



IMPERIALIST WAR AND THE BOLSHEVIKS

Selected Documents
and
Articles
First and Second World War



Translations and selections based on the books
"Imperialist wars and Bolsheviks"

Yakelova dated 1924

And

"Decade -Anniversary of World War",

by Ohitovich dated 1925

Foreign Literature, Moscow, 1954

Svitlana M
Erdogan A

IMPERIALIST WAR
AND THE
BOLSHEVIKS

Selected Articles

First and Second World War

Svitlana M, Erdogan A

Articles related to the First World War is based on the Russian originals written in the book "Imperialist wars and Bolsheviks" Yakelova dated 1924, and "Anniversary of World War", by Ohitovich dated 1925.

Any existing translation of articles has been compared with the new translation and revised if and when it was deemed necessary.

Book has documents and articles in two sections, 1st WW and 2nd WW. Both wars were imperialist but with distinctive characteristics of each. That is why it is important to read and understand the attitude differences in each war.

As always, this book has no copyrights, shared free for interested readers.

It is a compilation of articles we researched, translated, read, and found important for others to read.

Contents

Introduction **P-5**

Extract from the introduction of Yakelova -**P9**

On Zimmerwald, The journal Kommunist – **P16**

Economic Causes and Consequences of the World War, E. Varga.- **P20**

The Attitude of The Russian Social Democratic Labor Party towards the war- **P35**

Lecture on "The proletariat and the War", Lenin- **P55**

Resolution adopted at the Seventh International Socialist Congress at Stuttgart- **P62**

Manifesto of the International Socialist Congress at Basel- **P66**

Manifesto of Central Committee. ("Theses on War")- **P73**

Reply of the Central Committee to Vandervelde- **P82**

Greeting of the representative of the Central Committee at the Swedish S.-D. Congress.- **P85**

Declaration of the Central Committee of R. S.-D. R.P. presented to the London Conference – **P88**

Proposals Submitted by the CC of the R.S.D.L.P to the 2nd Socialist Conference, Maximovich -**P91**

The Position and Tasks of the Socialist International, Lenin – **P101**

International and the "defence of the fatherland", Lenin- **P108**

On the split with the opportunists, Lenin- **P115**

Several Theses, Lenin- **P119**

Zimmerwald Left, Draft manifesto submitted to the conference- **P123**

World War and the Tasks of Social Democracy, Draft resolution introduced by the left Zimmerwald- **P127**

Manifesto of the International Socialist Conference in Zimmerwald-
P130

Two statements at Zimmerwald conference- **P136**

Draft resolution submitted by the Zimmerwald Left at the conference
in Kienthal – **P138**

The Kienthal Manifesto- **P142**

Statement delivered at the Kienthal Conference- **P148**

The collapse of the Zimmerwald International- **P149**

Conferences, meetings about the attitude towards the war- **P153**

Okhrana on the First Bern Conference- **P155**

Resolutions of the conference of foreign sections of R. S.D. R.P-**P156**

Statements from groups: Moscow Committee, Russian S.-D. labor
party, Tver group in Moscow, Presnenskaya group in Moscow, A
group of organized Social-Democrats in Moscow, Moscow Group of
S.-D, Saratov organization, Price of War, Baltic region, Chronicle of
the Social Democrat, Kronstadt S.D, Ural S.D. about the war and the
tasks of the Social-Democrats -**P162**

Party press attitude to the war- **P189**

Decade of the World War, Results of the war; prospects for new wars-
P191

The International Socialist Congress in Stuttgart (Proletary)- **P208**

War and Leninism, G. Zinoviev- **P216**

The main work of German opportunism on the war, Lenin- **P225**

British Pacifism and the British Dislike of Theory, Lenin- **P231**

Bellicose (aggressive) Militarism and the Anti-Militarist Tactics of
Social-Democracy, Lenin- **P238**

Report On Foreign Policy, Lenin- **P250**

A shame that nothing can atone for, Clara Zetkin-**P272**

After WW 1

On the international situation and foreign policy of the USSR, Molotov- **P284**

A Warmonger's International, Otto Kuusinen- **P296**

The war Danger at the Present Time, O.W. Kuusinen- **P314**

Interview with a "Pravda" Correspondent , Stalin- **P318**

The Question of Peace and Security, Stalin- **P325**

When is War Not Inevitable?, Stalin- **P331**

Notes on Contemporary Topics, Stalin- **P333**

Speech Delivered at the Fifth-Union Conference of the All-Union Leninist Young Communist League, Stalin- **P372**

Interview Between J. Stalin and Roy Howard- **P374**

Report on the Work of the Central Committee to the Eighteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B.), Stalin- **P376**

Answers to Associated Press Moscow Correspondent's Questions, Stalin- **P387**

The Allied Campaign in Africa Answers to Associated Press Moscow Correspondent, Stalin- **P388**

On the Allied Landing in Northern France, Stalin- **P390**

Stalin's address to the people- **P391**

Interview to "Pravda" Correspondent Concerning Mr. Winston Churchill's Speech at Fulton, Stalin- **P395**

Concerning the Situation in Japan, Stalin- **P401**

Economic Problems of the USSR, Stalin- **P403**

From Falsifiers of History- **P408**

Introduction

It is important to note that the approach to the war in Ukraine is slowly but surely drawing the demarcation line between Marxism Leninism and Liberalism, between the idealist abstractionist and dialectic approach. Marxist "teaching is not a dogma, but a guide to action, Marx and Engels always used to say, rightly ridiculing the learning and repetition by rote of 'formulas' which at best are only capable of outlining general tasks that are necessarily liable to be modified by the concrete economic and political conditions. It is essential to realize the incontestable truth that a Marxist must take cognizance of real life, of the concrete realities, and must not continue to cling to a theory of yesterday."(1) Practice of applying general principles and rules as prescription formulas for the determination of the tactics and stands to be taken in a given situation is a betrayal to the sole of Marxism and its dialectics. "In politics, in which sometimes extremely complicated—national and international—relationships have to be dealt with, but it would be absurd to concoct a recipe, or general rule that would serve in all cases. One must have the brains to analyze the situation in each separate case." (2) "Marxism requires of us a strictly exact and objectively verifiable analysis of the relation of classes and of the concrete features peculiar to each historical situation." (3) "Relations of classes" is not limited to the relations between the competing monopoly-capitalist classes, but in their direct relation to the working classes.

The political aims of monopoly capitalists in their relations and conflicts will always have an effect in the life and struggle of the working class. "Concrete political aims must be set in concrete circumstances. All things are relative, all things flow, and all things change." (4) The approach to each and every war cannot be based on the generalization of "wars" and prescriptive application of to all. To consider the matter

concretely does not mean to examine the “era “and apply the formula fits that “era”. To hold such a view “says Lenin, “is to reduce the whole thing to an absurdity and apply a ridiculous stereotype in place of a concrete analysis of each separate war.” (5)

“Marxist dialectical method forbids the employment of “ready-made schemes” and abstract formulas, The dialectical method demands, first, that we should consider things, not each by itself, but always in their interconnection with other things. (6) “Genuine dialectics,” Lenin wrote, proceeds “by means of a thorough, detailed analysis of a process in all its concreteness. The fundamental thesis of dialectics is: there is no such thing as abstract truth, truth is always concrete.” (7) Because the strategy, tactics and stands of Communists derive from the interests of the working class and of their struggle and are guided by Marx’s principle that “they always and everywhere represent the interests of the movement as a whole.” (8) In order not to err in policy, in order not to find itself in the position of idle dreamers, the party of the proletariat must not base its activities on abstract “principles of human reason,” but on the concrete conditions of the material life of society.” (9)

“For a Marxist,” says Lenin,” clarifying the nature of the war is a necessary preliminary for deciding the question of his attitude to it. But for such a clarification it is essential, first and foremost, to establish the objective conditions and concrete circumstances of the war in question. It is necessary to consider the war in the historical environment in which it is taking place, only then can one determine one’s attitude to it. Otherwise, the resulting interpretation will be not materialist but eclectic.” Depending on the historical circumstances, the relationship of classes, etc., the attitude to war must be different at different times. (10)

“The character of a war and its success depend chiefly upon the internal regime of the country that goes to war, that war is a

reflection of the internal policy conducted by the given country before the war. "(11) Thus, war cannot be assessed without first understanding its connection with the policies preceding it, without a study of the policies pursued long before the war.

"The character of the social contradictions and the way in which they are resolved depend on economic relations" says Fyodorov and co-writers. "The economic system ultimately determines all social, political, and ideological relations, including also the conditions for the emergence of wars." (12)

"Capitalist society" says Bukharin, "is unthinkable without armaments, as it is unthinkable without wars...the rule of finance capital implies both imperialism and militarism. In this sense militarism is no less a typical historic phenomenon than finance capital itself... even where there are relatively equal economic structures, but the military powers of the state capitalist trusts differ considerably." (13)

That is true "the war is a continuation of politics" but throwing this generalization does not tell us the nature of "politics" that is being followed by each imperialist at each given time. Bourgeois ideologists and opportunists try hard to conceal the link between politics and war.

That is why the issue of "imperialism" and attitude to it cannot be studied independently from its political aspect- that is (militarization of industry and) war- in each given concrete condition and situation. Lenin was saying that "Abstract theoretical reasoning may lead to the conclusion at which Kautsky has arrived .. by abandoning Marxism. It goes without saying that there can be no concrete historical assessment of war, unless it is based on a thorough analysis of the nature of imperialism, both in its economic and political aspects." (14)

"Imperialism" by its general and economic "definition" is not decisive in every situation and condition to determine the

specific stand to be taken against. Without studying the political aspect, the “policy” concretely at any given situation, repeating the statement that “war is a continuation of policy in different form”, “explains absolutely nothing.”

Erdogan A

Notes

- (1) Lenin-The Tasks of The Proletariat in Our Revolution
- (2) Lenin, Left-wing Communism
- (3) Lenin, Letters on Tactics
- (4) Lenin, Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution
- (5) Lenin, A Caricature of Marxism and Imperialist Economism
- (6) Maurice Cornforth, Materialism, and the Dialectical Method
- (7) Lenin, One Step Forward, Two Steps Back
- (8) Marx and Engels, The Communist Manifesto
- (9) History of Communist Party of The Soviet Union (B)
- (10) Lenin, Lecture on the Proletariat, and the War”
- (11) Lenin, Address To The Second All-Russia Congress Of Communist Organisations Of The Peoples of The East
- (12) Fyodorov, Byely, Koztov, Marxism-Leninism on War and Army
- (13) N.I. Bukharin, Imperialism and World Economy
- (14) Lenin, Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism

Imperialist war and the Bolsheviks

Instead of Preface

In the history of the party, the period of the imperialist war is one of the little researched and meager published materials. Meanwhile, the period of the war which immediately preceded the February upheaval and, together with it, led to the role-playing revolution of October, is of world-historical significance.

The Bolsheviks, the vanguard, and the spokesman for the will of the proletariat towards socialism, were the only ones to resist the infection of chauvinism and nationalism, spread by imperialism, which knocked down the party organizations of the Second International, which had long since been internally corrupted by opportunism, legality, and handouts from the bourgeoisie.

The need for young party members studying its history to have at hand a collection of materials scattered in various publications, for the most part already out of circulation, has led to the compilation of this book. Our task did not include a comprehensive coverage of the activities of the revolutionary Social Democracy during the war.

The book contains resolutions, manifestos, declarations, leaflets, some leading articles by Lenin and Zinoviev, the most typical literary speeches, and documents. The desire to reduce the cost of the book in the interests of its general availability forced us to select material very sparingly.

If the tense heroic struggle of Lenin and his party against the imperialist bourgeoisie and its agents from the Second International has been correctly reflected in our work, instructive for the young proletarian generations, who did not have the opportunity to live through the great era with us, it

will be possible to consider that our book has not been written in vain.

The era of Imperialism

After the revolution of 1848, the relative stability of the capitalist regime set in, and the cycle of organic development of capitalism began, which pushed its catastrophic features and its most striking contradictions to its colonial periphery. In the main nodes of the growing large-scale industry we had a process of organic growth, the growth of the productive forces with the relative prosperity, enlightenment of the working class.

On this socio-economic basis, we also had a corresponding political superstructure - consolidated national states; "fatherlands". The bourgeoisie sat firmly in the saddle. The imperialist policy began, which began to manifest itself especially sharply, approximately in the 80s of the last century. On the basis of the rise in the standard of living of the working class, the separation and rapid progress of the labor aristocracy, a process of slow growth of workers' organizations, internally, was re-born. This process thus served as a background, as a soil for the rebirth of the ideologically of the Labor movement, degenerating into the system of the general capitalist mechanism, which found its main expression, its most rational expression, in its political head, that is, in the state power of the ruling bourgeoisie.

Therefore, there is a certain lack of coordination between the development of Marxism in the ideological field and the development of Marxism in the purely practical field.

Marxism in its two main forms began to be reborn. The most striking formulation of the trend of degeneration was given by the revisionist current within the German Social Democracy. Since we are talking about precise theoretical formulations, we

in other countries do not have a more classical examples, even in spite of a more decisive regenerations. Due to a whole series of historical conditions, which I cannot enter into an analysis of here, this practice did not receive sufficiently clear and precise formulations there, which it received in the most, so to speak, - thinking of country.

In Germany, the revisionist trend has already signaled quite clearly, and not only signaled, but very fully expressed the departure from the Marxism that was characteristic of Marx and Engels and of the entire previous era. Much less clear was the departure from Marxism of other groupings, which was called the radical, or "orthodox" Marxist, with Kautsky at the head. ... I personally consider it wrong to think that the fall of the German Social-Democracy and of Kautsky begins and dates back to 1914. It seems to me (now: we can say so) that it has been a long time ago, though not with such haste; as with the revisionists, with this grouping in the milieu of the German Social Democracy, which for a long time set the tone for the entire International, we can quite clearly see a departure from genuine orthodox, from truly revolutionary Marxism, as it was formulated by Marx and Engels in the previous phase of development working ideology.

I repeat, at the beginning of this period there was a certain lack of coordination between theory and practice. The most far-reaching ideologues of the revisionist type laid down the practice of the German Social-Democrats, having worked out the corresponding theory. Another part of the S.D. still rested in its theoretical formulations, not being able, and not really trying, in practice to overcome these harmful tendencies. This was the position taken by the Kautsky group, but at the end of this period, when history posed point-blank a number of the most fundamental and essential questions (commencement of world war) it turned out that there was almost no significant

difference between these wings, both practically and theoretically. As a matter of fact, these two wings—revisionism and Kautskyianism—expressed one and the same tendency to degenerate and brand from, the tendency to adapt, in the worst sense of the word, to those new social conditions that were emerging in Europe and which were characteristic of this cycle of European development—they expressed one and the same theoretical current that was leading away from Marxism in its real and truly revolutionary formulation.

From a general point of view, one can characterize this difference in such a way that revisionist Marxism in its purest form—this has become most clear in recent years—that this revisionist Marxism in its purest form, or Marxism in quotation marks, has acquired a pronounced fatalistic character in relation to state power, to the capitalist regime, etc., whereas in Kautsky and his group we have a Marxism that could be called democratic-pacifist.

This line of differentiation was arbitrary, it has become more and more blurred in recent years as these currents began to follow the same channel, which more and more resolutely moved away from Marxism. The essence of this process lies in the exfoliation of the revolutionary essence of Marxism, in the replacement of the revolutionary theory of Marxism, revolutionary dialectics, the revolutionary teaching on the development of capitalism, the revolutionary teaching on the collapse of capitalism, the revolutionary teaching on dictatorship, etc.,—replacement of all this by the usual bourgeois Democratic-Evolutionary pacifist doctrine.

It could be shown in detail how this bias manifested itself very clearly in a whole series of theoretical questions. I partly made this analysis in a speech devoted to the program of the Communist International at one of the international congresses. This revisionist deviation is found in Kautsky, who is

completely falsifies in his theory of the state and state power; the same with Plekhanov, who was one of the "most orthodox".

The presence of such revisionism in the theory of the state makes it quite clear why the Kautskyite wing also took a bourgeois-pacifist position during the "world imperialist war".

The real Marxian formulation in the field of the theory of state power is known to all of us. This teaching can be expressed roughly in this way. During the socialist revolution, the state apparatus of the bourgeoisie is destroyed, and a new dictatorship is created— "anti-democratic"— and at the same time proletarian-democratic state, a completely unique and specific form of state power, which then begins to wither away. In Kautsky however, you will not find anything of the kind in this point; and in Kautsky, as in all Social-Democratic Marxists in quotation marks, all of them elucidate this point in such a way that state power is something that passes from the hands of one class into the hands of another in the same way "like a machine that was in the hands of one class, and then passes into the hands of another class, without this new class dismantling all its cogs and then putting them back together in a new way.

From the same formulation, theoretically pure, from this teaching follows the defensive position during the war. Argumentation along this line could be heard dozens of times at the socialist meetings at the beginning of the war, and this extremely primitive argumentation has a certain kind of logic from its point of view. It goes without saying that " if this given bourgeois state will be tomorrow in my hands, then there is nothing to destroy it, but, on the contrary, it must be protected, because tomorrow it will be ours."

The task was posed in a completely different way from that of Marx.

"If the state must not be destroyed, because it will be in my hands tomorrow, then the army must not be disorganized, because it is an integral part of the state apparatus, no state discipline can be violated," and so on. Everything here is harmonious, and it goes without saying that when these complexes were exposed to blows in mutual struggle, then Kautskyianism, the German Social-Democrats, in full solidarity with its theoretical presuppositions, drew the corresponding practical conclusion.

I repeat that it is wrong to think that here we have some kind of momentary, catastrophic fall. It was theoretically "justified." We just didn't notice this inner rebirth even in the so-called "orthodox" wing, which had little in common with real orthodoxy.

The same could be said about the theory of the collapse of capitalist society, about the theory of impoverishment, about the colonial and national questions, about the doctrine of democracy and dictatorship, about tactical doctrines, such as the doctrine of mass struggle, etc. Regarding this point of view, I would recommend to all comrades to read Kautsky's well-known classic pamphlet *The Social Revolution*, which we have read, but now we will read it with completely different eyes, because now it is not difficult to discover in it a whole *Mont Blanc* of all sorts of distortions of Marxism and opportunist formulations, which are completely clear to us.

If these Marxist "epigons" took into account certain new changes in the field of the capitalist system, in the field of the relationship between economics and politics, if they put some new phenomena from the field of current life under their theoretical lens, then these new phenomena are always in essence they took into account from one point of view, from the point of view of the growth of workers' organizations in an

evolutionary way into the general system of the capitalist mechanism.

For example, a new joint-stock company appeared, but now they were using it to explain that capitalism was being democratized.

There has been an improvement in the condition of the working class on the continent, and the conclusion was drawn from this immediately that perhaps a revolution is not needed, but we can do everything by peaceful means.

Since they relied on Marx, they immediately seized on a whole series of quotations, on individual snatching of provisions and words ripped out of context.

It was well known that Marx said of England: "In England, perhaps things can get along without bloodshed."

This was shared by everyone.

It was known that Engels once said not particularly good things about the barricade struggle.

Thus, from this, every possible conclusion was at once drawn with the necessary quotations; every phenomenon was considered from the aspect whereby the workers' organizations were being absorbed by the general capitalist system, from the aspect which we might agree to call the standpoint of class truce. In the end its revolutionary essence flew off from revolutionary Marxism. What happened very often in history, when we have the same words, the same nomenclature, the same phrases, the same labels, the same symbols, and I repeat, we have a completely different socio-political content.

Bukharin, "Lenin as a Marxist"

The journal “Kommunist”

The Zimmerwald and Kienthal conferences were essentially opportunistic; the majority of them were vacillating, Kautskyian. This was reflected in the manifestos of the conferences (under the Rio and by the Left Group, as the first call of the International to struggle); Conference, under pressure from the Left Group, in solidarity with the Bolshevik faction of the Duma; they were unable to put directly the basic question of a complete, organized break with the Second International, which had stained itself with chauvinism and outright opportunism—and they did not indicate revolutionary ways to fight the war. Both were clearly formulated in the resolution and manifesto submitted by the Left group to the Zimmerwald Conference and rejected by the majority. (19 against 12; the composition of the Left see the draft resolution of the Left Group).

The Zimmerwald Left is thus the foundation, the germ of the Third International. For the first time in 14 months of the war, the revolutionary Marxists from various regions, united at a conference against the opportunist majority, came out with their manifesto, openly expressing the views of the revolutionary Social-Democrats. to the main questions raised by the war.

After the Zimmerwald Conference, the Left continued to exist and spoke again at the Second Socialist Conference in Kienthal with its revolution, which was also rejected by the majority of the conference. The Kienthal conference, although already to the left of Zimmerwald and Decoy, also had an opportunist majority; this character of both conferences was the reason for their failure, the collapse, which Lenin speaks of in the article cited in the collection, “The collapse of Zimmerwald” (chapter from the booklet “The Tasks of the Proletariat in Our

Revolution," written after the February Revolution), stating the birth of the Third International.

Of the Bolshevik conferences and meetings that expressed their attitude towards the war, the main one is the Berne Conference of Foreign Sections, which adopted resolutions on the main questions related to the war, which are the most complete and consistent expression of the attitude of the revolutionary SD to the war and the collapse of the Socialist-Democratic Party.

At the same conference, the question of the slogan of the United States of Europe, which was put forward in the Manifesto of the Central Committee (this manifesto the Bern Conference was based), was raised, but was not resolved here due to the lack of elucidation of the economic side of the issue. Subsequently, the Central Committee's point of view on this issue was expressed in Lenin Article "On the slogan of the United States of Europe."

The meeting (conference) in Finland (the Okhrana calls it a congress) was betrayed by the provocateur Romanov and arrested.

The role of the Bolshevik faction and its attitude towards the war is discussed in the cited article from a brochure Lenin and Zinoviev "Socialism and War". .

The declaration on the attitude towards war credits was issued by the entire faction as a whole...

After the trial of the Duma members, in the archives of the PB of the Judicial Chamber, there were interesting documents about the activities of the faction during the war period, which were not covered anywhere due to censorship conditions; these documents perished during the February days in Petrograd, From party organizations within Russia itself.

The most active and most consistently pursuing the line of attitude towards the war, coinciding with the line of the Central

Committee, was the St. Petersburg organization, the vanguard of the St. Petersburg proletariat, which during the war increased quantitatively and was strengthened by a qualitatively large number of metal workers drawn into the PC to work at metallurgical plants . . .

Of the other organizations, the most consistent in their attitude to the war and related issues and the most active were the Saratov and Tver (named so for conspiratorial reasons) groups in Moscow.

The Bureau of the Central Committee was organized in the PB on behalf of the Central Committee in the fall of 1915 and connected Russian organizations with the Central Committee?.

The Interdistrict Committee (Mezhrayonka), while coinciding in fundamental questions with the line of the Central Committee, diverged from it in its unity (with the opportunists) aspirations.

Moscow for a long time did not have a leading center due to constant failures, which affected the attitude towards the war, in which there was confusion for a long time. Separate groups were active in Moscow, of which, as already mentioned above, the Tver group was the most consistently revolutionary.

The legal party press, under wartime conditions, could not openly propagandize its attitude towards the war

The newspapers in the center were all closed, only the existence of professional journals was possible, which had to (the St. Petersburg Voprosy Insurance and the Moscow Voice of Printed Labor, which did not exist for long) take over some functions of party organs and speak out on general, fundamental issues. associated with the war, due to which they often came out with white pages. The Saratov Nasha Gazeta, published in 1915, seemed to be the only provincial Bolshevik

newspaper (2 issues of the Proletarian Golos were published in St. Petersburg a year); she captured some of the Volga cities in her sphere of influence. Of the illegal literature, the pamphlets of the Central Committee and the Central Organ were especially widespread: 1) "Socialism and War, Lenin and Zinoviev outlining the principled line of the Central Committee, 2) "Who Needs War", Kollontai, 3) "War and High Cost in RUSSIA".

The journal Kommunist was published abroad in 1915 and the Collections of S.-D. Nos. 1 and 2, 1916. This literature was smuggled into Russia.

Economic causes and consequences of the World War.

E. Varga.

(Extracts without statistics)

I. Reasons.

In evaluating a world war, one very often makes the mistake of considering the war as an isolated, accidental phenomenon that could have been avoided if a more reasonable policy had been pursued.

But the truth is that wars are inevitable under capitalism and that a whole series of others preceded the world war. In the last fifty years before the World War there was, it seems, no such moment when a war was not waged in Washington or anywhere else on the globe.

Truth; these wars were economically somewhat different. These were predominantly wars against defenseless peoples in order to bring more and more territories under the control of the imperialist world powers. And a whole series of colonial wars thus contributed to the development of imperialist forms of capitalism.

The world war in economic terms is essentially different from the previous ones. Here it was no longer a matter of subordinating new regions to the regime of imperialism, but of the struggle of the representatives of imperialism among themselves for a new redivision of the exploited colonial and semi-colonial regions.

(...)

The development of capitalism has not been uniformed all over the world.

Several development centers can be identified. The center of gravity fell on Western Europe and was represented by England, France, and Germany. In addition to these states, Austria-Hungary and Russia were important as capitalist countries, and outside the European continent, the United States of America and Japan.

It was characteristic of the Western European core of capitalism that, in order to support its economy, it imported agricultural products and raw materials in large quantities, and in order to be able to pay for them, it exported industrial goods.

At the same time, these countries are increasingly becoming countries for the export of capital. An increasing part of the accumulated capital is beginning to be placed not in the country itself, and abroad, in order to exploit the higher rate of surplus value and the higher rate of profit in backward countries; at the same time it was also to counteract the tendency of the falling rate of profit). At the same time there was a strong concentration of production and centralization of property.

The economy of the imperialist countries, and with it the economy of the whole world, was in the hands of an ever-decreasing number of the biggest capitalists enterprises in cartels, trusts and concerns made a small group of bosses, in cooperation with large banks, masters of the entire economic life of the country. With economic power, they, if not formally, then in fact, received political power. The big bourgeoisie controlled the state, directing its policy in the interests of its own pocket.

The growth of the upward curve of capitalism and the exploitation of the semi-colonies and colonies made it possible for the bourgeoisie of the imperialist powers to provide the industrial proletariat of their countries with its standard of living, which was rising slowly but steadily.

This fact explains why a significant part of the working class in the imperialist countries has separated from the general mass of the proletariat and has become a labor aristocracy. And this labor aristocracy served as the basis for revisionism and the approval of the colonial policy by the social democracy. It was also the economic basis for social patriotism and for the joint action of the industrial proletariat with its bourgeoisie during the war. The unity of the bourgeoisie in organizations of a monopolistic type and the actual seizure of the state apparatus by it gave it the opportunity to monopoly subjugate the internal markets of various countries.

High protective duties excluded foreign competition and allowed surplus production to be thrown onto the world market in comparison with the needs of the domestic market and sold on the world market at prices lower than within the country, and in many cases even at prices that only paid off the actual costs of production. Over time, the desire for monopoly domination extended to the outer regions and formed the basis of colonial policy; in particular, here it was about three different, but closely related things:

- 1) on the monopoly exploitation of raw materials and natural resources of the colonies. It must be noted here that in the period of the rise of capitalism, with favorable conjuncture, industry suffered almost constantly from a shortage of the most important raw materials, and the bourgeoisie of every imperialist state was keenly interested in securing its own sources of raw materials and enjoying them exclusively;
- 2) on the monopoly use of sales markets for the industry and
- 3) about new monopoly opportunities for capital investment.

The last point, as capitalism developed, acquired more and more importance, and was closely connected with the second point, since the deployment of new capital abroad, of course,

took place mainly in the form of the export of means of production to less developed countries.

That phase of highly developed capitalism, which can be characterized by the striving of the bourgeoisie to expand the home market which it monopolizes by annexing less developed regions to it, we call imperialism.

This striving of the bourgeoisie of highly developed capitalist countries to conquer markets and dominate them monopoly was bound to lead to clashes, since most of the world was already divided into spheres of influence. This led to a sharp contrast between the interests of individual capitalist powers, which, in turn, in connection with the interests of the military industry, which had great political influence, led to severe conflicts between individual states.

Clash of interests between England and Germany.

Of all the capitalist states of Europe, Germany experienced the greatest upswing during this period. It increasingly competed on the world market with British industry. At the same time, Germany, as the youngest of the capitalist powers, was left almost without colonies during the division of the world. All that fell to her lot was the miserable remnants provided to her by England. Therefore, the German bourgeoisie felt left out and demanded a "place in the sun," i.e., a place in the sun. providing it, in accordance with its economic development, with part of the regions of the world that have not yet been captured by capital for monopoly exploitation.

This aspiration of the German bourgeoisie led to huge armaments on land and, mainly, at sea. The latter were the main cause of the jealousy of England, which before that she was the only ruler of the seas.

In view of the dominion of England on the seas, Germany was forced to seek spheres of influence mainly on the continent. Therefore, it directed all its efforts towards subordinating Eastern Europe and Asia Minor to German capital.

The construction of the Baghdad Railway, a direct rail line between Berlin and Baghdad, was the beginning of the takeover plans. But this could not but arouse the greatest anxiety in England since the final stage of this route on the coast of the Persian Gulf posed a threat to India. The economic line on which the world war flared up thus boiled down to the question of whether Western Asia would fall into the sphere of influence of Germany and or into the sphere of influence of England, or—in an even more general form— whether Germany will be recognized as an equal imperialist power on land and sea by England.

Clash of interests between Germany and France.

