

throughout India. In it, for the first time, a frank difference of opinion was expressed on the tactics and program of the national struggle, and an inability to arrive at any agreement between the two schools of thought. Mr. Gandhi reiterated his faith in the "Constructive Program" which he had laid down at Bardoli in February of 1922, and which limited the activities of the National Congress to the Charka (spinning-wheel), Khaddar (the wearing of homespun cloth), and social reform activities, such as the removal of "untouchability" of the lower castes, the campaign against the drink-evil, and village-education. The absolute boycott of Government schools, lawcourts and legislative councils was insisted upon, as well as the boycott of foreign cloth.

To this program, the Swarajists opposed their own, which was to enter the Legislative Councils with the object of carrying on obstruction to government measures, until their demand for Swaraj (self-government) should be granted. They agreed to carry on the constructive program of Gandhism outside the Councils, and to enforce the boycott of merely British, as opposed to all foreign cloth. To these modifications in his program, Mr. Gandhi could not agree, and the statement of difference was issued to the country as a means of testing public opinion before the session of the All-India Congress Committee in June, which would have to decide between the two factions.

It was the first time that Mr. Gandhi's word had been challenged upon an issue of national importance. The gauntlet had been thrown down, the leadership of the Indian National Movement hung in the balance. Mr. Gandhi had declared that if his program were rejected, he would retire from politics and devote himself to social reform. The choice therefore, was clear and uncompromising. He further announced that he would submit a resolution, declaring that all persons who did not spin for half an hour a day, and who did not observe the five-fold boycott of Legislative Councils, Law-Courts, Government Schools, titles and mill-made cloth, would be forced to resign from the All-India Congress Committee. This resolution, if carried, would automatically exclude the Swarajists from power, and restore the leadership of the Congress to the orthodox Non-cooperators.

The All-India Congress Committee met at Ahmedabad — Mr. Gandhi's own province and seat of authority — on June 27, and continued its deliberations for three days. Mr. Gandhi submitted his famous "self-denying ordinance", despite the heated opposition of the Swarajists, and even that of some of his own followers, who vainly sought to reach a compromise beforehand. It was a dramatic moment, Mahatma Gandhi, the idol of the Indian people, stood at bay, defied by the opposition within the Congress ranks. It fell to the lot of the Pundit Moti Lal Nehru to state the case for the Swarajists:

"We decline to make a fetish of the spinning-wheel, or to subscribe to the doctrine that only through that wheel can we obtain Swaraj. Discipline is desirable, but it is not discipline

for the majority to expel the minority. We are unable to forget our manhood and our self-respect, and to say that we are willing to submit to Mr. Gandhi's orders. The Congress is as much ours as our opponents, and we will return with a greater majority to sweep away those who stand for this resolution."

With these words, Pundit Nehru and Deshbandhu Das left the hall taking with them fifty-five Swarajists. One hundred and ten persons remained; when the resolution was put to vote, it was carried by 67 for and 37 against, with six abstentions. This apparent victory of the Gandhists is merely apparent; had the Swarajists remained in the hall, the resolution would have been defeated by about twenty votes.

As a result of this vote, Mr. Gandhi recognized defeat. After hurried consultation with his followers, he agreed to drop his resolution on compulsory spinning and the five-fold boycott, making it only advisory in nature, and with these and other concessions, the Swarajists were persuaded to rejoin the session. Thus, the defeat of orthodox Gandhism is complete and final; the Swarajists have won the day and Mr. Gandhi, as leader of the Indian National struggle, has sung his swan-song.

UNION OF SOVIET REPUBLICS.

An Appeal of the Communist Academy in Moscow to all Parties.

Dear Comrades,

The Communist Academy in Moscow is one of the highest scientific institutions of Soviet Russia. It has taken it as its task to investigate the social problems of our time. For this purpose the Communist Academy unites the best Marxist forces of Soviet Russia and of those abroad, under whose leadership and direct co-operation the scientific labours of the Academy are carried on. The work of the Academy is divided into sections and one of the sections is specially devoted to the study of the communist labour movement.

The Academy possesses a vast library of over half a million books. It is intended that the library shall include the communist literature of all countries but unfortunately great difficulties have been encountered here on account of the very few consignments of this literature which have been received.

We appeal to you, dear comrades, to support the work of the Communist Academy by sending everything that your party has published, as well as the currently appearing literary books, pamphlets, reviews, newspapers and leaflets.

We firmly rely on your support in our work of rendering the Communist Academy an international scientific centre of communist investigation.

(signed) Henriott Deruna, Librarian.

Special Number: Against War and Social Treachery.

English Edition.

Unpublished Manuscripts - Please reprint.

- INTERNATIONAL - PRESS CORRESPONDENCE

Vol. 4 No. 45

21st July 1924

Editorial Offices: Langegasse 26/12, Vienna VIII. — Central Despatching Department: Berggasse 31, Vienna IX. — Postal Address, to which all remittances should be sent by registered mail: Postamt 64, Schlessfach 29, Vienna VIII. — Telegraphic Address: Inprecorr, Vienna.

Lenin and the Outbreak of the World War.

By G. Zinoviev.

A few words on how Lenin reacted to the outbreak of the war will no doubt be interesting. Lenin, long ago ceased to believe in the European Social Democracy. He knew well that something was "rotten in the State of Denmark". Long ago he had seen that the official European Social Democrats were carrying on a contraband trade in rotten opportunist goods. When the war broke out, we were living in a God forsaken little mountain village in Galicia. I remember having a bet with him. I said to him: "You will see, the German Social Democrats will not dare vote against the war, but will retain in the vote on the war credits." Comrade Lenin replied: "No, they are not such scoundrels after all. They will not, of course, fight the war, but they will, to ease their conscience, vote against the credits in order that the working class might not rise against them." In this case Lenin was wrong, and so was I. Neither of us had taken the measure of the flunkeyism of the Social Patriots. The European Social Democrats proved complete bankrupts. They voted for the war credits. When the first number of the "Vorwärts", the organ of the German Social Democrats, came at first refused to believe. "It cannot be," he said, "it must be a forged number. Those scoundrels, the German Social Democrats, have specially published such a number of the 'Vorwärts' in order also to compel us to go against the war credits." Alas! It was not so. It turned out that the Social Patriots really had voted the war credits. When Lenin said it his first word was: "The Second International is dead!"

At that time those words had the effect of a bursting bomb. At present we all see clearly that this is so, the Second International was dead. It is now as obvious to us as the A B C; but think only how great the prestige of this International had been before the war. It, at least, on paper, counted several million members and contained in its ranks such authorities as Kautsky, Vandervelde, Valliant, Plechanoff. And all of a sudden a Russian Marxist stood up and announces to all the world, "The Second International is dead; may it rest in peace." The howling and protest of the acknowledged "leaders" of the Second International against the impertinent Bolsheviki knew no bounds. It was monstrous, they declared, that Lenin should insult the entire Socialist world.

Lenin was one of the authors of the main thesis of the resolution of the Stuttgart International Congress of 1907. He, with Rosa Luxemburg, Lenin invited the Stuttgart Congress to proclaim that should an imperialist war begin, the workers would be to raise a revolution, that is, a civil war. After protracted arguments, the commission of the Congress adopted his decision, but in different words. Lenin told the time how he had been arguing with Bebel about

those words. According to Lenin, Bebel had accepted the idea, but demanded great care in formulating it in order not to alarm the enemy before the time.

Then the imperialist war actually came, but when Lenin now repeated the Stuttgart resolution, when he now submitted to the leaders of the Second International Bebel's I. O. U., the leaders only waived it aside and passed to the order of the day, that is, to their respective governments.

I remember the first manifesto of our party on the war. Naturally, it was drawn up principally by Lenin himself, as in fact all our most important party documents were. When we translated it into various European languages and read them out to various comrades, even the Swiss internationalist Grimm, and the Roumanian revolutionary Rakovsky, who is now in our ranks, were very indignant. They were almost horror-stricken when they read the words that the imperialist war must be transformed into a civil war.

To-day it is all as simple as A, B, C. We are all doing it, we are all practically transforming the imperialist war into a civil war, but at that time it seemed monstrous. We were told that only an anarchist could preach such things, and virtually war was declared upon us. Even at Zimmerwald not only moderate men, but also extremists were bitterly opposed to us, for our opinion that Martoff was an agent of the bourgeoisie. "How dare you say such things," they shouted at us; "we have known Martoff for the last twenty years." But we replied: "We know Martoff as well as you and we are certain that all that is honest among the Russian workers will follow us and will oppose the war, while Martoff is championing bourgeois ideas."

But of course, all these petty incidents are of no particular importance. I only mention them to show you how dead, how stagnant was the European Social Democracy at the beginning of the war. No one was prepared to fight. All had become habituated to the old tracks of legalism and parliamentarism; all the old leaders had faith in "law," and made of it a fetish. Tremendous efforts were needed to make an impression even among the Zimmerwaldians. I remember a clash at Zimmerwald between Lenin and Ledebour. Ledebour argued: "It is all right for you here living abroad to issue appeals for a civil war, I should have liked to see how you would have done it if you had lived in Russia." If Ledebour still remembers those words, I think he must feel very much ashamed of them now. But Comrade Lenin coolly replied to him: "When Marx was drawing up his Communist Manifesto he also was living abroad, and only narrow-minded philistines could reproach him for that. I now live abroad, because I was sent here by the Russian workers, but when the time arrives, we shall know how to stand at our posts."

And our Comrade Lenin kept his word.

An Unexpiated Disgrace.

By Clara Zetkin.

Ten years have passed since the outbreak of the imperialist world war proclaimed the bankruptcy of the Second International of the proletariat. An incomparably disgraceful bankruptcy — with no extenuating circumstances whatever — and at the same time a most disastrous bankruptcy. Its effects have not been exhausted by the countless piles of dead bodies and heaps of ruins which have followed in its trail, or by the profound economic convulsions which it has brought about all over the world, and which bear and develop within them, in the dialectic counterplay of historical phenomena, such forces of renewal as press forward toward revolution and can only be rendered fruitful by revolution. The first and most tangible result of the bankruptcy was the perversion of the historical life of the proletariat as a class, the stultification and misleading of proletarian revolutionary forces, and with this a retardation of the social process leading to Communism.

The legend of "defence of native country" poisoned and paralysed the fighting will to revolution among the workers. They scattered in all directions in accordance with the frontier lines drawn between the bourgeois states and imperialist groupings of powers, and made common cause with their most deadly enemies within their own country, in the name of "civil peace" and "sacred unity". From being champions of social revolution they sank to the level of butchers and butchered in the service of imperialist bourgeois lust for gold and power. Thus it came that they failed, in their confusion and cowardice, to transmute the historically necessary into the historically possible. That is, they failed to transmute the imperialist world war, brought about by the insatiable lust for exploitation possessing the bourgeoisie, into an international civil war against the bourgeoisie, carried on with clear revolutionary aims, and with determined revolutionary energy. The objective conditions for a victorious issue to the civil war were given in the mature state of advancement in the conditions of production, in the abysmal contradiction existing between the gigantic development of productive forces and the capitalist methods of production and laws of property limiting these forces, and in the whole of the resultant economic and social antagonism, finding counter-revolutionary expression during the great war.

Historically speaking, the Second International is at least as much to blame for the crime of the world war as the bourgeoisie of the capitalist states and their governments. Indeed, it is responsible for the war in a much higher degree than all the powers which strove for and desired the war. These powers were merely executing the will of that class whose historical function it is to exploit and enslave the non-propertied and the small propertied, and for whom war is solely a matter of business, a source of profit. They betrayed no class interests, no class ideals, when they drove millions of soldiers into battle against one another, on the contrary, they served their own class.

With the parties belonging to the Second International the matter was quite otherwise, they betrayed the interests and ideals of the class which they had solemnly sworn to serve. This they did even during the war, or rather especially during the war. In comparison with Scheidemann, Renaudel, Vandervelde, and Henderson, even Poch and Ludendorff, Stinnes, Wendel, Armstrong, Ciefost, and their like, appear as comparatively minor and insignificant war-mongers and war-criminals. The imperialist world war was greatly contributed to by those elements which still venture to call themselves social democrats. It could not possibly have come about without the slogans with which they corrupted the masses, nor could it have come to pass if they had made a determined struggle against it, and stood for revolution.

It is the most impudent and insolent hypocrisy imaginable on the part of the leaders of the Second International, now to play the part of indictors of the imperialist world bourgeoisie, and to stigmatize the bourgeois war-mongers with belated words of censure. All their accusations and censures recoil upon their own heads. For years they waded through the blood of the world war, side by side with the most relentless and loot hungry imperialists. For years they helped to swell this tide of blood, dinning their social patriotic jingo music into the ears of the proletariats of the separate countries, and inducing them to take part in the merciless massacre, or holding back these proletariats from fighting against the root evil,

bourgeois society, by means of unctuous social pacifist phrases. Truly, all feeling of shame must be lost to human beings when the leaders of the Second International dare to come forward, beneath the very shadow of the murder which broke out ten years ago, and call upon the workers to protest against war and the danger of war.

In the face of such mendacity and unscrupulousness, we might almost expect the spirits of the many hundreds and thousands of victims to arise from the mass graves on the battle fields, from the remote forest retreats and mountain ravines in which the wounded crept to suffer and to die alone, and from the depths of the ocean, to thunder into the ears of the social patriot agitators and social pacifist poltroons heading the Second International: "you are our murderers!" Do not further desecrate our graves and our peace. Your crocodile tears will not wash away the stain of blood from your hands. They but deepen and increase the stain. An endless procession of the crippled and disabled in the war, of those who have lost sons, husbands, and fathers, should arise and crush out the slightest tendency towards a renewal of the deception of the masses, the slightest movement in this direction on the part of those who, like Vandervelde and others, one-time ministers in the war cabinets of the bourgeoisie and its rulers, have trampled underfoot the class interests and class ideals of the proletariat, or who, like Macdonald in his capacity as Prime Minister, or like Ebert in his capacity of President of the German republic, continue to sacrifice these ideals and interests at the command of the ruling minority. For the fate of these unhappy war-victims is often enough so wretched, that even death would be welcome as release, and they can one and all be before this clique of reformist Second International leaders those promises to pay which were so lavishly distributed by never honoured by the "thankful Fatherland", and which were vouched for by this clique of leaders with all the zeal of a ready-tongued and well trained footman of the upper class.

This intense misery of certain special groups of war victims is not the only spectre left behind by the war. The spectre of the general impoverishment of the peoples of Europe is even more gigantic. And is not merely a threat, it is a frightful reality. The war and its consequences have impoverished the world, and have cast the masses of workers in particular, the middle and the petty bourgeoisie into material and cultural need and even barbarism. The cry of the countless millions of those thus pillaged, tormented, and down-trodden, is penetrating and excruciating that it cannot be drowned, even the clamour of the orgies and festivities of the profiteers, usurers, and speculators. The Great War has left but one victorious state behind it, alike in the victorious states of the Entente and in the countries of the defeated Central Powers, the wretched, the mutilated and economically and politically muzzled as they are, there is a set of industrial, financial and speculating capitalists, joyfully rubbing their hands. They can scarcely count the millions and milliards thrown into their lap, all by the war, and by the economic upheaval, and the bankruptcy of states since the end of the war. The leaders of the Second International will be accorded their share of responsibility by history for the totality of misery caused by the war. Their crime will not become less, but rather greater, that they seek to conceal their treachery by pleading as excuse the will of the social democratic parties and the chauvinist feeling of the masses. Leaders should point out the way to their parties, and in so doing to the masses as well, a determined resolution, and not stagger uncertainly about, pushed and driven in any direction.

German social democracy enjoyed the proud name of being the leading party the model party of the Second International. It regarded its unsurpassability as proved by the number of its members, votes, and seats in parliament, by the circulation and tenor of its daily press, its agitative and educative literature, by its conference resolutions and Reichstag speeches. Its views and influence dominated the conferences of the Second International. But German social democracy reared no revolutionary fighting spirit in the prevailing atmosphere of imperialist capitalism. On the contrary, it sank from a determined conscious leading revolutionary party to a tame and bourgeois democratic reform organization. With the outbreak of the world war, the much admired German social democracy

party plunged in advance of all its sister parties into the deepest bog of alliances with the bourgeoisie and its Wilhelm II government. Its shameful treachery at the decisive historical moment, imperfectly cloaked by the irresolution of its leaders, by their complete political incapacity to recognize and to act — see the grotesque Hermann Müller Intermezzo in Paris — gave the signal for the collapse of that Second International upon which the proletariat of every country had set its hopes for the preservation of peace.

German social democracy, with the lack of principles and honour required from it by the "victory of the country's flag", or, in plain language, by imperialist greed for power, continued to set an example to the loose world union of the proletariat. Its social patriotic leaders lent successive support to every war credit proposed by any government empowered to exploit the working people, by the whim of Wilhelm II, or by the dictatorship of war profiteers. Beneath Helfferich's hospitable pool they pressed with emotion the hand of the once despised monarch. At the front — but comfortably out of range, for bullets are no respecters of persons — in the offices and parliamentary lobbies, they fraternized with narrowminded and conceited generals. They played the part of touts for German imperialism, going begging for allies among the neutral countries, as was done by Sudekum in Italy, and by Otto Braun and other ornaments of the party committee when they propagated in Sweden the white book issued by the government in the causes of the war, compiling a collection of "documents" into one great lie for the serving of one end.

By means of their press and literature they maintained the war psychology among the condemned men in the trenches, and among the starving at home. They cast scorn and suspicion, and contempt, upon everyone who did not imitate them in treating the social democratic program and the resolutions of the international congresses as scraps of dirty paper, and endeavored to trample underfoot every sign of the awakening revolutionary protest among the masses. Whilst I was imprisoned on remand on the charge of "high treason", the police magistrate placed before me, as a document greatly substantiating the charge laid against me, a circular issued by the social democratic party committee. In this the comrades were expressly instructed not to propagate the manifesto and resolutions of the Extraordinary International Women's Conference at Berne in March 1915. As reason for these instructions was stated that these publications were likely to have the inevitable effect of causing the public prosecutor to interfere. Hugo Haase had pointed out in vain, basing his objection on legal experience, that this circular was bound to act upon authorities like a letter from an informer.

The social democratic opponents of Scheidemann and their companions did not even show as much courage and readiness for self-sacrifice as some of the steadfast bourgeois pacifists, and the will to revolution did not venture to draw breath in them at all. Their party discipline did not signify unshakeable unity and determination in revolutionary struggle; it rather signified a letting off of revolutionary fighting energy. Their parliamentary representatives, behind locked doors, could scold long and loudly against the social patriotic "scoundrels" and "shallow-minded fools". But they afforded these "scoundrels" the cover of their silence for long enough. Finally they did decide to refuse the war credits, to break with the social patriots, but until they had sacrificed Liebknecht, the sole bold standard-bearer of the International of the revolutionary proletariat, until Dittmann, Rosenfeld, and their like, showed no inclination to mobilize the proletarian masses and lead them to battle, until they had mustered the power of the workers and preparing for organizing the struggle, they set their hopes on Wilson, his program and his League of Nations. But how could it be otherwise? Their capacity for thought and will was so small that they were unable to loosen the leading strings still holding them to Kautsky, the most highly esteemed theoretician of the Second International. And Kautsky sought to conceal the bankruptcy of the Second International behind the foolish and cowardly declaration that the International was a peace instrument only, not to be used in war.

A relentless historical Nemesis willed it that among the states taking part in the war, the proletariat of no country has had to pay so heavy a penance for its share in the imperialist activity of a Scheidemann and the ignominious passivity of a Dittmann. It was not that the reformist activity of the working class in the other imperialist countries

were one jot better than these men. This was not at all the case. But in other countries these leaders did not enjoy the confidence and trust of broad masses of workers, they were not backed up by the mighty organized force supporting the German leaders, they were not irradiated by the dazzling lustre of tradition, the authority of profound and purposeful Marxian training and of tried and tested fighting experience, the lustre which lent to German social democracy a unique position. The greatness and importance of the party had become historical, and it was from this standpoint that the actions of its leaders were decisive for the German proletariat and the Second International. The leading German social patriots and social pacifists threw the high prestige and decisive power possessed by their party in the Second International into the scales in favour of the imperialist bourgeoisie. Their decision and their attitude decided the fate of the Second International.

The despicable capitulation of the Second International is responsible for much more than the starvation, the impoverished culture, the ruin and death of countless millions. It soiled and destroyed the exalted ideal of revolutionary proletarian brotherliness for the exploited and enslaved all over the world, for it granted its blessing and approval to the command that the proletariats of the different countries should slay one another. Broad masses lost their faith in the redeeming power of the international solidarity of the workers of the world, their faith in their own power to break their chains, their faith in socialism.

From the Basle Manifesto.

The International, at its congresses of Stuttgart and Copenhagen, has laid down the following principles for the guidance of the proletariat of all countries in the campaign against war: "Whenever there is a menace of an outbreak of war, it is the duty of the working class and their parliamentary representatives in the combatant countries, backed by the organising activity of the International Bureau, to do everything in their power to prevent the outbreak of war by the use of the means which appear to them to be efficient, varying these means in accordance with the growing acuteness of the general political situation.

If the war does break out in spite of all opposition, it is the duty of the working class to exert all efforts to bring about a speedy termination of the war, while making use of the economic and political crises engendered by the war to arouse the people, and in this manner to accelerate the abolition of the capitalist class rule."

and revolution. Everything which had been dearest to them, which had even been their highest ideal, now appeared to them as empty and worthless words, lost in the murderous clouds of poisonous gas. Their own power became dwarfed in their own eyes when the air was filled with falling bombs, and far-flying projectiles reduced flourishing cities to heaps of ruins. And yet the international solidarity of the bearers of capitalist burdens is not merely a wild flight of fancy. It is the powerful offspring of the proletarian class situation, and it grows and develops, nourished by the sufferings and sorrows which are the inheritance of the exploited.

Bleeding from a thousand wounds, international proletarian solidarity arose from the battle fields. It spoke out of the declaration inscribed on the much derided flag of those four faithful in Germany who, gazing steadfastly forward to the proletarian revolution, were the first in the camp of the international proletariat to protest against the attitude taken by the social democratic party committee, against the imperialist war. Its voice was heard again in Karl Liebknecht's manly No in rejection of the war credits. It was expressed once more at the International Socialist Women's Conference in Berne, and again somewhat later at the International youth Conference, the first convocations to call upon the producing masses in all countries to join together in the revolutionary class struggle. It took further strides forward at Zimmerwald-Kienthal. And finally it stepped forward in its full historical significance before the world proletariat, and gave us the November revolution of the Russian workers. This immortal deed has become the firm rock restoring to the wage slaves of the world their faith in their own powers, their hope that the international solidarity of the proletariat will put an end to the destructive raging of the imperialist struggle for power. The Second International deceived and betrayed these hopes most

shamefully, and has utterly destroyed all belief that it can ever be the instrument helping the proletariat to realize its dream of attaining peace and liberty by the power of its international solidarity.

