshevik party in August 1917. p. 39

⁴³ *The Emancipation of Labour group* was the first Russian Marxist group; it was founded by Georgy Plekhanov in Geneva in 1883. It performed important work in the dissemination of Marxism in Russia. p. 39

⁴⁴ *Iskra* (The Spark)—the first all-Russia Marxist newspaper published illegally, which was founded by Lenin in 1900. After the Second Congress of the R.S.D.L.P. it became the Central Organ of the Party. In speaking of the old *Iskra*, Lenin is referring to *Iskra* from No. 1 to No 51. From No. 52 onwards, the Mensheviks converted the paper into their factional organ. p. 40

⁴⁵ This refers to the Sixth (Prague) All-Russia Conference of the R.S.D.L.P., which took place in Prague from January 5th to 17th (18-30), 1912, and which virtually had the significance of a Party congress. p. 41

⁴⁶ *Pravda*—a legal Bolshevik daily published in St. Petersburg. It was founded in April 1912, on the initiative of the St. Petersburg workers.

Pravda was a popular working-class newspaper, published with money collected by the workers themselves. A wide circle of worker-correspondents and worker-publicists formed around the newspaper. Over eleven thousand correspondence items from workers were published in the course of a single year.

Pravda had an average daily circulation of 40,000, with some issues running into 60,000 copies.

Lenin directed *Pravda* from abroad where he was living. He wrote for the paper almost daily, gave instructions to the editorial board, and rallied the Party's best literary forces around the newspaper.

Pravda was constantly being hounded by the police. In the course of twenty-seven months it was banned eight times by the tsarist

government, but was reissued under different names. The paper was closed down on July 8 (21), 1914, on the eve of World War I.

Publication was not resumed until after the February Revolution. From March 5(18), 1917 onwards, *Pravda* appeared as the Central Organ of the R.S.D.L.P. From July to October 1917 *Pravda* frequently changed its name as a result of obstruction by the counter-revolutionary Provisional Government. It appeared successively under the names of *Listok Pravdy*, *Proletary*, *Rabochy*, and *Rabochy Put*. On October 27 (November 9), 1917, following the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the newspaper began to appear under its former title—*Pravda*.

p. 42

⁴⁷ *Luch* (Ray)—a legal daily of the Menshevik liquidators, published in St. Petersburg between September 1912 and July 1913; it was financed from funds donated by "rich friends from among the bourgeoisie" (Lenin).

p. 42

⁴⁸ *Marxism and Liquidationism. A Symposium of Articles on the Fundamental Issues of the Modern Labour Movement. Part II* was published in July 1914, by Priboi, the Party's publishing house.

A number of articles by Lenin directed against the liquidators were published in this symposium. Lenin is referring to the following articles in the symposium: "The Working Class and Its Press", and "How the Workers Responded to the Formation of the R.S.D.L. Group in the Duma".

p. 42

⁴⁹ *Leipziger Volkszeitung*—a daily of the Left German Social-Democrats, published from 1894 to 1933. For many years Franz Mehring and Rosa Luxemburg were its editors. From 1917 to 1922 it was the organ of the German Independents. After 1922 it became the organ of the Right-wing Social-Democrats.

p. 42

⁵⁰ *The August bloc*—an anti-Party bloc of liquidators, Trotskyites and other opportunists directed against the Bolsheviks. It was founded by Trotsky at a conference of anti-Party groups and sections, held in Vienna in August 1912. The conference was attended by delegates from the Bund, the Caucasian Regional Committee, the Social-Democrats of the Lettish Area and from small liquidationist, Trotskyite and otzovist groups abroad; delegates from Russia were sent by several liquidationist groups which took no direct part in local Party work. The conference passed anti-Party liquidationist decisions on all questions of Social-Democratic tactics, and declared themselves to be against the existence of an illegal Party.

Being composed of heterogeneous elements, the anti-Bolshevik bloc began to fall apart even while the conference was still in session and in a year or so the blows delivered by the Bolsheviks resulted in the final disintegration of the bloc.

p. 44

⁵¹ *The "July Third" (Brussels) bloc* was formed at the Brussels "Unity" Conference held from July 16th to 18th, 1914, which was called by the Executive Committee of the International Socialist Bureau for an "exchange of opinion" on the possibility of restoring unity within the R.S.D.L.P. The delegates represented the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. (Bolsheviks), the Organising Committee (Menshe-

viks) and the affiliated organisations—the Caucasian Regional Committee and the *Borba* group, that is the Trotskyites, the Duma Social-Democratic group (Mensheviks), Plekhanov's *Yedinstvo* group, the *Vperyod* group, the Bund, the Social-Democrats of the Lettish Area, the Social-Democrats of Lithuania, the Polish Social-Democrats, the Polish Social-Democratic opposition and the P.S.P. (the Left wing).

Though the conference had been called only for an exchange of opinion and was not intended to adopt any binding resolutions, Kautsky's resolution on the unification of the R.S.D.L.P. was put to the vote. Though the Bolsheviks and the Lettish Social-Democrats refused to vote, the resolution was carried by a majority. Following Lenin's lead, the Bolsheviks refused to abide by the decisions of the Brussels Conference.

The Brussels bloc was a hypocritical attempt to disguise the opportunism of its participants and it soon fell apart.

p. 45

⁵² *An*—N.N. Jordania, leader of the Caucasian Mensheviks.

p. 45

⁵³ *The Bund* (General Jewish Workers' Union of Lithuania, Poland, and Russia) was organised in 1897 at the inaugural congress of the Jewish Social-Democratic groups in Vilna. It was an association mainly of semi-proletarian elements from among the Jewish artisans of Russia's Western regions.

During the First World War the Bundists took up a social-chauvinist stand. In 1917 the Bund supported the bourgeois Provisional Government and fought on the side of the enemies of the October Socialist Revolution. During the foreign military intervention and the Civil War its leaders joined forces with the counter-revolution. At the same time a change was taking place among the rank-and-file membership in favour of collaboration with Soviet power. In March 1921 the members of the Bund decided to disband the organisation.

p. 45

⁵⁴ *Golos* (Voice)—a Menshevik daily paper published in Paris from September 1914 to January 1915; it followed a Centrist line.

In the early days of the imperialist war (1914-18) *Golos* published several of Martov's articles directed against the social-chauvinists. After Martov's swing to the right, the newspaper came out in defence of the social-chauvinists, preferring "unity with the social-chauvinists to drawing closer to those who are irreconcilably hostile to social-chauvinism" (Lenin).

In January 1915 *Golos* ceased publication and was replaced by *Nashe Slovo* (Our Word).

p. 45

⁵⁵ *Internationale Korrespondenz*—a German weekly of social-chauvinist leanings, published in Berlin from 1914 to 1918.

p. 45

⁵⁶ *Sovremennyy Mir* (The Contemporary World)—a literary, scientific and political monthly published in St. Petersburg from 1906 to 1918. Its chief contributors were Mensheviks, including Plekhanov. Bolsheviks contributed to the journal in the period of their collaboration with Plekhanov's group of pro-Party Mensheviks, and in early 1914.

During World War I (1914-18) it became the organ of the social-chauvinists.

p. 45

REQUEST TO READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of the translation and design of this book. Please send your comments to 21, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, U.S.S.R.

7.66
21

В. И. ЛЕНИН
СОЦИАЛИЗМ И ВОЙНА

На английском языке