The second main contradiction is the interests of Germany and France, and it was about domination over Central Europe. The question was whether Germany would become the dominant power of the European continent at the head of the "United States of Central Europe" or whether the said role would fall to the lot of France, as had been the case throughout recent history, except for the period from 1871 to 1914. This question is connected with the problem of the Western European mining industry, coal, and iron.

Opposite interests of England and Russia.

The third contradiction was Russia's desire to gain access to the sea in the south, i.e. striving for Constantinople or the Indian Ocean. The traditional struggle between England and Russia on this issue was temporarily eliminated by Germany's desire to reach the Indian Ocean in the direction from west to east. Both rivals—England and Russia—united in order to get out of the

way a new enemy, at that moment more dangerous for England—Germany.

Of the other great powers, Austria-Hungary was, economically and materially, wholly drawn into the sphere of German influence, while Japan and the United States, apparently, stood out for the time being from these major clashes of interests.

These economic contradictions led to the greatest war in world history.

Much has been written about the possibility of avoiding this war by a more prudent policy. Such a formulation of the question can be considered a rather idle exercise, it can only make sense if lessons can be learned from it for future. Even before the war there was a strong pacifist trend, and some economists, like Norman Engel, for example, tried to prove that war was not profitable for the bourgeoisie.

The fallacy of this point of view lies in the fact that it operates with the concept of the common interest of the country or the bourgeoisie. In fact, the policy of countries with highly developed capitalism is determined not by the entire people and not even by the bourgeoisie, but only by a small group of the big bourgeoisie—heavy industry, big banks, cartels, trusts and concerns.

The war ruined not only the sections of the population of various countries, but the groups of capitalists that were of decisive importance were greatly enriched. True, many human lives have been lost and the economic losses are enormous, which in general is a major economic loss, but the leaders of the capitalists have not suffered during this time.

At the present time, ten years after the World War, armaments continue at the same accelerated pace as before. And this is the

best proof that the bourgeoisie did not learn the pacifist lessons from the world war.

Despite the fact that Germany is disarmed, millions of soldiers are constantly under arms, and the killing technique is being improved more and more every day. Just as idle is the question of who the attacker in the world war was.

Virtually all imperialist powers were preparing for a world war. In judging who attacked, it is important that everyone was preparing for war, and one can safely say about each side that it was the attacker.

II. Consequences.

The World War had profound consequences for the entire economy of the capitalist system. It laid the foundation for the crisis of capitalism, a colossal shake-up of the entire capital and social system. The war itself was an incredible squandering of valuables.

a) About 20 million men, fully able-bodied, were cut off from productive work and engaged in murder.

b) Other millions were cut off from normal conditions of production and had to work for the defense.

c) In the theaters of war, the means of production and other values were destroyed on a huge scale.

d) It is extremely difficult to fix the reduction in labor productivity resulting from the impoverishment and malnutrition of workers.

In addition, one must also take into account war invalids, whose number, according to the International Labor Office, is 10 million. Based on this, one can try to calculate the damage caused by the war to production, as follows:

1) The value of the annual production of one person was on average 2,000 gold marks. If this number is multiplied by 20 million, i.e. on the number of participants in the war, then we will get 40 billion a year, and for the entire time of the war, i.e. in 41/3 years—170 billion marks in gold.

2) 10 million workers were employed in the war industry; in 4V* years, at the rate of 2,000 marks each, this will amount to 85 billion marks in gold. To this we must also add a reduction in production by the population itself due to insufficient nutrition, as well as a reduction in living productive forces due to a decrease in the birth rate; The latter circumstance is only just beginning to show itself.

3) The immediate destruction caused by the war is difficult to account for. For France alone, they are determined at 26 billion marks in gold. To this must be added Belgium, East Prussia, Northern Italy, Serbia, Rumania, and Russia, as well as all the ships sunk—a total of approximately 200 billion gold marks.

In general, for all three points, it comes out round about 450 billion marks in gold .

4) The decrease in production, as a result of the impoverishment and malnutrition of the workers, cannot be accounted for at all. On the other hand, it was possible to achieve an increase in production by employing the entire reserve army of labor: women, children and the elderly were involved in the production process.

In addition, the decline in productivity is equal to 100 billion marks annually. The impoverishment due to war can be established in its natural form. Construction activity has completely stopped, and so far in many countries it has not yet been resumed. Annual items—furniture, clothes, etc.—are not renewed.

The land was exploited in a predatory way, no care was taken to provide adequate fertilizer to restore its fertility. Stocks of metals, manufactories and foodstuffs were depleted.

The capital invested abroad has been expended in acquiring food supplies and the most necessary raw materials, and has been almost entirely spent. Most of the countries participating in the war, if they could, took out loans from neutral states and thus anticipated and consumed in advance the product of future production.

Uneven impoverishment in different areas.

In different countries participating in the war, impoverishment was different. It affected the central states most of all, which, thanks to the blockade, were cut off from the world market and depended almost exclusively on their own production.

In England and France, this impoverishment in terms of means of production and other valuables was less, because these states were able to use many of the capital placed abroad and received large loans.

And, conversely, America and its colonies were rich. The absence of European competition contributed to the strong industrialization of the overseas regions - this was facilitated by the lack of tonnage, as well as the transition of European industry to defense work, as a result of which it could no longer be an exporter, as before.

This industrialization of the colonial countries is a new long-term cause of the crisis of Western European capital, which is no longer able to feed its population on the export of industrial goods alone. That is why the capitalists are now in favor of emigration, and Malthusianism is beginning to flourish again.

The balance of power between the great powers.

Of the seven great imperialist powers, three failed after the war:

Russia, as a result of the revolution and the secession of the border states, which, in the imagination of the imperialists, should serve as a barrier against Bolshevism.

Germany, which was deprived of all possibilities for continuing to be considered a great world power (disarmament of the fleet and army, military control, annexation of Alsace-Lorraine, Holstein, Poznań, Upper Silesia, subjection to the economic control of the Entente—to the meaning of the project of experts). Thanks to this, Germany has already become a colony of the Entente, an object of imperialist exploitation.

Astro-Hungary was partitioned, which resulted in the Balkanization of all of central and eastern Europe.

England and France, thanks to the war, expanded and rounded their colonies. The power of England now extends from Cap to Egypt, and from Egypt to India. The French colonies have over 100 million people.

However, the real winner is still not France and not England, but the United States, which, thanks to the war, has turned from a debtor into a creditor. The Entente countries owe America a total of 10.2 billion dollars (including Great Britain 4.1 and France 3.3), and before the war America's foreign debts were much higher than the capital she placed abroad. To this must be added the considerable quantity of American banknotes circulating in the Central European countries; for these tickets, the United States receives real benefits in one form or another from Europe.

In addition, this calculation does not yet include loans from private companies and commodity credits.

America's position as a creditor to the Entente gives it the opportunity at any moment to exert strong political pressure on the powers of Europe. Thanks to the war, the economic center of gravity finally shifted to the United States. This is primarily evidenced by the production of the most important raw materials: America's participation in world oil production from 65.3% in 1913 reached 72.4% in 1923; in the production of iron, from 39.7% to 61.6%, steel, from 40.1% to 61.6%. The same is true for most of the other commodities. The number of cars in America is 90% of the world contingent. Of the visible gold reserves, more than half is in the States themselves. In recent years there has been a period of high economic activity in the United States, while the crisis has continued in Europe.

The favorable conjuncture, from the beginning of 1922 to April 1924, was limited almost exclusively to the United States, not touching Europe at all. This shift of the economic center of gravity to America is not the result of the war alone; the war only underlined the trend that had existed before, arising from the presence in America of great natural wealth (coal, oil, copper). While in Europe especially the production of coal is only more and more expensive, in the United States the costs of production are falling. In addition, the mentioned trend is based on the enormous land wealth of the United States (only 15 inhabitants per square kilometer), cultivated with the latest technology.

Thanks to all this, Europe is forced to play, in comparison with the United States, a secondary economic and political role.

Changes in class relations.

Impoverishment in European countries is not universal and does not extend to the ruling groups of capitalists and large landowners; on the contrary, these groups snatched for themselves an even larger share of the diminished national

wealth than they had before the war. More and more concentrated and centralized. After the war, the big bourgeoisie succeeded, mainly as a result of the depreciation of money, in expropriating the middle strata.

All expenses for the war, in the form of war loans and paper-monetary inflation, finally and completely fell on the broad circles of the population.

This affected rentiers, petty savers, owners of insurance policies, pensions, etc. most severely. Characteristically, the formation in Germany during the last elections of the "party of deceived savers" (the party of guez). The impoverishment was masked by loans and paper-money inflation, and sometimes they even managed to turn it into an apparent enrichment, but this could only hide their impoverishment from the middle strata for a while.

The liquidation of state war debts, as well as private ones through inflation, was so beneficial for the bourgeoisie that even the bourgeoisie of the victorious countries seeks it, in an open or hidden form. And indeed, inflation gradually captures both the victorious countries (with the exception of the United States) and neutral states.

As a result of all this, a strong exacerbation of the class resistance into oracles. A small group of big capitalists are even more vehemently opposed and rising above the impoverished middle strata. At the same time, the strongest growth of trusts and cartels is observed. And monopolies without restraint seek to use to rob consumers.

The question of reparations.

The development of this question clearly reflects the entire crisis of capitalism. We can establish the following points:

1) Germany demands the comfort of payment to the allies for all their losses.

Result: the collapse of the currency, since in the end payments could only be made by increased exportation of goods or gold. But artificial barriers were placed on the export of goods, and payments from a considerable gold reserve could not be made for any length of time.

For a short period of time, Germany's solvency was extended by buying a paper stamp abroad, selling houses, shares, land, and other real values to foreigners.

2) Germany is unable to pay more. The Ruhr area is occupied, which marks the beginning of the struggle between French and British imperialism to turn Germany into a colony. France defeated Germany in this case, but must submit to the economic pressure of England and America and cannot implement his plan for the division of Germany.

3) Report of the Commission of Experts. It marks the victory of England over the attempts of the French to dismember Germany. Strict and systematic control by experts should turn Germany into an Entente colony, for all the most important branches of production are subject to financial control. The burden of new obligations secured by pledges is placed on German industry. The taxation of the German railways with an annual tribute of almost a billion serves the same purpose. The welfare index was introduced with the aim of being able to increase payments in the absolutely improbable case if the national economy were to rise in Germany.

The meaning of all these measures is to stifle the growth of inflation and German industry for a long time. The main thing is to weaken its competition with British and French industry.

The period of the crisis of capitalism.

The years that have elapsed since the end of the World War have led to a state which we have called the period of the crisis of capitalism. Within the framework of this period, there is a change of crises and the rise of the conjuncture.

(..)

The burden placed on the proletariat.

At the present time, almost all the hardships of the war are borne by the proletariat.

The first revolutionary war in 1918 prompted the bourgeoisie to make some concessions (an 8-hour day, social legislation, higher wages).

With the fall of the spontaneous wave of revolutionary ferment among the working masses, the offensive of capital against the gains of the revolution begins everywhere.

The offensive is characterized primarily by a systematic decrease in real wages in all European countries by 50-80% compared with pre-war times.

Wage cuts are accompanied by serious clashes. The decisive moment was the struggle of the British miners in the spring of 1921, which ended in complete defeat. In the autumn of 1923, the wages of German woodworkers were only 12% of the pre-war real wage, while the wages of other categories fluctuated between 15 and 45%.

Along with the reduction of wages, we see the desire of international capital to increase the working day, which in many cases has already been crowned with success.

Social-Democracy and a section of bourgeois economists expect from a new attempt to settle the reparations question on the

basis of a project of experts a decisive turn towards an improvement in the economic situation in Europe.

These expectations are in vain: the experts' report signifies a continuation of deliberate and systematic attempts to

all the hardships of the war on the proletariat without a trace, since the middle strata for the most part have already been expropriated and, moreover, refuse to tolerate further robbery.

The success or failure of these plans depends on the combat readiness of the proletariat. In economic terms, the experts' report means a partial renunciation of reparation payments, but instead the transformation of Germany into a colony of the imperialist powers of the Entente, in order to artificially keep the development of German industry within the boundaries required by the interests of French and British industry.

This new solution to the problem will alleviate the acute crisis of capitalism in Germany, but will exacerbate the general crisis of the Western European industrial countries. The crisis will continue for a long time (if the victorious proletarian revolution does not put an end to capitalism). The contradictions of capitalism are becoming more and more dimensions.

The military preparations of the victorious countries against each other are on a forced march. Despite the shocking events of the world war, the big bourgeoisie is preparing for a new war. Under such conditions, bourgeois pacifism cannot prevent war.

War will be prevented only by a proletarian revolution.

The Attitude of The Russian Social Democratic Labor Party towards the war

Lenin Socialism and War

Socialists have always condemned war between nations as barbarous and brutal. But our attitude towards war is fundamentally different from that of the bourgeois pacifists (supporters and advocates of peace) and of the Anarchists. We differ from the former in that we understand the inevitable connection between wars and the class struggle within the country; we understand that war cannot be abolished unless classes are abolished and Socialism is created; and we also differ in that we fully regard civil wars, i.e., wars waged by the oppressed class against the oppressing class, slaves against slave-owners, serfs against land-owners, and wage workers against the bourgeoisie, as legitimate, progressive, and necessary. We Marxists differ from both the pacifists and the Anarchists in that we deem it necessary historically (from the standpoint of Marx's dialectical materialism) to study each war separately. In history there have been numerous wars which, in spite of all the horrors, atrocities, distress and suffering that inevitably accompany all wars, were progressive, i.e., benefited the development of mankind by helping to destroy the exceptionally harmful and reactionary institutions (for example, autocracy or serfdom), the most barbarous despotisms in Europe (Turkish and Russian). Therefore, it is necessary to examine the historically specific features of precisely the present war.

Historical types of wars in modern times

The Great French Revolution ushered in a new epoch in the history of mankind. From that time to the Paris Commune, from 1789 to 1871, one of the types of wars were wars of a bourgeois-progressive, national-liberating character. In other

words, the chief content and historical significance of these wars were the overthrow of absolutism and feudalism, the undermining of these institutions, the overthrow of alien oppression. Therefore, those were progressive wars, and during such wars, all honest, revolutionary democrats, and also all Socialists, always sympathized with the success of that country (i.e., with that bourgeoisie), which had helped to overthrow, or sap, the most dangerous foundations of feudalism, absolutism, and the oppression of other nations. For example, the revolutionary wars waged by France contained an element of plunder and conquest of alien territory by the French, but this does not in the least alter the fundamental historical significance of these wars, which destroyed and shattered feudalism and absolutism in the whole of old, serf-ridden Europe. In the Franco-Prussian war, Germany plundered France, but this does not alter the fundamental historical significance of this war, which liberated tens of millions of German people from feudal disintegration and from the oppression of two despots, the Russian tsar and Napoleon

The difference between aggressive and defensive war

The epoch of 1789-1871 left deep traces and revolutionary memories. Before feudalism, absolutism and alien oppression were overthrown, the development of the proletarian struggle for Socialism was out of the question. When speaking of the legitimacy of "defensive" war in relation to the wars of such an epoch, Socialists always had in mind precisely these objects, which amounted to revolution against medievalism and serfdom. By "defensive" war Socialists always meant a "just" war in this sense (W. Liebknecht once expressed himself precisely in this way). Only in this sense have Socialists regarded, and now regard, wars "for the defence of the fatherland," or "defensive" wars, as legitimate, progressive, and just. For example, if tomorrow, Morocco were to declare war on

France, India on England, Persia, or China on Russia, and so forth, those would be "just," "defensive" wars, irrespective of who attacked first; and every Socialist would sympathize with the victory of the oppressed, dependent, unequal states against the oppressing, slave-owning, predatory "great" powers.

But picture to yourselves a slave-owner who owned 100 slaves warring against a slave-owner who owned 200 slaves for a more "just" distribution of slaves. Clearly, the application of the term "defensive" war, or war "for the defence of the fatherland," in such a case would be historically false, and in practice would be sheer deception of the common people, of philistines, of ignorant people, by the astute slave-owners. Precisely in this way are the present-day imperialist bourgeoisie deceiving the peoples by means of "national" ideology and the term "defence of the fatherland" in the present war between slave-owners for fortifying and strengthening slavery.

The present war is an imperialist war

Nearly everybody admits that the present war is an imperialist war, but in most cases this term is distorted or applied to one side, or a loophole is left for the assertion that this war may, after all, have a bourgeois-progressive, national liberating significance. Imperialism is the highest stage in the development of capitalism, reached only in the twentieth century. Capitalism now finds the old national states, without the formation of which it could not have overthrown feudalism, too tight for it. Capitalism has developed concentration to such a degree that whole branches of industry have been seized by syndicates, trusts, and associations of capitalist billionaires, and almost the entire globe has been divided up among the "lords of capital," either in the form of colonies, or by enmeshing other countries in thousands of threads of financial exploitation. Free trade and competition have been superseded by the striving for monopoly, for the seizure of territory for the investment of

capital, for the export of raw materials from them, and so forth. From the liberator of nations that capitalism was in the struggle against feudalism, imperialist capitalism has become the greatest oppressor of nations. Formerly progressive, capitalism has become reactionary; it has developed the forces of production to such a degree that mankind is faced with the alternative of going over to Socialism or of suffering years and even decades of armed struggle between the "great" powers for the artificial preservation of capitalism by means of colonies, monopolies, privileges, and national oppression of every kind.

War between the biggest slave-owners for preserving and fortifying slavery

To explain the significance of imperialism, we will quote exact figures showing the division of the world among the so-called "great" (i.e., successful in great plunder) powers: [See p. 9 --Ed.] From this it is seen how most of the nations which fought at the head of others for freedom in 1789-1871, have now, after 1876, on the basis of highly developed and "overripe" capitalism, become the oppressors and enslavers of the majority of the populations and nations of the globe. From 1876 to 1914, six "great" powers grabbed 25 million sq. kilometers, i.e., an area two and a half times that of Europe! Six powers are enslaving over half a billion (523 million) inhabitants of colonies. For every four inhabitants of the "great" powers there are five inhabitants of "their" colonies. And everybody knows that colonies are conquered by fire and sword, that the populations of colonies are brutally treated, that they are exploited in a thousand ways (by exporting capital, concessions, etc., cheating when selling them goods, subordination to the authorities of the "ruling" nation, and.....so on and so forth). The Anglo-French bourgeoisie are deceiving the people when they say that they are waging war for the freedom of nations and for Belgium; actually they are waging war for the purpose of

retaining the colonies they have inordinately grabbed. The German imperialists would free Belgium, etc., at once if the British and French would agree "fairly" to share their colonies with them. The peculiarity of the situation lies in that in this war the fate of the colonies is being decided by war on the Continent. From the standpoint of bourgeois justice and national freedom (or the right of nations to existence), Germany would be absolutely right as against England and France, for she has been "done out" of colonies, her enemies are oppressing an immeasurably far larger number of nations than she is, and the Slavs who are oppressed by her ally Austria undoubtedly enjoy far more freedom than those in tsarist Russia, that real "prison of nations." But Germany is fighting not for the liberation, but for the oppression of nations. It is not the business of Socialists to help the younger and stronger robber (Germany) to rob the older and overgorged robbers. Socialists must take advantage of the struggle between the robbers to overthrow them all. To be able to do this, the Socialists must first of all tell the people the truth, namely, that this war is in a treble sense a war between slave-owners to fortify slavery. This is a war firstly, to fortify the enslavement of the colonies by means of a "fairer" distribution and subsequent more "concerted" exploitation of them; secondly, to fortify the oppression of other nations within the "great" powers, for both Austria and Russia (Russia more and much worse than Austria) maintain their rule only by such oppression, intensifying it by means of war; and thirdly, to fortify and prolong wage slavery, for the proletariat is split up and suppressed, while the capitalists gain, making fortunes out of the war, aggravating national prejudices and intensifying reaction, which has raised its head in all countries, even in the freest and most republican.

**"War is the continuation of politics by other" (i.e., violent)
"means"**

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

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

It is sufficient to glance at the present war from the view point that it is a continuation of the politics of the "great" powers, and of the principal classes within them, to see at once the howling anti-historicalness, falsity, and hypocrisy of the view that the "defence of the fatherland" idea can be justified in the present war.

The example of Belgium

The favourite plea of the social-chauvinist triple (now quadruple) entente (in Russia, Plekhanov, and Co.) is the

example of Belgium. But this example goes against them. The German imperialists shamelessly violated the neutrality of Belgium, as belligerent states have done always and everywhere, trampling upon all treaties and obligations if necessary. Let us suppose that all the states interested in the observation of international treaties declared war on Germany with the demand for the liberation and indemnification of Belgium. In such a case, the sympathies of Socialists would, of course, be on the side of Germany's enemies. But the whole point is that the "triple (and quadruple) entente" is waging war not over Belgium: this is perfectly well known, and only hypocrites conceal this. England is grabbing Germany's colonies and Turkey; Russia is grabbing Galicia and Turkey, France wants Alsace-Lorraine and even the left bank of the Rhine; a treaty has been concluded with Italy for the division of the spoils (Albania, Asia Minor); bargaining is going on with Bulgaria and Rumania, also for the division of the spoils. In the present war waged by the present governments it is impossible to help Belgium without helping to strangle Austria or Turkey, etc.! How does "defence of the fatherland" come in here? Herein, precisely, lies the specific feature of imperialist war, war between reactionary bourgeois, historically obsolete governments, waged for the purpose of oppressing other nations. Whoever justifies participation in the present war perpetuates imperialist oppression of nations. Whoever advocates taking advantage of the present embarrassments of the governments to fight for the social revolution champions the real freedom of really all nations, which is possible only under Socialism.

What is Russia fighting for?

In Russia, capitalist imperialism of the latest type has fully revealed itself in the policy of tsarism towards Persia, Manchuria, and Mongolia; but, in general, military, and feudal

imperialism predominates in Russia. In no country in the world is the majority of the population oppressed so much as it is in Russia; Great Russians constitute only 43 per cent of the population, i.e., less than half; all the rest are denied rights as aliens. Of the 170 million inhabitants of Russia, about 100 million are oppressed and denied rights. Tsarism is waging war to seize Galicia and finally to crush the liberties of the Ukrainians, to seize Armenia, Constantinople, etc. Tsarism regards the war as a means of diverting attention from the growth of discontent within the country and of suppressing the growing revolutionary movement. At the present time, for every two Great Russians in Russia there are from two to three rightless "aliens": tsarism is striving by means of the war to increase the number of nations oppressed by Russia, to perpetuate this oppression and thereby undermine the struggle for freedom which the Great Russians themselves are waging. The possibility of oppressing and robbing other nations perpetuates economic stagnation, because, often, the source of income is not the development of productive forces, but the semi-feudal exploitation of "aliens." Thus, on the part of Russia, the war is distinguished for its profoundly reactionary and anti-liberating character.

What is social-chauvinism?

Social-chauvinism is advocacy of the idea of "defence of the fatherland" in the present war. Further, this idea logically leads to the abandonment of the class struggle during the war, to voting war credits, etc. Actually, the social chauvinists are pursuing an anti-proletarian, bourgeois policy; for actually, they are championing not "defence of the fatherland" in the sense of fighting foreign oppression, but the "right" of one or other of the "great" powers to plunder colonies and to oppress other nations. The social-chauvinists repeat the bourgeois deception of the people that the war is being waged to protect

the freedom and existence of nations, and thereby they go over to the side of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat. In the category of social-chauvinists are those who justify and embellish the governments and bourgeoisie of one of the belligerent groups of powers, as well as those who, like Kautsky, argue that the Socialists of all the belligerent powers have an equal right to "defend the fatherland." Social-chauvinism, being actually defence of the privileges, advantages, robbery, and violence of one's "own" (or every) imperialist bourgeoisie, is the utter betrayal of all socialist convictions and of the decision of the Basle International Socialist Congress.

The Basle Manifesto

The manifesto on war that was unanimously adopted in Basle in 1912 had in view the very war between England and Germany and their present allies that broke out in 1914. The manifesto openly declares that no plea of the interests of the people can justify such a war, waged "for the sake of the profits of the capitalists" and "the ambitions of dynasties" on the basis of the imperialist, predatory policy of the great powers. The manifesto openly declares that war is dangerous "for the governments" (all without exception), notes their fear of "a proletarian revolution," and very definitely points to the example of the Commune of 1871, and of October-December 1905, i.e., to the examples of revolution and civil war. Thus, the Basle Manifesto lays down, precisely for the present war, the tactics of revolutionary struggle by the workers on an international scale against their governments, the tactics of proletarian revolution. The Basle Manifesto repeats the statement in the Stuttgart resolution that, in the event of war breaking out, Socialists must take advantage of the "economic and political crisis" it will cause, to "hasten the downfall of capitalism," i.e., to take advantage of the governments'

embarrassments and the anger of the masses, caused by the war, for the socialist revolution.

The policy of the social-chauvinists, their justification of the war from the bourgeois-liberation standpoint, their sanctioning of "defence of the fatherland," voting credits, entering cabinets, and so on and so forth, is downright treachery to Socialism, which can be explained only, as we will see lower down, by the victory of opportunism and of the national-liberal labour policy in the majority of European parties.

False references to Marx and Engels

The Russian social-chauvinists (headed by Plekhanov), refer to Marx's tactics in the war of 1870; the German (of the type of Lensch, David and Co.) to Engels' statement in 1891 that in the event of war against Russia and France together, it would be the duty of the German Socialists to defend their fatherland; and lastly, the social-chauvinists of the Kautsky type, who want to reconcile and legitimize international chauvinism, refer to the fact that Marx and Engels, while condemning war, nevertheless, constantly, from 1854-1855 to 1870-1871 and 1876-1877, took the side of one or another belligerent state once war had broken out.

All these references are outrageous distortions of the views of Marx and Engels in the interest of the bourgeoisie and the opportunists, in just the same way as the writings of the Anarchists Guillaume and Co. distort the views of Marx and Engels in justification of anarchism. The war of 1870-1871 was a historically progressive war on the part of Germany until Napoleon III was defeated; for the latter, together with the tsar, had oppressed Germany for many years, keeping her in a state of feudal disintegration. But as soon as the war developed into the plunder of France (the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine), Marx and Engels emphatically condemned the Germans. And

even at the beginning of that war Marx and Engels approved of the refusal of Bebel and Liebknecht to vote for credits and advised the Social-Democrats not to merge with the bourgeoisie, but to uphold the independent class interests of the proletariat. To apply the appraisal of this bourgeois-progressive and national-liberating war to the present imperialist war means mocking at truth.

The same applies with still greater force to the war of 1854-1855, and to all the wars of the nineteenth century, when there was no modern imperialism, no ripe objective conditions for Socialism, and no mass Socialist parties in any of the belligerent countries, i.e., none of the conditions from which the Basle Manifesto deduced the tactics of "proletarian revolution" in connection with a war between the great powers.

Whoever refers today to Marx's attitude towards the wars of the epoch of the progressive bourgeoisie and forgets Marx's statement that "the workers have no fatherland," a statement that applies precisely to the epoch of the reactionary, obsolete bourgeoisie, to the epoch of the socialist revolution, shamelessly distorts Marx and substitutes the bourgeois for the socialist point of view.

The collapse of the second international

The Socialists of all the world solemnly declared in Basle, in 1912, that they regarded the impending war in Europe as the "criminal" and most reactionary affair of all the governments, which must hasten the downfall of capitalism by inevitably calling forth a revolution against it. The war came, the crisis came. Instead of revolutionary tactics, the majority of the Social-Democratic parties conducted reactionary tactics, went over to the side of their respective governments and bourgeoisie. This betrayal of Socialism signifies the collapse of the Second (1889-1914) International, and we must understand

what caused this collapse, what brought social-chauvinism into being, what gave it strength.

Social-chauvinism is consummated opportunism

During the whole epoch of the Second International, a struggle raged everywhere in the Social-Democratic parties between the revolutionary and the opportunist wings. In a number of countries a split has taken place along this line (England, Italy, Holland, Bulgaria). Not a single Marxist has any doubt that opportunism expresses bourgeois policy within the working-class movement, expresses the interests of the petty bourgeoisie and the alliance of a tiny section of bourgeoisified workers with "their" bourgeoisie against the interests of the proletarian masses, the oppressed masses.

The objective conditions of the end of the nineteenth century exceptionally intensified opportunism, converted the utilization of bourgeois legality into subservience to it, created a tiny stratum of bureaucrats and aristocrats within the working class, and drew into the ranks of the Social-Democratic parties numerous petty-bourgeois "fellow travelers."

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

Opportunism and social-chauvinism have the same economic basis: the interests of a tiny stratum of privileged workers and of the petty bourgeoisie who are defending their privileged position, their "right" to crumbs of the profits "their" national bourgeoisie obtain from robbing other nations, from the advantages of their position as the ruling nation, etc.

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

Unity with the opportunists means alliance between the workers and "their" national bourgeoisie and splitting the international revolutionary working class

In the past epoch, before the war, although opportunism was often regarded as a "deviationist," "extremist" part of the Social-Democratic Party, it was nevertheless regarded as a legitimate part. The war has shown that this cannot be so in [the -- DJR] future. Opportunism has "matured," is now playing to the full its role as emissary of the bourgeois in the working-class movement. Unity with the opportunists has become sheer hypocrisy, an example of which we see in the German Social-Democratic Party. On all important occasions (for example, the voting on August 4), the opportunists come forward with an ultimatum, which they carry out with the aid of their numerous connections with the bourgeoisie, of their majority on the executives of the trade unions, etc. Unity with the opportunists actually means today, subordinating the working class to "its"

national bourgeoisie, alliance with it for the purpose of oppressing other nations and of fighting for great-power privileges, it means splitting the revolutionary proletariat in all countries.