Twice since the fateful summer of 1914 has History placed the Second International at the parting of the ways. The first time was in November 1917, when the glorious Russian revolution sent forth the word «peace» over the blood-stained world. Not only peace for the young Soviet republic struggling into existence, but peace for all the peoples breaking down beneath the burdens imposed upon them by imperialist madness. Peace, secured by emancipation from the yoke of the war-instigating capitalism which is only to be overcome by revolution. The second time was a year later when the Second International had to decide upon its course of action in face of the rising revolution in Germany. Ebert, Vandervelde, Henderson, Sembat, and their consorts made their choice. On both occasions they led the international proletariat into enslavement to the bourgeoisie, not into the camp of revolution. Some of them undertook without a tremor the responsibility for the «sword peace» of Brest-Litovsk, intended to enable the first workers' and peasants' state to be strangled, and the others joyfully signed the «blood peace» of Versailles and other treaties embodying essentially the same aims, intended to crush Germany and Austria, economically and politically, into the position of Entente colonies.

But that which divides them on the one hand, in their capacity as faithful servants of their national bourgeoisie, holds them together with lion bands in another direction. It is their «historical task» to protect the «sacred blessing» of bourgeois order, and to guard against their being swallowed up in «the red tide of Bolshevism». The reformist leaders of the Second International are fully agreed, are souls with but one single thought as far as their intense, tenacious, and treacherous hate against the glorious Russian revolution, or against any proletarian revolution, is concerned. They hate revolution as they fear their evil conscience, and they seek to crush it wherever it raises its head. They have aided the bourgeoisie to accomplish that which it never would have attained alone. With the aid of the Second International the bourgeoisie has

succeeded in temporarily reestablishing its shaken powers of exploitation and rule over the workers, and is proceeding to exercise these powers with renewed relentlessness.

Wels & Co., in Germany and in the other countries, are responsible for those immeasurable sufferings and countless sacrifices which the campaign of anti-Bolshevist lies and slanders, and the counter-revolutionary conspiracies, have endeavored to place at the door of the heroic Russian workers and peasants. Their hands are dripping with the blood of the revolutionary fighters in the Baltic lands and Finland, in the Hungarian and Munich Soviet republics. It is they who are stained with the blood of Rosa Luxemburg, Karl Liebknecht, Leo Jogiches, Levine, and of all those who have been assassinated and murdered by Noskeists and Fascists during the rule of the Ebertian democracy. The prisoners starving and martyred behind the prison walls of the capitalist states are witnesses against them. The leaders of the Second International have continued, since the war, the work which they began during the war — the betrayal of the proletariat and the revolution. By this they have made themselves responsible for the threatened disaster of a new imperialist world war, a war which would be even more frightful, murderous, and horrible than its predecessor.

The Second International has not yet expiated the disgrace of the rôle which it played in the great war. It has only added to its cup of iniquity by its combat against revolution. Its disgrace can never be wiped out by its leaders; it can only be eased when the proletarian masses turn with a shudder of horror from these war and revolution criminals, and leave their ranks. There is only one way of wiping out the disgrace, and that is by the proletarian world revolution. But its battles will never be fought under the leadership of the Second International. The organizer and leader of the world proletariat on its road to the world revolution is the Communist International, the daughter of the Russian revolution and of the indestructible will to liberty possessing the exploited and enslaved. The Communist International calls upon the working masses to arise and fight for the wiping out of this disgrace, to cancel the historical defeat and enslavement of the proletariat in the world war by its emancipating victory in the world revolution.

The Proletariat before the Imperialist War.

By A. Rosmer. (Paris)

It is now ten years since the clash of rival imperialism let loose the world war, which proceeded to pile up victims by the million and for fifty two months darkened Europe with barbarity. A sinister apotheosis of the greedy and rapacious bourgeoisie! But out of this prolonged butchery the capitalist world emerged shattered, strewn with corpses and covered with ruins. Its remnants everywhere were convulsed with revolution. Fortunately the revolution was victorious in Russia. Elsewhere, alike among the victors and vanquished who had remained in the war up to the end, the revolutionary wave was broken by the reformist leaders, the social patriots, who, having betrayed the working class during the war, remained united as accomplices with the bourgeoisie of their country. The lasting peace promised to the people remains more distant than ever. In the new world, with its frontiers drawn by the treaties of rapine by which the victors have imposed their will upon the vanquished, menacing conflicts are continually arising, new alliances, new groupings are being formed, the old allies are now rivals. Having retained its powerful military force, French imperialism is making preparations against British imperialism, which latter is threatened by a fearful economic crisis, and the desire for liberation which is stirring the colonial peoples which it oppresses, while American imperialism, the veritable profiteer of the war, dominates both and imposes its law upon them.

The tenth anniversary of the letting loose of the great imperialist slaughter should be the occasion for us, to bring to the all-too-forgotten workers the days of July 1914, so pregnant with great events, and to gain to revive in their memories the preparation of the great deception by means of which the bourgeoisie succeeded in dragging them into the war.

We have seen how the bourgeoisie was able to attain such an end, how it was able to realize such a purpose; this forms part of our experience for the future, and it is doubtless the most instructive experience in this sphere for

the French worker, for even the striking symbol of the death of Jaurès assassinated on the eve of mobilisation was enough to enlighten them.

The ministry which was in power in France in July 1914 was a ministry of the left, presided over by Viviani, a renegade socialist, while the important post of Minister of the Interior was occupied by the radical Malvy. While they were preparing the war and assuring Tsarist Russia of their unconditional support, they were lavish in pacifist propaganda and before all set themselves to demoralising the workers by means of the information which they caused to be published by their servile press. One morning they would be optimistic in the evening all was changed and the next day the menace of war rose afresh, inevitable. After being closed eight days on these cleverly concocted deceptions, the workers and even the peasants, who are more difficult to

Declaration by Social Democratic Reichstag Fraction on August 4, 1914.

"Now we stand before the crude fact of the war. We are threatened with the horrors of hostile invasions, not for or against the war that we have to decide to-day, but on the question of the means required for the defence of the country."

"The future liberties of our people will be greatly not entirely, at stake in the event of a victory of Russian despotism which has besmirched itself with the blood of the best of its own people. We must avert this danger, we must safeguard the culture and the independence of our country. We have to reassert what we have always said: in the hour of danger we shall not leave our fatherland the lurch."

from their fields and are fundamentally anti-militarists, were prepared to resign themselves to mobilisation, the more so as the men who ought to have aided them to see through these deceptions stooped to betrayal. One thing alone could have made the government hesitate to sign the decree for mobilisation: the clearly and energetically expressed will of the workers' organisations and of the socialists to thwart the plans of the bourgeoisie, and the daily calling to mind of the decisions of the international proletarian congresses, according to which it was the duty of socialists to bring war to an end as rapidly as possible and to make use of the upheavals caused by it to lead the workers in the fight for the seizure of power.

Instead of such a clear and energetic attitude on the part of the responsible representatives of the workers, instead of hurling defiance at the bourgeoisie, we had the spectacle of shameful weakness. In the socialist party, Jaurès fought right up to end, courageously and obstinately, till the hour of his assassination. He had seen the war coming, he had emphasised on every occasion the menacing development of the imperialist rivalries. He could not deceive himself as to the character of the gigantic conflict which was approaching, but he acted more as a pacifist than as a socialist. As is known, he thought of addressing a final appeal to President Wilson. He did not realise that the only effective means against the war consisted in the mobilisation of the working class against the bourgeoisie.

The leading trade union organisation exercised a more shameful betrayal of their principles. The General Confederation of Labour (CGT.) was led by revolutionary syndicalists who, for the previous ten years had never ceased denouncing the reformism of the International Federation of Trade Unions, demanding at every congress that the question of anti-militarism, of anti-patriotism, of the preparation of the general strike against the menace of war, should be placed on the order of the day. If the socialist party, already rotten with reformism, with parliamentarism and infested with mere careerists and politicians could, in spite of the fame which Jaurès lent it, inspire no great confidence among the working class, it would have seemed that they at least could have found a sure refuge in the CGT. An open air demonstration was organised in the centre of Paris, meetings were arranged; when an agitation ceased. The CGT. only gave evidence of its existence now and again by pacifist manifestos, which were far from summoning the workers to immediate action, and in which the bourgeoisie was able to discern its abdication. Secret conferences united the socialist and trade union leaders at the house of the Minister of the Interior, the radical Malvy, where an agreement was arrived at. The police had drawn up in the course of the preceding years, a list of suspects which was known by the name of "Carnet B 2". In the event of serious agitation, and before all on the eve of

a war, all the men appearing on this list were to be immediately arrested and imprisoned. The minister Malvy made the proposal that "Carnet B 2" should not be used, but only on condition that the socialist and trade union leaders renounced all socialist action and rallied to the war policy of the bourgeoisie. Renaudel and Jouhaux accepted this odious agreement which handed the working class over to the bourgeoisie. From whining pacifists they were transformed into agents of the government. They immediately fabricated a socialist and trade union theory consistent with war. French imperialism, British imperialism existed no longer. There was only Prussian imperialism, and against this it was necessary to defend democracy, right, justice etc.

They consented to carry out the basest work which the bourgeoisie demanded of them. They carried out all the missions entrusted to them. They were to be seen everywhere both within and outside of France, busily engaged in deceiving

Karl Liebknecht.

Declaration in the Reichstag on December 2, 1914.

It is an imperialist war, and in fact on the German side with the object of great conquests.

the workers, in duping them, in dragging them into the «democratic crusade», i. e. to be slaughtered for the sake of Russian, British and French imperialism. The government protected them against the attacks arising against them in their own organisations. The minorities then very feeble, remaining faithful to socialism and revolutionary trade unionism were stifled. The censor permitted only one language, "Humanité", then in the hands of Renaudel, vied, with the capitalist newspapers in patriotism and official deception. In addition, the renegades had a powerful means of corruption at their disposal. By the granting of exemptions from military service, by postponing the date for being called up, or recalling from the abominable life of the trenches those who had already gone to the front, they bought men's consciences and formed a guard of militants united to them by their common betrayal.

Nevertheless, a few isolated voices succeeded in piercing the deception and in denouncing it. But long months were necessary to collect the few and scattered forces which were still, subjected to the persecutions of the government. The Zimmerwald conference provided the first solid basis for the action of socialist and trade union minority against the war and against imperialism which, fighting both the bourgeoisie and its social patriotic lackeys, the renegades of socialism and the revolutionary trade union movement, steadily increased and gathered together the resolute defenders of the working class.

The World War and the Anglo-Saxon Proletariat.

By Tom Mann.

The war that commenced in 1914 gave a serious shock to civilisation. All countries were affected by it, and most of them suffered very much as a consequence. The Anglo-Saxon world was of course in the thick of it from the first day, though all Anglo-Saxon countries at the same time. The British Government had made many preparations, as was evident to the world by what happened during the first week in the sending of the expeditionary force across the channel, while the state of readiness within the limits of the then existing Navy and Army alike, showed that the Government had determined to employ them with the utmost vigour and determination.

How the Necessary Outlook was Engineered.

The Bourgeois Government of the United Kingdom was alive to the fact that some sections of the community would probably show hostility to the war and to the government that engaged in it, for involving the inhabitants in all horrors and expense of the war. Therefore from the outset commenced an extensive, vigorous and unscrupulous propaganda. The government knew that various organizations would largely to combat war, from the humanitarian and moral standpoint. They knew that earnest and capable men would face any consequences and risks to their personal liberty

In their opposition to war, and especially to conscription for the war, and these they prepared to cope with. Very early in the struggle it was seen by those capable of judging that the duration of the war would run into years, and would require the actual training of an army out of those who had not the most elementary experience of what army work was. They knew that amongst the trade unionists were many whose work would be absolutely vital to the carrying out of the war, and these they determined to propitiate by a pretence of consulting them and requesting them to realise now that the nation needed their labours as much as it needed an adequate supply of men at the front. The trade-union officials were invited to conferences with Cabinet Ministers, Heads of Departments and technical experts, Leaders of Labour Trade Unions and publicans alike, were bribed by invitation to take free trips at the governments expense to France and Belgium, and to become war advocates, apparently at their own free will, but to be well paid by the government, and some of them were supplied with an automobile and a chauffeur exclusively for themselves, and the press was instructed to report such speeches as would be made by these government puppets and to decry all such as would not respond to the governments call to help the (capitalist) government and the country; meaning the support of capitalist civilisation, and the continued enslavement of

98% of the workers. Every form of deliberate falsehood was systematically circulated by the capitalist press by order of the government. The governments publicity departments continued year after year as long as the war lasted, to prepare statements utterly regardless of truth and to compel the speedy and constant repetition of these statements, till others should take their place, under penalty of incurring the displeasure of the capitalist oligarchy, that acted as the British governments and its advisors.

By flattering trade-union officials, by appointing a number of them to high paid governmental positions and by causing others to hope the same might happen in their case, they were able to get the unions to eliminate from their rules, conditions as to overtime and apprenticeship, which it had

Comrade Zinoviev: The Slogan of the Revolutionary Social Democracy.

In the present epoch of imperialist war, revolutionary social democracy can have no other slogan but that of the Transformation of the Imperialist War into Civil War.
(Dec. 5, 1914 "Against the Current.")

taken 50 years to establish. Engineers were told a thousand times that it was an engineers war, and their work was so vital to the carrying on of the war, that at whatever cost the government must have the valuable services of the engineers every hour of every day. Besides, did not the engineers recognise the honour — aye and the glory that would be theirs when the war was won? The engineers and metal chemical trades should loyally accept the responsibility, and the government and a grateful country would make adequate reparation and honourable recognition at the end of the war. And on the strength of this the metal workers unions advised their members to comply with the governments requirements. Then came «dilution» in the engineering industry, not only were untrained men brought into the munition shops with the approval of the unions, but whilst the engineers had to make the machines and fix them, and adjust them with all necessary tools, the machines were also made fool proof so that by means of checks and stops it was difficult for a novice to make a mistake. Persons who had never been in a machine shop were brought in and taught to handle the automobile machines. Farm labourers, to most of whom a machine was a marvellous affair, and young women by tens of thousands were brought into mechanic shops and after a week or two's experience were able to earn on their piece work rates 60 to 70% more than the skilled mechanic who was responsible for the accurate adjustment of the machines. At the close of the war, when the engineers looked for a fulfilment of the government's promise to acknowledge adequately the special services rendered; not only were they laughed at, but the capitalists demanded that the men should submit to drastic reductions in wages and these were enforced.

When the government failed to get the necessary number of recruits by the various methods of enlistment, conscription was introduced. The anti-conscriptionists stoutly resisted, and very many were arrested and imprisoned.

The Balkans in the World War.

By Marinovich (Belgrad).

The Balkan war served as the prelude to the imperialist world war, and should therefore be considered as an integral part of it. And when to-day, ten years after the outbreak of the imperialist world war, we raise our voices against the terrible bloodshed and devastation inflicted upon mankind by that war, it is necessary for us to say a few words about the Balkan war too.

On instructions from France and Russia, a military alliance was formed between Serbia, Bulgaria, and Greece against Turkey (1912). In spite of the claims of the bourgeoisie of the free Balkan countries that it was a war for the liberation of the oppressed Christian nations, the then Socialist Party of Serbia and the Socialist Party of Bulgaria (the "narrow" socialists — Tesnyaki) voted in their respective parliaments against the war and against the war est-

The Uses of Empire.

The war was made use of by the ruling Plutocracy to carry on propaganda for empire on an unprecedented scale. The bourgeoisie of Australia and New Zealand are ever ready to beat the big drums of capitalist supremacy, disguised as democracy, and every device originated in England for gulling the workers and riveting upon them still more firmly the spurious theory of the Freedom secured to workers in the British Empire, this supplemented by bribes, cajollery and imprisonment or deportation of opponents.

Most astutely, the Empire Conference had been organized before the war and questions concerning imperialism and the welding of empire were always the one dominating subject. Every part of the Empire was brought in and the whole powers of organization of the astute British diplomats were brought to bear to ensure that what could only be properly termed as a «Preparedness» campaign should be systematically conducted in every part of the Empire. Titles were given, positions were allotted, every variety of propagandist work was engaged in on behalf of the ruling class under the most vague and non-committal title for a conference. And as we know, the mass of Australians, whilst stoutly resisting conscription, fell in with the bourgeois throng and crossed the seas to take part in the war.

South Africa, equal to the rest, had been carefully prepared over a period of years, and natives were brought in to share in military work and the authorities had everything

From "Hamburger Echo" of August 4, 1914:

"Well, it means «endurance» The struggle has broken out. Now is not the time to discuss and to search for the innermost cause of this terrible catastrophe. We must defend the fatherland. We are not guilty of this calamity. We have asked for peace and understanding. It has turned out differently. The issue will now be decided by Steel and Blood. The German people must defend itself.

in readiness to bring in hundreds of thousands of Zulus, Basutos, and coloured persons to be taken to Britain to work at the docks and elsewhere, but on their export psychologists telling them that the workers of Britain would certainly revolt if this were done, it was not acted upon on a large scale.

But now ten years after the outbreak of the war the revolutionary portion of the English workers have realised that the only possibility for the world peace is the setting up of a federation of Soviet Republics.

To Russia who is leading the world to social and economic freedom, the revolutionary minority in Britain, Australia, New Zealand, Canada, and South Africa, on the tenth anniversary of the world war, send revolutionary greetings and sincere congratulations.

Long live the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics
Long live the Social Revolution of the World

imates. They declared that the war was being waged at the behest of the imperialist powers of Russia and France that it pursued annexationist aims; that the war would bring liberty to the Balkan peoples, and that those who were now in alliance against Turkey would soon be at each other's throats over the division of the spoils.

And so it was. Already in June 1913, there was a quarrel between Serbia and Greece on the one hand, and Bulgaria on the other. The former war-allies were murdering each other over the partition of Macedonia, the most important province in the Balkans which has a mixed population. Bulgaria was not slow in taking advantage of the situation and it declared red war on Bulgaria. It tried to curb the content of the peasants who were clamouring for land, promising them new allotments of land in the Dobruja

to be wrested from Bulgaria. The war was soon over and Roumania took possession of Dobruja without firing a shot.

The two Balkan wars took a heavy toll of human lives and rendered the economic and financial situation of the Balkans worse than ever before. The Serbian losses in the Balkan wars amounted to 36,000 dead, 45,000 disabled, 60,000 wounded, and over one billion diners in money. Bulgaria's losses consisted of 55,000 dead, 105,000 wounded, hundred of thousands maimed, and nearly two billion leis in money. Although Roumania did not fire a shot in this "war", nevertheless, it cost the toiling people of Roumania 250,000,000 lei, and 11,000 soldiers who perished from starvation and disease. Turkey lost in this war 150,000 dead, 450,000 disabled, and 80,000 maimed. Financially the war cost Turkey 1 billion 75 million francs. Greece had more than 100,000 dead, and more than 20,000 disabled. Even the Albanian people had to suffer: the warring Balkan States slew more than 100,000 Albanians and burnt down their villages.

Thus the cleavage among the Balkan States had grown deeper. The bourgeoisie of the Balkans had proved incapable of solving the national problems. Instead of national emancipation and security of economic and cultural development, new feuds and new chains of bondage were imposed upon the Balkan peoples.

One year later, in July 1914, the world war broke out which the two groups of imperialist powers, the Entente and the Triple Alliance, had in fact been preparing for many years, and which was only precipitated by the Balkan wars. Serbia was the first State to enter the imperialist world war on July 30. The revolutionary party of Serbia, through its two representatives in parliament, protested vigorously against the war and against any war credits. The Socialist Party maintained the same attitude even after the whole of Serbia had been occupied. This imperialist war was waged by two groups of imperialist powers fighting each other for world domination: Serbia, Turkey and Bulgaria joined the war on the side of Germany, and Roumania on the side of the Entente.

Greece did not join the war, but it was not because the Greek bourgeoisie was against the war, but because it was fighting for a larger share of the spoils. Meanwhile the Entente invaded Greece and established in that country a military dictatorship. The socialist, revolutionary party and groups of Serbia, Bulgaria and Roumania, fought against the war from beginning to end, voting against all war credits and insisting on peace. These Parties and groups followed consistently the previous resolutions of the Second International, which has betrayed the proletariat not only by supporting no opposition to the war, but also by entering into the service of capitalists and imperialists, thus playing a counter-revolutionary role.

The Balkan peoples, victors and vanquished alike emerged from the war completely exhausted, and with increased hatred against each other. Immeasurable, inestimable and indescribable losses were borne by the Balkan peoples in this terrific war.

Serbia was occupied for more than three years; one can imagine her economic and financial conditions. Counting that Serbia has a total population of 4,500,000, it is that she sustained the greatest proportionate loss in lives. Serbia had more than 800,000 dead, more than 1,000,000 wounded, and more than 1,000,000 maimed. Of the young men between the ages of fourteen and eighteen, more than 500,000 were drafted by order of the government on the well known pretext of their military service. In Austria-Hungary alone 150,000 men were interned, and according to reports, no less than 100,000 of them died. Many thousands were also interned in Bulgaria, and many of them perished. In the part of Serbia which was occupied by Bulgaria, the occupying authorities killed 20,000 people and burned down about 40 villages. The war costs amounted to 15 billion diners. Bulgaria's losses in the world war were 150,000 dead, 300,000 wounded, 100,000 maimed, and 7 billion lei in war costs.

Roumania entered the world war in September 1916, and sided with the Entente. This did not stop the Roumanian bourgeoisie in the first two years of the war from selling their souls to Germany for good money; practically everything was taken from Roumania, so that Roumania was left economically desolate. The Roumanian capitalists and landlords carried off heaps of money, leaving the country; they went to Europe and America where they lived in affluence and tranquillity, while

hundreds of thousands of workers and peasants were perishing from starvation and on the battlefields, which meant the realisation of the fond desire of the Roumanian nobility: let millions of peasants and workers perish rather than that they should get land and reforms. The Roumanian bourgeoisie and the military clique could be well content: the Roumanian soldiers went to the front without boots and without clothing, and sometimes even without arms.

Eight-hundred thousand Roumanians lost their lives in this war, through war casualties, hunger, cold and disease. The war costs amounted to 12 billion lei.

Turkey's losses in the world were 350,000 dead at the front, 900,000 victims of epidemics, and 710,000 Ottoman citizens massacred by the Turkish troops. Turkey's expenses in this war were 1 billion 20 million francs and 220 million Turkish pounds.

The conclusion of the war made evident the truth which had long since been proclaimed by the socialist parties. This war had brought no peace and liberty to the nations, but increased antagonism, paving the way for new wars. The cleavage among the Balkan States had grown even wider. After the termination of the world butchery, a new war fought between Turkey and Greece, the peoples of these countries had to sustain new sacrifices and sufferings. The Turkish losses of this war were 180,000 dead on the battlefields and 150,000 from epidemic. For the prosecution of this war the Turkish government requisitioned anything that it could lay its hands on, inflicting untold misery and distress upon the people. Greece lost 60,000 dead on the battlefield, scores of thousands dead from disease and cold, and over a million refugees.

The people of the Balkan countries, victors and vanquished alike, were ruined by this war. On the one hand, the working masses of the villages and towns were even more enslaved economically and financially by their native bourgeoisie, and on the other hand the Entente — France, Italy and England — had made the Balkan countries even more safe and obedient vassal-colonies, which should make the road secure for the penetration of imperialism into Africa and Asia. The great powers, having sliced up the Balkans to suit their respective interests, incited the Balkan peoples to fight with each other, thus rendering them incapable of independent existence and paving the way for new wars. The bourgeoisie and the court cliques of the victorious Balkan countries, to secure their sway over the conquered provinces, are spending billions on military preparations. France, who is now at the head of reactionary imperialism, advanced new loans to her Balkan vassals for military purposes. A few months ago Yugo-Slavia obtained from France a loan of 1,600 million dinars. The war budget, which in 1920 amounted only to 577 millions dinars, was increased for the year 1924 to 2,159 million dinars, which means more than one-fifth of the total revenues of the State. Yugo-Slavia has now a national debt of 20 billions, which was contracted mostly for military purposes. It means an encumbrance of 1,700 dinars per head of the population.