Hard as the struggle may be, in individual cases, against the opportunists who predominate in many organizations, peculiar as the process of purging the workers' parties of opportunists may be in individual countries, this process is inevitable and fruitful. Reformist Socialism is dying; regenerated Socialism "will be revolutionary, uncompromising and insurrectionary," to use the apt expression of the French Socialist Paul Golay.

"Kautskyism"

Kautsky, the biggest authority in the Second International, gives us a highly typical and glaring example of how the verbal recognition of Marxism has led actually to its conversion into "Struveism," or into "Brentanoism." We see this also from the example of Plekhanov. By means of obvious sophistry they rob Marxism of its revolutionary living spirit; to recognize everything in Marxism except revolutionary methods of struggle, the preaching of and preparation for such methods, and the training of the masses precisely in this direction. Kautsky, in an unprincipled fashion, "reconciles" the fundamental idea of social-chauvinism, recognition of defence of the fatherland in the present war, with a diplomatic, sham concession to the Lefts in the shape of abstaining from voting credits, the verbal claim of being in the opposition, etc. Kautsky, who in 1909 authored a whole book on the approaching epoch of revolutions and on the connection between war and revolutions, Kautsky, who in 1912 signed the Basle Manifesto on taking revolutionary advantage of the impending war, is now, in every way, justifying and embellishing social-chauvinism and, like Plekhanov, joins the bourgeoisie in

ridiculing all thought of revolution, all steps towards direct revolutionary struggle.

The working class cannot play its world-revolutionary role unless it wages a ruthless struggle against this renegacy, spinelessness, subservience to opportunism and unexampled vulgarization of the theories of Marxism. Kautskyism is not a fortuity, but a social product of the contradictions within the Second International, a combination of loyalty to Marxism in words and subordination to opportunism in deeds.

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

The Marxists' slogan is the slogan of revolutionary social-democracy

The war has undoubtedly created a most acute crisis and has increased the distress of the masses to an incredible degree. The reactionary character of this war, and the shameless lies told by the bourgeoisie of all countries in covering up their predatory aims with "national" ideology, are inevitably creating, on the basis of an objectively revolutionary situation, revolutionary moods among the masses. It is our duty to help the masses to

become conscious of these moods, to deepen and formulate them. This task is correctly expressed only by the slogan: convert the imperialist war into civil war; and all consistently waged class struggles during the war, all seriously conducted "mass action" tactics inevitably lead to this. It is impossible to foretell whether a powerful revolutionary movement will flare up during the first or the second war of the great powers, whether during or after it; in any case, our bounden duty is systematically and undeviatingly to work precisely in this direction.

The Basle Manifesto refers directly to the example set by the Paris Commune, i.e., to the conversion of a war between governments into civil war. Half a century ago, the proletariat was too weak; the objective conditions for Socialism had not yet ripened; there could be no coordination and cooperation between the revolutionary movements in all the belligerent countries; the "national ideology" (the traditions of 1792), with which a section of the Parisian workers were imbued, was their petty-bourgeois weakness, which Marx noted at the time, and was one of the causes of the fall of the Commune. Half a century after it, the conditions that weakened the revolution at that time have passed away, and it is unpardonable for a Socialist at the present time to resign himself to the abandonment of activities precisely in the spirit of the Paris Communards.

The example shown by the fraternization in the trenches

The bourgeois newspapers of all the belligerent countries have reported cases of fraternization between the soldiers of the belligerent nations even in the trenches. And the issue by the military authorities (of Germany, England) of draconic orders against such fraternization proved that the governments and the bourgeoisie attached grave importance to it. The fact that such cases of fraternization have been possible even when opportunism reigns supreme in the top ranks of the Social-

Democratic parties of Western Europe, and when social-chauvinism is supported by the entire Social-Democratic press and by all the authorities of the Second International, shows us how possible it would be to shorten the present criminal, reactionary and slave-owners' war and to organize a revolutionary international movement, if systematic work were conducted in this direction, if only by the Left-wing Socialists in all the belligerent countries.

The importance of underground organization

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

While under no circumstances or conditions refraining from utilizing all legal possibilities, however small, for the purpose of organizing the masses and of preaching Socialism, the Social-Democratic parties must break with subservience to legality. "You shoot first, Messieurs the Bourgeoisie," wrote Engels, hinting precisely at civil war and at the necessity of our violating legality after the bourgeoisie had violated it. The crisis has shown that the bourgeoisie violate it in all countries, even the freest, and that it is impossible to lead the masses to revolution unless an underground organization is set up for the purpose of advocating, discussing, appraising, and preparing revolutionary methods of struggle. In Germany, for example, all the honest things that Socialists are doing, are being done in spite of despicable opportunism and hypocritical "Kautskyism," and are being done secretly. In England, people are sent to penal servitude for printing appeals against joining the army.

To regard the repudiation of underground methods of propaganda, and ridiculing the latter in the legally published press, as being compatible with membership of the Social Democratic Party is treachery to Socialism.

Concerning defeat of "one's own" government in the imperialist war

Both the advocates of victory for their governments in the present war and the advocates of the slogan "neither victory nor defeat," equally take the standpoint of social-chauvinism. A revolutionary class cannot but wish for the defeat of its government in a reactionary war, cannot fail to see that its military reverses facilitate its overthrow. Only a bourgeois who believes that a war started by the governments must necessarily end as a war between governments and wants it to end as such, can regard as "ridiculous" and "absurd" the idea that the Socialists of all the belligerent countries should wish for the of all "their" governments and express this wish. On the contrary, it is precisely a statement of this kind that would conform to the cherished thoughts of every class-conscious worker, and would be in line with our activities towards converting the imperialist war into civil war.

Undoubtedly, the serious anti-war agitation that is being conducted by a section of the British, German and Russian Socialists has "weakened the military power" of the respective governments, but such agitation stands to the credit of the Socialists. Socialists must explain to the masses that they have no other road of salvation except the revolutionary overthrow of "their" governments, and that advantage must be taken of these governments' embarrassments in the present war precisely for this purpose.

Pacifism and the peace slogan

The sentiments of the masses in favour of peace often express incipient protest, anger, and consciousness of the reactionary character of the war. It is the duty of all Social-Democrats to utilize these sentiments. They will take a most ardent part in every movement and in every demonstration on this ground; but they will not deceive the people by conceding the idea that peace without annexations, without the oppression of nations, without plunder, without the germs of new wars among the present governments and ruling classes is possible in the absence of a revolutionary movement. Such a deception of the people would merely play into the hands of the secret diplomacy of the belligerent governments and facilitate their counter-revolutionary plans. Whoever wants a lasting democratic peace must be in favour of civil war against the governments and the bourgeoisie.

THE RIGHT OF NATIONS TO SELF-DETERMINATION

The most widespread deception of the people perpetrated by the bourgeoisie in the present war is the concealment of its predatory aims with "national-liberation" ideology. The English promise the liberation of Belgium, the Germans of Poland, etc. Actually as we have seen, this is a war waged by the oppressors of the majority of the nations of the world for the purpose of fortifying and expanding such oppression.

Socialists cannot achieve their great aim without fighting against all oppression of nations. Therefore, they must without fail demand that the Social-Democratic parties of oppressing countries (especially of the so-called "great" powers) should recognize and champion the right of oppressed nations to self-determination, precisely in the political sense of the term, i.e., the right to political secession. The Socialist of a ruling or

colony-owning nation who fails to champion this right is a chauvinist.

The championing of this right, far from encouraging the formation of small states, leads, on the contrary, to the freer, fearless, and therefore wider and more widespread formation of very big states and federations of states, which are more beneficial for the masses and more fully in keeping with economic development.

The Socialists of oppressed nations must, in their turn, unfailingly fight for the complete (including organizational) unity of the workers of the oppressed and oppressing nationalities. The idea of the juridical separation of one nation from another (so-called "cultural-national autonomy" advocated by Bauer and Renner) is reactionary.

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

Lecture on "The proletariat and the War"

Lenin

October 1, 1914

Newspaper report

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

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

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

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

Has the bourgeoisie given such an explanation? No. Far from having given one, it will not manage to give one in any circumstances. Judging by what is going on among the

socialists, one might think that they, too, have no idea of the distinctive features of the present war.

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

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

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

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

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

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

This task of the national wars was performed either by democracy itself or with the help of Bismarck, quite independently of the will and the consciousness of those who took part in them. The triumph of present-day civilization, the

full flowering of capitalism, the drawing of the whole people and of all nations into capitalism—that was the outcome of national wars, the wars at the beginning of capitalism.

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

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

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

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

Of course, even now there are blotches of the old color in the living picture of reality. Thus, of all the warring countries, the Serbs alone are still fighting for national existence. In India and China, too, class-conscious proletarians could not take any other path but the national one, because their countries have

not yet been formed into national states. If China had to carry on an offensive war for this purpose, we could only sympathize with her, because objectively it would be a progressive war. In exactly the same way, Marx in 1848 could call for an offensive war against Russia.

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

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

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

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

It is hard to say just now what the new form of organisation, corresponding to this phase, should be. But it is clear that in view of the new tasks, the proletariat will have to create new organisations or modify the old. All the more absurd is the fear of disarray in one's organisation, so vividly manifest among the German Social-Democrats; all the more absurd is this legalism at all costs. We know that the St. Petersburg Committee has issued an illegal leaflet against the war. The same has been done by the Caucasian and certain other organisations in Russia.

There is no doubt that this could also be done abroad, without any rupture of ties.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

This conception was clearly and precisely defined by the Communist Manifesto, in the brilliant pages whose truth has been fully tested and justified by experience. Lenin read an extract from the Communist Manifesto, where the conception of fatherland is regarded as a historical category, which corresponds to the development of society at a definite stage

and which later becomes unnecessary. The proletariat cannot love what it has not got. The proletariat has no country.

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

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

From this angle, Comrade Lenin then examined the actual stand taken by socialists in the various countries. Apart from the Serbs, the Russians have done their duty, as the Italian *Avanti!* notes, and Keir Hardie is doing it by exposing the policy of Edward Grey.

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

Resolution adopted at the Seventh International Socialist Congress at Stuttgart

The Congress reaffirms the resolutions adopted by previous international congresses against militarism and imperialism and declares once more that the struggle against militarism cannot be separated from the Socialist class struggle in general.

Wars between capitalist states are, usually a consequence of competition on the world market, for each state seeks to secure not only its existing markets, but also to conquer new ones and the main role here is played by the oppression of foreign peoples and countries. These wars are the main instrument of bourgeois class domination and economic and political oppression of the working class.

Wars are favored by the national prejudices which are systematically cultivated among civilized peoples in the interest of the ruling classes for the purpose of distracting the proletarian masses from their own class tasks as well as from their duties of international solidarity.

Wars, therefore, are part of the very nature of capitalism; they will cease only when the capitalist system is abolished or when the enormous sacrifices in men and money required by the advance in military technique and the indignation called forth by armaments, drive the peoples to abolish this system.

For this reason, the proletariat, which contributes most of the soldiers and makes most of the material sacrifices is a natural opponent of war which contradicts its highest goal -- the creation of an economic order on a Socialist basis which will bring about the solidarity of all peoples.

The Congress, therefore, considers it as the duty of the working class and particularly of its representatives in the parliaments to combat the naval and military armaments with all their

might, characterizing the class nature of bourgeois society and the motive for the maintenance of national antagonisms, and to refuse the means for these armaments. It is their duty to work for the education of the working-class youth in the spirit of the brotherhood of nations and of Socialism while developing their class consciousness.

The Congress sees in the democratic organization of the army, in the substitution of the militia for the standing army, an essential guarantee that offensive wars will be rendered impossible and the overcoming of national antagonisms facilitated.

The International is not able to determine in rigid forms the anti-militarist actions of the working class which are naturally different in different countries and for different circumstances of time and place. But it is its duty to coordinate and increase to the utmost the efforts of the working class against war.

In fact, since the International Congress at Brussels the proletariat has employed the most diverse forms of action with increasing emphasis and success in its indefatigable struggles against militarism by refusing the means for naval and military armaments and by its efforts to democratize the military organization -- all for the purpose of preventing the outbreak of wars or of putting a stop to them, as well as for utilizing the convulsions of society caused by war for the emancipation of the working class.

This was evidenced especially by the agreement between the English and French trade unions following the Fashoda Affair for the maintenance of peace and for the restoration of friendly relations between England and France; by the procedure of the Social-Democratic parties in the German and French parliaments during the Morocco crisis; the demonstrations arranged by the French and German Socialists for the same

purpose; the concerted action of the Socialists of Austria and Italy who met in Trieste in order to prevent a conflict between the two countries; furthermore, by the energetic intervention of the Socialist workers of Sweden in order to prevent an attack upon Norway; finally, the heroic, self-sacrificing struggle of the Socialist workers and peasants of Russia and Poland in order to oppose the war unleashed by czarism, to put a stop to it, and to utilize the crisis of the country for the liberation of the working class.

All these efforts are evidence of the growing power of the proletariat and of its increasing ability to secure the maintenance of peace by resolute intervention. The action of the working class will be all the more successful the more that its spirit is prepared by a corresponding action and the labor parties of the various countries are spurred on and coordinated by the International.

The Congress is convinced that, under the pressure of the proletariat, by a serious use of arbitration in place of the miserable measures of the governments, the benefit of disarmament can be secured to all nations, making it possible to employ the enormous expenditures of money and energy, which are swallowed up by military armaments and wars, for cultural purposes.

If a war threatens to break out, it is the duty of the working classes and their parliamentary representatives in the countries involved, supported by the coordinating activity of the International Socialist Bureau, to exert every effort in order to prevent the outbreak of war by the means they consider most effective, which naturally vary according to the sharpening of the class struggle and the sharpening of the general political situation.

In case war should break out anyway, it is their duty to intervene in favor of its speedy termination and with all their powers to utilize the economic and political crisis created by the war to rouse the masses and thereby to hasten the downfall of capitalist class rule.

Manifesto of the International Socialist Congress at Basel

Extraordinary International Socialist Congress at Basel, November 24-25, 1912. Vorwärts Publishers, Berlin, 1912

If an outbreak of war threatens, it is the duty of the working classes and their parliamentary representatives in the countries involved supported by the coordinating activity of the International Socialist Bureau to exert every effort in order to prevent the outbreak of war by the means they consider most effective, which naturally vary according to the sharpening of the class struggle and the sharpening of the general political situation.

If, in spite of this, war still breaks out, it is the duty of the working class to intervene in favor of its speedy termination and with all their powers to utilize the economic and political crisis created by the war to arouse the people and thereby to speed the downfall of capitalist class rule.

The events of recent times, more than ever, impose on the proletariat a duty with the greatest force and energy to develop their planned general actions. On the one hand, the general madness of armaments has aggravated the high cost of living, thereby intensified class antagonisms, and created in the working class an implacable spirit of revolt; the workers want to put a stop to this system of panic and waste. On the other hand, the incessantly recurring menace of war has a more and more inciting effect. The peoples of Europe have reached such a point that they can be turned against one another, although these attempts are crimes against humanity and reason cannot be justified by even the slightest justification of being in the interest of the people.

If the Balkan crisis, which has already led to such terrible disasters, if it spread further, it would become the most frightful danger to civilization and the proletariat. At the same

time it would be the greatest disgrace in world history because of the glaring disparity between the enormity of the catastrophe and the insignificance of the interests that would have caused this catastrophe.

It is with satisfaction that the Congress records the complete unanimity of the Socialist parties and of the trade unions of all countries in the war against war.

The proletarians of all countries have risen simultaneously in a struggle against imperialism; each section of the international has opposed the resistance of the proletariat to the government of its own country, and has mobilized the public opinion of its nation against all bellicose desires. Thus there resulted the grandiose cooperation of the workers of all countries which has already contributed a great deal toward saving the threatened peace of the world. The fear of the ruling class of a proletarian revolution as a result of a world war has proved to be an essential guarantee of peace.

The Congress therefore calls upon the Social-Democratic parties to continue their action by every means that seems appropriate to them. In this concerted action it assigns to each Socialist party its particular task.

The Social-Democratic parties of the Balkan peninsula have a difficult task. The Great Powers of Europe, by the systematic frustration of all reforms, have contributed to the creation of unbearable economic, national, and political conditions in Turkey which necessarily had to lead to revolt and war. Against the exploitation of these conditions in the interest of the dynasties and the bourgeois classes, the Social-Democratic parties of the Balkans, with heroic courage, have raised the demand for a democratic federation. The Congress calls upon them to persevere in their admirable attitude; it expects that the Social-Democracy of the Balkans will do everything after the

war to prevent the results of the Balkan War attained at the price of such terrible sacrifices from being misused for their own purposes by dynasties, by militarism, by the bourgeoisie of the Balkan states greedy for expansion. The Congress, however, calls upon the Socialists of the Balkans particularly to resist not only the renewal of the old enmities between Serbs, Bulgars, Rumanians, and Greeks, but also every violation of the Balkan peoples now in the opposite camp, the Turks, and the Albanians. It is the duty of the Socialists of the Balkans, therefore, to fight against every violation of the rights of these people and to proclaim the fraternity of all Balkans peoples including the Albanians, the Turks, and the Rumanians, against the unleashed national chauvinism.

It is the duty of the Social-Democratic parties of Austria, Hungary, Croatia and Slavonia, Bosnia, and Herzegovina to continue with all their power their effective action against an attack upon Serbia by the Danubian monarchy. It is their task to continue as in the past to oppose the plan of robbing Serbia of the results of the war by armed force, of transforming it into an Austrian colony, and of involving the peoples of Austria-Hungary proper and together with them all nations of Europe in the greatest dangers for the sake of dynastic interests. In the future the Social-Democratic parties of Austria-Hungary will also fight in order that those sections of the South-Slavic people ruled by the House of Hapsburg may obtain the right to govern themselves democratically within the boundaries of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy proper.

The Social-Democratic parties of Austria-Hungary as well as the Socialists of Italy must pay special attention to the Albanian question. The Congress recognizes the right of the Albanian people to autonomy but it protests against Albania, under the pretext of autonomy, becoming the victim of Austro-Hungarian and Italian ambitions for domination. The Congress

sees in this not only a peril for Albania itself, but, in a short time, a menace to the peace between Austria-Hungary and Italy. Albania can lead a truly independent life only as an autonomous member of a democratic Balkan federation. The Congress therefore calls upon the Social-Democrats of Austria-Hungary and Italy to combat every attempt of their governments to envelop Albania in their sphere of influence and to continue their efforts to strengthen the peaceful relations between Austria-Hungary and Italy.

It is with great joy that the Congress greets the protest strikes of Russian workers as a guarantee that the proletariat of Russia and of Poland is beginning to recover from the blows dealt it by the czarist counterrevolution. The Congress sees in this the strongest guarantee against the criminal intrigues of czarism, which, after having drowned in blood the peoples of its own country, after having betrayed the Balkan peoples themselves innumerable times and surrendered them to their enemies, now vacillates between the fear of the consequences that a war would have upon it and the fear of the pressure of a nationalist movement which it has itself created. However, when czarism now tries to appear as the liberator of the Balkan nations, it is only to reconquer its hegemony in the Balkans in a bloody war under this hypocritical pretext. The Congress expects that the urban and rural proletariat of Russia, Finland, and Poland, which is growing in strength, will destroy this web of lies, will oppose every belligerent venture of czarism, will combat every design of czarism, whether upon Armenia or upon Constantinople, and will concentrate its whole force upon the renewal of the revolutionary struggle for emancipation from czarism. For czarism is the hope of all the reactionary powers of Europe, the most terrible enemy of the democracy of the peoples dominated by it; and the achievement of its destruction must be viewed as one of the foremost tasks of the entire International.

However, the most important task within the action of the International devolves upon the working class of Germany, France, and England. At this moment, it is the task of the workers of these countries to demand of their governments that they refuse any support either to Austria-Hungary or Russia, that they abstain from any intervention in the Balkan troubles and maintain absolute neutrality. A war between the three great leading civilized peoples on account of the Serbo-Austrian dispute over a port would be criminal insanity. The workers of Germany and France cannot concede that any obligation whatever to intervene in the Balkan conflict exists because of secret treaties.

However, on further development, should the military collapse of Turkey lead to the downfall of the Ottoman rule in Asia Minor, it would be the task of the Socialists of England, France, and Germany to resist with all their power the policy of conquest in Asia Minor, which would inevitably lead in a straight line to war. The Congress views as the greatest danger to the peace of Europe the artificially cultivated hostility between Great Britain and the German Empire. The Congress therefore greets the efforts of the working class of both countries to bridge this hostility. It considers the best means for this purpose to be the conclusion of an accord between Germany and England concerning the limitation of naval armaments and the abolition of the right of naval booty. The Congress calls upon the Socialists of England and Germany to continue their agitation for such an accord.

The overcoming of the antagonism between Germany on the one hand, and France and England on the other, would eliminate the greatest danger to the peace of the world, shake the power of czarism which exploits this antagonism, render an attack of Austria-Hungary upon Serbia impossible, and secure

peace to the world. All the efforts of the International, therefore, are to be directed toward this goal.

The Congress records that the entire Socialist International is unanimous upon these principles of foreign policy. It calls upon the workers of all countries to oppose the power of the international solidarity of the proletariat to capitalist imperialism. It warns the ruling classes of all states not to increase by belligerent actions the misery of the masses brought on by the capitalist method of production. It emphatically demands peace. Let the governments remember that with the present condition of Europe and the mood of the working class, they cannot unleash a war without danger to themselves. Let them remember that the Franco-German War was followed by the revolutionary outbreak of the Commune, that the Russo-Japanese War set into motion the revolutionary energies of the peoples of the Russian Empire, that the competition in military and naval armaments gave the class conflicts in England and on the Continent an unheard-of sharpness, and unleashed an enormous wave of strikes. It would be insanity for the governments not to realize that the very idea of the monstrosity of a world war would inevitably call forth the indignation and the revolt of the working class. The proletarians consider it a crime to fire at each other for the profits of the capitalists, the ambitions of dynasties, or the greater glory of secret diplomatic treaties.

If the governments cut off every possibility of normal progress, and thereby drive the proletariat to desperate steps, they themselves will have to bear the entire responsibility for the consequences of the crisis brought about by them.

The International will redouble its efforts in order to prevent this crisis; it will raise its protest with increasing emphasis and make its propaganda more and more energetic and comprehensive. The Congress therefore commissions the

International Socialist Bureau to follow events with much greater attentiveness and no matter what may happen to maintain and strengthen the bonds uniting the proletarian parties.

The proletariat is conscious of being at this moment the bearer of the entire future of humankind. The proletariat will exert all its energy to prevent the annihilation of the flower of all peoples, threatened by all the horrors of mass murder, starvation, and pestilence.

The Congress therefore appeals to you, proletarians, and Socialists of all countries, to make your voices heard in this decisive hour! Proclaim your will in every form and in all places; raise your protest in the parliaments with all your force; unite in great mass demonstrations; use every means that the organization and the strength of the proletariat place at your disposal! See to it that the governments are constantly kept aware of the vigilance and passionate will for peace on the part of the proletariat! To the capitalist world of exploitation and mass murder, oppose in this way the proletarian world of peace and fraternity of peoples!

Manifesto of Central Committee. ("Theses on War").

November 1, 1914

Sotsial-Demokrat No. 33

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

First of all, it is the duty of Social Democracy to reveal this true meaning of the war and mercilessly expose the lies, sophisms and "patriotic" phrases spread by the ruling classes, the landlords and the bourgeoisie in defense of the war.

At the head of one group of warring nations stands the German bourgeoisie. It is fooling the working class and the toiling masses by asserting that this is a war in defence of the fatherland, freedom, and civilisation, for the liberation of the peoples oppressed by tsarism, and for the destruction of reactionary tsarism. But in fact, it was precisely this bourgeoisie, servile to the Prussian junkers with Wilhelm II at their head, that was always the most faithful ally of tsarism and

the enemy of the revolutionary movement of the workers and peasants in Russia.

In fact, it is this bourgeoisie, together with the junkers, will direct all its efforts, whatever the outcome of the war, to support the tsarist monarchy against the revolution in Russia.

In fact, the German bourgeoisie has launched a robber campaign against Serbia, with the object of subjugating her and throttling the national revolution of the Southern Slavs, at the same time sending the bulk of its military forces against the freer countries, Belgium, and France, so as to plunder richer competitors.

In fact, the German bourgeoisie, spreading tales of a defensive war on its part, chose the moment it thought most favourable for war, making use of its latest improvements in military matériel, and forestalling the rearmament already planned and decided upon by Russia and France.

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

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

Neither group of belligerents is inferior to the other in spoliation, atrocities and the boundless brutality of war; however, to fool the proletariat and distract its attention from the only genuine war of liberation, namely, a civil war against the bourgeoisie both of its "own" and of "foreign" countries—to achieve so lofty an aim—the bourgeoisie of each country is trying, with the help of false phrases about patriotism, to extol the significance of its "own" national war, asserting that it is out to defeat the enemy, not for plunder and the seizure of territory, but for the "liberation" of all other peoples except its own.

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

It is with a feeling of the most bitter disappointment that we have to record that the socialist parties of the leading European countries have failed to discharge this duty, the behaviour of these parties' leaders, particularly in Germany, bordering on downright betrayal of the cause of socialism. At this time of supreme and historic importance, most of the leaders of the present Socialist International, the Second (1889-1914), are trying to substitute nationalism for socialism. As a result of their behaviour, the workers' parties of these countries did not oppose the governments' criminal conduct, but called upon the

working class to identify its position with that of the imperialist governments.

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

The German and the Austrian Social-Democrats are attempting to justify their support for the war by arguing that they are thereby fighting against Russian tsarism. We Russian Social-Democrats declare that we consider such justification sheer sophistry. In our country the revolutionary movement against tsarism has again assumed tremendous proportions during the past few years. This movement has always been headed by the working class of Russia. The political strikes of the last few years, which have involved millions of workers, have had as their slogan the overthrow of tsarism and the establishment of a democratic republic. During his visit to Nicholas II on the very eve of the war, Poincaré, President of the French Republic, could see for himself, in the streets of St. Petersburg, barricades put up by Russian workers. The Russian proletariat has not flinched from any sacrifice to rid humanity of the disgrace of

the tsarist monarchy. We must, however, say that if there is anything that, under certain conditions, can delay the downfall of tsarism, anything that can help tsarism in its struggle against the whole of Russia's democracy, then that is the present war, which has placed the purses of the British, the French and the Russian bourgeois at the disposal of tsarism, to further the latter's reactionary aims. If there is anything that can hinder the revolutionary struggle of the Russia's working class against tsarism, then that is the behaviour of the German and the Austrian Social-Democratic leaders, which the chauvinist press of Russia is continually holding up to us as an example.

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

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

While the collapse of the Second International has given rise to a sense of burning shame in revolutionary Social-Democrats—as represented by the minority of German Social-Democrats and the finest Social-Democrats in the neutral countries; while socialists in both Britain and France have been speaking up against the chauvinism of most Social-Democratic parties; while the opportunists, as represented, for instance, by the German Sozialistische Monatshefte, which have long held a national-liberal stand, are with good reason celebrating their victory over European socialism—the worst possible service is being rendered to the proletariat by those who vacillate between opportunism and revolutionary Social-Democracy (like the “Centre” in the German Social-Democratic Party), by those who are trying to hush up the collapse of the Second International or to disguise it with diplomatic phrases.

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

The opportunists have wrecked the decisions of the Stuttgart, Copenhagen, and Basle congresses, which made it binding on socialists of all countries to combat chauvinism in all and any conditions, made it binding on socialists to reply to any war begun by the bourgeoisie and governments, with intensified propaganda of civil war and social revolution.

The collapse of the Second International is the collapse of opportunism, which developed from the features of a now bygone (and so-called “peaceful”) period of history, and in recent years has come practically to dominate the International. The opportunist have long been preparing the ground for this collapse by denying the socialist revolution and substituting bourgeois reformism in its stead; by rejecting the class struggle with its inevitable conversion at certain moments into civil war,

and by preaching class collaboration; by preaching bourgeois chauvinism under the guise of patriotism and the defence of the fatherland, and ignoring or rejecting the fundamental truth of socialism, long ago set forth in the Communist Manifesto, that the workingmen have no country; by confining themselves, in the struggle against militarism, to a sentimental, philistine point of view, instead of recognising the need for a revolutionary war by the proletarians of all countries, against the bourgeoisie of all countries; by making a fetish of the necessary utilisation of bourgeois parliamentarianism and bourgeois legality, and forgetting that illegal forms of organisation and propaganda are imperative at times of crises. The natural "appendage" to opportunism—one that is just as bourgeois and hostile to the proletarian, i.e., the Marxist, point of view—namely, the anarcho-syndicalist trend, has been marked by a no less shamefully smug reiteration of the slogans of chauvinism, during the present crisis.

It is impossible to fulfill the tasks of socialism at the present time,, it is impossible to achieve real international rallying without a decisive break with opportunism, and without explaining its inevitable fiasco to the masses.

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

Given the present situation, it is impossible to determine, from the standpoint of the international proletariat, the defeat of which of the two groups of belligerent nations would be the

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

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

Since Russia is most backward and has not yet completed its bourgeois revolution, it still remains the task of Social-Democrats in that country to achieve the three fundamental conditions for consistent democratic reform, viz., a democratic republic (with complete equality and self-determination for all nations), confiscation of the landed estates, and an eight-hour working day. But in all the advanced countries the war has placed on the order of the day the slogan of socialist revolution, a slogan that is the more urgent, the more heavily the burden of war presses upon the shoulders of the proletariat, and the more active its future role must become in the re-creation of Europe, after the horrors of the present "patriotic" barbarism in conditions of the tremendous technological progress of large-scale capitalism. The bourgeoisie's use of wartime laws to gag the proletariat makes it imperative for the latter to create illegal forms of agitation and organisation.

Let the opportunists "preserve" the legal organisations at the price of treachery to their convictions—revolutionary Social-

Democrats will utilise the organisational experience and links of the working class so as to create illegal forms of struggle for socialism, forms appropriate to a period of crisis, and to unite the workers, not with the chauvinist bourgeoisie of their respective countries, but with the workers of all countries. The proletarian International has not gone under and will not go under. Notwithstanding all obstacles, the masses of the workers will create a new International. Opportunism's present triumph will be short-lived. The greater the sacrifices imposed by the war the clearer will it become to the mass of the workers that the opportunists have betrayed the workers' cause and that the weapons must be turned against the government and the bourgeoisie of each country.

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

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

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

Long live a proletarian International, freed from opportunism!

Central Committee of the Russian Social-Democratic Labour Party

Reply of the Central Committee to Vandervelde.

Dear comrade!

Having read your telegram from Russian newspapers, we consider it necessary, on our part, to make the following statement to you: The great conflict that has pitted the main civilized nations among themselves cannot leave R. S.-D indifferent.

This war deeply affects the interests of world democracy; on the one hand, it exposes the French Republic and the British and Belgian democracies to the blows of German semi-feudal militarism, and, on the other hand, leads to the growth of political influence and the strengthening of the despotic monarchy of the Romanovs.

Considering in full measure the anti-democratic character of Prussian hegemony and Prussian militarism, we Russian Social-Democrats cannot forget another no less dangerous enemy of the working class and democracy, namely, Russian absolutism.

In the field of domestic politics, he still remained the spokesman for merciless oppression and unlimited exploitation. Even now, when the war seemed to oblige him to be more cautious, he remains true to his nature and continues the policy of suppressing all democracies, all oppressed nationalities, and especially the working class. At present, all socialist newspapers are closed, workers' organizations are disbanded, arrests and exiles without trial continue.

If the war ends with the complete triumph of the Russian government, if the democratic movement does not triumph, then after the war this government will continue its anti-popular policy both inside and outside, where it can become the center and stronghold of international reaction. Therefore,

the Russian proletariat cannot under any circumstances go hand in hand with our government, cannot conclude any truce with it, even if temporary, and cannot give it any support. There can be no question of any loyalty here. On the contrary, we consider it our urgent task to wage the most implacable struggle against it, standing on the basis of the old demands so unanimously put forward and supported by the Russian working class in the revolutionary days of 1905, and again met with wide recognition in the mass political movement of the Russian working class over the past two years.

Our (immediate) task during the war, in which millions of peasants and proletarians are drawn, is only to counteract the disasters caused by the war by expanding and vigorously developing the class organizations of the proletariat and broad sections of democracy and using the military crisis to prepare the people's consciousness, (facilitating) speedy implementation by the masses of the tasks of 1905.

Our next slogan is the convocation of a constituent assembly. And we are doing this precisely in the interests of that democracy, to whose support you are inviting the Russian S.-D. in your telegram.

RS-D constitutes by no means an unimportant detachment in the ranks of world democracy, and while fighting for its interests, we are at the same time defending the interests of the second, expanding its base and strengthening its forces.

At the same time, we do not think that this struggle of ours runs counter to the interests of European democracy that are dear to all of us. On the contrary, we are convinced that it was the existence of absolutism in Russia that mainly supported reactionary militarism in Europe and made Germany the hegemon in Europe and a dangerous enemy of European democracy.

Moreover, we cannot close our eyes to the future of European socialism and democracy.

After the war, the era of further construction of European democracy will inevitably come. And then, the Russian government, which will emerge from the victorious war with increased strength and prestige, will be one of the strongest obstacles and threats to this democracy. That is why the full use by us of his difficult position in the interests of Russian freedom is your direct duty and, in the final analysis, will turn out to be beneficial precisely for that cause of democracy, which is as close to us as to all members of the International.

The real interests of European and world democracy can be secured not by Russian tsarism, but only by the growth and strengthening of Russian democracy. Thus, from all points of view, history entrusts us with the task of further struggle against the ruling regime in Russia for the next revolutionary slogans.

Only in this way will we render real service to the Russian working class and world democracy and the socialist International, whose role, in our deep conviction; should in the near future, / when summing up the results of this terrible war, inevitably increase, since this war will certainly open the eyes of the backward sections of the working masses and force them to seek salvation from the horrors of militarism and capitalism solely in the implementation of its socialist ideal.

Central Committee' R. S.D. Labor Party.

Greeting of the representative of the Central Committee at the Swedish S.D. Congress.

Dear comrades.

I bring you greetings from the organized proletariat of Russia, from its class organization, R. O.-D. R.P.

I wish the Swedish Social-Democratic working party of success in her work.

At the present moment of general disintegration, when the bourgeoisie of Europe, Western and Eastern, under the guise of national "self-defense" is pursuing an armed policy of conquest, we socialists must raise high our international revolutionary red banner and not allow the waves of reformism to overflow, which during the present criminal war puts into practice his theory of "class unity".

We Russians, and in particular the workers of St. Petersburg, followed with great joy your struggle against the trend that wanted to draw the Swedish people into a world war, and we rejoiced in the highest degree that all attempts in this direction on the part of militaristic salesmen ended in a complete fiasco. in your friendly country.

Allow me to say a few words about our labor movement, which, beginning in 1912, experienced a period of upsurge and was marked by an unusually strong growth in the strike movement, especially the growth of the so-called mass strikes.

To illustrate my point, I will give some figures concerning our struggle.; In 1911 the number of strikers in our vast country reached 105,000; a year later (in 1912) the number of strikers reached 1,070,000, of which 855,000 were political strikes. In 1913, the strike movement was no less broad in character: during it, 1,185,000 took part in strikes, of which 821,000 fall on the political movement, moreover, the official statistics of the

factory inspectorate are not complete, since they do not concern small business and government enterprises.

Cruelty and/or persecution by government authorities and organized capital could not break the solidarity of the Russian working class. This year is a prime example of this. This year the struggle of the workers has intensified to the extreme. All economic and professional clashes, thanks to government repression, quickly turned into a political movement.

The working class reiterated its readiness to fight for a republic, a constituent assembly. for an 8 hour work day.

In July, the political struggle flared up with extraordinary force. The working class of St. Petersburg responded to the bloody provocation of the government with a general strike, which swept over 250,000 workers in St. Petersburg alone. The streets of the city in many places were covered with barricades and workers' blood was shed. The movement has already spread to the provinces and covered the Baltic provinces, Poland, the Caucasus..

Precisely at the very moment when our struggle reached this point, the monster of war approached Us. ! The bourgeoisie has sounded the alarm, its fatherland, the fatherland of the money bag! was in! dangers: Soldiers in gray overcoats, the sons of peasants and workers, reached out to the Borders.

During the days of mobilization, the workers of St. Petersburg quit their jobs and loudly protested against the war. To the sounds of revolutionary songs, with red banners and ribbons, the workers escorted their mobilized comrades to the collection points.

We class-conscious workers did not believe in the possibility of a world war. We turned our hopeful eyes to the West, to our organized brothers, the Germans, the French, the Austrians. We

expected that there we would find support and hear a mighty call to fight against the diabolical conspiracy of the bourgeoisie.

But the bitter reality brought us something else. Government newspapers and bourgeois newspapers, as well as compatriots who fled from abroad, informed us! about treason on the part of leaders stronger than the German, Social-Democratic, and then also many others. who considered the case "from the point of view of national self-defense". But our S.-D. the labor party was not engulfed in a general fire, it has not forgotten the true causes of the present war, to which the policy pursued by the bourgeois governments of all countries of the imperialists has led, the Duma faction correctly expressed the Will of the organized proletariat by refusing to vote on the military budget and kicking the new negative attitude towards wars to those who left the meeting hall. Many local organizations have issued leaflets about the war. (Petersburg, Moscow, Riga, Warsaw, Caucasus, etc!).

The Central Committee of our Party and its "central organ" "Social-Democrat" has entered the struggle against international opportunism and calls on all proletarian revolutionary elements in all countries to this struggle in the name of the common interests of the world proletariat.

In conclusion, I' wish successful sessions of the congress of our fraternal ICRT

Long live the 'Swedish proletariat', and its class Party, Social Democracy!

Declaration of the Central Committee of R.S.D. R.P,
presented to the London Conference by Party delegate
Comrade Maksimovich.

Citizens! Your conference calls itself the conference of the socialist parties of the allied warring countries of Belgium, Britain, France, and Russia. Let me first of all draw attention to the fact that s. e. The party of Russia, as an organized entity, represented by the Central Committee and affiliated with the M.S. Bureau, has not received an invitation from you. Russian S.D, whose views were expressed by members of the Ross. The S. D. Workers' Fraction in the Duma, arrested at the present time by the tsarist government (Petrovsky, Muranov, Samoilov, Badaev, Shagov—representatives of the workers of Petersburg, Yekaterinoslav, Kharkov, Kostroma, and Vladimir provinces) have nothing in common with your conference. We hope that you will publicly state this so as not to be accused of perverting the truth.

Allow me now to say a few words about the purpose of your conference, that is, to say what conscious social workers expected from you. e. workers of Russia.

We think that before entering into any discussion of the question of restoring the International, before attempting to restore international ties between socialist workers, our socialist duty compels us to demand:

- 1) That Vandervelde, Guesde and Samba immediately withdraw from the bourgeois ministries of Belgium and France.
- 2) For the Belgian and French socialist parties to break the so-called. the "national bloc", which is a renunciation of the socialist banner and serves as a cover for the orgies of chauvinism celebrated by the bourgeoisie.

3) That all socialist parties stop their policy of ignoring the crimes of Russian tsarism and resume their support for the struggle against tsarism that the workers of Russia are waging, without stopping at any sacrifice.

4) That, in pursuance of the resolutions of the Basel Congress, it should be declared that we extend our hand to those revolutionary Social Democrats in Germany and Austria who responded to the declaration of war by preparing propaganda for revolutionary action. Voting of war credits must be unequivocally condemned.

The Social Democrats of Germany and Austria have committed a monstrous crime against socialism and the International by voting war credits and making "civil peace" with the junkers, priests and bourgeoisie, but the Belgian and French socialists have done no better. We fully understand that circumstances are possible when socialists, being in a minority, are forced to submit to the bourgeois majority, but under no circumstances should socialists cease to be socialists and join the choir of bourgeois chauvinists, forget about the workers' cause, and enter bourgeois ministries.

The German and Austrian socialists are committing a great crime against socialism when, following the example of the bourgeoisie, they hypocritically assert that the Hohenzollerns and Habsburgs are waging a war for liberation "from tsarism".

But no less crime is committed by those who assert that tsarism is becoming more democratic and civilized, who ignore the fact that tsarism is strangling and ruining unfortunate Galicia, just as the German emperor is strangling and ruining Belgium—and those who are silent about the fact that the tsarist gang threw into prison the parliamentary representatives of the working class of Russia and quite recently sentenced several Moscow workers to 6 years of hard labor for belonging to the village.

party, that tsarism is oppressing Finland worse than before, that the workers' newspapers and workers' organizations in Russia are closed, that the billions demanded by the war are being extorted by the tsarist clique from the hungry peasants and poor workers.

The workers of Russia are comradely stretching out their hand to the socialists who are acting like Karl Liebknecht, like the socialists of Serbia and Italy, like the British comrades from Nez. Slave. Party" and some members of "Br. Social P.", as our arrested comrades from Ross. S. D. R. parties.

We call you to this path, to the path of socialism. Down with chauvinism that ruins proletarian affairs! Long live international socialism!

On behalf of C.K. Ross. S. D. R. parties

M. Maksimovich

London, 14 Feb. 1915".

Proposals Submitted by the Central Committee of the R.S.D.L.P. to the Second Socialist Conference

1. Just as all war is but a continuation by violent means of the politics which the belligerent states and their ruling classes had been conducting for many years, sometimes for decades, before the outbreak of war, so the peace that ends any war can be nothing but a consideration and a record of the actual changes brought about in the relation of forces in the course of and as a result of the war.

An imperialist war, as long as the foundations of present-day, i.e., bourgeois social relations, remain inviolable, can only lead to an imperialist peace, i.e., to strengthening, expanding, and intensifying the oppression of weak nations and countries by financial capital, which is especially; grew enormously not only before this war, but also during it. The objective content of the policy pursued by the bourgeoisie and the governments of both groups of great powers, both before and during the war, leads to increased economic oppression, national enslavement, and political reaction. Therefore, a peace that ends a given war, whatever its outcome, cannot but consist in consolidating this worsening of the economic and political condition of the masses once the bourgeois social system is preserved.

2. To assume the possibility of a democratic peace arising out of an imperialist war means - in theory - to put a vulgar phrase in the place of a historical study of the policy that was carried out before the given war and is being carried out during it; means to deceive the masses of the people in practice obscuring their political consciousness, covering up and embellishing the real policy of the ruling classes preparing the coming world, hiding from the masses the main thing, namely, the impossibility of a democratic world without a series of revolutions.

3. Socialists do not give up to fight for reform. Even now, for example, they must vote in parliament for improvements, however slight, in the condition of the masses, for increased relief to the inhabitants of the devastated areas, for the lessening of national oppression, etc. But it is sheer bourgeois deception to preach reforms as a solution for problems for which history and the actual political situation demand revolutionary solutions. These are the questions placed on the order of the day by this war. These are the fundamental questions of imperialism, i.e., the very existence of capitalist society, the questions of postponing the collapse of capitalism by a re-division of the world to correspond to the new relation of forces among the "Great" Powers, which in the last few decades have developed, not only at fantastic speed, but—and this is particularly important—also with extreme unevenness.

Real political activity changing the balance of social forces in society, and not merely deceiving the masses with words, is now possible only in one of two forms—either helping "one's own" national bourgeoisie to plunder other countries (and calling this "defence of the fatherland" or "salvation of the country"), or to help the proletarian socialist revolution fostering and stirring up the ferment which is beginning among the masses in all the belligerent countries, aiding the incipient strikes and demonstrations, etc., extending and sharpening these as yet weak expressions of revolutionary mass struggle into a general proletarian assault to overthrow the bourgeoisie.

Just as the social-chauvinists are at present deceiving the people by obscuring the question of the real, i.e., imperialist, policy of the capitalists, which is being continued in the present war with hypocritical phrases about the "dishonorable" attack and "honest" defence on the part of this or that group of predatory capitalists, in the same way phrases about a "a democratic peace" serve exclusively to deceive the people, as if the coming

peace, now being prepared by the capitalists and diplomats, could "simply" eliminate the "dishonorable" attack and restore "honest" relations, and was not a continuation, development and consolidation of the same imperialist policy, i.e., the policy of financial robbery, colonial robberies, national oppression, political reaction, and every kind of aggravation of capitalist exploitation.

What the capitalists and their diplomats now need is such "socialist" servants of the bourgeoisie to deafen, dupe and drug the people with talk about a "democratic peace" who would stun, fool, and lull the people with phrases about "democratic peace", cover up their real policy with these phrases, make it difficult for the masses to open their eyes to its essence, distract the masses from revolutionary struggle.

4. It is just such a bourgeois deceit and hypocrisy that the program of a "democratic peace" which the most prominent representatives of the Second International are now busy concocting. For example, Huysmans at the Arnhem Congress and Kautsky in *Die Neue Zeff*, the most authoritative, official, and "theoretical" spokesmen of this International, formulated this programme as suspension of the revolutionary struggle until the imperialist governments have concluded peace; in the meantime, there are verbal repudiation of annexations and indemnities, verbal recognition of the self-determination of nations, democratisation of foreign politics, courts of arbitration to examine international conflicts between states, disarmament, a United States of Europe, etc., etc.

With particular clarity, the real political significance of this "peace program" was revealed by Kautsky when, as proof of the "unanimity of the International" on this question, he cited the unanimous adoption by the London Conference (February 1915) and the Vienna Conference (April 1915) of the main point of this programme, namely, the "independence of nations". In

this way, Kautsky, before the whole world, thus openly gave his sanction to the deliberate deception of the people perpetrated by the social-chauvinists, who combine verbal, hypocritical recognition of "independence" or self-determination of nations, recognition that binds no one and leads nowhere, with support for "their own" governments in the imperialist war, notwithstanding the fact that on both sides the war is accompanied by systematic violations of the "independence" of weak nations and is being waged for the sake of consolidating and extending their oppression.

The objective significance of this most popular "peace program" is to strengthen the subordination of the working class to the bourgeoisie by "reconciling" the workers who are beginning to develop the revolutionary struggle of the workers with their chauvinist leaders, by obscuring the root of the crisis towards socialism in order to return to the state of socialist parties that existed before war and which precisely gave rise to the transition of the majority of the leaders to the side of the bourgeoisie.

The danger of this "Kautskian" policy is all the greater for the proletariat because it is covered up with plausible phrases and is carried on not in Germany alone, but in all countries. In Britain, for instance, this policy is being pursued by the majority of the leaders; in France, by Longuet, Pressemane and others; in Russia, by Axelrod, Martov, Chkheidze and others; Chkheidze is screening the chauvinist idea of "defence of the country" in the present war with the "save the country" phrase, paying lip-service to Zimmerwald, on the one hand, and on the other, praising Huysmans's notorious Arnhem speech in an official declaration by his group: but neither from the floor of the Duma nor in the press has he actually opposed the participation of the workers in the war industries committees, and remains on the staff of newspapers advocating such

participation. In Italy, a similar policy is being pursued by Treves: see the threat made by Avanti!, the Central Organ of the Italian Socialist Party, of March 5, 1916, to expose Treves and other "reformist-possibilists", to expose those "who resorted to every means to prevent the Party Executive and Oddino Morgari from taking action to secure unity at Zimmerwald association and to create a new International", etc., etc.

5. The main "question of peace" at the present time is the question of annexations. And it is on this question that one can most clearly see both the socialist hypocrisy now prevailing and the tasks of truly socialist propaganda and agitation.

It is necessary to clarify what annexation is; why and how the socialists must fight against annexations. Any accession of "foreign" territory cannot be considered an annexation, for, generally speaking, socialists favour the abolition of frontiers between nations and the formation of larger states; nor can every disturbance of the status quo be described as an annexation, for this would be extremely reactionary and a mockery of the fundamental concepts of the science of history; nor can every military seizure of territory be called annexation, for socialists cannot repudiate violence and wars in the interests of the majority of the population.

Annexation should be considered only the annexation of a territory against the will of its population; in other words, the concept of annexation is inextricably linked with the concept of self-determination of nations.

But on the basis of this war, precisely because it is imperialist on the part of both groups of belligerent powers, the phenomenon must have grown and has grown that the bourgeoisie and social-chauvinists are strenuously "fighting" violently against annexations when this is done by an enemy state. This kind of "struggle against annexations" and this kind

of "unanimity" on the question of annexation is plainly sheer hypocrisy. It is clear that those French socialists who advocate a war over Alsace and Lorraine, and those German socialists who do not demand the freedom to secede Alsace and Lorraine, German Poland, etc., from Germany, and those Russian socialists who call "the salvation of the country" the war for the new enslavement of Poland by tsarism, demanding the annexation of Poland to Russia in their "peace without annexations", etc., etc.

In order for the struggle against annexations from being mere hypocrisy, or an empty phrase, to make it really educate the masses in the spirit of internationalism, the question must be presented in such a way as to open the eyes of the masses to the fraud in this matter of annexations, instead of covering it up. It is not enough for the socialists of each country to pay lip-service to the equality of nations or to orate, swear and invoke the name of God to witness their opposition to annexations, The socialists of every country must demand immediate and unconditional freedom to secede for the colonies and nations oppressed by their own "fatherland".

Without this condition, recognition of the self-determination of nations and principles of internationalism would, even in the Zimmerwald Manifesto, at best remain a dead letter.

6. The "peace program" of the socialists, just like their program of "struggle to end the war," must proceed from the exposing the lie of the "democratic peace", the peace-loving intentions of the belligerents, etc., now being spread among the people by demagogic ministers, pacifist bourgeois, Social-chauvinists, and Kautskyites in all countries,.

Any "peace programme" will deceive the people and be a piece of hypocrisy, unless its principal object is to explain to the masses the need for a revolution, and to support, aid, and

develop the mass revolutionary struggles breaking out everywhere (ferment among the masses, protests, fraternization in the trenches, strikes, demonstrations, letters from the front to relatives—for example, in France—urging them not to subscribe to war loans, etc., etc.)

It is the duty of socialists to support, extend and intensify, every popular movement to end the war. But it is actually being fulfilled only by those socialists who, like Liebknecht, in their parliamentary speeches, call upon the soldiers to lay down their arms, and preach revolution and transformation of the imperialist war into a civil war for socialism.

As a positive slogan that draws the masses into the revolutionary struggle and dispels the need for revolutionary measures in order to make a "democratic" peace possible, the slogan of refusing to pay state debts must be raised.

It is not enough that the Zimmerwald Manifesto alludes to revolution by saying that workers must make sacrifices for their own cause, not for someone else's. The masses must be shown their road clearly and definitely. They must know where to go and why. That mass revolutionary actions during the war, if successfully developed, can lead only to the transformation of the imperialist war into a civil war for socialism, this is obvious, and it is harmful to conceal this from the masses. On the contrary, this goal must be clearly indicated, no matter how difficult it may seem to achieve it when we are only at the beginning of the path.

It is not enough to say, as the Zimmerwald Manifesto does, that "the capitalists lie when they speak about defence of the fatherland" in the present war, and that the workers in their revolutionary struggle must not take into account the military situation of their country; it is necessary to state clearly what is merely hinted at here, namely, that not only the capitalists, but

also the social-chauvinists and the Kautskyites lie when they allow the term “defence of the fatherland” to be applied in the present, imperialist war and that revolutionary action during the war is impossible unless “one’s own” government is threatened with defeat; it must be stated clearly that every defeat, of the government in a reactionary war facilitates revolution, which alone is capable of bringing about a lasting and democratic peace.

Finally, it is necessary to tell the masses that without the creation of illegal organizations themselves and a press free from military censorship, i.e., an illegal press, it will be quite impossible to render serious support to the incipient revolutionary struggle, to develop it, to criticise some of its steps, to correct its errors and systematically to extend and sharpen it.

7. But the question of the parliamentary struggle (action) of the socialists, it must be borne in mind that the Zimmerwald resolution not only expresses sympathy for the five Social-Democrats; deputies in the State Duma, who belong to our Party, and who have been sentenced to exile to Siberia, but also expresses its solidarity with their tactics. It is impossible to recognise the revolutionary struggle of the masses while resting content with exclusively legal socialist activity in parliament. This only leads to legitimate dissatisfaction among the workers, and to their departure from Social-Democracy for anti-parliamentary anarchism or syndicalism. It must be stated clearly and publicly that Social-Democratic members of parliament must use their position not only to make speeches in parliament, but also to render all possible aid extra-parliament to the underground organisation and the revolutionary struggle of the workers, and that the masses themselves, through their illegal organisation, must supervise these activities of their leaders.

8. The question of the convening of the International Socialist (MS) Bureau boils down to a fundamental question of principle, i.e., whether the old parties and the Second International can be united. Every step forward taken by the international labour movement along the path outlined by Zimmerwald shows more and more clearly the inconsistency of the position adopted by the Zimmerwald majority; for, on the one hand, it identifies the policy of the old parties and of the Second International with bourgeois policy in the labour movement, with a policy which does not pursue the interests of the proletariat, but of the bourgeoisie (for example, the statement in the Zimmerwald Manifesto that the “capitalists” lie when they speak of “defence of the fatherland” in the present war; also the still more definite statements contained in the circular of the International Socialist Committee of February 10, 1916); on the other hand, the International Socialist Committee is afraid of a break with the International Socialist Bureau and has promised officially to dissolve when the Bureau reconvenes.

We state that not only was such a promise never voted on, but it was never even discussed in Zimmerwald.

The six months since Zimmerwald have proved that actual work in the spirit of Zimmerwald—we are not talking about empty words, but only about work—in our world is connected with the deepening and widening of the split.

In Germany, illegal anti-war leaflets are being printed despite the Party's decisions, that is, in a splitting manner. When Deputy Otto Ruhle, Karl Liebknecht's closest friend, said openly that there were actually two parties in existence, one helping the bourgeoisie, and the other fighting against it, many, including the Kautskyites, scolded him, but no one refuted him. In France, Bourderon, a member of the Socialist Party, is a determined opponent of a split, but at the same time he submits

a resolution to his Party disapproving of the Party's Central Committee and of the parliamentary group (des approuver Comm. Adm. Perm. A Gr. Parl.), which, if adopted, would certainly have caused an immediate split. In Britain, T. Russell Williams, a member of the I.L.P., writing in the moderate Labour Leader, openly admits that a split is inevitable and finds support; in letters written by local functionaries. The example of America could be even more instructive, even in a neutral country, two irreconcilably hostiles have already been discovered: on the one hand, the adherents of so-called "preparedness", that is war, militarism, and navalism, and on the other hand, socialists like Eugene Debs, former presidential candidate from the Socialist Party, who openly preaches civil war for socialism, precisely in connection with the coming war.

In fact, there is already a split throughout the world; two entirely irreconcilable working-class policies in relation to the war have crystallised. We must not close our eyes to this fact; This will only lead to the confusion of the working masses, to the obscuring of their consciousness, in hindering the revolutionary mass struggle with which all Zimmerwaldists officially sympathise, and in strengthening the influence over the masses of those leaders whom the International Socialist Committee, in its circular of February 10, 1916, openly accuses of "misleading" the masses and of hatching a "conspiracy;" (Pact) against socialism.

The bankrupt of International Socialist Bureau will be restored by the social-chauvinists and Kautskyites of all countries. The task of the socialists is to explain to the masses the inevitability of a split with those who pursue a bourgeois policy under the flag of socialism.

Published in Social-Democrat No. 2 54-55, June 10, 1916.

The Position and Tasks of the Socialist International

Sotsial-Demokrat No. 33 November 1, 1914

The gravest feature of the present crisis is the victory of bourgeois nationalism and chauvinism over the majority of official representatives of European socialism. It is with good reason that the bourgeois press of all countries scoff at them, now condescendingly praise them. And there is no task more important for someone who wants to remain a socialist than the elucidation of the causes of the socialist crisis and the analysis of the tasks of the International.

There are people who are afraid to admit the truth that the crisis, or rather the collapse of the Second International, is the collapse of opportunism.

They refer to the unanimity, for example, of the French socialists, to the alleged complete shuffling of the old factions in socialism on the question of their attitude towards war. Such references, however, are groundless.

Advocacy of class collaboration; renunciation of the idea of socialist revolution and revolutionary methods of struggle, adaptation to bourgeois nationalism, oblivion of the historically transient boundaries of nationality or fatherland, turning into a fetish of bourgeois legality, rejection of the class point of view and class struggle for fear of alienating "the broad masses population" (you read: petty bourgeoisie)—such are undoubtedly the ideological foundations of opportunism.

It is on this soil that the present chauvinist and patriotic mood of most Second International leaders has grown. The actual predominance of opportunists among them has long been noted from the most varied angles, by various observations.

The war only brought to light the real extent of this predominance with particular rapidity and sharpness. That the

extraordinary acuteness of the crisis caused a series of reshufflings in the old factions is not surprising. But in general, these shuffling affected only personalities. The directions within socialism remained the same.

There is no complete unanimity among the French socialists. Even Vaillant himself, who, with Guesde, Plekhanov, Hervé and others, is following a chauvinist line, has had to admit that he has received a number of letters of protest from French socialists, who say that the war is imperialist in character and that the French bourgeoisie is to blame for its outbreak no less than the bourgeoisie of any other country. Nor should it be overlooked that these voices of protest are being smothered, not only by triumphant opportunism, but also by the military censorship. With the British, the Hyndman group (the British Social-Democrats—the British Socialist Party has completely sunk into chauvinism, as have also most of the semi-liberal leaders of the trade unions. Chauvinism is rebuffed by MacDonald and Keir-Hurdy of the opportunist Independent Labor Party. This is really the exception to the rule. However, certain revolutionary Social-Democrats who have long been in opposition to Hyndman have now left the British Socialist Party. With the Germans the situation is clear: the opportunists have won; they are jubilant, and feel quite in their element. Headed by Kautsky, the “Centre” has succumbed to opportunism and is defending it with the most hypocritical, vulgar, and self-satisfied sophistry. Protests have come from the revolutionary Social-Democrats—Mehring, Pannekoek, Karl Liebknecht, and a number of unidentified voices in Germany and German-speaking Switzerland.

In Italy too, there is a clear grouping: the extreme opportunists, Bissolati and Co. stand for “fatherland”, for Guesde-Vaillant-Plekhanov-Hervé. The revolutionary Social-Democrats (the Socialist Party), with Avanti! at their head, are combating

chauvinism and are exposing the bourgeois and selfish nature of the calls for war. They have the support of the vast majority of progressive workers.