Roumania to-day, with a total annual revenue of 20 billion lei, and a national debt of 25 billion gold lei, spends about 3 billion annually on militarism. She squanders recklessly the peoples' money, primarily in order to retain Bessarabia in bondage.

Bulgaria, who on paper was forbidden by the great powers from maintaining a standing army based on conscription, is preparing herself for new wars, with the knowledge and secret consent of the great powers. The Bulgarian rulers have imposed upon the Bulgarian people a burden of more than 100 billion lei for war expenses and militarism, which means an encumbrance of 22,273 lei per head of the population.

To-day on the tenth anniversary of the outbreak of the world war, the toiling masses of the towns and villages of the whole of the Balkans should recall the terrible bloodshed and devastation caused to the Balkan peoples by the last imperialist war; they should well bear in mind that these wars were waged for the interests of the capitalist and monarchist cliques. It is the duty of all the Balkan peoples, oppressed as they are now by unparalleled economic and financial burdens, to raise their voice against any new imperialist wars that are now being prepared by capitalism.

The last wars have shown that the workers and poor masses of the peasantry have one common enemy, and it

is therefore the duty of the workers and peasants to wage a common war upon the common enemy. It is to the supreme interest of the Balkan peoples to live with each other in peace and friendship, but this peace and friendship they cannot obtain unless they fight shoulder to shoulder for the overthrow of the capitalist and monarchist regime. It is the only way to bring about an alliance of the workers and peasants under the slogan of a workers' and peasants' government, aiming at the creation of a federation of workers' and peasants' republics of the Balkans, as a guarantee of peace and freedom, and of economic and cultural development of all the Balkan peoples.

Trade Unions and the War.

By A. Lozovsky.

The world war could not have lasted even a few months had it not received unexpected support from the socialist parties and the trade unions. It is difficult to say who played a more vile part in the war, the leaders of the socialist parties or the trade union leaders. It would be difficult to choose between them. One can only say that both were vile. Could capitalist society have drawn millions of people into the war without the aid of the trade unions? Could the murder of millions of human beings by the State, the church and the press proceed for several years without the support of the labour organisations? Of course not!

The special feature of the war is the fact that the trade unions played the part of a cannon fodder contractor. They used their apparatus built up by decades of class discipline and played up to craft prejudices of the working men in order to involve the masses in the war. The trade unions not only played the part of recruiting agents and cannon fodder contractors but they supplied the ideological and moral basis for this mutual destruction. This is the worst side of their activities. As soon as war was declared all these gentry, the Jouhauxs, the Leiparts, the Appletons, the Hendersons, and other trade union bureaucrats, large and small, rushed to the support of their fatherland. The trade unionists of the Entente countries were protecting democracy from the onslaughts of the barbarians. The patriots of the Central Empires were safeguarding their civilisation from the attacks of the Russian Cossacks. Every one of them professed to be protecting the workers' interests; in reality they were fighting for the continuance of the hegemony of their own bourgeoisie.

When one recollects the history of the European War and all that the trade union bureaucrats did during that period to warp the minds of the workers, when one considers the fact that these instigators of mass murders still speak in the name of the working class and that millions of proletarians trail after the reformists, one cannot but ask oneself: "Will the working class ever succeed in freeing itself from the influence of these gentlemen and how many more millions will have to be killed in order to convince the remainder?" However, these are no grounds for pessimism. We must understand the reasons why the proletariat is following the reformists and, having understood, we must continue our efforts to remove these reasons. Why was it that the trade unions were the main support of this holocaust? What was it that induced the English workers to throw themselves with such fury against the Germans, and why did the latter exterminate the French with such bitterness? It cannot be explained merely by State compulsion, or that the military situation demanded it. No! The reason must be sought much deeper. Capitalism at its zenith subjects the working class intellectually as well as physically; when capitalism is on the upgrade the workers benefit to a certain extent; the more powerful capitalism becomes, the greater is its sphere of influence; it can give more concessions to its workers in order to obtain aid in exploiting colonial and weaker countries.

The war meant the struggle for financial and political hegemony. The English, French and German workers not only defended the position their country occupied in the world market, they help to extend it, unconsciously, it is true. Capitalism through its educational and political institutions (schools, churches, the press, etc.) influenced the labouring masses for a considerable period, developed their patriotism, national pride and roused a spirit of rivalry with other countries, etc. This influence was felt acutely at the beginning of the war. Class organizations and organizations which at the first glance would appear to be independent proved

The Communist Parties of the Balkan countries, as the representative of all the exploited and oppressed, pledged themselves to-day, on the tenth anniversary of the outbreak of the terrible butchery, to do their utmost to lead the whole of the proletariat and peasant masses in order to lead these masses into the unrelenting fight against capitalism and imperialism, which are preparing new wars against the Balkan peoples.

To the slogan: "Down with capitalist wars!" The proletariat and the peasant masses of the Balkans must add slogan: "Onward into the fight for a federation of workers' and peasants' republics in the Balkans!"

to be an organic part of bourgeois society. Only the war pressed the canker in the labour movement. We saw dangers of reformism before the war but none expected it could lead the working class to such a downfall.

The war began on the pretext that it was for national defence. The trade union bureaucrats repeatedly stated they remained on their class positions. This was bluff, and simple. As a matter of fact the labour organization from the beginning of the war, became part of the bourgeois State-machine, while the trade union leaders fulfilled the duty of recruiting sergeants. The history of the war is the history of the gradual moral and political fall of the trade unions. In taking up the position of national defence they were called forced to accept police functions in order to control the workers. They abrogated the successes of many years struggle. They smothered any voice of protest rising among the masses; in conjunction with the police and gendarmes they suppressed all free opinion and criticism of the State. Their only slogan was "Fight to a finish". They substituted the slogan "Workers of the World, Cut Each Other's Throats" for "Workers in the World, Unite." They brought corruption into the working masses, they introduced espionage among them, all in the name of their beautiful homeland, etc. for the sake of the fat pocket-books of the bankers and industrialists. The history of the trade union movement of the war has not yet been written. Every leader of the union movement considered it a pleasure to help the State placed robbers. This continued for four years of war paralleled for its extent and the losses it entailed.

National bigotry existing in the labour masses received its apogee thanks to the activities of these gentlemen, who preached nationalism and imperialism, and corrupted the minds of the masses and undermined the very foundation of international solidarity of the working classes. As a result of their actions they were forced to break up the national. Attempts were made in 1916 to form a trade union international of Entente countries. This was the way the union bureaucrats of all countries fulfilled their patriotic duty. They proved that the labour organizations can unite with the bourgeois State and subject themselves to its interests and live its life.

The war is ended... and the deadly enemies of the day are talking of resuscitating the International. Can an international can be formed by people whose heads are wrapped in a bloody fog? What sort of international can be formed by people whose patriotism is part of their very life? Who place the interests of the bourgeoisie above those of the working class? They can form an international in name, but not in fact. They can collect all the national organizations and christen the assembly with the name of international, but they cannot launch themselves into international politics with this passport. They have done so too.

The emaciated, exhausted, deluded masses were urged for international connections. They urged their leaders to international relations. Instead of the bread they asked they received a stone; instead of an organization they received against capital they gave them a bauble, attached to the "League of Nations", called the International Federation of Trade Unions. The social patriots stood at the side of the cradle of this international in blood-stained clothes. We saw this "International" at work. It began its activity by signing the "League of Nations" without any reservation, part in working out the Versailles Treaty; it supported the move to lay the responsibility for the imperialist war on the shoulders of the German proletariat and white-washed bourgeoisie of their own countries, the Entente.

Every time the smell of powder pervaded Europe, this so-called International disintegrated into its integral parts; as soon as the danger of war passed by, the Amsterdam gentry began to cry that they were against war. Who is not acquainted with these fiery pacifists? Did they not convene the International Peace Conference at the Hague? Did they not accept a resolution calling the workers to strike in case war be declared? Did they not form a united front with the bourgeois pacifists? Did they not repeat a week, or so ago that they were still against war and fixed the third Sunday in September for a demonstration against the horrors of war?

But who ever believes their vapourings is an idiot! These gentleman cry against war very loudly during times of peace... but as soon as it is declared, they cry that they must fight to the finish.

Ten years have passed since the war began. The world is not the same as it was at the beginning of the war and the proletariat is far from what it was in July 1914. The years of war ingrained a deadly hate of the capitalists and their agents in the minds of the workers. During this period

The Working Youth Confronted by Imperialist War.

By Jaques Doriot.

Ten years have passed since the declaration of war. Far from being lessened, the imperialist antagonisms are more acute than ever. The Versailles Peace which decided a new division of the world, has set all the imperialist powers one against the other, ready to combat each other.

The working youth must understand this dangerous situation and prepare itself for the struggle. The experiences of the last years were too severe to be forgotten by the working youth.

The young generation took the largest share in the war, it suffered the most severe losses from it. A German official statement has shown that the young men from 19 to 25 years have suffered 44% of the total sum of mortal losses of the war. In the 1913, 1914, 1915 classes were almost without exception annihilated; in England the conscription system crushed the whole youth; in Belgium the age limit for military service (not 30 years) threw the whole burden of active service upon the small stratum of young workers.

Besides the losses suffered by the working youth in the trenches, there remain to be added the sufferings experienced by the still younger lads, by those who were not called up. The protective legislation in favour of the youth was abolished in the name of national defence; the youngest of the rising generation had to go into the factories, where they had to take the place of the dismissed adults and to work the longest working hours.

The extraordinary increase during the war in those diseases arising from poverty (Tuberculosis etc.) among the heavily exploited youth furnishes proof of the misery which it had to sustain. During the war the Social Democratic youth organisations committed treacheries no less than the parties. They allied themselves directly with imperialism and were its best recruiting agents. Their treachery, in view of the consequences of the war upon the youth, must be regarded as still greater and still more abominable than that of the Social Democratic parties. Beginning from 1915, a group of comrades revolted against the treachery of the leaders within the ranks of the international and formed the first nucleus which subsequently rallied around itself the broad masses of the youth and constituted the Communist Youth International.

Its first tasks were to attack the Social Democratic parties and to fight against militarism. In this sphere they achieved considerable results. In the Ruhr Area during the occupation, the Youth International

Peasants and War.

By Th. Dombal.

From time immemorial to the present day, war has been the greatest scourge of the peasantry. It is always accompanied by destruction, pillaging and burning of the country. It destroys the fruits of the hard labour of the land and of his family. It was the peasant who always bore the heaviest sacrifices of war. Although in olden times, during the period of feudalism, war had become the craft of a group of knights and nobles, and although in those days the peasants

the Communist International has developed into a great power, the Red Trade Union International has come into being and grown immensely. More and more detachments are gathering round these revolutionary centres. Capitalism is fighting for its existence with fury; the reformists are defending their position with desperation. But they will not succeed in retaining their hold. They will and must be driven out of their trenches. In this decade of war, the proletariat will throw its hatred of capitalism in its face; it will remind them of the millions killed and crippled. When the working men and women curse the tenth anniversary of this nightmare they will remember those who laid the ideological and political foundation under it. They will remember the reformists and trade union bureaucrats who carried corruption and decay into the international labour movement. They will remember their services before the labouring masses. Resolutely, they will inscribe on their banners the slogans, "Down with Capital!" "Down with the fascist reaction!" "Down with international reformism", "Down with the social patriots". "Kick the traitors to the working class out of the labour organizations!"

systematically organized the penetration of the army and propaganda among the soldiers. Fraternisation was our slogan. The efforts of the French and German Young Communists were successful. The soldiers in numerous places of the occupied territory have fraternised with the German workers. Owing to this growing movement the military authorities were compelled to concentrate the troops and to take most rigorous police measures. Mass arrests were carried out. Dozens of workers and soldiers have been sentenced to heavy penalties, and sentences from 5 to 10 years imprisonment have been frequently imposed.

Karl Liebknecht.

The war is not only the result of the policy of competitive armaments which we have always opposed, it is not only the result of secret diplomacy, it is not only a Bonapartist undertaking directed against the working class movement, it is, in its very historical nature, imperialistic. It is imperialistic in its origin. It is imperialistic in its objects, i. e. it pursues capitalist aims of expansion and conquest.

(From the resolution of August 4)

The defensive measures of the capitalists and militarists prove that the communist propaganda was a great danger to the French army. Its disorganizations by means of propaganda is no more a utopian idea but a living reality.

The propaganda in the Ruhr Area must become the classic example for communist work against war. The day on which all parties have developed a large-scale agitation among the soldiers and have established their organizations within the very regiments, capitalism will have lost the possibility of making use of troops. This important task must be based upon a large-scale agitation among the masses of the young workers in order to prepare them for their work within the army.

Ten years after the declaration of the imperialist war, the vigorous thought of Lenin of revolutionary antimilitarist work must assume a foremost place in our work.

were not enlisted into the army, nevertheless they had to bear the burden of heavy military duties, since they were compelled to pay enormous taxes either in money or in kind, while their property was usually subjected to the pillage of the soldiers or of passing armies. Violence, pillage, conflagrations, hunger, distress and ruin followed in the wake of every war. The old proverb of the Polish peasantry says truly: "The nobles quarrel among themselves, but it is the peasants' hair

which is torn." The peasants possessed no arms and could not protect themselves successfully against the pillage of the nobles and the soldiers of fortune. Such was the state of affairs in olden times, when the art of warfare was simple, when cold steel was the most important weapon used, and when war was waged by relatively small armies. In the course of time, however, the terrors of war increased. The invention of gun-powder and fire-arms caused a change in the composition of armies. The resplendent knight, in shining armour was replaced by the drab infantry recruited from the peasant class. Thus, in addition to the former heavy burden of taxes, the peasants were now called upon to pay a heavy tribute in blood, to furnish the human material for the army. Compulsory military service was introduced, the entire burden of which chiefly fell on the shoulders of the toiling masses of the peasantry. The old proverb of the peasantry was therefore radically modified. It was substituted by the saying: "The peasants fight and the masters grow fat."

A Great Amsterdamer During the Great War and After.

Scene: The Queen's Hall, London, on the occasion of a mass meeting convened by social patriots in support of the Great War. H. M. Hyndman, the self-styled "Father of English Socialism" is among the speakers. Among the "star turns" is Ben Tillet, now perhaps better called Benjamin Tillet Esqre, as he is now the darling of the bourgeoisie. Soldiers in Khaki are present to keep order and to act as "chuckers out" in the event of anti-war elements being present. Benjamin: (foaming with indignation against German militarism and German atrocities and waving his arms like a wind-mill) "Women in Belgium have been raped! raped!! raped!!!" (to the anti-war and revolutionary members of the audience who are interrupting and interjecting) "You cowards! You skulkers! You pro-Germans! You are sheltering behind the quivering bodies of our brave boys at the Front! ... I want to rise your dander for you!" ... A "Voice" (ironically) "Three cheers for the Tsar!" Benjamin: "If I could only get hold of that man who said 'three cheers for the Tsar,' I would let him have it!" *

Mr. Ben Tillet at the recent Vienna Conference of the Amsterdam Trade Union International. "We must fight more energetically than hitherto against war. Till now the Communists were the only energetic opponents of war, we must not leave them this monopolist position. We must take timely preventive measures against war, for if a war breaks out, everyone of us stands by his own country."

The peasants did not understand the real cause of war, and to the present day the bulk of them do not understand its main cause. Unfortunately, they still believe the obese clergy of all religious denominations, who tell them that war is a "divine punishment for the sins of man", and is inevitable as long as this world exists. It is true that the last imperialist world-war has opened the eyes of millions of peasants. The peasants, whom the priests of the various creeds with their benedictions used to send to war for the alleged purpose of "defending the fatherland", protecting civilisation, and so on, began to see that while they were bleeding at the front and their families were dying from hunger at home, the handful of landlords and bourgeois parasites, together with their crowd of priests, rabbis, mullahs and so on, were living in the lap of luxury and increasing their wealth. The idea began to dawn in their minds that they were being shamefully deceived, that they were the victims of predatory knaves; they began to understand that they were shedding their blood for the vile interests of a handful of parasites. No wonder the mass of the soldiers began to rebel, and when in October 1917 the bolsheviks launched the slogan: "War against war!", the mass of the peasants, clad in military uniforms, went over to the side of Revolution. It was not only the Russian front which crumbled; all the other military fronts began to crumble. The arms were then in the hands of the masses, and there was a moment when it seemed as though the wave of revolution would engulf the whole of Europe, and wipe out for ever the power of the bourgeoisie and of the landlords and establish in its place the power of the workers and peasants, and thus put an end to all wars. The "spectre of bolshevism" began to stalk through Europe. The capitalist exploiters were seized with

mortal fear. They flew to the last resort of safety. Through the mouths of their social-democratic flunkies and of the peasants' leaders who were in the service of the rich, they promised to satisfy all the demands of the toiling masses in a peaceful way, by means of parliamentary enactments. They hastened to conclude peace and passed a number of social reforms. But now they are ignoring these reforms without the slightest compunction. They managed to save their criminal domination not merely by the treachery of the popular leaders, but chiefly because the masses, particularly the peasants, failed to understand the principal cause of war, and being anxious for peace, the peasants allowed themselves to be hoodwinked by pacifist slogans. It is here one must look for the chief cause of the subsidence of the war of Revolution.

In the imperialist world-war the peasants of all countries served as cannon-fodder. The peasants have yet to understand the essence of the capitalist system. They must realise that the earth is now ruled by a handful of mighty industrial magnates and bankers. In their hands are concentrated the huge industrial enterprises, which are united into so-called corporations, trusts and combines. The Stinnes industrial concern in Germany, which has its own coal mines, iron mines, machine construction works, electric power stations, wharves, and even its own newspapers and printing plant for the manufacture of "public opinion" is a striking example of this. This concern employs over half a million workers and office employees. In America there is the United States Steel Corporation with a capital of two milliard dollars, whose output of steel products exceeds the combined output of France and England. The peasants must learn that the world's supply of petroleum (with the sole exception of Soviet Russia) is really owned by two trusts, the American Standard Oil and the Royal Dutch Shell Company.

These huge industrial commercial combines dominate the medium and small industry and commerce, while they themselves are controlled by the large banks which finance them. Thus, for instance, German industry, commerce and agriculture are dominated by four banks; the group of so-called "D" banks, while American finances are dominated by the groups of Morgan and Rockefeller. These banks collect the savings of the peasants and the petty-bourgeoisie and grant or refuse loans out of these funds as it suits their own interests. Thus this new oligarchy of finance dominates the whole world. Not cabinet ministers and parliaments, but exist merely to fool the masses and for the delectation of the credulous, but the groups of bankers and large industrialists conduct the politics of the nation and decide the questions of war and peace. The world's overlord is now finance capital, which in the race for profits and for the exploitation of the countries, dictates annexationist and imperialist wars. The war was a war between two capitalist gangs for a distribution of the world, and millions of peasants shed their blood on the field of battle, killing their own brothers and other nationalities in the interest of the capitalist robbers.

The permanent rivalry between these capitalist groups is the cause of new conflicts and new wars. The race for profits inevitably leads to rapine and murder. Under the capitalist system, when the whole of human productivity is carried on not to serve the needs of the community, but to provide profits for a handful of rich exploiters, there is bound to be competition between the various gangs of capitalists for the capture of new markets, for new spheres for investment of capital and to exploit the natural wealth of the human energy of the masses of the people in other countries. As long as this system exists, all the points of

From "Bataille Syndicalists" of August 14th, 1914

"We must save the democratic and revolutionary tradition of France. Against the might of the fist, against German militarism."

Jouhaux at the grave of Jaurès:

"And now, from this grave, we proceed to the war, I too shall go!"

Vaillant:

"We swear that we shall do our duty for our country, for the republic, for the revolution."

"peace everlasting" will be in vain. Peace can only come as the result of the overthrow of the criminal capitalist regime, and the introduction of a new socialist order. Production will then be carried on for use instead of for profit, and will be regulated in accordance with the needs of the community. Distribution between town and village and between the different countries will be systematically arranged. The road towards this goal is clear: it is the road of the overthrow of the capitalist regime, which is the cause of wars, of perpetual calamities and misfortunes to the masses of peasants and workers. Instead of the capitalist dictatorship there will be the Proletarian Dictatorship, the power of the town and village will be supplanted by the power of the workers and peasants.

The last imperialist world war took a toll of ten million man lives and left an equal number of cripples. The majority of these victims came from the peasantry. Every peasant knows that he has been greatly impoverished by the war, owing to the shortage of labour power and stocks, as well as by direct destruction. To this day there are numerous desolate, while the capitalist gangs fill their pockets out of restored villages and hamlets; once fertile meadows are now so-called "restoration". The scandals in connection with the restoration of the devastated areas in France are matters of common knowledge. Everybody knows also that in Poland peasants are still living in mud-huts, and so on. Further-

From "Le Peuple" (Brussels) of August 18, 1914.

"The final victory of the Allies must deliver the teutonic race to the scorn of mankind without mercy or sentimentalism, and this race must expiate its terrible sin for many generations to come..."

Plekhanov's "righteous war".

"What Russia has demanded for Serbia is almost fully in agreement with the demands of the social democratic international. Nothing can be more true than this."

(Plekhanov's collection of Articles on "The War" 19, 25, 23, quoted on p. 127 of "Against the Current").

the war has increased the death-rate of the race. As a result of mass starvation, and the lack of medicines, contagious diseases have spread. We witnessed mass epidemics of Spanish influenza, typhus and other diseases and the general death-rate has increased tremendously in comparison with pre-war times. Although the depreciation of currency released part of the peasants from their mortgage burden, while the temporary rise in prices of agricultural products has brought some relief to the peasantry; nevertheless economic crisis, coupled with stagnation of trade and depression of currency, has caused a mad rise in the prices of manufactured goods, with a tremendous discrepancy between the prices of the products of industry and the products of agriculture, which we now describe as "the scissors". This leads to the impoverishment of the masses of the peasants, while the growing burden of taxation drives the peasants to extreme distress and despair.

All the expenses of the restoration and recuperation of the economy are shifted by the bourgeoisie on to the shoulders of the workers and peasants. To make things worse, the landlords and the bourgeoisie are preparing for new wars, and these wars too fall upon the toiling people of town and village.

Women and War.

By Käthe Duncker.

On August 1st, 1924, ten years will have elapsed since the beginning of the world war. What need and poverty, suffering and despair these ten years have brought for us!

How dreadful were those first August days in 1914, the day from husband, father, son or brother and then the weeks and months of waiting for news and when the first letter came always there was the thought — who would be the hand that wrote it, is it not already lying cold in some common grave! And the awful news that said "wounded", or worse, "missing". The longed-for yet

According to data given by the French government, published in "Le Temps" of the 17th of July 1922 the relative expenditure on armaments of the various countries as compared with 1913, the year particularly marked by the race for armaments, was as follows: England 181%; America 174%; Japan 290%; Spain 275%; and so on; while in Poland, for instance, expenditure on armaments absorbed as much as 75% of the national Budget. On the whole, it is safe to say that expenditure on armaments has increased three times. The capitalist criminals are preparing for a new military butchery, in which they will apply the latest scientific and technical achievements for the wholesale destruction of workers and peasants. The war which they plan will be transferred from land and water to the air. In addition to the huge numbers of aeroplanes, they are manufacturing poison gases for wholesale use in war. The savagery of the so-called "cultured and civilised" bourgeoisie knows no bounds.