In Russia, the extreme opportunists from the camp of the liquidators have already raised their voice in defense of chauvinism in abstracts and in the press. P. Maslov and Y. Smirnov are defending tsarism on the pretext that the fatherland must be defended. (Germany, you see, threatens to impose trade agreements on "us" with the "power of the sword", while tsarism, we are expected to believe, has not been using the sword, the knout, and the gallows to stifle the economic, political, and national life of nine-tenths of Russia's population!) They justify socialists participating in reactionary bourgeois governments, and their approval of war credits today and more armaments tomorrow! Plekhanov covering up his Russian chauvinism with Frenchism, and Aleksinsky sank into nationalism. To judge from the Paris Golos, Martov is behaving with more decency than the rest of this crowd, and has come out in opposition to both German and French chauvinism, to Vorwärts, Mr. Hyndman and Maslov, but is afraid to come out resolutely against international opportunism as a whole, and against the German Social-Democratic Centrist group, its most "influential" champion. The attempts to present volunteer service in the army as performance of a socialist duty (see the Paris declaration of a group of Russian volunteers consisting of Social-Democrats and Socialist-Revolutionaries, and also a declaration by Polish Social-Democrats, Leder, and others) have had the backing of Plekhanov alone. These attempts have been condemned by the majority of our Paris Party group. The leading article in this issue will inform readers of our Party Central Committee's stand. In order to avoid any misunderstanding, the following facts relating to the history of our Party's views and their formulation must be stated here. After overcoming tremendous difficulties in re-establishing

organisational contacts broken by the war, a group of Party members first drew up “theses” and on September 6-8 had them circulated among the comrades. Then they were sent to two delegates to the Italo-Swiss Conference in Lugano (September 27), through Swiss Social-Democrats. It was only in mid-October that it became possible to re-establish contacts and formulate the viewpoint of the Party’s Central Committee. The leading article in this issue represents the final wording of the “theses”.

Such, in brief, is the present state of affairs in the European and the Russian Social-Democratic movement. The collapse of the International is a fact. It has been proved conclusively by the polemic, in the press, between the French and German socialists, and acknowledged, not only by the Left Social-Democrats (Mehring and Bremer *Bürger Zeitung*), but by moderate Swiss papers (*Volksrecht*). Kautsky’s attempts to gloss over this collapse are a cowardly subterfuge. The collapse of the International is precisely the collapse of opportunism, which has become a prisoner of the bourgeoisie.

The position of the bourgeoisie is clear. It is no less clear that the **opportunists are blindly echoing bourgeois arguments**. In addition to what has been said in the leading article, we need only mention the insulting statements in *Die Neue Zeit*, suggesting that internationalism consists in the workers of one country shooting down the workers of another country, allegedly in defence of the fatherland!

The question of the fatherland—we tell the opportunists—cannot be posed without due consideration of the concrete historical nature of the present war. This is an imperialist war, which is, a war being waged at a time of the highest development of capitalism, a time of its approaching end. The working class must first “constitute itself within the boundaries of nations”, the Communist Manifesto declares, emphasising

the limits and conditions of our recognition of nationality and fatherland as essential forms of the bourgeois system, and, consequently, of the bourgeois fatherland. The opportunists distort that truth by transferring to the period of the end of capitalism that which was true of the period of its rise.

And about this epoch, about the tasks of the proletariat in its struggle for the destruction not feudalism but capitalism, the Communist Manifesto gives a clear and precise formula: "The workingmen have no country." One can well understand why the opportunists are so afraid to accept this socialist proposition, afraid even, in most cases, openly to reckon with it. The socialist movement cannot triumph within the old framework of the fatherland. It creates new and superior forms of human society, in which the legitimate needs and progressive aspirations of the working masses of each nationality will, for the first time, be met through international unity, provided existing national partitions are removed. To the present-day bourgeoisie's attempts to divide and disunite them by means of hypocritical appeals for the "defence of the fatherland" the class-conscious workers will reply with ever new and persevering efforts to unite the workers of various nations in the struggle to overthrow the rule of the bourgeoisie of all nations.

The bourgeoisie is duping the masses by disguising imperialist plunder with the old ideology of a "national war". The proletariat exposes this deception by proclaiming the slogan of turning the imperialist war into a civil war. It was precisely this slogan that was outlined by the Stuttgart and Basel resolutions, which, in fact, did not foresee a war in general, but precisely the present war, and which spoke not of "defending the fatherland", but of "accelerating the collapse of capitalism", of using the crisis created by the war for this purpose, of example

of the Commune. The Commune was the transformation of the war of nations into civil war.

Such a transformation, of course, is not easy and cannot be carried out "at the will" of individual parties. But precisely such a transformation lies in the objective conditions of capitalism in general, and the era of the end of capitalism in particular. It is in this direction, only in this direction, that socialists must conduct their work. Not to vote for war credits, not to indulge the chauvinism in their "own" country (and allied countries), but primarily to strive against the chauvinism of their "own" bourgeoisie, without confining themselves to legal forms of struggle when the crisis has matured and the bourgeoisie has itself taken away the legality it has created. Such is the line of action that leads to civil war, and will bring about civil war at one moment or another of the European conflagration.

War is not an accident, not a "sin" as is thought by Christian priests (who are no whit behind the opportunists in preaching patriotism, humanity, and peace), but an inevitable stage of capitalism, just as legitimate a form of the capitalist way of life as peace is. Present-day war is a people's war. What follows from this truth is not that we must swim along the "popular" current of chauvinism, but that the class contradictions dividing the nations continue to exist in wartime and manifest themselves in conditions of war. Refusal to serve with the forces, anti-war strikes, etc., are sheer nonsense, the miserable and cowardly dream of an unarmed struggle against the armed bourgeoisie, vain yearning for the destruction of capitalism without a desperate civil war or a series of wars.

It is the duty of every socialist to conduct propaganda of the class struggle, in the army as well; work directed towards turning a war of the nations into civil war is the only socialist activity in the era of an imperialist armed conflict of the bourgeoisie of all nations.

Down with the priestly sentimental and stupid sighs about "peace at all costs!".

Raise the banner of civil war.

Imperialism has staked the fate of European culture: unless there are a series of successful revolutions, will soon be followed by other wars—the tale of the "last war" is an empty, harmful tale, a petty-bourgeois "mythology" (to use the correct expression of Golos).

The proletarian banner of civil war , if not today, then tomorrow, if not during the present war, then in the next war, will rally together, not only hundreds of thousands of class-conscious workers but millions of semi-proletarians and petty bourgeois, now deceived by chauvinism, but whom the horrors of war will not only intimidate and depress, but also enlighten, teach, arouse, organise, steel, and prepare for the war against the bourgeoisie of their "own" country and "foreign" countries.

The Second International died defeated by opportunism.

Down with opportunism, and long live the Third International, purged not only of "defectors"(as Golos wishes), but of opportunism as well.

The Second International has done its share of useful preparatory work in preliminarily organising the proletarian masses during the long, "peaceful" period of the most brutal capitalist slavery and most rapid capitalist progress in the last third of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries.

The Third International is faced with the task of organising the proletarian forces for a revolutionary onslaught against the capitalist governments, for civil war against the bourgeoisie of all countries for the capture of political power, for the triumph of socialism!

International and the "defence of the fatherland".

It is not true that the International paid little attention to the question of war. Almost every international socialist congress has dealt with this question. It is enough to recall the facts.

The Old International devoted two resolutions to this question at two congresses. The Second International dwelled on this question in 8 resolutions at 8 congresses. And besides that, he also touched on this issue in 5 resolutions dedicated specifically to colonial policy.

Further, it is not true that the International taught the workers that all they had to do was establish whether a given war was defensive, so that by doing so the question would already be settled and they would only have to shoulder their guns and go and exterminate the "enemy".

Whoever takes the trouble to acquaint himself with the genuine decisions of both the First and Second Internationals will be convinced that not a single such resolution has ever been adopted.

Let's take a look at these solutions.

In 1867, the Old International at the Congress in London gives the first detailed resolution on the attitude towards the war. The culminating point of this resolution is the indication that "to abolish war it is not enough to abolish standing armies, but it is necessary to change the entire social system."

Only one practical step has been outlined: entry into the bourgeois-democratic Peace League (with which, to put it in parentheses, a break soon occurred).

In 1867, at the Brussels Congress, the International "recommends to the workers, in particular, the cessation of work in case of outbreak of war in their country."

At a conference in 1888 in London, Social-Democratic deputies are instructed to seek the establishment of arbitration courts to deal with conflicts between individual states.

The General Council of the old International in 1866, at the beginning of the Austro-Prussian war, adopts a resolution in which it recommends that the proletariat look at this conflict as a feud between two despots and use the situation that has arisen for their own liberation.

In an address to trade unions (July 1868), the same General Council, which, as you know, was led by Karl Marx, wrote:

“The basis of the social system should be the brotherhood of working people, free from petty national envy. “Labor has no homeland.”*)).

**) Paraphrase of the famous statement of the Communist Manifesto: “The workers have no fatherland” —a proposition which “in modern times” is recognized as “outdated” not only by the Südekums and Bernsteins, but also by Plekhanov. Note, the author.*

Such are the decisions of the First International.

At the first congress of the new International (Paris 1889), a detailed anti-military resolution was adopted. The main demand is the replacement of the standing army by the people's militia.

In 1891 (Brussels), the congress “in view of the situation in Europe, which becomes more and more threatening every year, and in view of the chauvinist incitements of the ruling classes, calls on all working people to protest in uninterrupted agitation against all attempts at war and ... declares that in any case, responsibility ... lays on the ruling classes.

In 1893 (Zurich) the congress declares:

“The international revolutionary social democracy of all countries must rise up with all its energy against the chauvinist desires of the ruling classes.

Representatives of the workers' party are obliged to reject all loans for military needs and to protest against standing armies.

In 1896 (London) Congress declares:

"The working class in all countries must resist the violence resulting from the war, just as it resists every violence that the ruling classes use against it."

In Paris (1900), the International categorically decides:

"Socialist deputies of all countries are absolutely obliged to vote against any expenditure on militarism, navalism, or colonial expeditions."

In Stuttgart (1907), after a thorough discussion of the issue, the International adopts a detailed resolution, in which the following is the central point:

“If a war does break out, the socialists are obliged to intervene in order to put an end to it as soon as possible and to make every possible use of the economic and political crisis caused by the war in order to raise the people and thereby hasten the fall of capitalist domination.”

In Copenhagen (1910) the Stuttgart resolution was confirmed and once again the International declares that it is the "invariable duty" of the deputies to vote against all war credits.

At the Basel Congress (November 1912), convened during the Balkan War, the International comes forward with a direct threat of revolution if the criminal governments lead to a European war.

“Let the governments not forget,” declares the Congress of Basel, “that the Franco-Prussian war caused the revolutionary outburst of the Commune, that the Russo-Japanese war set in motion the revolutionary forces of the peoples who are feeding Russia...

The proletarians consider it a crime to shoot at each other—in the name of the profits of the capitalists, the competition of dynasties, and the prosperity of secret diplomatic treaties.”

And commenting on the Basel resolution, not only Jaurès declared:

“We do not go to war against our brothers, we will not shoot at them: if it comes to a collision, then—a war on another front, then—a revolution,” but even Victor Adler categorically proclaimed:

“The hour is approaching when the proletariat will use the instrument of revenge that is in its hands; the proletariat will come forward with an indictment; and the hour is coming when the working class also will have in their hand the sword with which they will carry out the guilty verdict” (quoted from Basler Vorwärts. No. 277).

This is the language in which the International has hitherto spoken. In vain would you seek in his decisions the blessings of wars, even if they were “defensive.”

He gave instructions on how to fight against war, how to act when it comes. He said: we must vote against credits, rouse the masses to fight, prepare for a civil war (remember the instructions to the Commune), he said that wars are the violence of the commanding classes against the workers, that wars are the product of the entire capitalist system. He called for war against modern warfare.

In his resolutions on colonial policy, in spite of the revisionists who wanted to pursue a "socialist" colonial policy, he said more than once that the wars of the capitalist period are wars exclusively over the seizure of foreign lands, the robbery of rivals, wars over markets and billions.

And now—how the International has been disgraced by the social-chauvinists of various countries!

The International never said that the socialists must "defend the fatherland" in every defensive war. In an era of **imperialist wars, this would be sheer nonsense.** There was a time when Kautsky himself wrote:

... "In the given world-political situation, it is impossible even to imagine a war in which it would be possible to allow the proletariat or democracy to be interested in defense or attack. Of course, the principles of democracy oblige us to defend national independence, and the principles of internationalism dictate to us the defense of the independence of each nation. But nowhere is the independence of those great nations now threatened, which must be taken into account in war. The only danger of war now threatens from the colonial world politics, in relation to which the proletariat from the very beginning takes a sharply negative position ... In this state of affairs, it is not necessary to assure the government that it can count on the enthusiasm of the workers if, as a result of its foreign policy, it is attacked by an external enemy, but every war must be branded as a crime against the interests of the people, which may arise." (See "Neue Zeit" 1907. pp. 855-).

In 1907 Kautsky did not yet allow himself to be reduced to the role of a "learned" interpreter and government "theoretician" under Messrs. Südekum and Haase.

Then he understood that the impending war could only be an imperialist one, then he knew that the German Fatherland was in no danger of losing national independence, that defending the principle of national independence did not at all mean marrying the Social Democratic Party with the Prussian Junkers... In the imperialist wars that characterize the entire epoch, the attacking side may tomorrow turn out to be on the defensive, and vice versa.

For this alone, the International could not issue a slogan: always and in all cases, support a defensive war and those countries that have fallen on the defensive.

We must not confuse individual unsuccessful statements by individual leaders of socialism with the opinions of the International. The International has repeatedly spoken out in favor of national self-determination. It's right. As early as Copenhagen (1910) he recommended "defending the right of all peoples to self-determination". The same statements were made by the old International. But can this apply to a typical imperialist war, such as the war of 1914?!

"The difference between an offensive and a defensive war in general is in most cases very doubtful," wrote Kautsky himself in 1905 (see his "Patriotism")

And in 1907, at the Essen Party Congress, the same Kautsky, objecting to Bebel, said:

"In fact, for us, in the event of war, the question will not be about this or that separate nation, because the war between the big powers will become a world war, it will affect not only two countries.

And it turns out that one fine day the German government will try to fool the German workers that Germany was attacked, and the French government will do the same in France. And then

we would be witnessing a war in which the French and German proletarians, with equal enthusiasm, following their governments, would cut each other's throats. No, the criterion of a defensive war, i.e., "defence of the fatherland," is no good for socialists. We are not against any war.

In 1848 Marx and Engels preached an offensive German religious war against Russia, The New Rhine Gazette wrote:

“Only a war against Russia is a war for revolutionary Germany, a war in which she will redeem the sins of the past, in which she can acquire a spirit of cheerfulness, where she can defeat her own autocrats.”

But how far is this from what Südeku-we and Haase are doing now, who are actually helping "their own autocrats" to tighten the noose around the neck of the German proletariat! The International has never justified or preached what the social-chauvinists have now done in Germany, Austria, France, and Belgium.

A simple collection of resolutions of the International could serve as the best indictment against the opportunists who thwarted these decisions and thereby led the International itself to collapse.

The opportunists were very strong in the Second International. But not so much as to openly carry out in his name the “patriotism” that Haase and Vaillant and Herve and Südekum are now vying with each other. And when opportunism and chauvinism triumphed for a time in the main European parties, the Second International ceased to exist.

It will be replaced by a new International.

Social-Democrat No. 35. Lenin.

On the split with the opportunists.

From Article, "Dead Chauvinism and Living Socialism"

The European war means the greatest historical crisis, a new era has begun.

Like any crisis, the war exacerbated deep-seated contradictions and brought them out, tearing all hypocritical veils, discarding all conventions, destroying rotten or rotten authorities (this, in parentheses, is the beneficial and progressive effect of all crises, incomprehensible only to stupid fans "peaceful evolution).

The Second International, having existed 25-15 years (depending on whether you count from 1870 or 1889) to do the extremely important and useful work of spreading socialism in breadth and the preparatory, initial, simplest organization of its forces, played its historical role and died, defeated not as much von Klukami as opportunism.

Let the dead now bury the dead.

Let the empty-headed troublemakers (if not the intriguing lackeys of the chauvinists and opportunists) "work" now to bring the Vandervelds and Sanba together with Kautsky and Haase, as if we were in front of Ivan Ivanovich, who called Ivan Nikiforovich a "goose" and was in need of a friendly pushing towards the enemy.

An International does not mean sitting at the same table and having hypocritical and pettifogging resolutions written by people who think that genuine internationalism consists in German socialists justifying the German bourgeoisie's call to shoot down French workers, and in French socialists justifying the French bourgeoisie' call to shoot down German workers in the name of the "defence of the fatherland"! The International consists in the coming together (first ideologically, then in due time organizationally as well) of people who, in these grave

days, are capable of defending socialist internationalism in deed, i.e., of mustering their forces and “being the next to shoot” at the governments and the ruling classes of their own respective “fatherlands”. This is no easy task; it calls for much preparation and great sacrifices and will be accompanied by reverses. However, for the very reason that it, is no easy task, it must be accomplished only together with those who wish to perform it and are not afraid of a complete break with the chauvinists and with the defenders of social-chauvinism.

Most of all, for the sincere, and not for the hypocritical, restoration of the socialist, and not the chauvinist, International, such people as Pannekoek, who wrote in the article "The Collapse of the International":

“If the leaders come together and try to patch up the differences, it won’t matter.”

Let's show openly what we have: the war will force us to do if not tomorrow, then after tomorrow.

There are three currents in international socialism:

- 1) chauvinists who consistently pursue a policy of opportunism,
- 2) consistent enemies of opportunism, who are already beginning to make themselves known in all countries (the opportunists have mostly beaten them on their heads, but "defeated armies learn well") and who are capable of carrying on revolutionary work in the direction of civil war;
- 3) confused and vacillating people who are now trailing after the opportunists and doing the most harm to the proletariat by their hypocritical attempts to justify opportunism in an almost scientific and Marxist method

Part of those who perish in this third current can be saved and returned to socialism, but not otherwise than by the policy of the most decisive break and split with the first current, with everyone who is able to justify the voting of credits, "defence of the fatherland", "subordination to the laws of wartime", satisfaction with legality, renunciation of civil war. Only those who pursue this policy actually build the Socialist International. For our part, having established relations with the Russian collegium of the Central Committee and with the leading elements of the St. Petersburg labor movement, having exchanged ideas with them and convinced ourselves that there is solidarity in the main, we can, like the editors of the Central Committee, declare on behalf of our Party that only in such a direction is work carried out by the Party and Social-Democrats.

The split of the German Social-Democrats seems to be an idea that frightens many too much because of its "extraordinary".

But the objective position guarantees that either this extraordinary thing will happen (after all, Adler and Kautsky did declare, at the last session of the International Socialist Bureau in July 1914, that they did not believe in miracles, and therefore did not believe in a European war!) or we will be witnesses to the painful decay of what was once the German Social-Democrats.

Those who are too accustomed to "believing" in the German Social-Democrats we will only recall in conclusion how people who have been our opponents for many years on a whole series of issues approach the idea of such a split - like L. Martov wrote in Golos: "Vorwärts is dead", the Socialist-Democracy, who publicly announces the renunciation of the class struggle, would do better if openly acknowledges the facts as they are, temporarily dissolve its organization, close its organs; — as Plekhanov, according to the report of Golos, said in his lecture:

“I am a big opponent of splits, but if principles are sacrificed for the integrity of organizations, then a split is better than a false unity.”

Plekhanov was referring to the German radicals: he sees the mote in the eye of the Germans and does not see the log in his own eye. This is his individual feature, to which we are all too accustomed over the past 10 years of Plekhanov's **radicalism in theory and opportunism in practice.**

But even if people with such individual ... oddities talk about a split among the Germans, then this is a sign of the times.

N. Lenin. ,December 12, 1914

From Art. "Dead Chauvinism and Living Socialism". S.-D. No. 35.

Several Theses

Taking into account the instructions of the comrades from Russia, we formulate several theses on topical questions of Social-Democratic work:

(1)The slogan of a “constituent assembly” is wrong as an independent slogan, because the question now is: who will convene it? The liberals accepted that slogan in 1905 because it could have been interpreted as meaning that a “constituent assembly” would be convened by the tsar and would be in agreement with him. The most correct slogans are the “three pillars” (a democratic republic, confiscation of the landed estates and an eight-hour working day), with the addition (cf. No. 9) of a call for the workers’ international solidarity in the struggle for socialism and the revolutionary overthrow of the belligerent governments, and against war.

(2)We are opposed to participation in military-industrial committees, which help prosecute the imperialist and reactionary war. We are in favour of utilising the election campaign; for instance, we are for participation in the first stage of the elections for the sole purpose of agitation and organisation. There can be no talk of boycotting the Duma. Participation in the second ballot is absolutely necessary. While we have no Duma deputies from our Party, we must utilise everything that happens in the Duma so as to advance the aims of revolutionary Social-Democracy.

(3) We consider the most immediate and urgent tasks to be the strengthening and expansion of Social-Democratic work among the proletariat, and then extending it to the rural proletariat, to the rural poor and to the army. It is revolutionary Social-Democracy’s most pressing task to develop the incipient strike movement, and to conduct it under the slogan of the “three pillars”. In agitation it is necessary to give due place to

the demand for an immediate end to the war. Among other demands, the workers must not lose sight of the demand for the immediate reinstatement of the workers' deputies, members of the R.S.D.L. Duma group.

(4) The Soviets of Workers' Deputies and other institutions must be regarded as organs of insurrection, as organs of revolutionary power. Only in connection with the development of mass politics, the strike, and in connection with the insurrection, in proportion as it is prepared, developed, and succeeded, can these institutions be of lasting benefit.

5) The social content of the next revolution in Russia can only be the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry. The revolution cannot win in Russia without overthrowing the monarchy and the feudal landlords. And they cannot be overthrown without the support of the proletariat by the peasantry. A step forward in the stratification of the countryside into "farmer landlords" and rural proletarians did not abolish the oppression of the Markovs and Co. over the countryside. We stood for the need for a separate organization of the rural proletarians and stand unconditionally, in all and any cases.

(6) The task of the Russian proletariat is to complete the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia in order to ignite the socialist revolution in Europe, this second task has now come extremely close to the first, but it still remains a special and second task, because it is a question of the different classes which are collaborating with the proletariat of Russia; for the first task, the collaborator is the petty-bourgeois peasantry of Russia, for the second, the proletariat of other countries.

(7) Participation of the Social-Democrats. in the provisional revolutionary government, together with the democratic petty

bourgeoisie, we still consider it acceptable, but not with the revolutionary chauvinists.

(8)By revolutionary chauvinists we mean those who want a victory over tsarism so as to achieve victory over Germany, plunder other countries, consolidate Great-Russian rule over the other peoples of Russia, etc. The basis of revolutionary chauvinism is the class position of the petty bourgeoisie. It always wavers between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. At present it is vacillating between chauvinism (which prevents it from being consistently revolutionary, even in the meaning of a democratic revolution), and proletarian internationalism. At the moment the Trudoviks, the Socialist-Revolutionaries, *Nasha Zarya*, Chkheidze's Duma group, the Organising Committee, Plekhanov, and the like are political spokesmen for this petty bourgeoisie in Russia.

(9)If the revolutionary chauvinists won in Russia, we would be opposed to a defence of their "fatherland" in the present war. Our slogan is: against the chauvinists, even if they are revolutionary and republican against them, and for an alliance of the international proletariat for the socialist revolution.

(10) To the question whether the leading role of the proletariat in the bourgeois Russian revolution is possible, we answer: yes, it is possible if the petty bourgeoisie sways to the left at decisive moments, and it is pushed to the left not only by our propaganda, but also by a number of objective factors, economic, financial (severity of war), military, political, etc.

(11)To the question of what the party of the proletariat would do if the revolution placed power in its hands in the present war, our answer is: we would offer peace to all those fighting on the condition of the liberation of the colonies and all dependent, oppressed, and deprived peoples. Under the present governments, neither Germany, nor Britain and France

would accept this condition. In that case, we would have to prepare for and wage a revolutionary war, i.e., not only resolutely carry out the whole of our minimum programme, but work systematically to bring about an uprising among all peoples now oppressed by the Great Russians, all colonies, and dependent countries in Asia (India, China, Persia, etc.), and also, and first and foremost, we would raise up the socialist proletariat of Europe for an insurrection against their governments and despite the social-chauvinists.

There is no doubt that a victory of the proletariat in Russia would create extraordinarily favourable conditions for the development of the revolution in both Asia and Europe. This was proved even in 1905. And the international solidarity of the revolutionary proletariat is a fact, despite the dirty wave of opportunism and social-chauvinism.

In presenting these theses for an exchange of opinions with comrades, we shall develop our views in the following issues of the Central Organ.

S.-D. No. 47,

N. Lenin.

Zimmerwald Left.

Draft manifesto submitted to the conference by a left group of delegates (C. K. R. S.-D. R. P., Polish opposition, Social-Democratic Lat. region, Sweden, and Norwegian, German and Swiss delegate).

Proletarians of Europe!

The war has been going on for over a year now. The battlefields are littered with millions of corpses; millions more have been crippled for the rest of their lives. The battlefields are strewn with millions of corpses, millions of cripples are condemned for life to be a burden to themselves and others. The war has caused terrible devastation, it will entail an unprecedented increase in taxes.

The capitalists of all countries, who at the cost of the blood shed by the proletarians make enormous profits during the war, demand from the masses of the people that they intensify their efforts and hold out to the end.

They say: the war is needed to defend the fatherland; it is waged in the interests of democracy. They lie!

In no country did the capitalists go to war because the independence of their country was endangered, or because they wanted to liberate some enslaved people. They have led the masses to the slaughter because they want to oppress and exploit other peoples. They could not agree among themselves how to divide the remaining independent peoples of Asia and Africa, they lay in wait for each other, trying to snatch the already captured prey from each other.

It is not for their own Liberty, not for the liberation of other peoples, that the masses of the people bleed in all parts of the vast slaughter called Europe.

This war will bring a new burden, new chains to the proletariat of Europe and the peoples of Asia and Africa.

Therefore, this fratricidal war has no point in being waged to the end, to the last drop of blood: on the contrary, it is necessary to exert every effort to put an end to it.

The time for this has already come.

First, you must demand that your socialist deputies, whom you sent to parliament to fight capitalism, militarism, and the exploitation of the people, do their duty.

All of them, with the exception of Russian, Serbian, Italian, and with the exception of Liebknecht and Rühle, trampled on this duty and either supported the bourgeoisie in its predatory war, or vacillated and shied away from responsibility; you must demand that they either resign their mandates or use the parliamentary rostrum in order to explain to the people the nature of the present war and, outside parliament, help the working class to start their struggle again; your first demand must be to refrain from voting on all military credits, to withdraw from the ministries of France, Belgium and England.

But this is not enough!

The deputies cannot save us from a rabid beast, a world war that drinks your blood. You must act yourself. You must use all your organizations, all your publications in order to arouse indignation against it among the broad masses, groaning under the burden of war. You must go out into the street and throw the cry in the face of the ruling classes: "Enough massacre!"

Let the ruling classes remain deaf to it; the discontented masses of the people will hear it and join us to take part in the struggle.

It is necessary immediately and vigorously to demand an end to the war, it is necessary to loudly protest against the

exploitation of some peoples by others, against the division of individual nationalities between different states. All this will take place with the victory of any capitalist government that will be able to dictate to others the terms of peace.

If we leave the capitalists to make peace in the same way they started the war: without the participation of the masses of the people, new conquests will not only strengthen reaction in the victorious country, the rule of police arbitrariness, but the seeds of new, even more terrible wars will be sown.

The overthrow of the capitalist governments is the goal that the working class of all the belligerent countries must set for itself, because only then will there be an end to the exploitation of some peoples by others, an end to wars, when the power to control the life and death of peoples will be wrested from the hands of capital. Only peoples liberated from want and calamity, from the domination of capital, will be able to organize their mutual relations not through wars, but through friendly agreements.

Great is the goal that we set, great are the efforts required to achieve it, great will be the sacrifices before the goal is achieved.

Long road to victory. Peaceful means of pressure will not be enough to overcome the enemy.

But only when you are ready to make part of those incalculable sacrifices that you make on the battlefield for the sake of the interests of capital, for the sake of your own liberation, fighting capital, only then will you be able to put an end to the war, lay the real foundation for a lasting peace that from slaves of capital will turn you into free people.

If, however, the false phrases of the bourgeoisie and the socialist parties supporting them keep you from vigorous struggle, and you are satisfied with sighing, not wanting to

attack, to give your soul and body for a great cause, then capital will continue to squander your blood and property at its own discretion.

In all countries, the number of those who think like us is growing every day: on their behalf, we, representatives of various countries, have gathered to address you with this call to struggle.

We will lead it, supporting each other, since no interests divide us.

It is necessary that the revolutionary workers of every country consider it their duty and right of honor to be a model for others, a model of energy and self-sacrifice. Not fearful waiting to see what the struggle of others will lead to, but the struggle in the forefront—this is the road that leads to the formation of a mighty International that will put an end to wars and capitalism.

World War and the Tasks of Social Democracy.

(Draft resolution introduced by the left Zimmerwald).

The world war, which has been devastating Europe for a year now, is an imperialist war waged for the political and economic exploitation of the world, for markets, sources of raw materials, areas for investment of capital, etc. It is a product of capitalist development, which, on the one hand, binds the whole world into one economic whole, and on the other hand allows the existence of independent state-national groups of capitalists with opposing interests.