New gangs of capitalists are preparing to fight among themselves for a new distribution of the world, and the cycle of calamities to millions of peasants is growing imminent.

Therefore, on the 10th anniversary of the last imperialist world war, the masses of workers and peasants should not content themselves merely with anti-war demonstrations. This alone is not enough. While the capitalist system goes on, while the bourgeoisie holds unchallenged sway, it is no use talking about a lasting peace. The Week of protest against the menace of new wars must be a week of propaganda, to explain chiefly to the peasants that the menace of war, and the causes of all social evils, are inherent in the capitalist system itself. It should be brought home to the peasants that they had arms in their hands in 1918, when they allowed themselves to be duped by pacifist promises. The moment will soon come when the bourgeoisie will again place arms in the hands of the peasants, and when that moment comes, the peasants should have the intelligence to use them, not against the revolutionary workers and peasants of their own country, nor against the workers and peasants of other countries, but against their own bourgeoisie and landlords and their flunkies. Hence it follows that the greatest enemies of the masses are those who preach the gospel of pacifism and indulge in foolish talk about conciliation with the exploiting class; because they merely serve the purpose of lulling the masses to sleep. The week of protest against war should inaugurate the beginning of untiring propaganda, not for pacifism, but for the revolutionary solidarity of workers and peasants throughout the world. The Peasants' International came into being under the slogan of the struggle against the menace of war and militarism, the greatest calamities that befall the toiling masses of peasants throughout the world; and its principal task should be to explain to the masses of peasants of all countries the tremendous importance of this very question, which will be of decisive moment in the revolutionary events which are imminent in the West.

Not pacifism and pious peace sermons, but relentless fight against militarism, revolutionary struggle against the bourgeoisie and landlords, is the road to enduring peace. Therefore, down with the narcotic poison of pacifism! Let the masses of the peasants prepare to declare war against war, in order to use the arms placed in their hands to kill their own brothers, to overthrow the criminal domination of the bourgeoisie and landlords and their flunkies throughout the world, and to establish the power of workers and peasants. Through the Proletarian Dictatorship, through untiring and organized revolutionary struggle against the bourgeoisie and landlords in all countries, lies the road to freedom. Only in this manner can the peasants and workers put an end to war for ever and be able to beat their swords into ploughshares.

bitter hours of meeting in some hospital, which gave us back our loved one, perhaps an invalid for life, horribly mutilated, robbed of sound limbs or of eyesight!

At last the awful day when the news came — husband, son or father had fallen, blown to pieces by a grenade, suffocated in some hole in the earth, slowly bleeding to death or dying in torment on barbed wire.

How awful were the sufferings of those who remained at home! In blockaded Germany where rations became always less and less, the war-kitchen soup more thin, while ever longer grew the queues in front of the provision shops

lined up for a little margarine, a quarter of a pound of meat, a handful of potatoes! Where the children's cheeks grew ever paler, the figures of the women more and more care-worn! Or in those regions where the war raged, the sufferings caused by the enemy invasion, the enforced flight from house and home, the destruction of the humble but nevertheless treasured household furniture! And everywhere the hard necessity which drove the women to the working front, to the plough, to the postal or railway service, to the heavy and injurious work in the munition factories.

Six years of so-called peace have followed on the four dreadful years of war. What have they brought for us women? In the fortunate cases where husband and father has returned home safe and sound from awful slaughter, was it always unalloyed joy? How often he came back nervous, overstrained, bullying and coarsened! How often it was found that husband and wife had become strangers to each other in the long years of the war. And the countless invalids and war-victims? What of the provision which a grateful country had so solemnly promised them? A glance at the crippled beggars, the emaciated women and children, whom we meet on all sides is the best answer to this question.

But has not "peace" also brought many good things for the women and for the whole of the working class? Have they not won in many of the warring countries political rights, as a reward of endurance, as a reward for having starved and turned out grenades so bravely? And the eight-hour-day, the unemployed benefit, the right to factory-councils — are they not all war achievements?

Ah, we know only too well, that women's suffrage was only granted, so that the patient women, for the most part still under the influence of the church, might form a reactionary counter weight against the men revolutionised in the trenches. And we Communist women have learnt to appreciate rightly the worth or rather the worthlessness of democratic rights in the class state.

And the eight-hour-day and the many other social conquests have for long been hotly contested and for the most part are already torn from us again. But the evil results of the war, high prices and unemployment with their consequences of hunger and sickness and impoverishment have remained, they prevail still, they depress the proletariat ever deeper and deeper, not only in the defeated countries, but also in the victorious and neutral countries.

Unfortunately it is necessary to remember all these things on the tenth anniversary of the outbreak of the war, for although millions have experienced them and are still feeling them, it seems as if these facts themselves, or at least their causal connections, are sinking already into oblivion. Otherwise it would be impossible that the fascists in almost all countries could catch wide masses of people with their nationalistic phrases, that in Germany for instance, the parties of the extreme right could play again with the idea of a war of revenge, a new imperialist bloodshed.

It would also be impossible that the party, which in August 1914 turned the words of Marx: "Proletarians of all countries, unite!" to their very opposite, the party, which it perhaps not at the outbreak, still at least during the long

"Liebknecht!"

By Henri Barbusse.
(From: "Le feu" ["Under fire"].)

Bertrand was not much of a talker as a rule, and he never talked about himself. All the same, he said "I've done in three of them. I laid about me as if I was mad. Oh! We were all of us beasts when we got here."

Then, raising his voice, which was trembling all the time: "It had to be," he said. "It had to be — for the sake of the future." — He folded his arms and nodded.

"The future!" He suddenly exclaimed in a prophetic tone. "What will those who come after us, and to whom progress — which comes like fate — will have brought at last a clear moral judgment, think of these butcheries and these exploits which we, we who are actually performing them, do not know whether to compare with the feats of Plutarch's and Corneille's heroes, or with those of apaches!"

"And yet" Bertrand went on. "Look! There is one figure which has raised itself above the battle and which will shine by the beauty and quality of its courage —"

I listened, leaning on my stick, hanging over him, drinking in his voice which came, in the silence of the twilight from lips which were seldom opened.

duration of the world war, had its measure of guilt shab down and running over, that Social Democracy has not lost all credit with the working masses. We communists do not wish to forget that Social Democracy in all countries disgracefully betrayed the working class to the imperial bourgeoisie, that they misused party discipline to drive men into the trenches and the women into "National Women Service" and forced labour, that they, these real Judas Iscariots, disgracefully betrayed the redeemer, the international brotherhood of all the enslaved and exploited, for the miserably silver pieces of a few ministerial seats. We should not forget how Social Democracy in all countries varied the hypocritical phrase of the German party executive: "In the hour of danger we do not forsake our fatherland!"

And when on August 1st, 1924 Social Democracy appeared as choir master in the pacifist chorus "No more war" shall do our utmost to call back to the minds of the working class their nationalist trumpet blasts of August 4th, 1914.

No more war? We Communists know that war is an accompaniment of the capitalist economic system, that so long as it exists, the greed for new sources of raw material and the necessity for disposing of the surplus goods and capital outside the boundaries of their own country will ever lead to bloody collisions between the various imperial powers. Only a classless, a communist society offers security for the real peace of nations.

War on war, that means war on capitalism, is — fight for communism.

For the sentimental pacifist formula! "No more war" which in these days will be proclaimed with variations in countless meetings and articles of the social democratic bourgeois apostles of peace, we Communists substitute the knecht's cry "class war against war". We Communists must not forget that just because we loathe war we must not let ourselves be caught by these pacifist phrases.

We will throw ourselves with passionate bitterness against any new imperialist war, we will not again allow our husbands and sons to be led to the slaughter in the interests of money bags disguised as defence of the fatherland.

But just because we wish for lasting peace, we take up with still greater passion, with sacrifice and devotion the fight against the bourgeois social order and for Communism, a fight which cannot be carried on with time and resolutions, but only in the last resort with weapons in the hand.

Si vis pacem — para bellum! If you wish for peace, prepare for war! This old saying with which the millions of all times have defended their war preparations, is for us in an altered sense: If you wish for the peace of nations, you must prepare the civil war against capitalism and for Communism.

Only in this way can we save mankind from the continual danger of war which is always threatening to devour our husbands and sons.

Not a man and not a cent for the imperialist war, the protection of capitalist interests, but all forces assembled prepared for every sacrifice in the fight against all forms of capitalist domination, in the fight for Communist Communism.

"Liebknecht!"

He stood up, still with his arms folded, his face, set with all the gravity of a statue, sunk in his face. But he emerged once more from his marmoreal silence to say:

"The future! The future! The work of the future will efface this present, and efface it more thoroughly than we are able, to efface it as something shameful and abominable of, the present had to be, it had to be! Shame on the glory, shame upon armies, shame on the soldiers' trade, turns men alternately into senseless victims or base executioners. Yes, shame: it is true, but it is too true; it is one of the eternal verities, but it is not yet a truth for us. Only when our thoughts are capable of at present! It will become true when we have a whole bible which is all true, it will be true when it has taken its place with the 'other truths' we shall be able to understand when our minds have been freed. We are still strangers and pilgrims, far from such as that. In our day, amongst present realities, this is scarcely more than an error, this sacred word is no more than blasphemy."

Effects of the Imperialist War upon the Colonies.

By M. N. Roy.

The fact that the colonies constitute a valuable reserve of Imperialism was very well demonstrated during the world war which broke out ten years ago. Although the centre of the great world conflagration was in Europe, the colonies belonging to the imperialist powers involved in the war were no less a victim. Firstly, the war was carried into several colonial countries which had very little to be engaged in that atrocious massacre. For example, the inhabitants of Africa were not at all concerned in this conflict between two robber powers under the domination of any of which they would be led out the same fate — that of spoliation, slavery and exploitation. Secondly, there were other countries which did not become the scene of actual warfare; nevertheless, they were forced to contribute heavily in human lives and materials. The most important in this category was India.

The scramble over colonial possession was not the least important of the causes that led to the imperialist war. That is the case, the very subject peoples had no reason to be involved in this conflict, which was undertaken to decide at the point of arms to which group of imperialist robbers they should belong. The forced participation of colonial soldiers in the war was, therefore, bullying the slave to forge his own chains. And the imposition of heavy economic burdens on the colonial people for the prosecution of the war was making them buy their slavery at a dear price. This was the greatest irony of history.

By its very nature capitalism forced upon the foremost European powers the necessity of colonial expansion. England, which held early enough. By virtue of the fact that she was more than fifty years the workshop of the world, she became the mistress of the world at the expense of earlier imperialist nations, namely the Portuguese and Dutch. She even succeeded in checking the march of French Imperialism in Asia and America. When towards the end of the last century many entered the lists, she found all the coveted regions of the globe in possession of England and partially of France. Her determination to secure a place in the sun by any means, led to the great world conflagration which has reduced the world to such a hopeless state from which capitalism cannot emerge.

This war, which was caused by such predatory motives, was shamelessly declared to be the war in defence of democracy and the rights of peoples to live in freedom. England, France and Tsarist Russia, which taken together, dominated the major portion of the world inhabited by hundreds of millions of people not belonging to the ruling nations, were champions of this fight for freedom. The subject races were called upon to participate in this war which was to liberate the world from autocracy — which would make the world safe for democracy, but which in fact was meant to perpetuate the upstart Teutonic Imperialism which dared to challenge the hegemony of the Anglo-Saxons and their allies.

Not aware of the fact that these empty phrases might not succeed in blindfolding the bourgeoisie of the most advanced colonial lands, like India, Imperialist governments felt it necessary to make some gestures indicating the prospect of some readjustment in imperial relations. That is, promises for administrative reforms and economic concessions were made to the native bourgeoisie in remuneration for services that they were required to render for the prosecution of the war. It means that the class character of the imperialist war was manifest even in the far off countries. The object was to harness the immense colonial reserve forces for the cause of the world slaughter; and the native upper classes were found ready to lend themselves willingly to the cause of Imperialism in return for the promise which was made, once the emergency was over.

At the end of 1915 and the beginning of 1916, when the Entente looked almost lost, the ability of England to heavily upon the reserve forces, both in man-power and material resources, saved the situation. Thanks to the soldiers sent out of India, a considerable portion of the British army could be withdrawn from the Eastern Fronts and sent into the decisive battles fought on the fields of France and Flanders. Besides, no less than 200,000 Indian soldiers were sent into the hardest campaigns on the Western Front. This contribution of India is calculated together with the soldiers from the French-African colonies and the masses

of coolies imported like cattle from China to work behind the trenches, one can visualise to what an extent the colonial peoples were bled to satisfy imperialist greed.

The story of the brutality with which these colonial herds were recruited to be sacrificed on the battle fields in unknown lands, often thousand of miles away from home, has not yet been told. In India, for example, recruits were enlisted from the peasantry which had been left largely under feudal tutelage. The native feudal barons enthusiastically undertook the task of sending their levies for the defence of the Empire which had so kindly protected them by systematically obstructing the growth of modern means of production. But the method of recruitment was often so violent and the enthusiasm among the old soldiers as well as the new recruits naturally so lukewarm, that the Indian troops were not at all trusted, and were treated like bands of convicts. In 1916 signs of mutiny among the troops were noticeable. Many instances of fraternisation with the nationalist insurrectionary movement were discovered. Consequently, all the Indian regiments were kept disarmed. Of course, as usual, they were invariably officered by Englishmen, and the artillery is as a rule manned by British soldiers.

There was no end to the deceitfulness with which the situation was handled. The troops were told that they would not be sent to the European fronts; that they were being sent to release the British troops in Egypt and Arabia; and that in no case would they be called upon to take part in actual fight. But in any case the Indian

From "Wiener Arbeiterzeitung" of August 5, 1924.

The Day of the German Nation.

"It is the ardent hope of our hearts that the arms will be victorious which fight for the sacred cause of the German people. The picture now presented by the German Reichstag as the representative of the nation will engrave itself indelibly in the consciousness of the whole German race and will remain in history as the day of the proud and tremendous revival of the German spirit. . . . Man for man, the German social democrats have voted for the loan. In line with the whole of the international social democracy, the German social democracy, the jewel class-conscious proletarian organizations, is also utterly opposed to war, and ardently in sympathy with the peace and solidarity of nations. . . . but since the German fatherland is in danger, since the national independence of the people is menaced, the social democracy stands up in the defence of the fatherland, and the 'men without a country', the 'red gang', as the Kaiser once sneeringly called them, are now offering to the State, the blood and treasure of the toiling masses."

soldiers were completely helpless. They were disarmed and placed under the constant vigilance of British soldiers and officers armed with the most modern means of warfare. At the least sign of disaffection they could be wiped out. It was, therefore, easy to herd them on the transport ships like packs of cattle; and once they were on ships they could be sent anywhere. On the fronts there was no choice. Indian troops were always placed in the front trenches. No less than fifty per cent of the Indian troops in France were killed.

Then the miserable economic plight into which the masses of the Indian peasantry has been reduced by imperialist exploitation, was helpful to recruitment. The large army of landless peasantry are hungry practically all the year round. The imperialist policy of obstructing the development of modern industry had overcrowded the land. Millions and millions of people are unemployed several months out of the year. And those who are fortunate to get employment are miserably paid. Therefore, the employment in the army is very much coveted. Low as the wages of the Indian soldiers are, they are almost princely as compared with the agricultural wages. Then the standard of living in the army is also much higher than that of the Indian poor peasant who hardly lives as a human being.

All these factors taken together made it possible for imperialism to draw fully upon Indian reserves. The contribution of India in the realm of supplies was no less considerable and

no less forced than as regards man-power. Practically the entire burden of supplying and outfitting the armies on the Eastern Fronts fell upon India. Besides the enormous contribution made in munitions, equipments, transport-vehicles, food-stuffs, etc., 100,000,000 pound sterling was raised and sent to England as "India's gift" to the war chest. Then the amount raised in the shape of loans comes up to several times as much.

During three years such a large portion of the total food-stuff produced in the country was exported to feed the armies, that not only the prices went up, in some cases as high as 400 per cent, but the scarcity caused by this export verged on famine all over the country. To demonstrate their loyalty the landlords had contributed handsomely to the war-chest, only to shift the burden on the already bent backs of the peasantry. So that it was the poor peasant who ultimately paid in human life and material resources for the war which was waged in order to vindicate the hegemony of British Imperialism, that is to keep him perpetually in slavery.

The end of the war found India absolutely exhausted. The economic ruin of the peasantry, which constitutes the great bulk of the population, told heavily upon the general economic life of the nation. The impoverishment of the majority of the people necessarily reduced their buying power. The war had ruined the people of India no less seriously than it ruined the belligerent nations actively involved in the conflict.

England came out of the war victorious. Not only was the impertinent German rival crushed, but new territories of large extent and many more millions of subject peoples were added to the British Empire. But what was India's share in this victory? She helped to free the small nationalities from Teutonic tyranny; she herself, however, continued to be under British domination. She helped to make the world safe for democracy, but she was considered unfit for democratic government. The promises made during the war were not translated into action. The bourgeoisie, which during the war had stood loyally by the British government in the hope of getting a place in the sun in renumeration for the meritorious services rendered, became discontented. They dared to demand that the doctrine of self-determination should be applied to India. Already during the war they agreed to help England prosecute the war on condition that India would be given Home Rule as soon as the victory was won. Victorious British Imperialism wriggled out of the promise by offering a beggar's share which was indignantly rejected by the largest section of the bourgeoisie; but the upper strata found the Reforms sufficient for their interest.

The American Negro and the World War.

By Lovett Fort-Whiteman.

When the world war broke out in 1914 there at once developed unprecedented industrial opportunities for the Negro. At the time there were yet but few Negroes in the basic industries, and the 1,750,000 Negroes who were then in the north were chiefly employed as elevator-operators, hotel workers, janitors, and domestic servants.

American industry expanded as a result of the war, and beginning with 1914 there was an overwhelming demand in the north for Negro labor. Hundreds of thousands of Negroes migrated from the south, and settled in the northern cities, engaging themselves in the factories, mills, mines, stock-yards, etc. It was only until then that the Negro worker became an element of conflict to organized white labor.

The Negro was interested in the war only in so far as it brought him enlarged industrial opportunities. And he never for a moment lost sight of the fact that ever being the victim of mob violence, racial discrimination, etc. he was called upon to bear arms in behalf of a government which was perfectly indifferent to his constant appeal for social reforms.

There were four hundred thousand Negroes in the American Expeditionary Force. One might ask why there occurred no incidents of physical resistance on the part of Negroes to military conscription. The reasons are: firstly, the three hundred years of Negro history in America have been those of an enslaved and oppressed people. The genuinely manly and resistive spirit on the part of the Negro has begun its development only since the war; secondly, the war allowed

Encouraged by the wide-spread discontent among the masses, the bourgeoisie threw down a challenge to Imperialism. The country was in a state of revolt. Imperialism did not hesitate a day in forgetting all the professions about the rights of nations and self-determination. It came down upon the popular movement with all the forces of repression. The stories of Amritsar are already notorious. The echo of that infamous incident was heard in England even in the last weeks of connection with O'Dwyer Sankern Nair Case. Before the League of Nations Covenant signed at Versailles the voice of a great people was drowned in blood.

It will be interesting to recollect what attitude the British Labour Party, and particularly Macdonald, took at that moment. They were not yet encumbered with the responsibility of the Empire. The League of Nations, which they hailed as a panacea for all the evils of Imperialism, had not yet been proposed in its true character as the pernicious instrument of imperialist domination. Nevertheless, Macdonald and his colleagues objected to such "insane acts" as the Amritsar Massacre, not as violent suppression of the rights of people, but as a crime which might provoke a situation which would place the English women and children in India in danger. The pacifist Mr. Macdonald has always been an imperialist. He believes in the civilising and democratising mission of the British Empire. Therefore, today we find him valiantly endeavoring to rescue the capitalist system from the impasse it has been dragged into by imperialist greed.

The tenth anniversary of the day when the predatory nature of Imperialism set fire to the whole world, finds one who ostensibly opposed the war, at the head of the great Empire which emerged victorious out of the international anarchy, trying to assure the permanence of this Empire, seeking to induce the hundreds of millions of people subjected by it to live peacefully under the protection of the British Lion. The bourgeoisie is staggered at the catastrophe in which the world has been landed. Having failed to drag the capitalist system out of this hopeless impasse, it calls in the hypocrisy of Social Reformism, and Snobbish Socialist Imperialism to help them in this graceless task. The pacification of the colonial people is considered to be one of the ways out. Labour Imperialists and petty-bourgeois reformists have been employed to perform this work and Imperialism thereby. But Imperialism has pronounced its sentence. Nothing can save it. The ravages of the imperial war will be remedied only by a victorious civil war on an international scale — a civil war which will overthrow capitalism and disrupt Imperialism. The sufferings of the last ten years are, therefore, the birth pangs of a new revindicated human

the Negro rare opportunities for the out-let of much pent-up energies. It afforded a bigger life, and a relief from the hum-drum, monotonous, and cramped social conditions imposed upon the Negro in America. True it is well to add that the most influential members of the Negro petty-bourgeoisie were coddled into endorsing whole-hearted support of the Negro to the war through a few political preferments. These few influential leaders were successful after a time in creating a large amount of ill-feeling among the Negro masses that the war was being waged in the interest of the ideals of social democracy, and that the victory of the Allies would come the liberation and general social up-lift of the enslaved and oppressed of the earth.

The American Government has been quite careful to give the Negro any large amount of military training. The most ardent objectors to military training for the Negro have been the whites of the southern states and their representatives in Congress. This was well exemplified at the time of America's entry into the war when the bill for the men for the army was debated in Congress. Southern legislators vigorously argued the danger to white supremacy in the south that lay in giving the Negro the experience of modern warfare and the discipline of organization.

The Negro was drafted, for to have left him to merely to man the industries would have at the start rise to such opposition on the part of the white

class throughout the nation that a successful prosecution of the war on the part of America would have been impossible. The Negro asked for officers' training camps that he might have his own officers. This was accorded, but with a well established policy of keeping the Negro out of the high commands. This was clearly demonstrated when but a few weeks after America's entry into the war, the one Negro lieutenant-colonel of the regular army, Charles Young, was relegated to the retired list as physically unfit. On the contrary, to prove his fitness for service he made a journey by horse-back from his native town in Ohio to the national capital, Washington; a distance of five hundred miles. It was widely understood as merely an incident of the Government's long-standing policy of not permitting the Negro to get into the higher positions of the army.

When peace was declared and the Negro soldier returned home he found no change had been made in his social status. There had been no stop put to the practice of lynching; black men had been burned at the stake, Negro women hanged

Pacifism as the Servant of Imperialism.

By Leon Trotzky (Leningrad).

Never were there so many pacifists in the world as now, when in all countries men are killing one another. Every historical epoch has not only its own technique and its own political form, but also a hypocrisy peculiar to itself. Once peoples destroyed each other in the name of the Christian teaching of love of humanity. Now only backward governments call upon Christ. Progressive nations cut each others' throats in the name of pacifism. Wilson drags America into the war in the name of the League of Nations, and perpetual peace. Kerensky and Tseretelli call for an offensive for the sake of an early peace.

Our epoch lacks the indignant satire of a Juvenal. In any case, even the most potent satirical weapons are in danger of being proved powerless and illusory in comparison with triumphant infamy and grovelling stupidity; which two elements were unfettered by the war.

Pacifism is of the same historical lineage as democracy. The bourgeoisie made a great historical attempt to order all human relations in accordance with reason, to supplant blind and dumb tradition by the institutions of critical thought. The guilds with their restriction of production, political institutions with their privileges, monarchistic absolutism — all these were traditional relics of the middle ages. Bourgeois democracy demanded legal equality for free competition, and for parliamentarism as the means of governing public affairs. It sought also to regulate national relations in the same manner. But here it came up against war, that is against a method of solving all problems which is a complete denial of "reason." It began to advise the people in poetry, in philosophy, in ethics, and in business methods, that it is far more useful for them to introduce perpetual peace. These are the logical arguments for pacifism.

The inherited failing of pacifism, however, was the fundamental evil which characterises bourgeois democracy. Its criticism touches only the surfaces of social phenomena, it has not the courage to cut deeper into the underlying economic facts. Capitalist realism, however, handles the idea of perpetual peace based on the harmony of reason, perhaps more skillfully than the idea of liberty, equality and fraternity. Capitalism, which developed technique on a rational basis, failed to regulate conditions rationally. It prepared weapons of mutual extermination which would never have occurred to the dreams of the "barbarians" of medieval times.

The rapid intensification of international conditions, and the unremitting growth of militarism, knocked away the ground from under the feet of pacifism. But, at the same time, these same forces were giving pacifism a new life before our very eyes, a life as different from the old one as a blood-red sunset is from a rosy dawn.

The ten years which preceded the war were the period what has been called "armed peace." The whole time was reality nothing but an uninterrupted war, a war waged in colonial lands.

This war was fought out upon the territories of backward and weak peoples; it led to the participation of Africa, Asia, and Asia, and prepared the way for the present war. But, as there had been no European war since 1871, there had been quite a number of small but sharp con-

and riddled with bullets at the hands of southern white mobs. He was still politically disfranchised in the south; the lines of racial segregation had remained unchanged, and he was again barred from positions of responsibility. Disillusionment and discontent showed itself in the countenance and conversation of every returned Negro soldier. A marked change in the morale of the masses manifested itself in the energetic and courageous resistance offered to mob attacks, as exemplified by the bloody conflicts of Washington, Chicago, and Longview.

To-day it is quite clear to the toiling masses of American Negroes that their heretofore loyal participation in America's wars accrues to the race no social advantages or improvement. From the Revolutionary War of 1776 to the end of the world war, the Negro has filled a large, if not conspicuous, place in American military history. And always after victory he has been pushed back into the same old rut. The cognizance of this fact is, to-day well established in the Negro social mind. And certainly these conditions constitute excellent ground for communist propaganda.

Conflicts, common opinion among the petty-bourgeoisie had been systematically encouraged to look upon an ever-growing army as a guarantee of peace, which would gradually bear its fruits in a new organisation of popular international law. As for the capitalistic governments and big business, they naturally saw nothing to object to in this "pacifist" interpretation of militarism. Meanwhile world conflicts were in preparation and the world catastrophe was there.

Theoretically and politically, pacifism has just the same basis as the doctrine of social harmony between different class interests.

Pacifism or Marxism?

Not the idea of international pacifism but the idea of international civil war will be the pledge of victory.
August 23, 1915. "Against the Current."

The opposition between capitalistic national states has just the same economic basis as the class struggle. If we are ready to assume the possibility of a gradual toning down of the class struggle, then we must also assume the gradual toning down and regulation of nationalistic conflicts.

The guardian of democratic ideology, with all its traditions and illusions, was the petty bourgeoisie. During the second half of the nineteenth century, it had become completely transformed inwardly, but it had not yet disappeared from the scene. At the very time when the development of capitalistic technique was permanently undermining the economic role of the petty bourgeoisie, universal franchise and compulsory military service were giving it, thanks to its numerical strength, the appearance of a political factor. Where the small capitalist had not been crushed out of existence altogether by big business, he was completely subjugated by the credit system. It only remained to the representatives of big business to subjugate the petty bourgeoisie also in the political field, by taking all its theories and prejudices and lending them a fictitious value. This is the explanation of the phenomena which were to be observed in the last ten years before the war, when reactionary imperialism was growing to such a terrific height, while at the same time the illusive blossoming of a bourgeois democracy, with all its reformism and pacifism took place. Big business subjugated the petty bourgeoisie to its imperialistic ends by means of its own prejudices.

France was the classic example of this two-sided process. France is a country of finance-capital supported upon the basis of a numerous and generally conservative petty bourgeoisie. Thanks to foreign loans, to the colonies, and to the alliance with Russia and England, the upper strata of the population were dragged into all the interests and all the conflicts of world capitalism. Meanwhile, the French petty bourgeoisie remained a provincial to his very narrow. He has an instinctive dread of geography, and all his life long he usually has only one son, to whom he will leave his business

and his furniture. This petty bourgeois sends a bourgeois radical to represent him in parliament, for that gentleman promises him that he will preserve peace for him by means of the League of Nations on the one hand and of Russian Cossaks, who will chop off the Kaiser's head for him, on the other. The radical deputy arrives in Paris from his circle of provincial lawyers, not only full of the will to peace, but also with only the vaguest of notions as to the position of the Persian Gulf, and without any clear idea of why or for whom the Bagdad Railway is necessary. These "radical pacifist" deputies provided from their midst a Radical Ministry, which immediately found itself entangled up to the ears in the meshes of all the previous diplomatic and military obligations undertaken by all the various financial interests of the French Bourse in Russia, Africa, and Asia. The Ministry and Parliament never ceased intoning their pacifist phraseology, but at the same time they were automatically carrying out a foreign policy which finally brought France into the war.

English and American Pacifism, despite all the variety of social conditions and ideology (despite also the lack of any ideology as in America) carry out essentially the same work: they provide an outlet for the petty bourgeois citizens' fear of world-shaking events, which after all can only deprive him of the remnants of his independence; they lull to sleep his watchfulness by useless notions of disarmament, international law, and arbitration tribunals. Then, at a given moment, they hand him over body and soul to capitalistic imperialism which has already mobilised every means necessary for its end; i. e. technical knowledge, art, religion, bourgeois pacifism and patriotic "socialism."

"We were against the war, our deputies, our Ministers, were all against the war," cries the French petty bourgeois: "Therefore, it follows, that we have the war forced upon us and in order to realise our pacific ideals we must pursue the war to a victorious end." And the representative of French pacifism, Baron d'Estournel de Constant, consecrates this pacifist philosophy with a solemn "jusqu'au bout!" — war to the end!

The thing which above all others the English Stock Exchange required for the successful conduct of the war, was pacifists like the liberal Asquith, and the radical demagogue Lloyd George. "If these men are running the war," said the English people, "then we must have right on our side." And so, pacifism had its allotted part to play in the mechanism of the war, like poison gas, and the ever rising pile of war loans.

From "Wiener Arbeiterzeitung" of October 1914.

"Whether diplomacy has acted right, whether the war was inevitable, is a matter for the future to decide. Just now the fate of the German people is at stake, and there is no room for hesitation and wavering. The German people is united in the indomitable resolution to submit to no foreign yoke. From this resolution neither death nor the devil will shake it..." and so on.

In the U. S. A., the pacifism of the petty-bourgeoisie showed itself in its true role, as the servant of imperialism, in an even less disguised manner. There, as elsewhere, it was the banks and the trusts which really managed politics. Even before the war, owing to the extraordinary development of industry, and of the export trade, the U. S. A. had been steadily moving in the direction of world interests and of imperialism. But the European war drove on this imperialistic development at a feverish pace. At the very moment when many pious people (even Kautsky) were hoping that the horrors of the butchery in Europe would fill the American bourgeoisie with the horror of militarism, the real influence of the events in Europe was proceeding, not on psychological, but on materialistic lines, and was leading to the very opposite results. The exports of the U. S. A., which in 1913 had totalled 2,466 millions of dollars, rose in 1916 to the crazy height of 5,481 millions of dollars. Naturally, the lion's share of this export trade was allotted to the munitions industry. Then came the sudden threat of a cessation in the export trade to the Entente countries, when unrestricted submarine warfare began. In 1915 the Entente had imported American goods up to thirty-five millions, while Germany and Austria-Hungary had barely imported as much as fifteen millions. Thus, not only a diminution of the gigantic profits was indicated, but the whole

of American industry, which had its basis in war industry was now threatened with a severe crisis. It is to these figures that we must look for the key to the division of "sympathies" in America. And so the capitalists appealed to the State. "It is you who started this development of war-industry under the banner of pacifism, it is now up to find us a new market." If the State was not in a position to promise the "freedom of the seas" (in other words, freedom to squeeze capital out of human blood) then it must open a new market for the threatened war industries — in America itself. And so the requirements of the European slaughter produced suddenly, a catastrophic militarisation of the U. S. A.

This business was bound to arouse the opposition of the great masses of the people. To conquer this undecided content, and transform it into patriotic cooperation was the most important task in the domestic politics of the U. S. A. And it was by a strange irony of fate that the official pacifism of Wilson, like the "opposition" pacifism of Byron, provided the most powerful weapons for the performance of the task, i. e. the taming of the masses by militaristic methods.

Rosa Luxemburg. "The Junias Brochure."

This war is not on behalf of "the existence and development" of Germany as the declaration of the social democratic faction states, it is not on behalf of German culture as the social democratic press asserts, but for the present profits of the Deutsche Bank in Asiatic Turkey and the future profits of the Mannesmann and Krupp in Morocco, and on behalf of the existence of reactionary Austria.

Byron hastened to give loud expression to the natural dislike of the farmers, and of all the petty-bourgeoisie to imperialism, militarism and increase in taxation. But at the very time when he was sending off wagon-loads of petitions and deputations to his pacifist colleagues, who occupied the highest places in the government, Byron was also using every effort to break away from the revolutionary lead of the movement.

"If it comes to war", thus for instance, Byron telegraphed to an anti-war meeting held in Chicago in February, "of course, we shall support the government; but up to the moment it is our most sacred duty to do everything that lies in our power to save the people from the horrors of war." In these few words we have the whole programme of petty-bourgeois pacifism. "Everything that is in our power to prevent war" means to provide an outlet for the opposition of the masses in the shape of harmless manifestoes, which the government is given a guarantee that it will consider, no hindrance will be put in its way by the pacifist opposition.

That indeed, was all that was required by the official pacifism personified by Wilson, who had already given plenty of proofs to the capitalists who were making the war, his "readiness to fight". And even Mr. Byron himself found it enough to have made this declaration, after which he was content to put aside his noisy opposition to the war, simply for one purpose — that of declaring war. Like Mr. Wilson, Mr. Byron hastened to go over to the side of the government. And not only the petty-bourgeoisie, but also the great masses of the people, said to themselves: "If our government has declared war, and if Byron himself can support the government on the question of war, then surely this must be a righteous and necessary war." This explains why the pious quakers and kind of pacifism, indulged in by the demagogues who headed the government, was so highly valued by the Stock Exchange and the leaders of war industry.

Our own menchevik, social-revolutionary pacifism, despite the difference in outward conditions, played in its own way exactly the same part. The resolution on war which was adopted by a majority of the All-Russian Congress of Workers' and Soldiers' Councils, is founded not only on the character of pacifist prejudices concerning war, but also on the characteristics of an imperialistic war. The Congress declared the "first and most important task of revolutionary democracy was the speeding ending of war. But all those resolutions are only directed towards a single end: so long as the national efforts of democracy have failed to make an end of war, so long must Russian revolutionary democracy fight with all its strength that the red army shall be prepared to fight whether defensive or offensive.

The revision of the old international treaties makes the Russian Congress dependent upon voluntary understandings with the diplomacy of the Entente, and it is not in the nature of these diplomats to liquidate the imperialistic character of war, even if they could. The "international efforts of democracy" leaves the congress and its leaders dependent upon the will of social-democratic patriots, who are tied and bound to their imperialistic governments. And this same majority of the congress, having first of all led itself into a blind alley with this business of the "quickest possible ending to war", has now landed itself, where practical politics are concerned, in a definite conclusion: the offensive. A "pacifism" which rallies the petty-bourgeoisie and brings it to the support of

Comrade Lenin on War.

It is the duty of the Third International to organize the forces of the proletariat for a revolutionary attack upon the capitalist governments, for civil war with the bourgeoisie of all countries for the sake of political power and the victory of socialism (November 1, 1914 "Against the Current.")

Apart from civil war on behalf of socialism, there can be no possibility of progress in Europe.

— July 26, 1915, "Against the Current."

The offensive will naturally be most warmly welcomed, not only by Russians but also by Entente imperialism.

Miliukov, for instance, says: "In the name of our loyalty to the allies and to our old (imperialistic) treaties, the offensive must inevitably be entered upon."

Kerensky and Tseretelli say: "Although our old treaties have not yet been revised, the offensive is inevitable."

The arguments vary, but the policy is the same. And it could not be otherwise, since Kerensky and Tseretelli are inextricably bound up in the government with Miliukov's party.

The social-democratic, patriotic pacifism of Dan, like the maker pacifism of Byron, are, when we come to actual facts, equally in the service of the imperialists.

It is for this reason that the most important task of Russian diplomacy does not consist in persuading the Entente diplomacy to revise something or other, or to abrogate some-

thing else, but in convincing them that the Russian revolution is absolutely reliable, and can safely be trusted.

The Russian ambassador, Bachmatiev, in his speech to the Congress of the U. S. A. on June 10, also characterised the activity of the Provisional Government from this point of view:

"All these events," he said, "show us that the power and significance of the Provisional Government are growing every day, and the more they grow the more capable will the government be of throwing out all disintegrating elements, whether these come from the reaction or from the agitation of the extreme left. The Provisional Government has just decided to take all possible means to achieve this end, even if it has to resort to force, although it does not cease to strive for a peaceful solution of its problems."

One need not doubt for a moment that the "national honour" of our social-democratic patriots remained undisturbed while the ambassador of the "revolutionary democracy" eagerly proved to the American plutocracy that the Russian government was ready to pour out the blood of the Russian proletariat in the name of law and order. The most important element of law and order being its loyal support of Entente capitalism.

And at the very moment when Herr Bachmatiev was standing hat in hand, humbly addressing himself to the hyenas of the American Stock Exchange, Messieurs Tseretelli and Kerensky were setting the "revolutionary democracy" by the ears, in assuring them that it was impossible to combat the "anarchy of the left" without using force, and were threatening to disarm the workers of Petrograd and the regiment which supported them. We can see now that these threats were delivered at just the right moment: they were the best possible guarantees for the Russian loan from America.

"You see now," Herr Bachmatiev might have said to Mr. Wilson, "our revolutionary pacifism does not differ by a hair's breadth from the pacifism of your stock exchange. And if they can believe Mr. Byron, why should they not believe Herr Tseretelli?"

And now the final question: how much Russian cannon fodder, and how much Russian blood, must be provided on our frontiers, and inside our frontiers, in order to guarantee the Russian loan, which is itself the guarantee of our further loyalty to the Entente.

The Economic Costs of the World War?

By E. Varga.

The greatest and most irreparable damage was done to the world by the killing and maiming of the best manhood of the population. We propose here to submit the figures of the sacrifice of human life and health that was caused by the war.

Human lives lost in the War.

Country	Population before the war (in millions)	Mobilised	Dead	Wounded	Prisoners
Germany	65	13,250	1,887	4,248	773
Austria-Hungary	51	9,000	1,200	3,200	443
Turkey	23	—	437	308	104
Bulgaria	5	857	101	152	11
Russia	40	—	1,359	—	—
French Colonies	55	8,195	67	4,200	454
Great Britain	45	—	744	1,693	—
Latin America and Colonies	376	9,496	202	420	65
Italy	35	5,615	507	950	1,359
Belgium	7.5	380	267	140	10
Romania	7.5	1,000	339	—	116
Spain	—	(including the missing)	—	—	—
Yugoslavia	3	150	707	350	100
Portugal	4.6	353	15	40	40
United States	91	3,800	107	246	5
Japan	166	—	2,758	4,950	2,500
Total:			10,697		

This data is culled from the Official Yearbook of the German Republic for the year 1923, and from the Yearbook of Industry, Statistics, and the Labour Movement, first-year of publication;

"International Finance and Reorganisation", by Findman. The figures for the wounded, for most of the countries, refer to the number of casualties, so that those that were wounded more than once are accordingly repeated in these figures. In some countries the missing are included among the dead.

We thus find that 10.5 million men were killed at their most productive age. This figure corresponds approximately to the total of the able-bodied male population of France. The number killed in the war exceeds the population in quite a number of countries in Europe. The number surpasses the population of Greater London, it is larger than the population of Berlin and Paris put together. If all these dead were buried in single graves, close to each other, a cemetery would be formed of 100 square kil. To this must be added the huge number of disabled. Their number has not been established for all countries. In France alone there are about 1,900,000 disabled, having more than 10% earning capacity. Until the close of 1919 the artificial limb dispensaries in France have dealt with 19,700 armless and with 24,900 legless cases. Assuming similar figures of the other nations that engaged in the war, we arrive at an army of 150,000 armless and 200,000 legless men. A large city of 350,000 inhabitants, exclusively cripples!

Among the cases of severe maiming in France we find the following figures: 3,000 who had 2 or 3 limbs amputated; 20,000 with injured skulls; 2 to 3 thousand blind; 3 to 4 thousand with serious injuries of face and jaw-bone. These figures, like the fore-going, are far from complete. According to the "Journal de la Société de Statistique de Paris" (1923, vol. IV), up till the year 1923 a total of 1,835,000 pensions were granted to disabled men, 599,000 to widows and orphans, and 871,000 to aged people deprived of their bread winners.

Assuming that 1.5 million are permanently disabled, agriculture has lost 740,000 able-bodied men between the wars

of 20 and 29 out of the total of 2,636,000; industry has lost 387,000 out of 2,226,000; and trade and commerce 200,000 out of 1,230,000.

Thus we find that for France alone we have the number 1,349,000 dead and 600,000 disabled, even if we assume that on the average there are only 30% permanently disabled. The total loss of working power amounts to 2,000,000, including those who died of diseases.

Assuming the value of the annual production per man in his best age to be 2,000 gold marks, the annual loss to French economy is 4 billion gold marks, in reduced production, which represents 1/4 of the pre-war production and nearly twice as much as is demanded from Germany in reparations.

Assuming the same conditions for the other countries who participated in the war, their total loss would amount to 30 billion gold marks.

Thus the economic consequences of the loss of human lives are more enduring and more burdensome than the direct expenses of the war. In this connection it should be pointed out that the loss by the reduced birth-rate has not yet been taken into consideration, and it will be revealed later on in a deficiency of young workers.

The actual expenses of the war are variously estimated (Findman, Bogardt). The following table shows the war costs of the various countries, according to Findman (the figures for Japan are taken from Bogardt). In order to avoid repetition of the inter-allied debts, the credits advanced by one country to another are entered in this table as the war expenses of the receiver of such credits, and not of the country which extended these credits.

Country	National wealth (before the war in billions of dollars)	National income (in billions of dollars)	War Costs (in millions of dollars)
United States	200,0	35,0	23,159
England	70,5	11,0	33,421
France	58,5	6,0	31,324
Russia	60,0	6,5	26,522
Italy	22,8	4,0	15,636
Belgium	15,0	1,3	1,387
Japan	11,7	1,7	40,000
Germany	80,5	10,5	46,323
Austria-Hungary	40,0	3,8	24,858
Turkey	4,0	0,5	1,802
Bulgaria	4,0	0,5	732
British Dominions	—	—	4,198
	567,0	80,8	249,362

From the Manifesto of the Central Committee of the Bolsheviks of 1st November 1914.

It is the task of Social Democracy in the first place to expose the real significance of the war and ruthlessly to unmask the lies, the sophisms and "patriotic" phrases which are circulated by the governing classes, the bourgeoisie and the junkers in defence of the war. . . . None of the parties conducting the war is less guilty than the other for the robbery, the cruelties and the beastly crimes connected with it. But in order to delude the proletariat and to divert it from the only real emancipatory war, from civil war against their "own" as against the "foreign" bourgeoisie — for this high aim the bourgeoisie of every country seeks by lying patriotic phrases to enhance the importance of their war and to persuade the people that they do not wish to vanquish the enemy for the purpose of plundering and seizing territory, but in order to liberate all other people — but not their own people.

The opportunists have for long prepared this collapse of the second International, in forsaking the social revolution and putting bourgeois reformism in its place; they did this by abandoning the class struggle and at the same time the necessity of converting it at the right moment into the civil

These figures are even higher than the figure of 80 million gold marks given by Comrade Trotzky in his report to the Third World Congress.

259 billion dollars are approximately 1,060 billion gold marks. It is a figure which it is very difficult to grasp in its full economic import.

The greatest item of national wealth in Germany are the railways. These were estimated in the Experts' Report at 26 billion marks, including all the buildings, rolling stock, warehouses etc.

Thus the costs of the war would suffice to build all the German railway system with all the rolling stock forty times over.

Assuming that the railways throughout the world were constructed on the average at the same cost per kilometre as the German railways, the whole railway system of the world could be rebuilt with the direct costs of the war, including all the bridges, tunnels, locomotives, and cars. The direct costs of the war have swallowed up in three years the total national income of the warring countries. If we proceed with the analogy of France in regard to the diminished production of all the warring countries on account of the loss of human lives, in capacity and sickness, assuming this loss to be one-tenth to one-sixth of the total, it becomes clear why the world is still languishing under the consequences of the war.

To these direct costs of the war must be added the devastation caused to the territories over which the various battles were fought. The losses of private property are estimated by Bogardt as follows: on land — 30 billion dollars or 126 billion gold marks; in sunk ships 6,8 billion dollars or 28 billion gold marks; total: 154 billion gold marks.

We thus may sum up the war costs as follows:

1. Permanent loss through the killing and crippling of man: 30 billion gold marks annually.
2. Casual losses: a) war costs 1,056 billion gold marks
b) war damages 154 billion gold marks
Total: 1,210 billion gold marks

This does not include the losses to the increase of mortality of the population, and to the diminished birth-rate. To this must be added also the losses of the neutrals who are estimated by Bogardt at 1,75 billion dollars, or 7,5 billion gold marks. We must also include the curtailment of production, which was not included in the war costs and which is estimated by Bogardt at 45 billion dollars, or 190 billion gold marks. By adding these amounts we find the total loss to be equal to 140 billion gold marks, and the permanent loss to be equal to 30 billion annually.

war, and also by propagating the joint co-operation of the classes. They did this by propagating bourgeois chauvinism under the mask of patriotism and defence of native countries and by the denial of the fundamental truth proclaimed in the Communist Manifesto, that the worker has no fatherland. . . . The sentimental-bourgeois method of fighting militarism consists in recognising the necessity of the revolutionary fight of the proletariat of all countries against the bourgeoisie of all countries; by allowing the reasonable use of bourgeois patriotism and of bourgeois legality to degenerate into an illegality of legality and by forgetting the duty to create illegal organizations in the epoch of political crises and to conduct illegal agitation.

The working masses will, in spite of all hindrances, create a new International. The present triumph of the opportunists will not last long. The more victims the war demands, the more apparent will the treachery of the opportunists become. The cause of the proletariat become to the working masses they will at the same time perceive the necessity of taking up arms against the government and the bourgeoisie of their country. The conversion of the present imperialist war into the civil war that is the only correct proletarian slogan.

A Protest.

By Franz Mehring.