By trying to obscure this character of the war by asserting that it is a forced struggle for national independence, the bourgeoisie and the governments are misleading the proletariat, for the war is waged precisely for the enslavement of foreign peoples and countries. In the same way, the legends about the defense of democracy with the help of this war are false, because imperialism means the most shameless domination of big capital and political reaction.

Imperialism can only be overcome by eliminating the contradictions that created it, by means of the socialist organization of the advanced capitalist countries, for which the objective conditions are already ripe.

When the war broke out, most of the leaders of the workers' parties did not counter imperialism with this, the only possible slogan. Seized by nationalism, divided by opportunism, at the time of the world war they betrayed the proletariat headlong to imperialism, renouncing the basic principles of socialism and, consequently, any real struggle for the interests of the proletariat.

Social-patriotism and social-imperialism, the point of view of which in Germany is held both by the openly patriotic majority

of the former Social-Democratic leaders, and by the center of the Party, which is in opposition, groups around Kautsky, in France and in With the Party and the majority, in England and Russia individual leaders (Hyndman, the Fabians, the trade unionists, Plekhanov, Rubanovich, the Nasha Zarya group) **are a more dangerous enemy for the proletariat than the bourgeois preachers of imperialism.** By misusing the banner of socialism, he can mislead the unconscious part of the proletariat. A ruthless struggle against social-imperialism is the first necessary prerequisite for the mobilization of the proletariat and the restoration of the International.

It is the task of socialist parties and of socialist oppositions within parties that have gone over to social-imperialism to arouse and lead the masses of workers to revolutionary struggle against the capitalist governments and to conquer political power for the socialist organisation of society.

Without ceasing the struggle within the framework of capitalism for every reform that strengthens the proletariat, without abandoning any means of organizing and mobilizing the proletariat, the revolutionary Social Democrats must, on the contrary, use every struggle, every reform required in our program—at least reform—to in order to exacerbate every social and political crisis of capitalism in general, as well as the crisis caused by the war, and turn this struggle into an attack on the fundamental foundations of capitalism. This struggle under the slogan of socialism will make unacceptable to the masses the slogan that manifests itself in supporting the domination of one nation over another, in cries for the need for new annexations. This struggle will make the masses deaf to the speeches of national solidarity, the speeches that have drawn the workers to the battlefields.

The beginning of this struggle is the struggle against world war, the struggle for the speediest possible end to human slaughter.

This struggle requires the rejection of all military credits; withdrawal from the ministries; exposure from the parliamentary platform, in the legal and, if necessary, in the illegal press, of the capitalist, anti-socialist character of the present war; the sharpest struggle against social patriotism; the use of every popular movement caused by the consequences of the war (need, heavy losses, etc.) to organize anti-government demonstrations; promoting international solidarity in the trenches; facilitating economic strikes and turning them into political strikes under favorable circumstances. Our slogan is not civil peace between classes, but civil war!

Contrary to any illusions that the decisions of diplomats and governments can create the basis for a lasting peace, lay the foundation for disarmament. revolutionary Social Democrats must constantly point out to the masses that only a social revolution can bring lasting peace and the emancipation of all mankind.

This draft resolution was signed by two representatives of the C.K.R.S.-D. R. P. Zinoviev and Lenin, representatives of the opposition of the Polish Social-Democrats, K. Radek and Social-Democrats. Latvian, region Winter, representatives of the left S.-D. Sweden, 3. Häglund and Norway Thure Nerman, Swiss delegate Fr. Nlatten and one German delegate. When voting on the issue of submitting this draft to the commission, 12 delegates voted (8-2 Socialist-Revolutionaries, Trotsky, Roland Golst), the rest 19 voted against.

Manifesto of the International Socialist Conference in Zimmerwald (Switzerland).

The war has lasted more than a year. The battlefields are littered with millions of corpses; millions more have been crippled for the rest of their lives. Europe is like a gigantic slaughterhouse. Its entire civilization, created through the labour of many generations, is consigned to destruction. Fierce barbarity celebrates its triumph over everything that was until now the pride of humankind.

Regardless of the truth regarding immediate responsibility for the outbreak of this war, one thing is clear: the war that produced this chaos is the result of imperialism, the striving by capitalist classes of each nation to feed their greed for profit through exploitation of human labour and natural resources around the entire globe.

In this way, economically backward or politically weak nations are subjugated by the great powers, who seek to utilize the war to redraw the world map through blood and iron in accord with their exploitative interests. In this way entire peoples and countries, like Belgium, Poland, the Balkan states, and Armenia, risk being partly or entirely torn apart and annexed.

As the war proceeds, its driving forces are revealed in their full depravity. Shred by shred, the veil that has concealed the nature of this global catastrophe from the masses' awareness falls away. Capitalists of every country, who coin the red gold of war profits from the blood spilled by the people, claim that this war serves to defend the fatherland, democracy, and liberation of oppressed peoples. They lie! In actual fact, they are burying on the fields of destruction the freedom of their own peoples along with the independence of other nations. New fetters, new chains, new burdens are arising that will weigh down on the proletariat of all countries, both the victors and

vanquished. When the war broke out, it was said to herald better living standards, but the real results are privation and want, unemployment and inflation, malnutrition, and epidemics. Paying the costs of war will consume the peoples' best energies for decades, imperiling the achievements of social reform and hindering every step forwards.

Cultural devastation, economic decline, political reaction: these are the blessings bestowed by this abominable conflict of nations.

The war thus reveals the naked form of modern capitalism, now incompatible not only with the interests of the working masses and the requirements of historical development, but with the basic requirements of the human community.

The ruling powers of capitalist society, who held the fate of nations in their hands--both monarchist and republican governments, secret diplomacy, the powerful business groups, the bourgeois parties, the capitalist press, the church--all of them bear the full weight of responsibility for this war, which arose from the social organization that nourishes these institutions and is defended by them--a war waged on behalf of their interests.

Workers!

Exploited, deprived of rights, scorned as you were when the war broke out, they called you brothers and comrades in order to lead you to the slaughter, to death. And now that militarism has crippled, maimed, degraded, and destroyed you, the rulers demand that you surrender your interests, your goals, and your ideals--in a word, accept slave-like subordination to the civil peace. You are denied the possibility of expressing your views, your feelings, and your pain; you are prevented from raising your demands and acting to achieve them. The press is gagged,

political rights and freedoms are trodden underfoot. Military dictatorship reigns with an iron fist.

No longer can we passively stand by in face of this situation, which threatens the entire future of Europe and humankind. For decades, the socialist proletariat has waged a struggle against militarism. At the proletariat's national and international conferences, its representatives grappled with growing concern with the constantly growing danger of war arising from imperialism. At the Stuttgart [1907], Copenhagen [1910], and Basel [1912] congresses, the international socialist congresses showed the path that the proletariat must tread.

Since the beginning of the war, socialist parties and workers' organizations in many countries that voted for this course have disregarded the obligations arising out of it. Their leaders have called on the working class to suspend the class struggle, the only possible and effective means of proletarian emancipation. They have approved war credits for the ruling classes. They have placed themselves at the disposal of governments for the most varied tasks. Through their press and their emissaries, they have sought to win the neutral powers for the policies of their governments. They have provided socialist ministers to serve as hostages for maintenance of civil peace. They have thus assumed responsibility before the working class, present and future, for the war, including its aims and methods. And just as the individual parties failed, so too did the most authoritative representative body of international socialism, the International Socialist Bureau.

These factors are largely responsible for the fact that the international working class, which did not succumb to the national panic when the war broke out, or subsequently broke free of it, has even now, in the second year of mass slaughter, not found ways and means to launch a simultaneous and effective struggle for peace in every country.

In this intolerable situation, we have gathered as representatives of socialist parties, trade unions, and minorities in their ranks--as Germans, French, Italians, Russians, Poles, Latvians, Romanians, Bulgarians, Swedes, Norwegians, Dutch, and Swiss. We stand not on the ground of national solidarity with the exploiting class but on that of international proletarian solidarity and class struggle. We have come together to retie the torn threads of international relations and to appeal to the working class to come to its senses and take up the struggle for peace.

This struggle is one for freedom, brotherhood among the peoples, and socialism. The task is to take up this struggle for peace--a peace without annexations or reparations. Such a peace is only possible if every thought of violating the rights and freedom of peoples is condemned. Occupation of entire countries or parts of countries must not lead to their forcible annexation. There must be no annexation, either open or concealed, and no forcible economic alignment, one made still more unbearable by denial of political rights. The right of nations to self-determination must be the unshakable foundation of national relations.

Proletarians!

Since the war began, you have placed your energies, your courage, and your endurance at the service of the ruling classes. Now the task is to act for your own cause, for the sacred aims of socialism, for the deliverance of oppressed peoples and subjugated classes through irreconcilable proletarian class struggle.

Socialists in the belligerent countries have the task and duty of taking up this struggle with full force. Socialists in the neutral countries have the task and duty of supporting by every

effective means their brothers in this struggle against blood-soaked barbarity.

Never in world history has there been a more urgent and noble task to be accomplished through our combined efforts. No sacrifice is too great, no burden is too heavy to achieve the goal of peace among the peoples.

Working men and women! Mothers and fathers! Widows and orphans! Wounded and crippled! We call on all of you who are suffering from the war and because of the war. We call to you across the borders, across the smoking battlefields, across the destroyed cities and villages:

PROLETARIANS OF ALL COUNTRIES, UNITE!

Zimmerwald (Switzerland), September 1915

Signatures

On behalf of the International Socialist Conference:

For the German delegation: Georg Ledebour, Adolf Hoffmann

For the French delegation: A. Bourderon, A. Merrheim

For the Italian delegation: G.E. Modigliani, Constantino Lazzari

For the Russian delegation: N. Lenin, Paul Axelrod, M. Bobrov

For the Polish delegation: St. Lapinski, A. Warski, Cz. Hanecki

For the Inter-Balkan Socialist Federation: C. Rakovsky (Rumanian delegation), Vasil Kolarov (Bulgarian delegation)

For the Swedish and Norwegian delegation: Z. Höglund, Ture Nerman

For the Dutch delegation: H. Roland-Holst

For the Swiss delegation: Robert Grimm, Charles Naine

Note. The Independent Labor Party of England declared its agreement with the objectives of the conference and appointed official delegates. But the government of "free", "democratic" England did not issue passports to the delegates, so that their trip to the conference could not take place. For this reason, the manifesto, with the main provisions of which the Independent Labor Party agrees, could not be signed by representatives of the English working class.

Two statements at Zimmerwald conference.

At the Zimmerwald Conference, the following 2 statements were made:

The undersigned declare:

The manifesto adopted by the conference does not fully satisfy us. It does not contain a characterization of both open opportunism and opportunism hiding behind radical phrases - opportunism, which is not only the main culprit for the collapse of the International, but also wants to perpetuate this collapse. The manifesto does not contain a clear description of the means of struggle against war.

As before, we will defend in the socialist press and at meetings of the International a resolute Marxist position in relation to the tasks that the epoch of imperialism has set before the proletariat.

We vote for the manifesto because we regard it as a call to struggle, and in this struggle we want to go hand in hand with the rest of the International.

We request that this statement be attached to the official record.

We vote for the manifesto because we regard it as a call to struggle, and in this struggle we want to go hand in hand with the rest of the International.

We request that this statement be attached to the official record.

N. Lenin, G. Zinoviev, Radek, Nerman, Heglund and Winter.

The second statement was signed by Roland-Holst and Trotsky, in addition to the group of Lefts that introduced the draft resolution. Here is the text of that statement.

“Since the adoption of our amendment (to the manifesto requiring a vote against war credits) could, to a certain extent,

call into question the success of the conference, we, protesting, withdraw our proposal and are satisfied with Ledebour's statement in the commission that in the manifesto already what our proposal wants is said.

Let us add that Ledebour issued an ultimatum, otherwise refusing to sign the manifesto."

Social Democrat No. 17. Geneva, October 13, 1915

Social Democracy and peace issues.

Draft resolution submitted by the Zimmerwald Left at the conference in Kienthal.

I. The world war, the nature of which they are trying to cover up with slogans of defense of national independence, democracy, more and more, over time, reveals its true essence.

This war is a struggle of the great capitalist powers for a new redivision of the rest of the countries, which must become the object of exploitation by individual cliques of financial capitalists.

A real world war will not lead to the final division of these countries. Strengthened in the world war by the policy of loans, by the powerful concentration of capital, after the war, finance capital will again set about further plunder and preparations for new world wars with the aim of dividing Asia Minor, the Pacific coast, and dividing the colonies of the weaker capitalist nations.

These new aims of robbery are served by the already begun negotiations, the already concluded secret treaties on the strengthening of economic agreements and on a new division of spheres of influence (plans for the creation of a Central European Union, an economic conference of the powers of agreement, an Anglo-Japanese treaty, etc.).

2. While a future peace is being forged in the fire of a world war, representing an agreement between the imperialist robbers on the division of spoils, while this peace increases the danger of new wars, the petty bourgeois, opportunists, and social pacifists (the "centre" of German socialism) parties, the Independent Labor Party, etc.) are themselves trying to get away and divert the masses from the real facts of life, chasing the mirage of a "democratic diplomacy;

The capitalist bourgeoisie of all large states cares only about their own profits, they strive to increase it to the best of their ability, and not at all to share it with the weaker capitalist states. From armaments, protective duties, new colonies, each capitalist clique receives new revenues. Not disarmament, not reconciliation, not "democratic" control of bandit inclinations, but the strengthening and spreading of the dominance of the arbitrariness of the cliques of finance capital, their imperialist world politics—such is the present state and future of capitalism.

The objective significance of the utopia of peaceful capitalism, capitalism without wars, therefore, lies in the fact that the masses of the people are deceived as to the true state of affairs; they are being diverted from the path of revolutionary struggle.

Therefore, the policy of social pacifism is only water for the mill of the opportunists, who must hide their desire to share the booty with the bourgeoisie, to weaken the revolutionary struggle, just as the imperialist bourgeoisie hides its intentions.

3. Imperialism, which threatens the proletariat with the greatest dangers, is digging its own grave.

Its basis is formed by a high concentration of production, the decisive role of a handful of powerful banks, monopolies, and the highest technology.

But these prerequisites are at the same time the prerequisites for socialism, for the realization of which, therefore, the time has come.

At the same time, imperialism mobilizes the masses of the workers under the influence of the unheard-of suffering associated with the world war and its consequences (raise in prices, worsening conditions for the professional struggle,

reaction), presenting the proletarians with a choice: either fight for socialism, or—degeneration and general exhaustion.

4. This revolutionary mass struggle of the proletariat for socialism will flare up from the struggle of the working masses against all those misfortunes and hardships that have been engendered by the imperialist epoch:

from the struggle against degeneration, against unemployment, the growing tax burden, colonial adventures, national oppression.

It will go under the slogan of destroying all the burdens of imperialism (cancellation of public debts), supporting the unemployed, a democratic republic, rejecting annexations, liberating the colonies, annihilation, borders, national equality.

All these types of struggle will merge into one mighty stream of struggle for political power, c. struggle for socialism, for the unification of the socialist peoples.

To call the proletariat to this struggle, to organize it for. a decisive attack on capitalism—that is the only peace program of the Social Democracy.

Layers and those weapons, turn them against the common enemy a!—the capitalist governments.—Such is the peace program put forward by the International.

This draft resolution was signed by the following delegates:

C. K. R. S.-D. R. P.—Lenin, Zinoviev, Petrova.

Kraev. Rule. O.-D. Poland and Lithuania—Radek, Vronsky, Dombrovsky.

German S.-D. opposition—I delegate of city X.

Members of the Swiss delegation—Platten, Nobs, Robman.

For the Serbian S.-D. Party - Deputy Kanclerovich.

Member of the Italian delegation G. M. Serrati (editor of Avanti),

Of the signatories, G. Zinoviev simultaneously introduced S.-D. Latvian Territory and Radek-Sots.-Rev. Union of Holland (its chairman is Mr. Rolland-Golst).

The Kienthal Manifesto

Proletarians of all countries, unite!

Two years of world war! Two years of devastation! Two years of bloody sacrifices and frenzy of reaction!

Who is responsible for this? Who stands behind those who threw the burning torch into the barrel of gunpowder? Who had long desired this war and prepared for it?

The ruling classes!

When in September 1915 we, the socialists of the belligerent and neutral countries, in spite of the bloody squabble, stretched out our hands to each other and united in Zimmerwald amid the frenzy of war passions, we said in our manifest:

The ruling powers of capitalist society, in whose hands rested the fate of nations -both monarchist and republican governments, secret diplomacy, the powerful business groups, the bourgeois parties, the capitalist press, the church--all of them bear the full weight of responsibility for this war, which arose from the social organization that nourishes these institutions and is defended by them--a war waged on behalf of their interests.

"Every nation" Jaurès said a few days before his death, "carried with a burning torch through the streets of Europe."

Having laid millions of people in the grave, plunged millions into grief, turned millions into widows and orphans, piled up ruins and destroyed irreplaceable cultural values, the war fell into a dead end.

Despite the mountains of victims on all battlefronts, no decisive has been achieved. Just to shake these fronts, the governments would have to sacrifice millions upon millions of soldiers.

No victors, no vanquished, or rather, all the vanquished, that is, all bled to death, all devastated, all exhausted—such is the result of this war full of horrors. Thus, the fantastic dreams of the ruling classes of imperialist world domination did not come true.

Once again it has been made clear that the only socialists to have served the interests of their peoples are those who, despite persecution and slander, have stood firm against nationalist hysteria and demanded an immediate peace without annexations.

So join with us in crying out across the battlefields:
Down with the war!

Long live the world!

Workers of cities and villages!

The governments and imperialist cliques, together with their press, tell you to hold out to the end, in order to liberate oppressed nations. This is the crudest method of deception of all those that have been utilized in this war. The true purpose of this general slaughter is to secure for some what they have plundered for centuries, for many, wars; others want a new division of the world in order to increase their possessions; they want to annex new regions, to tear apart peoples, to reduce them to the role of mere slaves and helots.

Your governments and your press tell you that the war must be continued in order to destroy militarism.

Don't let yourself be fooled!

The militarism of this or that nation can be overthrown only by itself, and in all countries it must be overcome.

Your governments and your press also tell you that the war must be continued so that it can be the last war. But this is also

a deception. Never has a war put an end to a war. On the contrary, each war awakens the lust for revenge. Violence breeds violence.

Thus after each sacrifice, your tormentors will demand new victims from you, and even the bourgeois pacifists cannot lead you out of this vicious circle.

There is only one way to prevent future wars; it is the conquest of political power and the abolition of capitalist property by the working class.

A "lasting peace" will be the fruit of the victory of socialism.

Proletarians!

Who preaches "war to the end", "to victory?"

These are the culprits of the war; corrupt press, military suppliers and all those who profit from the war; they are social patriots repeating bourgeois military slogans; they are reactionaries who rejoice in their hearts that those who yesterday were still a threat to the privileges of the ruling classes are dying on the battlefields; socialists, members of trade unions, all those who sowed the seeds of socialism in town and country.

Here are the supporters of the policy of war to the end!

They have state power, they command a false press that poisons the people, they enjoy freedom of agitation for the continuation of the war, for the continuation of bloody sacrifices and devastation.

You are the victims; you have the right to starve and remain silent, for you are the chains of martial law, the censorship muzzle, the dead air of prison.

You, The people, the working masses, are made victims of a war that is not your war.

You, the workers from city and countryside, stand in the trenches, in the front lines, while behind the lines you see many of the rich and their accomplices--shirkers living in safety.

For them war means the death of others.

And while waging their class struggle against you in an even sharper form than before, they are preaching civil peace to you.

Ruthlessly exploiting your misfortune, your need, they want to induce you to betray your duty towards your class and wrest from you and your souls your best strength, your hope for socialism.

Even more clearly than in peacetime, during the war, social injustice and class domination stand out. In times of peace, the capitalist system robs the worker of all joy in life; in times of war, it robs him of his life, even his life.

Enough killing! Quite suffering!

Quite also devastation!

For on you, on the workers, these piled-up ruins are now falling and will fall in a lot.

Hundreds of millions are now thrown into the jaws of the god of war and are thus wasted for the welfare of the people, for cultural purposes and for social reforms that might lighten your lot, improve the education of the people, and alleviate poverty.

And tomorrow new and heavy taxes will be laid on your burdened shoulders.

Enough waste of your labour, your money, your vitality!

Let us rise to fight the bonds of immediate peace without annexations.

Let the working men and women in all the belligerent countries rise up against the war and its consequences, against want and deprivation, against unemployment and high prices.

Let them raise their voices for the restoration of their civil liberties, for social legislation, for the demands of the working classes in town and country.

Let the proletarians of the neutral countries help the socialists of the belligerent countries in their hard struggle and oppose with all their might the further expansion of the field of war.

Let the socialists of all countries act in accordance with the resolutions of the international congresses, which state that it is the duty of the working class to make every effort to bring the war to an end as soon as possible.

Put the strongest pressure you can on your deputies, on your parliaments, on your governments.

Demand from the representatives of the socialist parties an immediate renunciation of support for the military policy of the governments.

Demand that the Socialist deputies should henceforth vote against all war credits.

Contribute with all the means at your disposal to the speedy end of the human slaughter!

Take up the slogan: For an immediate armistice! Rise up in struggle, peoples suffering ruin and murder!

Be brave! Bear in mind that you are the majority and, when you so desire, you can become power.

Let governments see that in all countries there is a growing hatred of war and a desire for social redemption.

Then the hour of peace among the nations will draw near.
Down with the war!

Down with the war!

Long live peace, immediate peace, without annexations!

Long live international socialism!

The Second International Socialist Zimmerwald Conference,

May 1, 1916.

Statement delivered at the Kienthal Conference

The undersigned declare:

Just as in Zimmerwald we declared the abstention of German Social-Democratic opposition deputies in voting for war credits to be unacceptable and a disgrace to German Socialist Democracy, we now declare the behavior of the minority of the French parliamentary faction voting for war credits **absolutely incompatible with socialism** and the struggle against war.

This behavior turns all the protests of these deputies against the war and the policy of civil peace into impotent platonic statements. It is capable of undermining all confidence in the socialist party among the opposition-minded masses.

It extremely weakens the efforts of the internationalist parties to raise an international front for the struggle against the world war.

Signatures:

Lenin, Zinoviev, Radek, Graber Gilbo, Katzlerovich, Vronsky, Dombrovsky, Nobs, Platten, Robman, Münzenberg, Serrati, a German comrade from the city of X., Savelyev, Vlasov, Petrova, Peluso Bobrov.

Social Democrat", No. 54-55 of June 14, 1916.

The collapse of the Zimmerwald International.—A third International must be founded

From the very beginning, the Zimmerwald International adopted a vacillating, "Kautskyite", "Centrist" position, which immediately prompted the Zimmerwald Left to immediately fence itself off, and to issue its own manifesto (published in Switzerland in Russian, German, and French).

The chief shortcoming of the Zimmerwald International, and the cause of its collapse (for politically and ideologically it has already collapsed), was its vacillation and indecision on such a momentous issue of crucial practical significance as that of breaking completely with social-chauvinism and the old social-chauvinist International, headed by Vandervelde and Huysmans at The Hague (Holland), etc.

It is not as yet known in Russia that the Zimmerwald majority are nothing but Kautskyites . Yet this is the fundamental fact, one which cannot be ignored, and which is now generally known in Western Europe. Even that chauvinist, that extreme German chauvinist, Heilman, editor of the ultra-chauvinistic Chemnitzer Volksstimme and contributor to Parvus's ultra-chauvinistic Glocke (a "Social-Democrat", of course, and an ardent partisan of Social-Democratic "unity"), was compelled to acknowledge in the press that the Centre, or "Kautskyism", and the Zimmerwald majority were one and the same thing.

This fact was definitely established at the end of 1916 and the beginning of 1917. Although social-pacifism was condemned by the Kienthal Manifesto, the whole Zimmerwald Right, the entire Zimmerwald majority, sank to social-pacifism: Kautsky and Co. in a series of utterances in January and February 1917; Bourderon and Merrheim in France, who cast their votes in unanimity with the social-chauvinists for the pacifist resolutions of the Socialist Party (December 1916) and of the

Confederation Générale du Travail (the national organisation of the French trade unions, also in December 1916); Turati and Co. in Italy, where the entire party took up a social-pacifist position, while Turati himself, in a speech delivered on December 17, 1916, "slipped" (not by accident, of course) into nationalist phrases whitewashing the imperialist war.

In January 1917, the chairman of the Zimmerwald and Kienthal conferences, Robert Grimm, joined the social-chauvinists in his own party (Greulich, Pflüger, Gustav Mümler and others) against the internationalists in deed.

At two conferences of Zimmerwaldists from various countries in January and February 1917, this equivocal, double-faced behaviour of the Zimmerwald majority was formally stigmatized by the Left internationalists of several countries: by Munzenberg, secretary of the international youth organisation and editor of the excellent internationalist publication *Die Jugendinternationale*; by Zinoviev, representative of the Central Committee of our Party; by K. Radek of the Polish Social-Democratic Party (the "Regional Executive"), and by Hartstein, a German Social-Democrat and member of the Spartacus group.

Much is given to the Russian proletariat; nowhere in the world has the working class yet succeeded in developing so much revolutionary energy as in Russia. But to whom much is given, of him much is required.

The Zimmerwald bog can no longer be tolerated. We must not, for the sake of the Zimmerwald "Kautskyites", continue the semi-alliance with the chauvinist International of the Plekhanovs and Scheidemanns. We must break with this International immediately. We must remain in Zimmerwald only for purposes of information.

It is we who must found, and right now, without delay, a new, revolutionary, proletarian International, or rather, we must not fear to acknowledge publicly that this new International is already established and operating.

This is the International of those “internationalists in deed” whom I precisely listed above. They and they alone are representatives of the revolutionary, internationalist mass, and not their corrupters.

And if socialists of that type are few, let every Russian worker ask himself whether there were many really class-conscious revolutionaries in Russia on the eve of the February-March revolution of 1917.

It is not a question of numbers, but of giving correct expression to the ideas and policies of the truly revolutionary proletariat. The thing is not to “proclaim” internationalism, but to be able to be an internationalist in deed, even when times are most trying.

Let us not deceive ourselves with hopes of agreements and international congresses. As long as the imperialist war is on, international intercourse is held in the iron vise of the military dictatorship of the imperialist bourgeoisie. If even the “republican” Milyukov, who is obliged to tolerate the parallel government of the Soviet of Workers’ Deputies, did not allow Fritz Platten, the Swiss socialist, secretary of the party, an internationalist and participant in the Zimmerwald and Kienthal conferences, to enter Russia in April 1917, in spite of the fact that Platten has a Russian wife and was on his way to visit his wife’s relatives, and in spite of the fact that he had taken part in the revolution of 1905 in Riga, for which he had been confined in a Russian prison, had given bail to the tsarist government for his release and wished to recover that bail—if the “republican” Milyukov could do such a thing in April 1917

in Russia, one can judge what value can be put on the promises and assurances, the phrases and declarations of the bourgeoisie on the subject of peace without annexations, and soon.

And the arrest of Trotsky by the British Government? And the refusal to allow Martov to leave Switzerland, and the attempt to lure him to Britain, where Trotsky's fate awaits him?

Let us harbor no illusions. We must not deceive ourselves.

To "wait" for international congresses or conferences is simply to betray internationalism, since it has been shown that even from Stockholm neither socialists loyal to internationalism nor even their letters are allowed to come here, although this is quite possible and although a ferocious military censorship exists.

Our Party must not "wait", but must immediately found a Third International. Hundreds of socialists imprisoned in Germany and Britain will then heave a sigh of relief, thousands and thousands of German workers who are now holding strikes and demonstrations that are frightening that scoundrel and brigand, Wilhelm, will learn from illegal leaflets of our decision, of our fraternal confidence in Karl Liebknecht, and in him alone, of our decision to fight "revolutionary defencism" even now ; they will read this and be strengthened in their revolutionary internationalism.

To whom much is given, of him much is required. No other country in the world is as free as Russia is now . Let us make use of this freedom, not to advocate support for the bourgeoisie, or bourgeois "revolutionary defencism", but in a bold, honest, proletarian, Liebknecht way to found the Third International, an International uncompromisingly hostile both to the social-chauvinist traitors and to the vacillating "Centrists".

After what has been said, there is no need to waste many words explaining that the amalgamation of Social-Democrats in Russia is out of the question.

It is better to remain with one friend only, like Liebknecht, and that means remaining with the revolutionary proletariat, than to entertain even for a moment any thought of amalgamation with the party of the Organising Committee, with Chkheidze and Tsereteli, who can tolerate a bloc with Potresov in Rabochaya Gazeta, who voted for the loan in the Executive Committee of the Soviet of Workers' Deputies, and who have sunk to "defencism".

Let the dead bury their dead.

Whoever wants to help the hesitant must begin by: stop hesitating himself.

Written April 1st, 1917.

Conferences, meetings about the attitude towards the war.

Okhrana documents on the meeting of Duma members and party workers in Finland.

Report from the Head of Moek Okhr of the Branch to the Director of the Department of Polit Nrpt dated October 10th.

"This September 30th. In Finland, in the same area where "Maxim Gorky" (Aleksey Maksimov Peshkov) and "Kamenev" (Lev Borisov Rosenfeld) currently live, a meeting was held between representatives of the Social-Democratic faction of the State Duma with some party workers.

The meeting was attended by:

1-4) members of the Social-Democrats. slave. factions: Petrovsky, Badaev, Samoilov and Muranov; 5) the above-mentioned "Kamenev"; 6) Nikolai Nikolaevich Yakovlev, a fugitive administrative exile of the Narym Territory, who lives in Petrograd on a passport in the name of Dm. Iv. Kurbatov and. 7) a certain "Elena" (Deryabina) - a participant in the last "Lenin" meeting.