The German Party Executive has, in its reply to the appeal which the Executive Committee of the International Socialist Bureau addressed to the German people, confined itself to a defence, especially by the sentence, that for a fruitful discussion regarding the attitude of the various powers in the days preceding the outbreak of the war there lies to hand no indisputable evidence. Nevertheless a part of the party press is overstepping the prescribed limits when they attempt to strengthen the reply of the party executive by some sentences, torn out of their context, from an article which Friedrich Engels published more than 20 years ago in the "Neue Zeit". It is alleged that these sentences, fully right up to the last syllable, apply to the present situation and justify the tactics of Social Democracy in the present world war.

Against these allegations there must be raised the most decided protest. What Engels expected and desired in the

event of a simultaneous French and Russian war against Germany, he has repeatedly expressed in a most unambiguous manner since the year 1859. To-day it is impossible for obvious reasons, to repeat or even to allude to them. One can only say, that the premises from which Engels drew his conclusions to-day do not exist, not merely to the last but not even to the first syllable, but much rather is the case as it stands at present the exact contrary. This would immediately be clear to the superficial reader if it were possible to publish the full text of this or the other article of Engels.

As this is impossible one should refrain from manipulating with sentences, which are torn from their context.

It is sad enough with the temporary collapse of the International without our entering on a fruitless and distasteful squabble.

The Reconstruction of the International.

By Rosa Luxemburg.

On August 4th, the German Social Democracy abdicated politically while at the same time the Socialist International collapsed. All attempts to deny or veil this fact, irrespective of the motive from which they proceed, have objectively only the tendency to foster that disastrous self-deception of the socialist parties; perpetuate and render normal that inner weakness of the movement which has led to its collapse and in the long run render the Socialist International a fiction and a hypocrisy.

The collapse itself is unexampled in the history of all times. Socialism or Imperialism — these alternatives practically comprised the whole political orientation of the labour parties in the last decade. In Germany it was formulated in innumerable program speeches, in public meetings, in pamphlets and newspaper articles as the slogan of Social Democracy, as its interpretation of the present phase of history and its tendencies.

With the outbreak of the world war the word became flesh and the alternative changed from a historical tendency to a political situation. Faced with these alternatives which at first they failed to recognise and concealed from the consciousness of the people, Social Democracy struck its colours, and surrendered to imperialism without a struggle. Never since political parties existed has there been a party which after fifty years of uninterrupted growth, after having attained a first class position of power, after having rallied millions around it, so absolutely disappeared in smoke within a few hours as a political factor as did German Social Democracy. In this case because they were the best organised and the best disciplined vanguard of the International, the present collapse of Socialism is most clearly proven.

Kautsky, the representative of the Marxist Centre or, politically expressed, the theorist of that consenting maiden, the official practice of the "party leaders" who played up to and actually contributed to the present collapse of the party, has now already thought out a new theory for the justification and minimising of the collapse. According to this theory Social Democracy is, it is true, an instrument of peace, but not a means of preventing war. Or as Kautsky's faithful pupils in the Austrian "Kampf" are decreeing to-day with many sighs and sobs over the present errors of German Social Democracy, the only correct policy for Socialism during war is silence. Only when the bells of peace ring shall it again begin to function. This theory of voluntarily accepted anarchism, which believes that they can only show the virtue of Socialism by shutting it off as a factor in the deciding moment in world history, suffers from the fundamental mistake of all reckonings of political impotence, namely the reckoning made without the host.

Placed before the alternative: for or against the war, at the moment when it sacrifices the "against", Social Democracy is compelled by an inexorable historical "must" to throw its whole weight into the scale for war. The same Kautsky who pleaded in favour of voting the war credits in that memorable fraction caucus of August 4th and the same Austro-Marxists "as they name themselves, who now in the "Kampf" accept the granting of the credits as a matter of

course, shed occasional tears over the nationalist excesses of the Social Democratic party organ and its insufficient theoretical schooling, namely in the hairsplitting over the term "nationality" and other terms which are alleged to be the cause of those errors. But facts have their logic even when human beings do not want to have it. After Social Democracy had decided through its parliamentary representatives on the support of the war, all other things evolved of themselves with the inevitableness of historical destiny.

On August 4th, far from observing "silence", German Social Democracy took upon itself a highly important historical function, that of esquire of imperialism in the present war. Napoleon once said, "two factors decide the result of a battle, the material factor, which is the ground, weapons and atmospheric conditions etc. and the spiritual factor which is

Clara Zetkin "For Peace" (Die Internationale, Vol. I.)

Our actions as international socialists cannot be determined by the political aims of German imperialism and the strategy of its military. . . . It appears to us unbrotherly and bad policy to make the conduct of the German social democrats depend upon the attitude of the French socialists. It must not be forgotten that apart from Belgium, a large part of Eastern and Northern France are under German occupation. Since when are the errors of a fraternal party an excuse for our own sins, since when have they replaced our own lack of virtue.

. . . We therefore regard immediate and energetic action for peace on behalf of the German social democrats as the greatest duty of the German workers: with the leaders if they can make up their minds, without them if they continue to be undecided, and against them if they sabotage. . . . Here again it may be said that, in the beginning was the deed. Here and there the signal bells are beginning to sound. The German proletariat must respond to their call.

the morale of the army, enthusiasm and belief in the cause." The material factors in the present war were provided by the firm of Krupps in Essen and the spiritual factor in the first place must be charged to the account of Social Democracy. The service which they rendered to the German military command since August 4th and are still rendering, are immeasurable. The trade unions who, with the outbreak of the war, shelved all wage struggles and who surrounded all measures of safety taken by the military authorities for the prevention of public disorder with the halo of "Socialism"; the Social Democratic women who withdrew their whole time and energy from Social Democratic agitation in order to apply it, arm in arm with the patriotic bourgeois women, to the silencing of the suffering war families; the Social Democratic press, which with few exceptions used their dailies, weeklies and monthlies to make propaganda for the war as the cause of the nation and of the proletariat and, according to the quarter from which danger threatened, to depict the horrors of the regime of the Tsar, to throw perfidious Albion

to the hatred of the masses, to rejoice over the risings and revolutions in the foreign colonies, to prophesy the strengthening of Turkey after this war, to promise liberties to the Poles, Ruthenians and all other peoples, to imbue the proletarian youth with warlike bravery and heroism — in short to work upon public opinion and the mass of the people entirely for the ideology of the war; finally the Social Democratic parliamentarians and party leaders, who not only voted money for the war but sought determinedly to choke every alarming tendency of doubt and the criticisms of the "intriguers" among the mass of the people and on their side by personal services of a discrete nature such as pamphlets, speeches, articles of the most genuine German national patriotism support the government — when was there a war in the world, when anything similar took place?

When and where has the suspension of all constitutional rights been accepted with such obedience? Where has ever the severest press censorship received such a paen of praise from the ranks of the opposition as in some of the publications of German Social Democracy? Never yet has a war found such Pindars, nor a military dictatorship such obedience which laid all that it was and possessed with such loving tribute upon the altar of a cause against which they had sworn a thousand times to themselves and to the world to fight to the last drop of their blood. Measured by this change the National Liberals are true Roman Catos, rocks of bronze. Precisely the powerful organization precisely the much-praised discipline of the German Social Democracy proved its value in that this body of four million strong changed about in twenty four hours at the command of a handful of parliamentarians, and allowed themselves to be harnessed to a chariot which for twenty five years had been the life-long object of their attacks. The twenty five years preparatory work of Social Democracy realises itself in the present war whose weight and victorious power on the German side is claimed by the leaders of the trade unions and the party to a large degree as the fruit of the schooling of the masses in the proletarian organizations. Marx, Engels, Lassalle, Liebknecht, Bebel and Singer schooled the German proletariat so that Hindenburg could lead them. And the higher the schooling, the organization, the famous discipline, the development of the trade unions and the labour press in Germany is than in France, the more efficient the war aid of the German Social Democracy in comparison to that of the French. Along with their ministers the Social Democrats of France appear as absolute blunderers at the unaccustomed work of nationalism and conduct of war when one compares their performances with the services which German Social Democracy and the German trade unions are performing for the imperialism of their fatherland.

II.

The official theory which distorts Marxism as and when required for the current requirements of the party leaders and for justification of their business of the day, and the organ of which is the "Neue Zeit" seeks to explain the slight incongruity between the present function of the workers party and their words of yesterday by saying that International Socialism, it is true, has occupied itself very much with the question of what is to be done against the outbreak of war, but not with what was to be done after the outbreak. As a wanton woman this theory assures us that the most beautiful harmony reigns between the present practice of socialism and its past, that none of the socialist parties have anything with which to reproach themselves, that would call in question their membership of the International. At the same time this comfortable pliant theory has already sufficient explanation at hand for the contradiction between the present position of Social Democracy and its past, a contradiction that now strikes the most stupid eye. The International has only ventilated the question of preventing war. Now however "we are in the war", as the formula goes, and it now appears that after the outbreak of war, quite other rules are in force for socialists than those before the war. As soon as the war has come, the only question for the proletariat is victory or defeat, or as another "Austro-Marxist" Fritz Adler declares, more or less after the manner of a natural scientific philosopher — "The nation, like any other organism must before all preserve its existence." In plain language this means that there is not one rule of life for the proletariat, as scientific socialism has hitherto proclaimed, but there are two: one for war and one for peace. In peace the class struggle is in force within each country and abroad international solidarity; in war there is solidarity between the classes and abroad the

struggle between the various countries. The world historical appeal of the Communist Manifesto undergoes an essential addition and according to Kautsky's correction reads: "Workers of the world unite during peace and cut each others throats during war". Therefore to-day "in every fight one Moskovicite, in every trench kill one of the French". But to-morrow after the conclusion of peace:

"Millions, join the hands together!
From land to land let men embrace!"

For the International is "essentially an instrument of peace but not an efficient tool in war".

This obliging theory does not merely open up pleasing prospects for the Social Democratic practice in raising the changeability of the weather-cock fraction (a liberal fraction) along with the jesuitism of the Centre up to the chief dogma of the Socialist International, but it inaugurates a quite new "revision" of the materialistic conception of history, a revision against which all former attempts of Bernstein appear as harmless child's play. The proletarian tactic before the outbreak of war and after this outbreak is to be quite different, in fact shall pursue directly opposite lines. This assures that the social conditions, the foundations of our tactics in war and peace are fundamentally different. According to the materialistic conception of history, as laid by Marx, all previously written history is the history of class struggles. According to Kautsky's revised materialism there must be added the phrase: "With the exception of periods of war". According to this, social revolution, as it has for thousands of years been

Kautsky in "Neue Zeit" of October 1914.

... It (the International) is not an effective weapon of war. It is essentially an instrument of peace. The International is strongest in peace time, weakest in war time. This is surely to be regretted."

interspersed by wars runs somewhat along the following lines: a period of class-struggles, then a pause in which the classes unite for national struggle, then once more a period of class struggles followed once more by a pause and class unity and so gracefully on. Each time the foundations of social life obtained in peace were turned upside down by war and were righted again by the return of peace.

This is already, as one sees, no longer a theory of social evolution by catastrophes, which Kautsky along with other "intriguers" had to oppose, this is a theory of evolution by somersaults. Society moves here somewhat like the floating iceberg in the spring seas, which when its base is melted away in the warm water turns turtle after a certain period and thereupon repeats the same little game periodically.

Now not only do all the known facts of history violently contradict this revised materialistic conception of history, the contrary they obviously display, instead of this fresh constructed antagonism between war and peace, a perpetual dialectic changing of war into class struggle and class struggle into war and thereby reveal their inner essential identity. So it was in the wars between the towns in the middle ages, in the wars of the Reformation, in the war of Dutch liberation, the wars of the French Revolution, the war of American independence, the Paris Commune and the great Russian Revolution of 1905. Also, considered abstractly and purely from the theoretical standpoint, Kautsky's theory of the materialistic conception of history does not leave one stone upon another in Marxist theory, as brief reflection will show. For instance, Marx assumes that neither class struggles nor wars are the result of the sky, but are the result of deep-rooted social and economic causes. This being so, they cannot both disappear periodically, if their causes do not also disappear. The result is that the proletarian class struggle is a necessary phenomenon of the wage relation as well as the class struggle of the bourgeoisie. But during war the wage relation does not disappear in the least, on the contrary its weight is greatly increased by the fever of speculation and company promotion which blooms in the fertile soil of war industry, as well as the pressure of the military dictatorship upon the workers. In addition, as little also does the class rule of the bourgeoisie disappear during war, on the contrary it is raised to a naked class dictatorship by the suspension of constitutional rights. How then can the inevitable results, the class struggle cease, when the economic and political causes of the class struggle are work ten times more strongly in society. On the contrary

wars of the present period of history arise out of the competitive interests of the capitalist groups and out of the necessity of capital to expand. Both main springs do not work merely during the roar of the cannons but also in time of peace, during which they prepare for the outbreak of war and render them inevitable. War is, as Kautsky likes to quote from Clausewitz, only the continuation of politics by other methods. And in fact the imperialist phase of the rule of capital made peace an illusion through the armament competition, which declares war to be a permanent thing.

From this there results an "either or else" for the revised materialistic conception of history. Either the class struggle is also in war the all-powerful law of existence of the proletariat, and the proclamation of the harmony of the classes in its place in war time by the party leaders is a crime against the vital interests of the proletariat, or the class struggle is also in peace "a crime against the national interests" and "the safety of the fatherland". Either the class struggle or class harmony, both in war and in peace, is the fundamental factor of social life. Thus stands the alternative in practical form. Either Social Democracy, like a former sower of wild oats now turned pious, will have to declare: "Father I have sinned to the bourgeois fatherland, and revise all its tactics and principles even in peace time in order to adapt itself to its social imperialist position of to-day, or it will have to declare "Father I have sinned" to the international proletariat and adapt its attitude in war to its principles in peace. And what is true for the German labour movement is naturally also true for the French labour movement.

Either the International remains a heap of ruins even after the war, or its resurrection begins upon the ground of the class struggle, from which alone its life sap draws its life sap. It will not come to life by bringing out the old barrel-organ after the war, upon which the old melodies shall be played with all solemnity as if nothing had happened, and the world enchanted again as it was before August 4th. Only by a thorough scorning of its own half measures and weaknesses, of its own moral fault since August 4th, can the reconstruction of the International begin. The first step in this direction is the action for the speedy termination of the war as well as for the establishment of peace in accordance with the common interests of the international proletariat.

III.

In so far as it is a question of peace, two different tendencies are now in the foreground in the party. One which is represented by Scheidemann, several members of the Reichstag and some party papers, gives as an echo of the government the slogan of "holding out" and combats the government for peace as being untimely and dangerous for the military interests of the fatherland. This tendency therefore stands for the continuation of the war, that is, it sees that the war shall be continued in the sense of the ruling class, until a victory compensates with our sacrifices, until an assured peace". In other words, the supporters of "holding out" see to it that the objective tendencies of the war shall be laid as closely as possible to all the imperialist requests which are openly pronounced by the "Post" of von Bismarck, of Dix and other prophets of Germany's world domination. If all these beautiful dreams are not realised and the war is set to the pride of imperialism, it will be as little the fault of the people of the "Post" as of their pace-makers in the ranks of Social Democracy.

Mehring - "Neue Zeit", October 2, 1914.

"The International has collapsed".
"The German party press have completely ceased to represent party principles."

It is not the solemn declarations in parliament against the war of conquest that are of public influence upon the will of the war but the support of the policy of "Holding out". The war for the continuation of which Scheidemann and others entered the lists, has its own logic, the bearers of which are those capitalist agrarian elements who are in the saddle to-day in Germany and not the modest Social Democratic party parliamentarians and journalists who merely hold the stirrups for them. The social imperialist attitude of the party comes to its most open expression in this tendency. Whilst in France the party leaders — it is true because quite another military situation — hold firmly to the slogan holding out until victory, a movement in all countries for

the speediest possible termination of the war is making itself noticeable. What characterises this idea and wish for peace most sharply is the carefully prepared guarantees of peace which are to be demanded with the end of the war; not only the unanimous demand for no annexations, but whole list of new demands appear, such as general disarmament, or the more modest program of a systematic limitation of armaments, abolition of secret diplomacy, free trade for all nations in the colonies and all kinds of beautiful things. What is admirable in all these clauses for the future blessing of mankind and the prevention of future wars is the indestructible optimism which issues out of the frightful catastrophe of the present without a scar and plants new resolutions on the grave of old hopes. If the collapse of August 4th has proven anything it is the world historical lesson that an efficient guarantee for peace and an actual war of defence against war are not to be formed by the highest wishes, carefully thought out recipes and utopian demands which are addressed to the ruling classes, but from nothing less than the energetic will of the proletariat to remain true to its class policy and its international solidarity during all the storms of imperialism. Not demands and formulas but the capability to place behind these formulas the will and the act in the spirit of a class struggle and international solidarity was lacking in the socialist parties of all important countries and before all in the German party. To-day after all that we have experienced, to regard peace action as a puzzling out of the best recipes of the war would mean declaring the most dangerous thing for international socialism, namely that in spite of all its cruel lessons it has forgotten nothing and learnt nothing.

Kautsky in "Neue Zeit" of October 2, 1914.

Social Democracy in the war.

"The contrast between the German and the French socialists is not in the criterion, not in fundamental conceptions, but in the different view of the situation, which in itself is the result of the geographical situation of the parties in question. . . . If, in spite of all the efforts of social democracy, a war will break out after all, then each nation will have to do its best to save its skin. Hence it follows that the social democracy of all nations will have the same right, or the same duty, to take part in this defence, and none of them need reproach the other. . . . In every national State the proletariat must stake the whole of its energy to safeguard the independence and integrity of the national territory."

Of this also we find the best example in Germany. In the "Neue Zeit", Hoch, a member of the Reichstag, recently presented a peace program which according to the party organ he recommended most heartily. Nothing was missing in this program, neither an exactly enumerated list of "demands" which would avoid future wars in a sure and painless manner, nor a very convincing exposition of the necessity and desirability of a speedy peace. Only one thing was missing, an explanation by what means one should work for this peace, and not with "wishes" but with deeds. The author belongs to that compact fraction of the majority, who not only twice voted for the war credits, but each time recommended their being granted as a political, patriotic, socialist necessity, and having been drilled in the new part, is prepared with the same matter of course to vote further credits for the continuation of the war. In one breath to recommend the means for the continuation of the war and to praise the desirability of a speedy peace and all its blessings, with one hand to press the sword into the hand of the government and with the other to wave the palm of peace gently over the head of the International — that is a classical example of the practical policy as propagated theoretically in the "Neue Zeit".

When the socialists of neutral countries, for example, the Copenhagen conference, consider the working out of peace demands and recipes on paper as a really serious action for the speedy termination of the war, that is a relatively harmless error. The recognition of the deciding factor in the present situation of the International and the causes of its collapse can and must be the common property of all socialist parties. The saying act for the restoration of peace, as well as of the International, can only proceed from the socialist parties of the warring countries. The first step towards peace is a turn about on the path of social imperialism. And if the Social Democratic parliamentarians continue to vote the means for carrying on the war, their wishes and recipes for peace and

their formal declarations against all annexations are individually the same as the Kautsky "International", the members of which "have nothing with which to reproach themselves and who periodically embrace each other or cut each other's throats, i. e., a piece of hypocrisy and what is still worse a chimera. In this case also events have their own logic. With the voting of the war credits the Hochs give the reins out of their hands and effect the exact contrary of peace, that is they practise "holding out" just as well as the Scheidemanns, who by the recommendation of "holding out", actually yield the reins out of their own hands into those of the "Post" people, and thus bring about the exact contrary of their formal declarations against any policy of annexation, namely, the unchaining of the imperialist instincts to the point of exhaustion by loss of blood. Here there is only an "either or else". Either a Bethmann-Hollweg or Liebknecht. Either imperialism or socialism as Marx understood it.

Just as in Marx himself the sharp historical analyst and the courageous revolutionist, the man of ideas and the man of action, were inseparably bound with each other, supported each other and complemented each other, so has Marxism, as a historical teaching, for the first time in the history of the modern labour movement, combined the theoretical knowledge with the revolutionary energy of the proletariat, one being illuminated and fertilised by the other. Both belong equally to the inmost being of Marxism. Each one separated from the other transforms Marxism into a sadly grotesque picture of itself. In the course of half a century, German Social Democracy has reaped the richest harvest from the theoretical knowledge of Marx, and through its sap has grown into a great and powerful body. Confronted with a test which it should

Resolution of the Zimmerwald Left on

The World War and the Tasks of Social Democracy.

November 1915.

The world war, which has for a year devastated Europe, is an imperialist war, which is carried on for the political and economic exploitation of the world, for markets, for sources of raw material and capitalist spheres of influence. It is a product of capitalist development, which at the same time has linked up the whole world into one world economic system and leaves existing independent national capitalist groups with antagonist interests.

The bourgeoisie and the governments, by attempting to conceal this character of the world war, by claiming that it is a war forced upon them for national independence, only mislead the proletariat, as the war is precisely carried on for the suppression of foreign peoples and countries. Equally lying is the legend concerning the defence of Democracy in this fight, as imperialism means the most ruthless domination of big capital and reaction.

The overcoming of imperialism is only possible by the abolition of the contradictions which have produced it, that is to say, by the socialist organization of the present economic system, for which the objective conditions are already ripe.

At the outbreak of the war the majority of the labour leaders did not oppose imperialism with this only possible slogan. Entangled by nationalism, eaten up with opportunism, at the moment of the world war they delivered the proletariat over to imperialism, forsook the principles of socialism and along with it the real fight for the interests of the proletariat.

Social patriotism and social imperialism, which stand-point in Germany, is not only adopted by the open patriotic majority of the former social democratic leaders, but also by the sham oppositional centre of the party following Kautsky, which in addition is recognised in France and Austria by the majority, in England and Russia by a portion of the leaders (Hyndman, the Fabians, the Trade Unionists, Plechanov, Rubanovits, the group of Nasche Djelo), is a more dangerous enemy for the proletariat than the bourgeois apostles of imperialism, as it misures the flag of socialism and can mislead the unenlightened workers. The ruthless fight against social imperialism forms the first premise for the revolutionary mobilisation of the proletariat and the reconstruction of the Internationals.

It is the task of the socialist parties, as well as of the socialist opposition in the social-imperialist parties, to summon and to lead the working masses to the revolutionary struggle

have theoretically foreseen with the certainty of a natural scientist and have predicted in its essential features, it lacked the second vital element of the labour movement: the energetic will, not only to understand history, but also to make history. With all its exemplary theoretical knowledge and its power of organization, it was seized by the whirlpool of the stream of history and in an instant, like a rudderless wreck, was placed at the mercy of the winds of imperialism, against which it should have striven forward as the saviour of socialism. The defeat of the whole International was already settled with this failure of its "vanguard", its strongest, best-schooled elite, even without the mistakes of any others.

It is a world historical collapse of the greatest magnitude, which delays the liberation of mankind from the rule of capitalism in a most dangerous manner. If it had to be so, however, Marxism is in no way to blame. All attempts to adapt today to the present morass of socialist practice and so substitute it to the cheap apologist for social imperialism are more dangerous than all the open excesses of the nationalist leaders in the ranks of the party. These attempts not only lead to the concealment of the actual causes of the deep fall of the International, but also block up the sources of its future restoration. The International, like peace in the interest of the proletariat, can only be born out of the self-criticism of the proletariat and out of the recollection of the its power, that power which bent before the storm on August 4th like a feeble reed, which, however, when restored to its true greatness has the historical mission to break the thousand year oak of social injustice and to move mountains. The way to this power — not mere paper resolutions — is at the same time the way to peace and the reconstruction of the International.

against the capitalist governments, for the capture of political power, for the purpose of organizing a socialist system of society.