In addition to these persons, at the meeting as representatives of Petrograd. At the invitation of the faction, 5 or 6 more people were present, for whom there is no identification data yet.

On the order of the day of the meeting, among other items to be discussed were:

a) the final wording of the reply to the Vandervelde telegram; and b) a report on "the current situation and the immediate tasks and tactics of the Party in connection with current events."

When discussing the question of the final wording of the answer to Vandervelde's well-known proposal, the draft answer drawn up earlier by the faction was only slightly changed).

The report "on the current situation" was read by Kamenev, who, apparently, finally convinced those present that the only correct motto of consistent Marxists at the present time should be the slogan "**war to war.**"

During further discussion of the issue of attitudes towards the war, it turned out that P.K. had already prepared an appeal corresponding to the views of those assembled for distribution, which could be selected in any number of copies using P.K.'s "technique".

At the end of the meeting, resolutions were passed on the attitude of the Russian Social Democracy towards collections and material support in connection with the current war.

Approximately in a month, in Finland, it is planned to organize the same meeting, but on a larger scale in terms of the number of participants, with the involvement of the largest possible number of representatives from the field to the meeting.

The time and place where it is supposed to organize a future meeting will be known to the agents of the department additionally.'

Okhrana on the First Bern Conference.

From the reports on the state of affairs in Russia it became clear that the mood of the working masses in Russia is **far from chauvinism and extremely favorable for revolutionary activity**. On the question of the tasks of agitation, on the basis of Lenin's report, it was customary to make the defeat of the troops of one's own country the starting point of all revolutionary activity.

On the question of literature, it was decided to take measures to organize the publication of an illegal organ in Russia and to publish literature with a tendentious account of the events of

the present war, and Ekaterina Maish agreed to provide material means for this.

In addition, it was decided to publish the newspaper Sots.-Dem. more often, and transport it by smuggling it to Russia via Norway. Along with the question of transport, the question of uniting all the extreme left elements of the Social Democratic parties of different countries was raised, and it was found out that the extreme left part of the German Social-Democrats, led by Karl Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, was growing strongly in the Germany, is counting on the organization of a rebellion in Germany and is connected with Lenin and his party. Due to this last circumstance, it was decided to use this connection to distribute Lenin's literature among Russian captured soldiers in Germany and among the army in the field ".....

"Overview of activities. RSDLP.

Resolutions of the conference of foreign sections of R.S.D. R.P.

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

On the Character of the War

The present war is imperialist in character. This war is the outcome of conditions in an epoch in which capitalism has reached the highest stage in its development; in which the greatest significance attaches, not only to the export of commodities, but also to the export of capital; an epoch in which the cartelization of production and the internationalization of economic life have assumed impressive proportions, colonial policies have brought about the almost complete partition of the globe, world capitalism's productive

forces have outgrown the limited boundaries of national and state divisions, and the objective conditions are perfectly ripe for socialism to be achieved.

The “Defence of the Fatherland” Slogan

The present war is, in substance, a struggle between Britain, France and Germany for the partition of colonies and for the plunder of rival countries; on the part of tsarism and the ruling classes of Russia, it is an attempt to seize Persia, Mongolia, Turkey in Asia, Constantinople, Galicia, etc. The national element in the Austro-Serbian war is an entirely secondary consideration and does not affect the general imperialist character of the war.

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

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

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

split the workers, and divert them from their class aims and from the revolutionary struggle against the bourgeoisie.

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

The Slogans of the Revolutionary Social-Democrats

“The conversion of the present imperialist war into a civil war is the only correct proletarian slogan, one that follows from the experience of the Commune, and outlined in the Basle resolution (1912); it has been dictated by all the conditions of an imperialist war between highly developed bourgeois countries.”

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

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

The organisation of the working class has been badly damaged. Nevertheless, a revolutionary crisis is maturing. After the war, the ruling classes of all countries will make a still greater effort to throw the proletariat’s emancipation movement back for decades. The task of the revolutionary Social-Democrats—both in the event of a rapid revolutionary development and in

that of a protracted crisis, will not consist in renouncing lengthy and day-by-day work, or in discarding any of the old methods of the class struggle. To direct both the parliamentary and the economic struggle against opportunism, in the spirit of revolutionary struggle of the masses—such will be the task.

The following should be indicated as the first steps towards converting the present imperialist war into a civil war: (1) an absolute refusal to vote for war credits, and resignation from bourgeois governments; (2) a complete break with the policy of a class truce (bloc national, Burgfrieden); (3) formation of an underground organisation wherever the governments and the bourgeoisie abolish constitutional liberties by introducing martial law; (4) support for fraternization between soldiers of the belligerent nations, in the trenches and on battlefields in general; (5) support for every kind of revolutionary mass action by the proletariat in general.

Opportunism And The Collapse Of The Second International

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

proved the social mainstay of these tendencies and channels of bourgeois influence over the proletariat.

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

The Third International

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

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

Pacifism and the Peace Slogan

Pacifism, the preaching of peace in the abstract, is one of the means of duping the working class. Under capitalism, particularly in its imperialist stage, wars are inevitable. On the

other hand, however, Social-Democrats cannot overlook the positive significance of revolutionary wars, i.e., not imperialist wars, but such as were fought, for instance, between 1789 and 1871, with the aim of doing away with national oppression, and creating national capitalist states out of the feudal decentralized states, or such wars that may be waged to defend the conquests of the proletariat victorious in its struggle against the bourgeoisie.

At the present time, the propaganda of peace unaccompanied by a call for revolutionary mass action can only sow illusions and demoralise the proletariat, for it makes the proletariat believe that the bourgeoisie is humane, and turns it into a plaything in the hands of the secret diplomacy of the belligerent countries. In particular, the idea of a so-called democratic peace being possible without a series of revolutions is profoundly erroneous.

The Defeat Of The Tsarist Monarchy

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

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

The Attitude Towards Other Parties And Groups

The war, which has engendered a spate of chauvinism, has revealed that the democratic (Narodnik) intelligentsia, the party of the Socialist-Revolutionaries (with complete instability of the oppositional trend, which is centred in Mysl), and the main group of liquidators (Nasha Zarya) which is supported by Plekhanov, are all in the grip of chauvinism. In practice, the Organising Committee is also on the side of chauvinism, beginning with Larin and Martov's camouflaged support of chauvinism and ending with Axelrod's defence of the principle of patriotism; so is the Bund, in which a Germanophile chauvinism prevails. The Brussels bloc (of July 3, 1914) has disintegrated, while the elements that are grouped around Nashe Slovo are vacillating between a Platonic sympathy with internationalism and a striving for unity, at any price, with Nasha Zarya and the Organising Committee. The same vacillation is manifest in Chkheidze's Social-Democratic group. The latter has on the one hand, expelled the Plekhanovite, i.e., the chauvinist, Mankov; on the other hand, it wishes to cover up, by all possible means, the chauvinism of Plekhanov, Nasha Zarya, Axelrod, the Bund, etc.

It is the task of the Social-Democratic Labour Party in Russia to consolidate the proletarian unity created in 1912-14, mainly by Pravda, and to re-establish the Social-Democratic Party organisations of the working class, on the basis of a decisive organisational break with the social-chauvinists. Temporary agreements are possible only with those Social-Democrats who stand for a decisive organisational rupture with the Organising Committee, Nasha Zarya and the Bund.

(...)

On the question of the International, the following resolution was adopted: Resolution on the International, R.P. considers it necessary:

The early establishment of the Third International; as a necessary condition for its successful work, it considers it obligatory for its representatives:

- 1) Recognition of the principles of the International.
- 2) Recognition of the class point of view.
- 3) The revolutionary struggle of the proletariat.

Having discussed the question of the attitude towards other Social-Democrats. organizations and trends, X. K. decided that: unification can take place ONLY with those organizations and groups that stand on the point of view of the class struggle, the international solidarity of the working class, and 'also recognize the revolutionary struggle...

November, 1914 , Collection of S.-D.

Credo of Moscow Bolsheviks.

In 1914, the world war broke out on an issue that seems downright insignificant in comparison with issues that did not lead to war a year before. '

The Proletarian International did not stand the test. There was not a single real attempt to prevent the war; 1 "After the declaration of war, the proletariat resignedly followed the ruling classes in France and Germany, in England and Austria-Hungary and brought selflessness and energy into the cause of the imperialists, which it had not yet brought into your own business; into their class struggle; such selflessness and . energy, which would have been sufficient to prevent the destruction, horrors, and shame of European wars. The subjugation of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie turned out to

be deeper, and the capture of opportunism, under the guise of which the bourgeoisie retains power over the thoughts, feelings and will of the working class, turned out to be infinitely wider than that previously assumed. The relatively small number of groups that have remained faithful to the precepts of the proletarian International, and the absence of energetic mass actions would give them broad support. In turn, it indicates how great the influence of the bourgeoisie on the proletariat, which has been preserved, despite the 3 months of the war. The Russian proletariat, dispersed, exposed to all the necessary conditions; for the development of a collective will and for the preparation of collective actions, could not show his attitude towards the war on a class scale and deprive the German opportunists of any opportunity to refer to Russian barbarism. as a justification for their betrayal of the proletarian International;

.....

The general position is such that they begin to live a new life, our old slogans are directly dictated by this position:

Confiscation of land from landlords.

Constituent Assembly.

8 hour working day.

Collection S.-D. No. 2, Moscow, 1916

Moscow Committee

Russian S.-D. labor party.

Proletarians of all countries, unite!

Comrades and workers - workers!

For the third year, the war, unprecedented in its cruelty, continues. It is conducted in the interests of the capitalists of

different countries. The capitalists are fighting for dominance over the world.

In the pursuit of power and profit, the governments, fulfilling the will of the capitalists, are forcing a million workers and peasants to go into battle and securing the rest in factories and plants. Formerly they exhausted the workers' strength, now they drain the blood of the workers.

Comrade workers, your children, husbands, and brothers are dying at the front; you remained in the rear, but for you and for your family there is neither bread nor firewood. Every hour more and more dead, more and more suffering.

The entire weight of the war fell on the shoulders of the working class. But it is always harder for you, workers. You have replaced your husbands and brothers in factories and factories, but for your work they give you two, three times less. You cannot clothe and feed your children.

When will the horrors of war end? Only the people themselves will put an end to the war. When the working class rises in its entirety, overthrows the tsarist government and the people take power into their own hands, then peace will come, the kind of peace the people need without new chains, without new taxes. Only such peace will bring freedom to the people.

Quite silent; can't bear it anymore.

The workers of all countries are again united for peace and freedom. The Russian workers are once again building their Russian Social Democratic Labor Party.

Comrade workers, help the workers' cause, join the common struggle, organize in the ranks of your party, carry our call everywhere.

February 23rd is your day, female workers.

This was decided three years ago by the congress of working women of all countries. And every year on this day, our word to you, workers.

In the very first year of the war, conscientious women workers of all the belligerent countries, at an international conference, handed each other a rush to fight against the war. Today we repeat. their call. Today, in all countries, class-conscious workers will repeat their call in the name of the international brotherhood of workers. The hour of struggle for peace and freedom is already near. - And when that hour comes, you, comrade workers, take part in the struggle under the red banner of socialism.

Down with the war!

Down with the tsarist government!

Long live the democratic republic!

Long live the international union of workers!

Moscow Committee of R.S.-D. R.P.

Moscow, February 23, 1917

("Proletarian Revolution" No. 14, 1923)

Tver group in Moscow.

Proletarians of all countries, unite!

WHAT TO DO?

Comrades! It's been a year since the earth is choking in our blood. Millions of flourishing lives have been cut down, entire regions and nationalities have been devastated. Cripples, like ghosts, trudge along at every step, and hunger stretches out its bony hands to the worker. Yes, it's still not over. The bourgeoisie is intensively mobilizing. On the newly opened

zemstvo and city-. Unions of workshops and factories are preparing new deadly weapons and shells, 18-year-old youths are being drafted into the ranks of the troops, and militia warriors of the 2nd category will follow them. A new massacre is being prepared, a new year of bloody sacrifices. We, comrades, know how to sacrifice ourselves when our working cause requires it. We have shown this many times in practice. It would be wrong and unforgivable if we willingly and consciously shed blood in favor of our sworn enemy, the bourgeoisie. That is why one should think about what real war is. G rostrum State. Dumas and various congresses, with the assistance of the press, are trying to convince us that this war is a people's war, that we must fight for faith, Slavism, and the homeland; for progress and humanity. We know, comrades, that this is all an obvious lie. History tells us that wars have always been waged by the ruling classes for profit, although they were covered by the same loud phrases as now. In our capitalist age, wars are caused by the rivalry of the bourgeoisie of nation-states. The capitalist classes live only on the thought of profit and strive to produce as many goods as possible. Soon such a quantity of goods is accumulated that it is impossible to sell them on the domestic market. Not only commodities but also capital are being accumulated; there is a need to float it to the external market abroad. Added to this is the desire to profit at the expense of weak states. All states strive for this. Here their interests clash, which cannot be settled peacefully, but only by war. An example of this is the Russo-Japanese War, in which both sides wanted to get hold of decrepit China. And we see the same thing in a real war. The Austrian bourgeoisie extended its tentacles to Serbia. Before her old illness, Russia gravitated towards the Middle East and acted as the defender of Serbia, hiding under the loud phrases of the liberation of the Slavs the same conquering goals. Germany was also looking for a way out for its capital, which had long been a serious rival not only

to France, but also to France. and England. On the one hand, she sought to open up for herself the markets of such backward states as Russia and Turkey, on the other hand, to finish off. English industry. In general, the aspirations of the entire bourgeoisie boiled down to one thing—to secure a market for their goods. But there are no more free colonial lands. All powers have protected themselves from > other people's capital with high customs walls, although for their capital they would like to see the walls open. There was only one way to satisfy the thirst for profit - to push the borders of their state by force, or to force them to open the doors to their capital by force. The result is war.

In it the national bourgeoisie fight for dominance in the world market.

But to wage war, the bourgeoisie needs an army. And the army is made up of the people. This people must be convinced that the adventure undertaken is the cause of the people. That is why beautiful phrases about the liberation of the Slavs, about the deliverance of the world from militarism, are again pouring in. That is why both sides are trying to present this obviously aggressive war as a defensive war, which is why they say that they did not prepare for war and did not want it. But even in peacetime, the overcrowded barracks, the allocation of the people's millions for the needs of the army, the furious competition in armaments, we are told that all states were preparing for war and wanted it. The international proletariat alone is not in the least interested in it. He has no reason to harbor enmity towards his foreign comrades. He has no opposing interests, only general enslavement. a common enemy in the face of the bourgeoisie and the desire to overthrow its oppression. Not a single war has ever given the proletariat anything but severe wounds. Even the so-called Patriotic War "gave nothing to the people. He remained a serf,

as before / Famine, ulcers, the government's black mittens allowed themselves to be called more than ever. Yes, and this war will not bring anything to the people. The bayonet will be replaced by a factory machine and a plow. Vital forces the proletariat will be sucked out little by little by the factory walls, labor, hunger strike and penal servitude.

No. comrades, No. Comrades, we cannot associate any positive tasks with this war. We must remain resolutely opposed to the war to the end under the banner of the international Social-Democrats. A real war we must strive; by all means immediately turn it into a civil war. ; The task of the Moment is not to work together with the government and the bourgeoisie with the banner of defending the fatherland, but to strengthen its illegal organization, to unite all its forces for a decisive struggle against the tsarist monarchy. Comrades, let our blood be shed for our workers' cause, for the emancipation of labor, for freedom. To the call of the bourgeoisie to unite and forget party strife, we will respond with a new struggle against it, to incite individual nationalities, with the international slogan: Workers of all countries, unite! j

Enough brotherly blood!

Down with the tsarist monarchy!

Long live the revolution!

Long live the democratic republic!

1915 Tver group R.S.-D. R.P.

("Span; Rev.", jé 2, 1923).

Presnenskaya group in Moscow.

Comrade soldiers! .

For the second year now, the terrible slaughter of people, called the World War, has been going on, the consumption of the healthiest part of the male population has been going on for the second year. Grain fields are flooded with people's blood, flourishing cities turn into heaps of dead bodies. Hundreds of thousands of civilians were expelled from their homeland and sent around the world, millions of orphans and mothers were left without breadwinners.

The whole country is terrified—groans and curses are coming from all sides. And at a time when our brothers are dying there, at the front, when the same fate awaits us, here, inside the country, the autocratic tsarist government, defending the interests of the nobility and the big bourgeoisie, is pursuing a policy of intensified exploitation of the people, squeezing out him the last juices, the policy of oppression and enslavement.

In the name of the interests of a handful of predators and embezzlers, the government has brought the country to the point of exhaustion of its last forces, brought it to the brink of the abyss. And now, having lost confidence in himself even among bourgeois society, hearing exclamations of protest and indignation from all sides, and not feeling his own close quarters, the great lord keeps hundreds of thousands of armed executioners at the ready and tries to suppress popular indignation with bloody reprisals. We saw executions in Kostroma, in Ivanovo-Voznesensk. Petrograd, and one of these days in Moscow; all this is done ostensibly in the interests of war with an external enemy and in the name of victory. But the people understand very well that the tsarist government considers its main enemy to be the toiling masses, with whom it is waging an incessant war.

Deper is now preparing for a decisive denouement of this age-old struggle, for which it seeks to finally weaken the forces of the people, having driven the last remnants of the adult

population to the war, and increases the armament of the police. With the same goal, it seeks to drag out the war "to the last soldier." But the people do not want and cannot wait until the last brothers and sons are killed. He wants an immediate end to the war that is harmful to him, harmful and nine-tenths already lost for the entire country, beneficial only to the big bourgeoisie and the bureaucracy, which build their wealth on the bones of the people.

The people want peace and the liberation of the country from the oppression of the tsarist autocracy, from the rule of the nobility and the big bourgeoisie. But only by a bloody struggle will the working masses pave the way to freedom—and only when they are united; and one with them Should be their brothers and sons in a soldier's overcoat. Comrade soldiers do not forget that you are all the same working peasants, the same rural laborers and factory workers, do not forget that we are all children of a working family, and our common enemy is all parasites, all bloodsuckers, and tyrants. That is why we call you under the common banner of struggle for the overthrow of the tsarist government, for the establishment of a democratic republic and the conclusion of peace.

Long live the National Constituent Assembly!

Down with war, long live peace!

1915 Presnenskaya group R.S-D. R.P.

("On the eve of the great rev.", collection. M. 1922).

A group of organized Social-Democrats in Moscow.

Comrades!

For four months now the war has been going on... Millions of workers and peasants' hands have been cut off from work... For four months now the bacchanalia of misanthropy has been

going on. vicious nationalism. Bourgeois governments, through the corrupt press, are doing their best to fool the masses of the people, covering up the true meaning of the war with phrases about the fight against militarism and national oppression. But time is passing, and evil intent is already needed in order not to see that the war that has been started, which has fallen with all its weight on the shoulders of the working population, is not being waged for the purpose of liberation. It is ridiculous to think that the tsarist government, which oppresses more than a dozen nationalities, has enslaved Poland, Finland, that this government would take upon itself the liberation of other countries.

The true meaning of war lies in the struggle for markets, in the robbery of countries, in the desire to fool, divide, and kill the proletarians of all countries. Because of the profits, because of the profits of the capitalists, this terrible war broke out.

Dynasties of Russia, Belgium. England, on the one hand, and dynasties on the other: Germany and Austria-Hungary, in the whirlpool of nationalism fanned by them, do not miss their advantages, and firmly repair their shattered thrones. This war brings oppression and poverty to the masses of the people.

Conscious of the ruin of this war, Russian Social-Democracy could not help declaring war on the war and coming out to fight against chauvinism and Russian tsarism. And the tsarist government began to crack down on the trend that remained true to itself. While squandering the sweet Slovaks of the bourgeoisie of Polynia and Galicia, with its dirty Azev hands, on the sly, it arrested the entire working-class Social-Democratic faction of the State Duma.

And we Social-Democrats, remaining under the old banner of international brotherhood; workers* we call on the democracy of Russia to rise up against a war so formidable. on; its

consequences, against tsarist monarchist chauvinism and its sophisticated defense by Russian liberals.

Our task at the present time should be all-round propaganda of socialist ideals, which also extends to the troops, and the need to direct the bayonets not against our brothers, wage-slaves of other countries, but against the reaction of the tsarist government. Let the struggle of the capitalists for the right to greater exploitation of the peoples be replaced by a civil war of these peoples for their liberation.

Long live the Constituent Assembly!

Long live the Democratic Republic!

Long live the international proletariat, bringing with it peace and freedom!

Long live the Russian Social Democratic Labor Party!

A group of organized social democrats.

Moscow. 1914

"Span. Roar", No. 14, 1923

Moscow Group of S.-D

Friends of all countries, unite!

Comrades, for the second year already, the proletariat of the whole world is celebrating its holiday on May 1 to the roar of cannons, to the groans of the dying and the wailing of orphans.

The fratricidal war brought disorder into the ranks of the Social Democracy, and some of its leaders forgot the holy slogans:

"Proletarians of all countries, unite!" "The workers of all countries are brothers among themselves," "The workers have no fatherland," and began to support bourgeois demands under the deceived slogan of "defence of the fatherland."

The real war is the imperialist war for the expansion of frontiers, for the acquisition of new markets, so that the bourgeoisie can line their pockets more tightly.

This war will give the workers nothing but new oppression, new deprivations.

The conscious comrades of all countries have understood this and are raising their voice against the war, refusing to vote on credits for the conduct of the war, and demanding peace by strikes and demonstrations.

Representatives of the socialist parties of France, Germany, Italy, Russia, Sweden, Holland, Serbia, Bulgaria and other countries, meeting in September 1915 in Zimmerwald (Switzerland), issued a manifesto calling for:

the workers themselves by intervening to put an end to this bloody slaughter.

In Germany, Liebknecht, and the faction of 18 staunchly demand a speedy conclusion of peace, and according to the latest information, they organized a grandiose demonstration against the war in Berlin and other cities of Europe on May 1.

In Russia, the war affected the position of the workers especially hard.

The ever-increasing high cost of living and miserable wages doom the workers to a half-starved existence. Oppress violence further intensified. The tsarist government responds to all attempts to improve its position with exile, prison, and hard labor. The working-class press has been stifled, the trade-union movement has been reduced almost to nothing, "everything alive, everything honest is squinting", but there are no forces in the world that could completely break the working-class movement. The conditions under which one has to work are difficult, but the more the Russian workers must exert their

strength for the cause of organization and agitation, socialism, etc. brotherhood of peoples

May 1, on the day of the International Workers' Day, let the old and eternally young cry of the workers sound louder: "Proletarians of all countries, unite!" And on May 2 we will show the world with strikes and demonstrations; his * readiness to stand up, as one man, in defense of his abused,! rights.

Yes, long live the international revolutionary army of workers.

Long live the May day :

Down with the war between peoples. ;

Down with tsarism. ;

Long live the Social Democratic Labor Party!

Long live socialism.

Group of Social Democrats:

Moscow. 1916 " ",

"Span. Rev.", N ° 2, 1923

Saratov organization.

"PRICE OF WAR".

The bloody world war continues for the second year. The population of the states is bleeding, and it seems that in the near future new peoples will be thrown into hell by the hands of the ruling classes," wars. It is important for the proletariat to know what financial hardships war brings for the population... (crossed out by Censorship). But in spite of this, a large share of all military expenditures will fall on the proletariat, the urban and rural poor. After all, if now the costs are covered by new loans and issues! money, then the loans will have to be repaid

in ringing gold, and the "reinforced" issue of paperwork leads to their stupor, to the possibility of: acute financial turmoil. Where, if not from the muzhik and the worker, can he get the money he needs.) After all, it's not for nothing that our "statesmen" have the conviction that the muzhik always has the "last kopeck" in reserve and, by introducing a new tax, it is possible to collect the necessary the amount of money ... We are not the first to try to calculate the approximate cost of the war. German Minister Hilferding, French scientist Guyot, Russian Marxist Ot. Volsky and others worked on resolving this issue. In the future, we use the data obtained by them when covering complex financial issues. What is the cost of a modern world war? We know that the war between England and the Boers in 1890-1902 - cost for England approximately 2 000 million, r., the Russo-Jannian war cost both sides about 2,500 million rubles. What are the costs of a modern world war? If we take 9 belligerent states (Russia, France, England, Germany. Italy, Austria-Hungary, Belgium, Turkey, and Serbia), it turns out that, with a total population of more than: 416 million.

(...)

These are some of the finances, the results of the year of the World War. What childish toys all the expenses and sacrifices of past wars seem to be. Only modern "cultural" humanity, which has created its own science, refined bourgeois culture, was able to throw hundreds of billions of rubles and millions of human lives into the bloody mouth of war

A. L - ov (Ottkovt Lomor). .

From. No. 7 Saratov "Our Newspaper",

Baltic region.

Chronicle of the Social Democrat.

They write to us from the Baltic Territory:

From the very beginning of the war, the Social-Democrats of the Latvian Territory took a strictly revolutionary position. Its slogans were and remain: "War to war!" International solidarity, of the proletariat! Implacable struggle against tsarism! Our organization, the IWN, did not back down a step in the face of the whirlwind of impending events, did not believe the legend of a "liberation" war" and decisively rejected all chauvinist interpretations about "national defence", about "defence of the fatherland", etc. The situation of the Lettish Social Democracy was very difficult: the war claimed many, many party comrades, the crisis and unemployment threw thousands of workers into the streets, the "patriotism" of the Lettish urban and After all, the war is being waged against the "Germans," and the year 1905 is not forgotten in our region—enmity and hatred against the barons, against the Germans flared up again, especially when it turned out that the former leaders of the punitive expeditions were suspected of being agents of the German government. the bourgeoisie was already rejoicing that the Russian government would reward the Latvians for their current loyal behavior, abolish at least some of the feudal nye privileges and will carry out the reform of local self-government. All this turned out to be a naive illusion: "the Latvian bourgeoisie did not achieve any benefits," and now, with the general reactionary course, along with the prohibition of the German language, the closure of German schools, etc., oppression of the Latvian language is already beginning, Patriotic frenzy in the Baltic Territory is already giving way to an anti-patriotic hangover.

Under these conditions—and in spite of all the police repressions—the Social Democracy of the Latvian Territory had to launch its agitation against the war, against rampant chauvinism. It must be noted that our organizations have been preserved, that the Party's illegal apparatus functions without interruption, and that the Party's printing houses throw out

thousands of leaflets and appeals. For the fourth time now, the proclamations of the Central Communist Party are being circulated all over the region, in which the true causes of the war are indicated, the policy of the Russian government is revealed, and the proletariat is called to its revolutionary tasks.

The 9th of January was celebrated all over the region. In Riga, proclamations were scattered throughout the working-class quarters. several small factories (7 or 8) were on strike, but demonstrations had to be abandoned. .Before the trial of five Social-Democrats. deputies were 2-3 meetings of protest in factories (for example, at the Salamander plant). On the day of January 9, newspapers bring news about banners with revolutionary inscriptions and appeals from Vindava, Tuksum, Jakobstadt (Courland province), from Wolmar and from a number of volosts in Riga, Vendee; Valksky and other counties (Lifland province.). In a word, almost all of our city organizations showed themselves on the day of January 9;

At the end of January, a new proclamation of Tsen appeared. K-ta. (10 thousand copies) against the war, which was also common in some soldiers' barracks. At the same time, a proclamation was issued to the rural workers, where, in connection with hiring for the new economic year, rural laborers are called upon to vigorously defend their economic interests. If we add here that life has not stopped for a moment in our legal societies (in trade unions, cooperatives, cultural societies), then it seems that we can say with some right that the class-conscious Latvian proletariat has fulfilled its duty and that it is only waiting for the moment when the entire Russian proletariat muster its forces and send them to fight for the slogans of international proletarian solidarity and revolutionary socialism.

"Social Democrat" No. 40 of March 29, 1915

Chronicle of the Social Democrat.

They write to us from the Baltic Territory:

From the very beginning of the war, the Social-Democrats of the Latvian Territory took a strictly revolutionary position. Its slogans were and remain: "War to war!" International solidarity, of the proletariat! Implacable struggle against tsarism! Our organization, the IWN, did not back down a step in the face of the whirlwind of impending events, did not believe the legend of a "liberation" war* and decisively rejected all chauvinist interpretations about "national defence", about "defence of the fatherland", etc. The situation of the Latvian Social Democracy was very difficult: the war claimed many, many party comrades, the crisis and unemployment threw thousands of workers into the streets, the "patriotism" of the Latvian urban and rural After all, the war is being waged against the "Germans," and the year 1905 is not forgotten in our region—enmity and hatred against the barons, against the Germans flared up again, especially when it turned out that the former leaders of the punitive expeditions were suspected of being agents of the German government. was already rejoicing that the Russian government would reward the Latvians for their current loyal behavior, abolish at least some feudal new privileges and will carry out a reform of local self-government. All this turned out to be a naive illusion: "the Latvian bourgeoisie did not achieve any benefits," and now, with the general reactionary course, along with the prohibition of the German language, the closure of German schools, etc., oppression of the Latvian language is already beginning, Patriotic frenzy in the Baltic Territory is already giving way to an anti-patriotic hangover.