Without giving up the struggle for every inch of ground within the sphere of capitalism, for every reform which will strengthen the proletariat, without forsaking any means for organization and agitation, the revolutionary social democrats have to make use of all the struggles and all the reforms demanded by our minimum program in order to intensify this war crisis, as every social and political crisis of capitalism, and to extend it to an attack upon its foundations. Whilst this attack will be carried on under the banner of socialism, it will make the masses of the workers accessible to the slogan of the suppression of one people by another as it finds expression in the maintenance of the rule of one nation over another, in the cry for further annexations. It will make them deaf to the seductions of national solidarity which has led the proletariat to the battle fields.

This fight is inaugurated by the fight against the world war, for the speedy termination of the slaughter of the people. This fight demands the refusal of war credits, the withdrawal from the ministries, the denunciation of the capitalist-socialist character of the war from the floor of parliament in the columns of the legal and, where necessary, in the illegals, the sharpest combatting of social patriotism and taking advantage of every movement of the people following in the consequences of the war (poverty, heavy losses, etc.) to organize street demonstrations against the governments, to propagate international solidarity in the trenches, to promote economic strikes, to endeavour, under favourable conditions, to convert them into political strikes. Civil war not developed is the slogan.

Against all illusions that it would be possible to bring about by any decisions of the diplomatists and of the governments the basis of an enduring peace and the beginning of disarmament, the revolutionary social democrats must continually impress upon the mass of the people that only social revolution can realise a lasting peace and the emancipation of humanity.

(Signed by the delegations of the Central Committee of the Social Democratic Labour Party of Russia, the National Executive of the Social Democratic Party of Russian-Poland and Lithuania, the Central Committee of the Social Democratic Party of Letland, of the Swedish and Norwegian Socialist Ungdomsforbund, by a representative of the revolutionary Social Democracy of Germany and by a Swiss Delegate.)

Our Greatest Enemy is in our own Country.

By Karl Liebknecht.

That which we have been daily expecting for the last 10 months, since Austria's attack upon Serbia, has happened: we are at war with Italy.

The masses of the people in the warring countries have begun to rise themselves from the official network of lies. The German people are too beginning to gain an insight into the causes and aims of the world war, and to discover who is directly responsible for its outbreak. The delusion as to the sacred purposes served by the war is being more and more dispelled, war enthusiasm is disappearing, and the will to a speedy peace is springing up rapidly everywhere, even in the army.

The Protest at the Potsdamer Platz, Demonstration

From Karl Liebknecht's leaflet of the 1st. of May 1916.

Workers, Party Comrades! Women of the Proletariat!

How long will you silently suffer the crimes of the wholesale massacres, misery and starvation? The rich people endure the war for a long time yet. They will not suffer by hunger. Away with the atrocious crimes of the slaughter of the peoples! Down with those responsible for it, who seduced it, who will profit by it! Our enemies are not the French, the Russian or the English people, they are the German bankers, the German capitalists and their business managers, the German government!

Forth to the fight against the deadly enemy of all freedom, the fight for everything which means the welfare and future of the cause of the workers, of humanity and of culture!

This has been causing much anxiety to the German and Austrian imperialists, and they have been looking for salvation vain. Now they seem to have found it. Italy's participation in the war offers them a welcome opportunity for arousing a rash paroxysm of national hate, for throttling the will to peace, for obliterating the traces of their own crimes. They speculate on the forgetfulness of the German people, on a forbearance which has stood only too many tests.

Should they succeed in their design, it will mean that the experience gained during 10 bloody months is simply wiped out, the international proletariat is once more disarmed and completely set aside as an independent political factor.

The plan must be defeated, in so far as it can be defeated, that section of the German proletariat which has remained faithful to international socialism, and continues to remember to be worthy of its historical mission in these tremendous times.

The enemies of the people reckon on the forgetfulness of masses — we oppose this speculation by the slogan

Learn everything — forget nothing!

We have seen how, at the outbreak of the war, the masses were decoyed, into following the alluring tones which urged them into the service of a war for capitalist ends. We have witnessed the bursting of the glittering soap-bubbles of demagogues, the dispelling of the foolish dreams of August 1914. We have seen the people plunged into want and misery instead of the glorious times promised, we have seen the tears of war widows and orphans swelling to a mighty stream, and we have seen how the maintenance of the injustice of the three classes, the obstinate canonisation of that quadruple monarchy, semi-absolutism, junker rule, militarism, and police despotism, have established themselves as bitter truths.

We are warned by experience. Learn everything, forget nothing!

How revolting are the tirades with which Italian imperialism publishes its piratical policy. How revolting the tragi-comedy carried on at Rome, a farce in which the usual gesture of "civil peace" is not lacking. But it is still more revolting that we can recognize in all this nothing more nor less than a repetition of the methods pursued by Germany and Austria from the beginning of the war until August 1914.

The Italian war-makers deserve the utmost condemnation. They are simply the counter — parts of those principally responsible for the outbreak of the war — the German and Austrian negotiators. They all belong to the same confraternity.

Whom has the German people to thank for this fresh visitation? Who is to be called to account for the lives of the countless victims again to be sacrificed!

The fact remains: the Austrian ultimatum to Serbia on 23. July 1914 was the torch which set the world on fire, though the fire did not spread to Italy until later.

The fact remains: This ultimatum was the signal for a fresh re-distribution of territory and was bound to call every capitalist robber state upon the scene.

The fact remains: this ultimatum raised the question of dominance in the Balkans, in Asia, and the whole Mediterranean, and thus simultaneously aroused the antagonisms existing between Austro-Germany and Italy.

The German and Austrian imperialists, in their present attempt to hide behind Italian piracy and Italian perfidy and in their endeavour to envelop themselves in the garb of moral indignation and injured innocence, whilst in reality they have only met their counter-parts in Rome, are worthy of nothing but utter contempt.

It appears to be forgotten that the German people have been more befooled in the Italian question than in many others. Befooled by most honourable German patriots.

The triple alliance treaty with Italy was always a farce; you have always been deceived on this question.

To those behind the scenes, Italy was always counted among the adversaries of Austria and Germany in case of war — but you have been told that Italy was a sure ally.

The triple alliance treaty involved a great part of Germany's political fate, but you were not asked to decide on its conclusion or renewal — you have not been informed as to one word of this treaty, not even up to today.

The Austrian ultimatum to Serbia, with which a small clique took the majority by surprise, was a breach of the alliance treaty between Austria and Italy — but you were told nothing about it.

This ultimatum was issued against Italy's express opposition — this too was hidden from you.

On the 4. May the alliance with Austria had already been dissolved by Italy, but this decisive fact was withheld from the German and Austrian peoples until the 18. May, and was even officially denied in derision of all truth — an action which is on a par with the wilful duping of the German people and the German Reichstag with regard to the German ultimatum issued to Belgium on 2. August 1914.

You were not permitted to exercise any influence upon the negotiations carried on between Austro-Germany and Italy, though Italy's participation in the war depended on the result. You were treated like irresponsible children in this vital question, and the war party with secret diplomacy, and a handful of persons in Berlin and Vienne gambled with the destiny of Germany.

The sinking of the Lusitania not only secured the power of the English, French, and Russian war parties, involved Germany in a severe conflict with the United States, and aroused the whole of the neutral countries to impassioned indignation against Germany but it facilitated the disastrous work of the Italian war party precisely at the critical moment. And the German people have again had to look on in silence, the mailed fist of the state of siege has held them by the throat.

Extract from the Speech of Defence of Karl Liebknecht

before the Court Martial.

"Penal Servitude", "Loss of honour!" Very well, but your honour is not my honour! But I tell you: no general ever wore a uniform with such pride as I shall wear the prison garb.

I am here to accuse — not to defend myself! Not civil peace but civil war is for me the slogan.

**Down with war!
Down with the government!**

Steps might have been taken towards peace in March of this year—England had already stretched out a hand — but the German imperialist greed for profit thrust it back. Favourable openings towards peace were frustrated by German endeavours towards gaining colonies on a large scale, towards the annexation of Belgium and French Lorraine, and by the efforts of the capitalist owning the great German shipping companies and German heavy industrial enterprises.

This, too, was kept secret from the German people — here again their advice was not asked for.

Whom has the German people therefore to thank for the continuation of the cruel war, for the coming in of Italy? Whom else than the responsible irresponsibles in Germany itself. Learn everything, forget nothing!

The Italian repercussion of last Summer's events in Germany cannot stimulate any thinking person into a renewal of jingoist enthusiasm, it can only serve to throw fresh light on the political responsibility, to reveal that these Austrian and German war agitators are public dangers, and to act as a fresh accusation against them.

From "Volkstribune" (Austria) of August 12, 1924.

"In this war, what ever its causes and however little they may have in common with the interests of the proletariat, the proletariat will do its duty. It is a question of European culture, of European liberty, of the development and progress of the international proletariat, and we know that by this fight we shall render the greatest service to the Russian people, to the Russian proletariat."

Above all we must learn, and not forget, that our Italian comrades have fought, and are still fighting heroically against the war. They have fought in the press, in meetings, at street demonstrations, with revolutionary power and courage, defying with body and life the furious attacks of the nationalist elements incited by the authorities. Our best wishes go with them in their struggle! May the spirit which upholds them be an example to us! Let it become an example for the International!

Spartacus.

By A. Thalheimer.

Through the poison gases of Germany social-imperialism and the stifling cloud of German social-pacifism, from the beginning of the war to the outbreak of the revolution, a safe and steady beacon-light gleamed; its name was: Spartacus.

Since the 4th of August, 1914, Spartacus was a reliable beacon, which with patient and courageous educational work kept the bewildered and misled masses of the social democracy enlightened about the social-chauvinist vapourings and about the Ebert—Scheidemann—Legien crowd, about the social-pacifism of Kautsky, Haase, etc. From the first day of its inception, Spartacus had one aim: to terminate the imperialist world-butcher by the proletarian revolution. The name of Spartacus made its first appearance in January 1916, when the first Spartacus-letters were published; previously the group was known as the "International Group", after the name of its organ of publicity — "Die Internationale", which was started in May 1915 under the editorship of Rosa Luxemburg and Franz Mehring and was promptly suppressed by the military dictatorship.

Spartacus or the International Group, under various names and under various forms of organization (until December 1918, since the formation of the organization later known as the Independent Party, Spartacus formally was, part of the Independent Social Democracy, but actually it was a separate organization enjoying complete political independence). It maintained one and the same clear and firm revolutionary line. Together with the International Socialist Groups of Bremen and Hamburg, it maintained the only real revolutionary line through the whole of the war period in Germany.

The role of Spartacus in the war was not determined by mere chance. What became known later as the Spartacus Group, and then the German Communist Party, was the ideological outgrowth not merely of the fight against the right wing of the German social-democracy, against the subsequent social-chauvinists like Ebert,

If this spirit had been international ever since the beginning of the war, it would have been better for the world. It would have been better for the international proletariat.

But the determined will to fight is always in time! The absurd slogan of "holding out", signifying nothing but an ever deeper plunge into carnage among the peoples, has reached the end of its tether. The most imperative necessity of the hour is international proletarian class war against international imperialist slaughter of the peoples.

The greatest enemy of every people is in their own country. The greatest enemy of the German people is in Germany. It is German Imperialism, the German war party, German secret diplomacy. The combatting of this enemy at home is the first task of the German people. A combat to be carried out in political conflict, and with the cooperation of the proletariat of the other countries, each fighting its own imperialist at home.

We know that we are at one with the German people — but we have nothing in common with such Germans as Tirpitz and Falkenhayn or with a German government working for political suppression and social enslavement. We have nothing for these — but everything for the German people! Everything for the international proletariat, for the sake of the German proletariat, for the sake of all downtrodden humanity.

The enemies of the working class are calculating upon the forgetfulness of the masses. Let it be your task to see that they are thoroughly mistaken in their reckoning! They are speculating on the forbearance of the masses — but we raise a challenging cry:

"How long are the gamblers of imperialism to abuse the patience of the people! We have had enough and more than enough of this massacre! Down with the war agitators, both on this and on the other side of the frontier!

End this murder of the peoples!

Workers of the world! Follow the heroic example of your Italian brothers. Join together in the international class war against the conspiracies of secret diplomacy, against imperialism, against war, for peace in the spirit of Socialism!

Our greatest enemy is in our own country!

Scheidemann, Legien etc. but also against the so-called Marxian centre represented by Kautsky, Hilferding, Eckstein, Haase, etc. The question of the imperialist war, and the cognate question of the revolutionary mass-movement were the touchstone which separated the left elements within the German social democracy. First of all, the discussions about the mass strike in Germany connected with the Russian revolution of 1905—1906, when it was already demonstrated that neither Legien and Scheidemann nor Kautsky and his friends were able to look beyond the narrow circle of parliamentary activity, and that they were not prepared to advocate the general mass-strike as a substitute to the parliamentary squabbles, and merely as a means of defence against an attack on democratic rights in the bourgeois State. Next came the discussion about the suffrage in Prussia when it was shown that the Marxian centre was not prepared to resort to the weapon of political mass-strike, either for the defence of the conquest of new political rights, even within the framework of the bourgeois democracy. The Morocco crisis of 1912 revealed quite clearly, although those who were concerned at the time were quite few in number, the total inability of the German social-democracy, in spite of all its speeches and pledges at international congresses, to take a serious step against the peril of imperialist war. The decision of the German social-democratic party in 1911, which was concerned about the safety of the party funds, did not dawn in the mind of any of these wiseacres that it was the duty of the strongest parties of the Second International to organise a serious campaign against the ominous danger of the outbreak of a world-wide imperialist war. In the course of the discussions on the question of disarmament, it became quite clear that the Marxian Centre, through its whole imperialist period, while it led the proletariat and was unambiguously preparing for the proletarian revolution, could not rise above the horizon of bourgeois democracy. Another landmark which led to the 4th of August was the voting of ar-

credits by the Social Democratic deputies in the Reichstag, when the Marxian Centre of the Social Democratic right wing gave ready assistance and it was only the small group of Rosa Luxemburg and Franz Mehring which raised the banner of protest. Thus we see that the attitude of the Spartacus group towards the war was the result of prolonged ideological preparations, from which the group emerged as a strong revolutionary body. No one in this group, even those of the left, thought of the possibility of a need arising to break with the German social democracy and to form an independent political organization. Even while criticising the social democracy most severely, no one dared foresee the event that was to happen on the 4th of August, the total collapse of the mightiest party of the Second International, the Party which set the pace for the Second International, which considered itself as the model socialist party in Europe.

It happened to be in the company of Rosa Luxemburg on the 4th of August, when we got the news of the social-democratic faction in the Reichstag, of the voting of credits, of the declarations made by Haase and by the Centrist opposition and of the silence even by Karl Liebknecht. Rosa Luxemburg at first appeared stunned by this tremendous blow. She saw at once that this event was fraught with tremendous consequences, that it meant the collapse of not only the German social democracy, but also of the Second International. She spoke of the decaying corpse of the German social democracy and the Second International, and this phrase expressed fully her feelings and her view of the situation created in International socialism. But she promptly braced herself up in the firm resolve to take up the work against the imperialist war and against the wave of social-chauvinism at all costs, to gather and to organize the forces which could bring about the re-birth of socialism in Germany and internationally. In those early days it was indeed no more than a small pennant hoisted by seven righteous people who took up the fight, a small pennant which never failed, even in the most severe and trying days. In those early days it was already shown with a good deal of clearness that very little could be expected from the parliamentary heroes who murmured against social-chauvinism in the privacy of their homes. The only exception was Karl Liebknecht, who showed himself as a real revolutionist. He was followed at that time by Rühle, but the latter was not made of the stuff to take upon himself the role which entailed tremendous sacrifices and unbounded courage, which Karl Liebknecht took upon himself. The other famed heroes of the social-democratic fraction in the Reichstag considered Karl Liebknecht from the very first as a man who was not quite normal, and in this they were perfectly right, if they considered as normal their own timidity cowardice and narrow-mindedness.

From "Naprzod" (Central Organ of Polish Socialist Party) of August 2, 1914.

"If we wish for a bright future for the Polish working class, if we want to be a free nation, a worthy member of the great family of nations, we must regard this fight as our sacred duty.

By preparing for the war against Tsarism, we do our duty not only to ourselves, but also to the working class of the whole of Europe, and in the first place, to those millions of working people in Russia, the clatter of whose chains have so loudly resounded in the streets of the Russian cities in these days! . . ."

What one was to expect from the Marxian Centre and from those who followed its train in the Reichstag and in the Prussian Landtag, was revealed in a terrifying manner on the attitude of Kautsky, when it was a question of declaring for or against the imperialist war. In those days of decision Karl Kautsky could only meekly mutter "yea-nay," and soon afterwards he wrote in "Neue Zeit" (in the organ of the International which was to be the instrument of peace, not of war) those shameful words which meant a decision in favour of war: "victory for ones own country, not for imperialism or revolution." In view of this situation it saw clearly that the only way to gather the forces of the German working class, to put an end to the war and to enter in the social revolution was to draw the sharpest line of demarcation extensively from the social-pacifist to the social-chauvinist wing of the German social democracy, and that this ideological fight was waged by means of newspaper cor-

respondence which was sent to the whole of the Party press. It then transpired that the falling courage of social-democratic editors vied with the red pencil of the censor in the effort to prevent the spread of the ideas contained in those articles.

Meanwhile the Spartacus group was busily consolidating its ranks. Man for man we picked the best, bravest and clearest head in the German social democracy, a few comrades here and there for a start, who closely allied themselves in a militant discipline. In 1914—15 we still thought it possible to raise the standard of revolt within the social democracy and to purify it of the opportunist elements. It was much later that we became convinced that nothing could be hoped for and nothing could be won in the old organization. It must be borne in mind that the Social Democratic Party has experienced some severe factional strife between the followers of Lassale and those of Eisenach and that the idea of a split was bound to meet with many hindrances and with hesitation even on the part of the most advanced workers. A fair share of the blame rested on August Bebel. It was he who together with the elder Liebknecht had brought about a union of the Lassaleans and Eisenachians, yet it was he who afraid to take a definite step in the controversy with the revisionists, constantly endeavoured to minimise the profoundest differences. We are quite certain that if a split between these elements had taken place during the controversy with the revisionists at the Dresden conference of 1903, the path of communism in Germany and the progress of the proletarian revolution would have been much easier and much quicker.

Organizationally and technically, the Spartacus group continued to work at the outset in conjunction with the motley organisation of the Centrist opposition of all shades of opinion. This was brought publicly into view in the well known letter of protest handed by the officials to the Party Executive in July 1915. When in May 1915 the first issue of "Die Internationale" edited by Rosa Luxemburg and Franz Mehring appeared, which attacked with equal severity the Marxian centre as well as the Social Democratic right wing, as it did also at the first Zimmerwald Congress of September 1915 the differences between Spartacus and the centrist group of Ledebour (the collaboration group) became fully revealed. The Ledebour group agitated for a termination of the war by an understanding between the belligerent governments. They were in favour of withholding war credits, a gesture which would have been of much significance in the beginning of the war, but had lost its importance in the course of the war, as far as I can see. It shrank from the idea that the only way to end the war was to bring about a revolutionary movement of the working class, and that it was the duty of the revolutionary socialists to hasten the revolution, to agitate and organize, regardless of possible defeat to one's own country. The line which separated us from the bolsheviks led by Lenin was made manifest. It was only in the course of the war and during the first months of the November revolution that the Spartacus group grew into a Bolshevik Party and served as the bridge which brought the German working class to the high level of the Russian revolution.

The organizational separation of the Spartacus group from the great Berlin opposition was started by local discussions and it was brought to a head at the national conference of the International Group which took place on January 1st, 1916 at the residence of Karl Liebknecht, at which it was resolved to establish an independent organ of publicity for the Group. The conference endorsed the theses elaborated by Rosa Luxemburg, which were published as a supplement to the June number. Karl Liebknecht and Franz Mehring undertook to contribute the first articles. We then adopted the pseudonym of "Spartacus" as the distinguishing feature of our publications. The Spartacus letters were first issued in typewritten copies and only later on (of course, illegally) were printed and distributed broadcast. The organizing spirit of Spartacus, after the arrest of Karl Liebknecht at the May Day demonstration of 1916 at Potsdamer Platz and of Rosa Luxemburg, Franz Mehring and Ernst Meyer, was Leo Jogisches. It was thanks to his untiring energy and experience in illegal work, that the Spartacus letters continued to be published and the communications with the literary contributors and organizers and agitators of the Group remained uninterrupted, in spite of numerous arrests, banishment to the war-front and so on. These Spartacus letters were the point of concentration for the young but strongly centralised organization, which was bound to base its activity largely on the factory organizations, not

because of any preconceived organizational ideas, but simply as the practical necessity of illegal activity.

The guiding principle of Spartacus was to develop the imperialistic war into civil war. The Spartacus letters showed the German workers, that there was only one solution which would benefit the proletariat and this was the revolutionary solution which must be prepared for and forced into being with all available strength. The outbreak of the Russian revolution in February and March 1917 gave a new impulse to the movement of the Spartacus Bund. It is well known that Rosa Luxemburg and her circle were at first opposed to some of the characteristics of the bolshevik party. All one can say to-day is that it would have been an historical impossibility, a miracle, if the left wing of the German Social-Democrats had been able to reach the heights of communism with one bound. The path to these heights had to be developed in mental conflict, but without this mental conflict the nucleus would never have been formed from out which the German Communist Party was later born. And one must also realize that the driving motives of this mental conflict and criticism resulted from first to last in the appeal to the revolutionary force and activity of the German proletariat. If Rosa Luxemburg rounded the German workers of the great danger of the peace policy pursued by the bolsheviks she only did so in order to make a more pressing appeal to them to fulfill their revolutionary duty and make it impossible for German imperialism to spring at the throat of the Russian revolution, so soon as the war was ended and the bourgeoisie of Europe met across the trenches in order to unite together in strangling the Russian revolution.

The activities of Spartacus were not limited to producing the Spartacus letters they extended to the soldiers at the front and in the rear. Every where in Germany where the first sparks of the revolutionary movement were being kindled, in the strikes in Brunswick (1916) and in Berlin (January 1917) etc. Spartacus stood at the centre, leading and guiding. Karl Liebknecht's appearance in the Reichstag had an immense significance. He was the first to set an example of the true revolutionary use of parliamentarism, he set the example of revolutionary activity in the army itself, and when he was buried behind the walls of a prison this fact itself became a revolutionary inspiration.

Renaudel in "L'humanite" of August 4th, 1914.

"The Chamber will to-morrow or after to-morrow take an attitude . . . by voting the necessary credits. These credits we will vote unanimously.

German imperialism as revealed in the recently published manifesto of the German Socialist Party, has shown itself in all its brutality, and it seems to us that the hour has struck when Europe, if unwilling to submit to the yoke of German imperialism, must punish it for the abuse of brutal force.

Germany has aroused against herself the whole of Europe. We await the verdict of the guns, and we wish that it might be in our favour."

The weight of war became heavier. The pacifist tendencies in the German social-democracy became stronger. On the occasion of the Stockholm Conference, the Spartacus letters told the German workers: "The necessary preliminary to the rejection of State socialism is a thorough process of self-criticism, laying bare and differentiating the true socialistic elements from those which carry on bourgeois politics under the cloak of social-democracy. This tendency which had begun to show itself in all countries and has made a certain amount of progress but which is on the whole only at its beginning will now be thoroughly suppressed by the Stockholm discussions. At Stockholm, the most heterogeneous tendencies and elements will meet together with the common slogan of peace and for work in preparing for peace.

The very fact that coalition socialists from all countries, namely the people who are really making war, are allowed to come together for common action in promotion of peace, transforms the whole business into a worthy continuation of the prostitution of socialism which is being carried on in our war politics all the three years that have passed since the 4th of August." (Spartacus letter No. 6, August 1917).

And when the military collapse came at last and Kühlmann announced in the Reichstag that the war could no

longer be ended by military decision, then again the Spartacus letters wrote: "The situation calls loudly for the saving and freeing arm of the proletariat . . . But what is the German proletariat doing? In the sweat of his brow he is besieging and destroying the one country in which the working class has conquered political power in order to clear out war and

From "Nepslava" (Central Organ of the Hungarian Social Democracy) of August 31, 1914.

"The war which is now waged against Russian Tsarism and its vassals is dominated by a great historical idea. The spirit of a great historical idea pervades the battlefields in Poland and in East Russia. The roar of the cannon, the rattle of machine guns, and the cavalry skirmishes signify the realisation of the democratic programme of the emancipation of peoples . . ." and so on.

imperialism and to make socialism a reality. Our brave soldiers are striving to rob, plunder and starve to death revolutionary proletarian Russia. And why? In order to prolong the bloodstained rule of German imperialism and its exhausted existence." When Ebert and Scheidemann joined in the government of Prince Max of Baden, the Spartacus letters wrote: "The German coalition socialists are joining in the work of the bourgeoisie in the ministry, and not at the beginning but at the end of the war when the coalition experiment both in France and in Belgium has utterly broken down and collapsed in corruption. They are doing this when the enlightenment of the proletarian masses and their return to the class struggle is already once more progressing when the Russian revolution has shaken bourgeois society and the whole structure of society to its very depths, when imperialism is exhausted from the military political and moral standpoints, when the existence of a class government in Austria is involved in a hopeless crisis, when discipline is breaking down in the German army and a revolutionary mood setting in with full force, when in Germany, Austria, Bulgaria, the masses

Scheidemann in his diary, August 3, 1914 (quoted in the book "The Collapse").

"The Imperial Chancellor Von Bethmann-Hollweg met the representatives of the Reichstag fractions . . . The Chancellor arrived about 12.30. It seemed to me that he squeezed my hand long and firmly and said: "Good-morning, Herr Scheidemann", that he desired to understand that he hoped our past differences had now disappeared . . . I pointed out the position of our Party, which the other gentleman must understand. Finally we agreed on the following basis: the text of our declaration was to be communicated to the leaders of the other parties by 9 p. m., so that they might formulate their counter-declaration. Haase added the solemn promise that under no circumstances would there be any occasion for counter-declarations on the part of any party. . . . There was yet another obstacle to overcome, the question of saluting the kaiser. "What will you do?" the gentleman asked us. . . . I asked that we might be spared any further difficulties. Meanwhile I "whispered" to Deputy Spahn who sitting next to me, so that Delbrueck must have overheard it. In case of emergency I think it admissible to say: "Hoch auf den Kaiser, the people and the fatherland."

The "English Scheidemanns" on the Outbreak of the War.

Scene: The House of Commons, following on the government's statement as to the reason for England's entry into the war. Mr. Will Crooks ("Labour" M. P. for Woolwich) filled to bursting point with patriotic enthusiasm. Mr. Speaker, may we sing "God Save the King?" — All parties thereupon join in singing the National Anthem.

of the people are in ferment — in short when the dialectic of a four-years war has made the international revolution of the proletariat inevitable. (Guesde and Vandervelde describe the class-struggle at the first moment of the war when the workers were faced with the onward march of the German battalions but Scheidemann and Bauer have entered the bourgeois government at the end of the war faced by the joyful on-

March of the revolutionary battalions of the socialist proletariat." The article ends with the following prophetic words: Scheidemann and Bauer who are blowing kisses as they part their reign in Germany will end by blowing gun-shot against the German workers who go on strike or demonstrate. Coalition socialism declares itself by its present entry into the government as the saviour of capitalism from the coming proletarian revolution. But the proletarian revolution will march forward over its corpse."

On the 7th of October a conference of the Spartacus group took place. The tasks it set before itself were the establishment of workers and soldiers councils everywhere, agitation of the army and the collective work of revolutionary groups.

Even now the task which Spartacus set the German working class on the eve of the November revolution has not been completed. The decaying corpse of German social-democracy poisons the air. The proletarian revolution is still at the beginning of its march. But Spartacus, with its

Military Programme of the Proletarian Revolution.

By N. Lenin.

This article will be found of special interest in view of the fact that it was written by Lenin shortly before his departure from Zurich in April 1917.

From the social democrats of Holland, Scandinavia and Switzerland, who are combatting the lies of the militarists of this imperialist war is a war for national defence, we now hear the opinion expressed that we ought to abandon the old programme in the social-democratic minimum programme — militia or citizen army — and substitute disarmament. This discussion was opened in No. 3 of the "International of Youth", which contained an editorial article in favour of disarmament. In the most recent writings of comrade R. Grimm, no concession unfortunately is made even to the idea of disarmament. The discussion has also been opened in the reviews "New Life" and "The Pioneer". Let us examine the arguments of the advocates of disarmament.

The basic argument is that the demand for disarmament is the clearest, most decisive and most logical expression of the struggle against militarism and against all war.

In this basic argument we find also the basic error of the advocates of disarmament. Socialists cannot oppose every war unless they cease to be socialists.

To begin with, socialists were never and could never be opponents of revolutionary war. The bourgeoisie of the "Great" imperialist powers has become thoroughly reactionary and we oppose the war which this bourgeoisie is now carrying on — a reactionary, enslaving, wicked war. But what about a war against this bourgeoisie? For instance a war commenced by the oppressed against the bourgeoisie; a war for freedom conducted by dependent or colonial peoples? In the "principles" of the group called the "International", we read (paragraph 5): "Within the framework of this unrestrained imperialism there can be no more national war." This is obviously untrue.

The history of the 20th century, this century of unrestrained imperialism, is replete with colonial wars, but the Europeans — Imperialist oppressors of the majority of peoples of the world with our egoistic contemptuous European chauvinism — call colonial wars, are clearly national wars or national risings on the part of these oppressed peoples. One of the fundamental characteristics of imperialism is precisely that in hastening the development of capitalism in backward countries, it extends and intensifies the struggle against national oppression. That is a fact, and it follows inevitably that imperialism must often cause national wars. The man who defends the "principles" which we have quoted, a pamphlet, says that in the imperialist epoch every national war against one of the great imperialist powers leads to the overthrow of imperialist power, in competition with the first, to the overthrow of imperialist power, and thereby every national war develops into an imperialist war. This argument, however, does not always hold good. Several of the colonial wars during the years 1900—1914 did not take this course. It would be simply laughable if we were to state that after the present war, if it ends with the exhaustion of the combatant countries, there "can be

handful of the best German proletarians, organized and prepared ideologically through those four hard years of war something which has grown mightily. Out of the Spartacus Bund the German Communist Party, a mass-party has grown up. Spartacus and the work of preparation it performed during the war make up a part of our Party history and of the preliminary history of the proletarian revolution in Germany which can never be neglected or forgotten.

Spartacus! The word sounds in the ears of a hundred thousand workers once again as a bold battle cry. To keep alive the name of Spartacus, to use its heroic tradition for the rallying of those masses of the workers who still stand apart from us, that is above all necessary just now, when the 4th of August is returning for the tenth time since the war and when it can clearly be seen that without a proletarian revolution in the west, the capitalistic world must proceed without a pause to another and more terrible imperialist slaughter.

no war" of a progressive revolutionary nature on the part, for instance, of China, in alliance with India, Persia, Siam, etc., against the great Powers.

The denial of all possibility of national war under imperialism is theoretically incorrect, historically obviously false, and practically it resembles European chauvinism. We who belong to nations which oppress one hundred millions of peoples in Europe, Africa, Asia, etc. are asked to tell the oppressed peoples that their wars against "our" countries are "impossible".

Secondly, civil wars are also wars. Whoever recognises the class war cannot avoid also recognising the civil war, which is in every class society under certain circumstances a natural inevitable, carrying on, development and intensification of the class war. All great revolutions make that clear. To reject civil war or to forget its possibility would be to fall into the most extreme opportunism and to deny the social revolution.

Thirdly, the victory of socialism in any country, would not immediately shut out the possibility of all wars. On the contrary, it implies war. The development of capitalism is very unequal as between one country and another. It cannot be otherwise under the commodity system of production. We have therefore the inevitable conclusion: socialism cannot triumph simultaneously in all countries. It will first triumph in one or several countries but others for a certain time will remain bourgeois or pre bourgeois. This must give rise not merely to friction, but also to a direct struggle on the part of the bourgeoisie of other countries to shatter the victorious proletariat in the socialist countries. In such a case, a war on our part would be legitimate and just. It would be a war for socialism, for the freeing of other peoples from the bourgeoisie. Engels was absolutely right when, in his letter to Kautsky of September 12, 1882, he expressly recognised the possibility of a war in defence of socialism, which had already triumphed. He was considering particularly the defence of the victorious proletariat against the bourgeoisie of other countries.

Only when we have completely overcome and expropriated the bourgeoisie, not in one country but in the whole world, will war become impossible. And it is scientifically incorrect — and certainly not revolutionary — if we disguise or hush up the most important matter, the most difficult, and that calling for the most struggle, that is, the overcoming of the resistance of the bourgeoisie. Social parsons and opportunists like to dream of a false socialism of the future, but they differ from the revolutionary social democrats in that they do not think nor care about the bitter class struggle and class battles which will make their beautiful future possible.

We must not allow ourselves to be deceived by words. For instance, many people hate the idea of national defence because the undisguised opportunists and the Kautskyites use this phrase as a means to conceal the lies of the bourgeoisie in their predatory wars. That is a fact. But it does not follow from it that we should forget to think about the meaning of political watchwords. To recognise national defence in the present war, is to accept the war as just and in the interests of the proletariat. Nothing more and nothing less. For invasion

is not ruled out in any war. It would be simply foolish to regard the national defence on the part of oppressed peoples in their war against the great imperialist powers or on the part of the victorious proletariat in its war against some Gallifet as national defence in the bourgeois sense.

It would be fundamentally theoretically false to forget that every war is but the conduct of politics by other means. The present imperialist war is the conduct of the imperialist policy of two groups of great powers, and this policy was produced and developed by the whole system of relations prevailing in the imperialist epoch. But the same epoch must necessarily give rise to the policy of struggle against national oppression and the struggle of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie; and therefore to the possibility and inevitability first of revolutionary national risings and wars, second, of war and risings of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, third, the uniting of both these kinds of revolutionary wars, etc.

II.

There is in addition, a still wider general consideration. An oppressed class which does not strive to learn the use of arms to possess them and to become practiced in them, is only fit to be oppressed, ill-treated and handled like slaves. We must not forget, unless we are to be degraded to the level of bourgeois pacifists and opportunists, that we live in a class society and that without the class war no salvation therefrom is possible. In every class society, based either on slavery — chattel slavery or as nowadays wage slavery — the oppressing class is armed. Not only the present day standing army, but also the modern militia — the Swiss militia not excepted — is the arming of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat. I do not think I need to prove this elementary truth; it is sufficient to draw attention to the employment of the militia during strikes in all capitalist countries.

The arming of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat is one of the cardinal facts of present day capitalist society. And in the face of this fact revolutionary social democrats are requested to support the "demand" for "disarmament": That would be a complete selling out of the class war point of view and of every idea of revolution. We declare that the arming of the proletariat with the object of defeating, expropriating and disarming the bourgeoisie is the one possible policy of the revolutionary class, — a policy which has been founded, developed and taught by the objective development of capitalist militarism. Only when the proletariat has disarmed the bourgeoisie can it, without betraying its historical mission, throw its weapons on the scrap heap, — which it will then certainly do, but not before.

And if the present war awakens only horror and distaste for the use of arms among the reactionary social parsons and the whining petty bourgeoisie, we reply, capitalist society was and is always a horror without end. We have no reasons to despair if, by this most reactionary of all wars, this society is brought to a dreadful end. The preaching of "progress" or in other words the present day dream of disarmament is nothing more than the outcome of despair when clearly before all eyes the one right and revolutionary war, the civil war against the imperialist bourgeoisie, is being prepared by this bourgeoisie itself.

To anyone who considers this mere theory, we would point out two facts of world history; the part played by the trusts and the employment of women in the factories, on the one hand and the Paris Commune of 1871 and of the December days of 1906 in Russia, on the other.

It is the métier of the bourgeoisie to command the trusts to drive women and children into the factories, to martyr them there and to sell them into degrading and unspeakable misery. We do not support this development, we demand nothing of this sort, we fight against it. But how do we fight? We declare that trusts and the employment of women in factories are progressive factors. We do not want to return to hand labour, to pre-monopolist capitalism, to home work by women. Forward by way of the trusts, etc. and through them to socialism!

The same is true mutatis mutandis of the present day, militarisation of the people. Imperialist and other types of bourgeoisie now militarise not only the whole peoples but also the youth. For aught I know, they may to-morrow militarise the women. Our reply to that is, all the better! We shall only go forward faster! The faster we go, the nearer we are to the armed rising against capitalism. How can the social democrats allow themselves to be bullied or discouraged by the militarisation of the youth, if they remember the example of the Commune? This is not a dream, but a fact.

It would be a matter for despair if the social democrats, defiance of all economic and political facts, began to do that the period of imperialism and imperialist wars inevitably, of its own nature lead to repetition of the events.

A bourgeois observer of the Commune wrote in an English newspaper in May 1871: "If the French nation consisted of women, it would be a terrible nation. Women and children from thirteen years upwards fought during the Commune on the side with the men." In the coming struggle for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, it will be the same. The working class women will not look on passively while the well armed bourgeoisie shoot down the poorly armed or quite unarmed proletariat. As in 1871 they will again seize arms. Out of the present horrified or discouraged nation, or more correctly out of the present disorganised labour movement, — disorganised more by the opportunists than by the government — there will certainly, sooner or later, arise an international league of "terrible nations" of the revolutionary proletariat.

Militarism at present permeates all public life. Militarism is everything. Imperialism is the embittered struggle of great Powers for the division and re-division of the world. It must therefore lead to further militarisation in all lands, in small and neutral countries. What are the proletariat to do against that? Are they only to plead against all and everything military, only to demand disarmament? No, will the women of an oppressed class which is revolutionarily adopt such a shameful part. Rather they will say to the sons:

"You will soon be big, and they will give you a rifle. Take it, and learn the use of arms, — that is necessary for the proletariat, not in order that you may shoot your brothers as is being done in this robbers' war, and as the trade union socialists advise you, but in order that you may be able to go against the bourgeoisie of "your" country, so that military and war may be ended not by pious wishes but by the coming and disarming of the bourgeoisie."

If one is not prepared to carry on such propaganda, particularly in relation to the present war, one should at least cease to use grand words about the international revolutionary social-democracy, about social revolution, and about the struggle against war.

III.

The supporters of disarmament are against the arming of the people especially because this is supposed to lead more easily to concessions to militarism. We have examined the most important points: the relation of disarmament to the struggle of the masses and to the social revolution, we must consider the question of its relation to opportunism. One of the most important reasons for opposing disarmament is this: that if we do not oppose it we weaken in every way our strength for the right against opportunism by illusions we inevitably create.

That the fight against opportunism is a permanent one on the agenda of the International cannot be denied. The fight against imperialism is not inseparably bound up with the fight against opportunism then it remains nothing but a hollow phrase or even a deception. One of the main causes of Zimmerwald and Kienthal, one of the chief causes of the possible fruitlessness of these seeds of the Third International lay precisely in that the question of the struggle against opportunism was not openly faced, still less was the question of the inevitable break with opportunism faced. Opportunism has — for a time — conquered the European labour movement. In all the larger countries there were two chief manifestations of this opportunism: first the open cynical and dangerous socialist imperialism of the Plechanovs, Schabernaks, Vandervelde, Hyndman, Henderson, etc., secondly the disguised Kautsky-ish form: Kautsky, Haase, and the social democrats in Germany; Longuet, Pressmane, Mavrodakis, etc. in France; Ramsey MacDonald and other leaders of the Independent Labour Party in England; Martoff, Tschelchewsky, etc. in Russia. Treves and other so-called Left wing reformists in Russia.

Open opportunism works openly and directly against the revolution, against all incipient revolutionary movements, outbreaks and in direct association with the governing power. However various forms this alliance may take — from taking an actual part in the government production (as in Russia). The committee for controlling production (as in Russia). Disarmament — the Kautsky brand — is a far greater danger to the working class because they hide or give plausible reasons for their support of this alliance with the governing powers.

their agreement with these powers by all sorts of high-sounding Marxist phrases and talk of "peaceful slogans". The struggle against both these forms of dominant opportunism can only be carried out on every field of proletarian activity: parliamentary and trade union activity, strikes, etc. But the characteristic of both these forms of opportunism consists in suppressing, distorting, or giving merely "official explanations" of the concrete problems of the revolution and the whole question of the relation of the present war to the revolution. And, this after endless unofficial manifestoes and the official Basle manifesto had, before the war, pronounced quite unambiguously upon the intimate relation between the coming war and the proletarian revolution! The chief mistake of the demand for disarmament is that it evades all the concrete questions of the revolution. It can be that the supporters of disarmament are looking for a perfectly new brand of revolution carried through without arms?

Karl Kreibich and Alois Neurath.

Comrade Kreibich, on the outbreak of the war, wrote a useful revolutionary manifesto against the war in the "Reichenberger Vorwärts" (unfortunately we have not the text of it). The "Vorwärts" was thereupon suppressed, the paper in the belligerent states which suffered this fate. Kreibich and Neurath (Secretary of the Youth in the Reichenberger District) then issued a new manifesto against the war and from that moment took a leading part in the militant work.

Further. We are not absolutely against the struggle for arms. We do not want to overlook the unpleasant possibility that the worse happens and if the revolution, despite serious mass risings, and despite all our efforts will not arise out of this war, mankind may have to live through yet another imperialist war. We are supporters of a program of reform which is also directed against the opportunists. For the opportunists would be only too pleased if we left the right for arms to them altogether, while they push away ugly realities by retiring into the cloud-cockoo-land of disarmament. Disarmament is a flight from the ugliness of reality not a struggle against it.

In the sort of program of reform to which we refer we would for instance say: "The slogan of national defence in the imperialist war 1914 to 1916 is simply a corruption of the working class by a lie of the bourgeoisie". Such a concrete program to a question would be theoretically more accurate, more directed to the proletariat and much more irritating to the opportunists than a demand for disarmament and the abolition of National defense" under all circumstances and might add: "The bourgeoisie of all the great imperialist powers, England, France, Germany and Austria, Russia, Italy, the United States has become so reactionary and so imbued with the desire to dominate the world, that every war waged by the bourgeoisie of these countries must of necessity be a national war. The proletariat should not only oppose every war but should also desire the defeat of its own government during such wars and use them for revolutionary purposes even if such an uprising fails to prevent the war"

With regard to the question of militia, our support would be for the bourgeois but in favour of a proletarian militia. A man or a halpenny would we give to the standing army, nor even to the bourgeois militia, even in countries like the U. S. A., Switzerland, Norway, etc. — and all the more since the growing Prussianisation of the militia, especially since 1907 and 1911, and its prostitution into a strike-breaking force have been noteworthy even in the republican countries like Switzerland.

Then we can demand: the election of officers by the workers, the abolition of military tribunals, an equal position for alien and native workers. This is especially important in countries where foreign workmen, for example, in Switzerland, are shamelessly exploited and have no right; for the right of say, every hundred freely to elect its own officers who shall be maintained by the state etc. It is by these methods, that the proletariat can get rid of

militarism for its own benefit and not for the benefit of its slave-drivers — which is in its own interest absolutely necessary. Every success, even if it is only a partial success of the revolutionary movement — for instance, the capture of a city of an industrial centre or a part of the army must necessarily, as the Russian Revolution has proved, compel the victorious proletariat to put this programme into action.

Finally, one can, of course, never conquer opportunism simply by programmes, it can only be conquered by action. The greatest and most fatal of the mistakes of the Second International (which is now broken to pieces) was this; that words were separated from deeds, and that deceit was mingled with revolutionary phrases (see for instance, the present attitude of Kautsky and Co. towards the Basle Manifesto) in the most shameless manner. Disarmament as a social idea, i. e. an idea derived from certain social surroundings and capable of influencing a social movement something more than a mere personal croquet — obviously springs from the petty and exceptionally peaceful conditions of some small States which are situated apart from the blood-stained high-road of the world war, and hope to retain their isolation. Consider the arguments of the supporters of disarmament in Norway: we are small, our army is small, we can do nothing against the Great Powers (and therefore, of course, nothing also against being drawn by force into an imperialistic alliance with some group or other of the Great Powers); we want to stay quietly in our corner and concern ourselves with our politics in our own small way; we demand disarmament, compulsory arbitration, and "permanent" neutrality (e. g. for Belgium) etc.

The desire of the small State to remain apart, the desire of the petty-bourgeois to keep out of the great world struggles and so make use of the sort of monopoly he has of selfish passivity — these are the social conditions which assure a certain success and popularity for the idea of disarmament in some small States. Naturally, this desire is illusory and reactionary, for imperialism must by degrees drag the small States into the whirl-pool of world economics and world politics.

Take Switzerland for example. The fact that it is surrounded by imperialistic powers, gives a choice of two lines along which the labour movement can develop. On the one hand, the opportunists may unite with the bourgeoisie in the attempt to turn Switzerland into a democratic Federal republic for making profits out of the bourgeois tourists of imperialist countries, and for quietly and happily keeping their position of monopoly. On the other hand, we true social-democrats of Switzerland may use the comparative freedom and the "international" attitude of Switzerland in order to draw the revolutionary elements in the labour parties of Europe closer together and so to help towards their victory. Mercifully, Switzerland has no language peculiar to itself, but uses three of the great world languages, and as it happens, just those three which are spoken in the States bordering on it, now at war. For instance, if 20,000 members of the Swiss Party pay two "Rappen" a week as an extra war tax, one would get 20,000 francs a year — more than enough to publish everything necessary in the three languages to the workers and soldiers of the countries at war; to tell them the truth in spite of the commands of the various general staffs — the truth about the growing uprising of the workers, of their fraternising in the trenches, of their views regarding the revolutionary use of arms against the imperialistic bourgeoisie of their own countries, etc.

This is nothing new, it is already being done by some of the best papers, "La Sentinelle", "Volksrecht", "Berliner Tagwacht", but unfortunately not to a sufficient extent. Only by activity of this kind can the beautiful resolutions of the Aarau Party Congress, become something more than beautiful resolutions. And it is enough merely to ask, does the demand for disarmament agree with this direction of social-democratic work?

Obviously it does not. Disarmament is a part of opportunism, petty nationalism and the limited development of the labour movement in small states. Disarmament is the nationalistic, the peculiarly nationalistic programme of small states, it is not the international programme of an international, revolutionary social-democracy.