Under these conditions—and in spite of all the police repressions—the Social Democracy of the Latvian Territory had to launch its agitation against the war, against rampant

chauvinism. It must be noted that our organizations have been preserved, that the Party's illegal apparatus functions without interruption, and that the Party's printing houses throw out thousands of leaflets and appeals. For the fourth time now, the proclamations of the Central Communist Party are being circulated all over the region, in which the true causes of the war are indicated, the policy of the Russian government is revealed, and the proletariat is called to its revolutionary tasks.

The 9th of January was celebrated all over the region. In Riga, proclamations were scattered throughout the working-class quarters. several small factories (7 or 8) were on strike, but demonstrations had to be abandoned. .Before the trial of five Social-Democrats. deputies were 2-3 meetings of protest in factories (for example, at the Salamander plant). On the day of January 9, newspapers bring news about banners with revolutionary inscriptions and appeals from Vindava, Tuksum, Jakobstadt (Courland province), from Wolmar and from a number of volosts in Riga, Vendee; Valksky and other counties '(Lifland province.). In a word, almost all of our city organizations showed themselves on the day of January 9;

At the end of January, a new proclamation of Tsen appeared. K-ta. (10 thousand copies) against the war, which was also common in some soldiers' barracks. At the same time, a proclamation was issued to the rural workers, where, in connection with hiring for the new economic year, rural laborers are called upon to vigorously defend their economic interests.

If we add here that life has not stopped for a moment in our legal societies (in trade unions, cooperatives, cultural societies), then it seems that we can say with some right that the class-conscious Latvian proletariat has fulfilled its duty and that it is only waiting for the moment when the entire Russian proletariat muster its forces and send them to fight for the

slogans of international proletarian solidarity and revolutionary socialism.

"Social Democrat" No. 40 of March 29, 1915

Kronstadt S.D

Proletarians of all countries, stand among us!

" When does it end?

"Comrades, soldiers, and sailors. The world war has been going on for three years already, and there is no end in sight. her. Millions of people have been killed and maimed on the battlefields, hundreds of towns, villages, and villages have been turned into ruins, flourishing countries have turned into deserts: for a year, the best forces of the peoples of Europe, dressed in soldier's overcoats and shackled with the chains of military discipline, will curse each other with a destructive hurricane of lead and steel, suffocate each other with gases and use a thousand more ways to mutually; extermination. And all the new masses of people are pouring into the place of those who were out of order, bearing their lives on the bloody "altar of the fatherland." At the same time, in the far rear, their families bear the hopeless hardships of need and exhaust their strength in the struggle for existence. But their efforts are in vain. Hunger is approaching humanity with slow but sure steps has already come in Germany, close to that with us. The impoverishment and degeneration of the people is what the continuation of the war brings with it.

Who needs all this? The tsarist government, landowners-nobles, manufacturers and breeders and our commanders and corrupt seal, all of them. they say and try to drive into our heads what this is. unheard of, slaughter is needed for the good of the people, that war is needed to protect people's freedom and people's property from the "enemy", and that this enemy is

none other than the entire German, Bulgarian and Turkish peoples, and that only by crushing them to the end can achieve a "lasting" peace. In Germany, and in Austria, Turkey, and Bulgaria, the government, and the rich-crowd the yellors tell their people the same thing. So who temper? Where is the truth? Is this war really a war of peoples, among themselves, and not only governments and ruling classes? Do the interests of the people of one country really demand the enslavement and plunder of other peoples?

Not the people—neither Russian, nor German, nor any other—need none of this. No matter how hard the ruling classes and their servants try to cloud the consciousness of the peoples with the poison of brutal enmity, they cannot hide the truth: the war is being waged not by the peoples, but by the governments and the ruling classes, and is being waged not for the interests of the people, as the corrupt hacks shout in the corrupt newspapers, but for the interests of the government, for the interests of the capitalist manufacturers and landlords of all the belligerent countries. The war is waged by them because it is not enough for them to plunder and oppress their people; they all want to enslave themselves and rob others as well; they could not peacefully; come to an agreement among themselves: who and whom will be robbed, and so they started this war and dragged their peoples into it.

Thus, all peoples fight only in order to increase the profits of their capitalist manufacturers and landowners, who stand behind them and wait for the moment when one of the parties is defeated. Then they, like hungry dogs, will pounce on the vanquished and begin to torment and rob them.

(From the book. Shlyapnikov: "Eve of the 17th year"

Ural S.-D. about the war and the tasks of the Social-Democrats.

International Proletariat and War.

The ongoing European war, which some call "liberation", others "defensive", others, finally, "the war of civilized countries against German militarism and barbarism"* is in reality an imperialist war, generated by the economic conditions of contemporary capitalist Europe.

The true cause of the war lies in the striving of the bourgeoisie of all the belligerent countries to expand the scope of capitalist production, uncontrolled economic activity, and predation beyond the borders of their own country, by seizing new markets and colonies. This war has the same character for the Russian bourgeoisie, with the difference that in addition to the desire to seize new markets, a significant role is also played by the desire to protect their home market from the competition of more advanced foreign capitalism by means of prohibitive entry duties.

Thus, in none of the fighting fears is this war of the people; on the contrary, the people in! in this war is only a tool with which the bourgeoisie and the ruling classes in general settle their class scores. The victory of this or that coalition does not judge the proletariat of both the victorious and the defeated countries, no benefits, but only brings new chains. Therefore, to determine the attitude of the proletariat to the war and the belligerent governments and the bourgeoisie, it does not matter who first started this imperialist war. Even if we admit that the immediate cause for the war was the imperialist desires of the Austro-German coalition in the Middle East, then even then this circumstance cannot in any way give the war against this coalition the character of a national defense, especially now after 14 months of war, when in all countries there is definitely

and the aggressive character of the war was sharply revealed: after all, the slogan—defence of the fatherland and self-defense—is put forward only in times of military failures, and in times of success is replaced by the aggressive slogans: "solution of national problems." For example, Russia's policy towards Galicia.

Thanks to this character of the war, of all the classes of modern society, only the proletariat can raise the banner of struggle against war With all determination and definiteness. Its interests are opposed to the interests of the bourgeoisie, which started and continues the war. The international solidarity of the interests of the proletariat, which is striving in all countries at war with each other towards the same final goal—international socialism—is immeasurably more valuable to it than the dubious benefits that individual few strata of the proletariat of one country or another can derive from the victory of the bourgeoisie of that country.

The bourgeoisie strives to impose on the proletariat of its country an understanding of the ongoing war as a people's war, in order to make it thus its obedient tool in the struggle until complete victory over the hostile coalition. That is why it advances the hypocritical slogans of "internal unity", "civil peace", "class truce", etc. To these slogans the proletariat must oppose the international slogan of the democratic elimination of war, and in each country take the lead in the struggle of the whole people for this slogan.

And this slogan, put forward from the very beginning of the war by the revolutionary wing of R. S.-D. R. P., part of the British and German socialists and socialists of neutral countries, is gradually winning over four supporters in all the belligerent countries and is becoming a real slogan of the proletarian class struggle, which has found international recognition in the

decisions of the recently held international socialist conference in Switzerland.

This slogan can only be carried out on an international scale. The victory of the people in one or more of the belligerent countries, which has revolted under the leadership of the proletariat, will be the impetus for revolutions in other countries and will make it possible to eliminate the war not through peaceful negotiations between the diplomatic representatives of modern governments, but on an international congress composed of real people's representatives. The proletariat will demand from this congress:

- 1) complete democratization of all European states;
- 2) renunciation of any annexations (forced accession to another state);'
- 3) recognition of the right of all nationalities to self-determination and renunciation of all types of national oppression;
- 4) the creation of such forms of international communication in which the danger of new imperialist wars between the peoples of Europe would be most averted and
- 5) general disarmament'.

For the success of the struggle of the proletariat of different countries for the democratic liquidation of war on the basis of the above-mentioned demands,¹ it is necessary to immediately re-establish the international socialist association in the form of the Third International.

Russian proletariat and war.

As in other belligerent countries, in Russia the proletariat is the only irreconcilable enemy of war, striving for its democratic

liquidation on the grounds set forth in the first resolution. But in Russia the ongoing international war found the proletariat in a different political situation than in the West.

Although, in terms of its economic development, Russia has long since entered the stage of capitalism and has reached developed forms of capitalism in some branches of production, its political system is a semi-autocratic monarchy based on the nobility and agricultural circles of the population, who have not yet abandoned feudal ideals and are incapable of no concessions or reforms. The bourgeoisie, which in Western Europe is the revolutionary class and which led the people's struggle against feudalism, found itself in Russia, out of fear of the growing Social Democratic movement, incapable of playing a revolutionary role. And the proletariat had to take upon itself the whole burden of leading the revolutionary democratic struggle, in which its ally is the unorganized, wavering, but interested in the complete liquidation of the existing regime, the petty bourgeoisie—the urban democrats and the peasantry. After the defeat of the revolutions of 1905 and 1906 and several difficult years of reaction from 1912, a new revolutionary upsurge of the labor movement began, which reached great tension in the middle of 1914 and led to open clashes with the government in July 1914. The war slowed down the development revolution. The government, however, took advantage of the martial law introduced after the declaration of war to close down all legal workers' organizations, to destroy the workers' press, to arrest and deport the advanced workers.

For the Russian bourgeoisie, a real war is valuable because of the imperialist prospects it opens up (the acquisition of Constantinople and the straits, opening up free access to the Mediterranean Sea, the Asian market, the capture of Galicia, etc.). While the bourgeoisie hoped for the victory of the Russian government, it forgot about its opposition and, despite the

black reaction that reigned in the country, unanimously (including the Cadets) supported the government. Military failures sobered her. She realized that the current government cannot save Russia from defeat, and defeat not only shatters hopes for obtaining new foreign markets, but also threatens to lose the internal one. And the bourgeoisie hastily mobilizes its forces. The military-industrial committees and congresses, the Fourth State Duma, city and zemstvo congresses and individual city dumas and zemstvo meetings, stock exchange committees and other industrial organizations unanimously put forward the slogan of fighting the enemies until complete victory at all costs. Based on this slogan, the bourgeoisie seeks to wrest power from its hands. its current bearers and put at the head of the government a person “strong in the confidence of the people” (read “bourgeoisie”), but at the same time the bourgeoisie is afraid of a broad popular movement even more than the current reaction. The program of the liberal bourgeoisie (which is also the platform of the parliamentary progressive bloc) retains in the hands of the expected liberal ministry all the means of combating the workers' and peasants' movement that are now being used. Not only is it still far from power itself, the liberal bourgeoisie, through the mouths of Malakhov and others, is already warning its like-minded people against a “possible movement of the popular lower classes.

That is why the proletariat in Russia, even now, during the war, has to reckon with two counter-revolutionary forces that are at odds with each other, but even more hostile to it—the feudal government, which has embarked on the path of irrevocable reaction, and the national-liberal bourgeoisie.

A different position is taken by the petty bourgeoisie of the cities (urban democrats), and especially by the peasantry. True, their ideals do not go beyond the limits of the capitalist system.

Therefore, they cannot break: with - the prejudice: of patriotism, and strive for - continuation. wars and victory over the enemy. But they believe that victory is possible in a truly people's war, in the transfer of power into the hands of the people.

Their interests are not connected: with the current > government; On the contrary, the peasantry is resolute: the enemy of landownership of the nobility, and strives for it. ; confiscation. The petty urban bourgeoisie, perishing from the competition of triumphant capitalism, is hostile to the present. the government and the ideologists of capitalism, the liberals. And that is why all this democracy is ready to embark on the path of revolution and support the slogan of its political representatives, the Trudoviks and other Narodniks, "a constituent assembly as the path to victory",

The proletariat, striving not for victory at all costs, but for the democratic liquidation of the war, will part ways with the Narodniks in a constituent assembly, but before the constituent assembly, until the democratic revolution is completely completed along the way.

To the liberal slogan "strong power enjoying public confidence", the proletariat, together with all bourgeois democrats, counterposes the slogan: "of the All-People's Constituent¹ Assembly"

The proletariat will oppose the nationalist slogan of this bourgeois democracy "revolution for victory" with the slogan ; "revolution for the international democratic elimination of war"

Note. -ed. Collection S. D.: "Sharing % the main position of 'G-D.', the authors of the document give some-questions-other: answers than we do"

October. 1915 collection. S.-D1 No. 2.

Party press attitude to the war.

"Insurance Issues".

The objective of the working class.

The global catastrophe that broke out last year, without a doubt, opens a new era in the development of mankind.

For about half a century, peace prevailed in Europe, broken through only occasionally by so-called colonial wars and complications in the Middle East, i.e., in the Balkans, which for centuries have served as an example of imperialist conquest tendencies.

This peaceful cohabitation was accompanied, however, by a constant increase in armaments, for international relations became more complicated in such a way that conflict eventually became inevitable.

The most capitalistically developed states, led by Germany and England, had to look for ever new markets for their goods, thus leading fierce competition among themselves.

This economic struggle finally led to a fatal denouement—the world conflagration. This is the real cause of the conflict, for which the Sarajevo murder was only a spark thrown into the powder magazine.

But industrial life is developing, more and more capturing new countries in its circulation and creating new competitors for itself.

The struggle for the world market thus becomes fiercer and more difficult, and all this carries with it the germs of new conflicts in the future.

Thus modern warfare is a direct consequence of the latest phase of development, imperialism.

This must be firmly grasped by all those who want to consciously give themselves an account of the events taking place.

But if a new epoch has begun in the development of the life of states, then modern democracy, in the person of its foremost representative, the working class, must open a new page in its international history. For half a century, the life of the Second International in the West proceeded peacefully: loud words did not turn into decisive action at the appropriate moment, on the contrary, we are witnesses of peaceful cooperation in the name of "defence of the fatherland"...

And, entering a new epoch, the old democracy must first of all dissociate itself, demarcate itself from all those whose actions did not turn out to be at the level of the words they proclaim.

This is the first challenge...

T. 3.

"Questions of Insurance", No. 4, 1915

Decade of the World War.

Theses

Adopted by the Commission on Commemorating the Decade of the Imperialist War.

Results of the war; prospects for new wars.

Ten years have passed since that moment, when the predators of world-wide globalism threw the peoples into a fratricidal slaughter. Warring among themselves over colonies, over markets, over sources of raw materials, over spheres of investment of capital, the imperialist cliques committed the crime that the theoreticians of socialism foresaw and warned about, and which the proletariat expected with horror.

The past years of military trials, post-war disappointments have weathered the tinsel, tore off those false deductions that obliging ideologists have fastened on the terrible tartans of war. The masses of the people saw with their own eyes what "the last war" means, "(the struggle for civilization", "the sacred rights of the peoples", for democracy and the liberation of the oppressed peoples.

The thunder of cannons, the glow of fires, suffocating gases, the calamities of millions of refugees, mountains of corpses, epidemics of the war and post-war period—such is the face of capitalism, which the masses of the people have seen with their own eyes.

Capital appeared before tortured humanity in all its disgusting nakedness.

Instead of mountains of gold promised by the capitalists to the workers after the victorious end of the war, which they called the last and just, the capitalists launched a decisive offensive against the working class. In a number of countries, the 8-hour

workday has been taken away. day, the rampant fascism destroyed the workers' organizations; the burden of post-war taxes, indemnities and reparations fell with all its burden on the shoulders of the working men; The working class, which before that left millions of corpses on the battlefields, can wonder in anguish when (the capitalists will rekindle the world fire.

The great lie of the bourgeoisie about the "last war", that after the war the principles of justice and humanity will triumph, is dissipating in the minds of the most backward strata.

Capitalism is hastening by its practice to prove the correctness of the thesis put forward by the revolutionary leaders of the proletariat that the massacre of the year will be only the initial link in the chain of imperialist massacres, the end of which (will be put only by the international proletariat, when it succeeds, having mobilized all the working masses, resolutely with capital, civil to overcome the imperialist war by war, to destroy the very cause and source of wars, the class rule of capital.

Six years have passed since the victors solemnly celebrated their cannibal victory, on the bones of millions of dead, proclaiming the victory of civilization, eternal peace, the development of international agreements under the leadership of the League of Nations. It is now clear to the blind that capitalism did not give peace, that it could not and cannot give it.

The wounds inflicted by the war are still oozing, even millions of participants in the war, the disabled, the crippled, have not wiped the nightmarish pictures of the war from their memory, and capital is already preparing new general wars and not only preparing, but also conducting, in the form of rehearsals, partial wars and military expeditions. . Since the Peace of Versailles, tools have not been left without work, expeditions in colonial countries "self-determine" the natives. A significant part of

Central Europe is an armed camp, with troops of the Belgians, French and British, mixed with colored troops placed in the service of the capitalist order. The poverty of the masses, the disorganization of economic relations, which has not been cured, despite all the tricks of the sorcerers of capitalism, the revelry of the military, the purulent ulcer of militant fascism, the rampant appetites of large and small capitalist powers, controlled from behind the scenes by financial bigwigs, heavy industry committees, (banks and stock exchanges , the insane excitement of armaments, covered up by pious motives for the limitation of armaments, the pursuit of new and new means of exterminating and destroying people, this is what capitalism gave after the war, which one of the clerks of capital, one of the organizers of the world massacre, the former president of France, Millerand, called "the most glorious from the wars."

The occupation of the Ruhr, new inevitable military clashes, which no Zarlamite or extra-parliamentary combination of bourgeois parties and their socialist servants can, cannot, will not want to prevent, completely bury hopes; on the possibility of successful restoration of the world economic organism.

The two great powers of the Entente, "solid together in the struggle for the great common cause of saving civilization from Prussian militarism," France and Great Britain are preparing to grapple with each other.

The contradictions of their interests are growing daily and are found everywhere, in Central Europe, Asia Minor and the Balkans, in northern Africa and in East Asia. Great Britain is following with the greatest anxiety the growth of French land armies and air squadrons, and the military agreements concluded by France.

In the field of naval structures, and especially air, there is an open competition: In the same way, the elements of the

imperialist conflict between America and Japan are steadily raging.

Thousands of inventors work on assignments to concoct diabolical measures of extermination, governments strive to penetrate each other's military secrets and outdo one another in ingenuity.

The British Minister openly declaims in the House the need to "create such an (air fleet for the defense of the homeland, which could protect against a raid - the strongest air power, the proximity of which makes such an attack possible."

In 1914, on the eve of the outbreak of the world war in all countries of the globe, 7 million people were under arms; in 1921, after the Treaty of Versailles and the disarmament of the defeated countries, the total number of all armies in peacetime states reached 11 million, i.e. e. almost doubled. The United States spent for military purposes in 1914 49 mil. fund sterling, and in 1920: 501 million.

Military races; In England, from 1914 to 1920, the rates increased by more than 3 times. France maintains an army larger than the pre-war German army, although her population is a whole third less. In Poland, armed with French money against the USSR, there is one soldier per 100 people. There was no such ratio even in the notorious militaristic Prussia, with which the democratic Entente waged the "last" "just" war in 1914-18.

But even more than the strength of the army, the strength and power of those destructive means that they will use against each other on the second day after the start (of the inevitable approaching new war) has increased and continues to grow every day.

Preparations for it will continue regardless of which bourgeois group heads the government or which front of the "workers" government covers the intimate springs of the bourgeois state.

The Macdonald government is also preparing ironclads and is also building an air fleet, as did the government of Curzon, Baldwin, Lloyd George, and others.

The government of the left bloc is no worse than the national bloc, no worse than Millerand and Poincaré, (will serve the god of imperialist war.

Pacifist fables about the possibility of disarmament, about an agreement on the limitation of armaments, about an international tribunal for the settlement of conflicts, cover up intensified preparations for war.

Powers that have strong navies are not averse to working on a serious general reduction of land armies;

the powers that have stockpiled shells for war for a number of years are busy reducing the production of poisonous substances for asphyxiating gases so that other powers do not catch up with them in this field.

The League of Nations, whose appearance was heralded as the beginning of an era of peace, turned out to be nothing but a toy in the hands of the imperialist powers or an arena for their hidden struggle. The Communist International tirelessly exposed the true essence of the League of Nations, exposed the deceit of the bourgeoisie and agents of the social patriots, and now the content of this bourgeois deception should be clear to everyone.

The most striking illustration and proof of the falsity of bourgeois pacifist speeches and the bankruptcy of the "peaceful" policy of bourgeois circles is the Ruhr epic.

The logic of events directs the policy of reparations in the direction of the imperialist conflict.

Contradictions of interests, the centrifugal forces of the development of world capitalism (America, Japan, England, and the colonies, with their growing young capitalism, England, and American capitalism, etc.) inevitably grow.

Tens of millions of dead wounded and maimed, the destruction of an enormous amount of economic wealth, savagery, poverty, degeneration —all this in order to face again and again, the inevitability of more and more new wars, more and more formidable, more and more terrible in their destructive power—such is the logic of imperialism.

The culprits of the war. The Second International is a criminal accomplice of the imperialist war.

After the end of the war, when the predatory Treaty of Versailles was concluded, the bourgeois gangs, in order to avert the anger and indignation of the masses of the people, hypocritically searched for the perpetrators of the war, on whom they could blame the world conflagration.

The proclamation of the German Emperor Wilhelm as the culprit could not knock out of the consciousness of the advanced working strata and peasants the firm conviction that all capitalist cliques, stock market bosses of all nations, bankers of all faiths, leaders of finance capital and heavy industry, both Germany on the one hand and France and England

On the other hand, they are equally guilty of the world war. World capitalism, imperialism in collaboration with the remnants of the tribal nobility, dynasties, priests—

Here is the true culprit of the massacre, the working masses and history will not forget that at the decisive hour of the military Trials, throughout the entire war and post-war period, capital

found itself voluntary servants and helpers, accomplices in the cause of the world war in the person of the leaders and leaders of the Second International, who criminally betrayed the interests of the working class, the interests of the working people, the interests of mankind.

Long before the start of the world war, international socialism foresaw its inevitability, pointing out its causes and factors, charting the paths of struggle.

Partial wars - Russo-Japanese, Balkan, Italian-Turkish - from year to year confirmed the fear of international socialism.

International Socialism, long before the imperialist war of 1914, established the guiding principles for the behavior of the socialist parties in relation to the preparations for war by the imperialists, the behavior of the socialist and workers' organizations in the event of a war at its international congresses (especially the Stuttgart in 1907, Basel-1912). , at a number of national congresses (Khemnitsky, Parteytag, German Social-Democrats, etc.).

The Second International, in adopting the resolution on war, assumed definite and unambiguous obligations.

The resolution of the Stuttgart Congress states:

"... The Congress considers it the duty of all workers and their representatives in parliaments to fight by all means against armaments, both on land and at sea, exposing the class character of bourgeois society and the motives that guide them while maintaining national antagonism, and also to refuse any financial support for such a policy and to try to ensure that the proletarian youth is brought up in the socialist ideas of the "brotherhood of peoples" and that their class self-consciousness is constantly maintained in them.

The resolution of the Stuttgart Congress contains approval of the activity of the Russian and Polish workers and peasants who waged a mass revolutionary struggle to prevent tsarism from waging the war, to put an end to it, in order to issue a call to the people and the proletariat for civil war in the midst of this conflict.

“If the war has already begun,” the Stuttgart Congress concludes its resolution, “despite everything from the measure, the socialists are obliged to make every effort to stop it as soon as possible, and to make every effort to use the economic and political crises caused by the war to in order to stir up the broad masses of the people and hasten the fall of capitalist domination.

On October 29, 1912, the International Socialist Bureau on the (Balkan War) adopted a resolution, in the final part of which it says:

“The near future will probably bring many trials for the Socialist Party and the proletariat and will require them to respond.

The proletariat will be able to meet them with the necessary courage... Let the rulers know well that playing with fire is dangerous for themselves.

If they light a monstrous fire all over Europe, it will not go unpunished for them.”

In November of the same year, an urgent international Basel Congress adopted a manifesto against the impending imperialist war, against any and the slightest assistance to the war and to the bourgeois governments and parliaments in its conduct.

“It (the International) is for the workers of all countries to oppose capitalist imperialism with the might of the international solidarity of the proletariat.

The Congress directly and clearly indicates the path that the workers will have to take if a crime is committed, if a war is started, the path of civil war. The indication that the proletariat responded to the Franco-Prussian war, to the Russo-Japanese war with uprisings, a civil war, is a direct call to the socialist parties and workers' organizations, and now, in case of war, to respond in the same way—civil war. They are mad if they do not understand that the mere thought of a terrible war arouses in the proletariat of all countries a feeling of anger and indignation. The workers consider it a crime to shoot each other for the benefit of the capitalists.”

Here are the promises made by the Second International, here are the obligations that it took upon itself.

How did he complete them?

Even on the eve of the war, when the alarmed proletariat was demonstrating against the war in the streets of Berlin, Paris and St. Petersburg, the leaders of the Second International were already conducting secret negotiations with the bourgeoisie, were already preparing to betray the cause of the workers' cause.

On July 30, 1914, the German Social Democracy pinned its hopes for the preservation of peace on Emperor Wilhelm.

Vile traitors to the cause of socialism were looking for paths to imperial thrones, to ministerial portfolios.

“Being open and principled opponents of the monarchy and remaining so in the future, waging an often bitter war against the imperialist bearer of the crown,” they wrote, “we nevertheless frankly admit, and now not for the first time, that

Wilhelm II, by his behavior, In recent years, he has shown himself to be a sincere friend of the preservation of peace.

Thus, the imperial socialists, the social Wilhelmians, prepared the masses for the false version of the bourgeoisie about the forced acceptance of the war, about the necessary defense.

Did the behavior of the opportunist heroes of the Second International in France and other countries differ from the behavior of the German Social Democratic leaders? Not at all. They also cared less about exposing their governments than about presenting them as peace-loving and peace-hungry.

The declaration of the French parliamentary socialist group (of March 29-1914) maintains the illusion of a peace-loving policy of France, that is, of the government and its peace-loving influence in Europe.

But these notes were still drowning in the mass of protests and declarations against the war.

The beginning of the war, as if by magic, changed the picture. The opportunist ideas that were developed and matured in the opportunist circles of the Second International, with the connivance of the leaders of the center of Kautsky and others, immediately surfaced and became the banner and military program of the entire Second International, instead of the buried, downtrodden, disgraced decisions of Stuttgart, Brussels, Chemnitz, Paris, etc. .

4-VIII 14 is a significant date in the history of socialism. The social-democratic faction of the German Reichstag carried out the decision taken the day before (by a majority of 78 votes against 14) to vote for war credits. Declaration of the Social-Democrats faction, (which the serfs and traitors of socialism faithfully wore for viewing and approval to the imperial chancellor, reads:

"We must now vote not for war or against it, but to raise the question of disbursing funds necessary for the defense of the country."

To justify the betrayal, the argument about the Russian danger is brought in. "It is necessary to prevent this danger to ensure the culture and independence of our own fatherland. Let us act as we have always declared: we will not leave the fatherland without help in the hour of danger.

We recognize ourselves as acting in solidarity with the Second International, which has always recognized the right of every people to national independence and self-defense, and in exactly the same way, in agreement with it, we condemn any war of conquest.

Commitments were forgotten, promises were trampled on, and the Social Democracy went into the service of the German bourgeoisie, in the service of Wilhelm, taking the official position of defending the fatherland, placing the powerful apparatus of the party, the social-democratic press, the trade unions, at the disposal of the military clique.

There was no such vile thing that the traitors to socialism would not carry out already in the first years of the war, rolling up the red banner of the working class and spitting on it. Arbeiter Zeitung, organ of the Austrian Social-Democrats, 5/VIII-1914, wrote:

"We will not forget this day, August 4th"

The proletariat will never forget this day.

And on its 10th anniversary, demonstrating its rabid hatred of the perpetrators of the war, the East will not forget their accomplices, the Social Democrats, and will say that having linked fate with the bourgeoisie, they must share with it the contempt and hatred of the working class.

The French socialists declared that they considered it their duty to uphold the independence and inviolability of a republican, thirsty for peace, Europe.

The General Council of the Belgian Workers' Party declared: "The Socialist Democracy bears no responsibility for such bloodshed. It stops at nothing to warn the peoples, to thwart reckless armaments, to avert (a catastrophe that threatens to afflict the entire population of Europe.

But now the evil has already been done, and by the will of fate we are preoccupied with one thought:

we have to make every effort to stop the enemy's invasion of our territory.

We will do it with that great fervor;

that, by defending neutralism and the very existence of our country from barbarian militarists, we will be aware that we have served the interests of democracy and the political liberation of Europe."

The Boitan Socialist Party said in its manifesto:

"The great war that threatened us suddenly broke out. The attack made by Austria on Serbia involved the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente in the struggle, and our homeland was thrown into the war as a result of Germany's declaration of war on Belgium, the cause of which was the refusal of this small state to violate the neutrality guaranteed to it in the interests of the attacking power.

Most of the leaders of the socialist parties of other countries (with few exceptions) committed treachery with greater or lesser cynicism, passing over to the point of view of their bourgeoisie or dipping into it.

The traitors to socialism turned the huge trade unions of Germany into mobilization centers for the German government, and the leaders of the trade unions used them as recruiting bureaus.

A renegade of French syndicalism, Jouhault, one of the present leaders of the Amsterdam International, not out of fear, but out of conscience, saves his native bourgeoisie.

Socially treacherous parties delegated their members to bourgeois governments (Jules Guesde, Samba, Thomas, Henderson, Vandervelde).

And they covered up the crime of the bourgeoisie with the authority of the Second International and shared with it the responsibility to the peoples. The theoreticians of the Second International, Kautsky, Victor Adler and others, took upon themselves the dirty, dirty work of explaining, substantiating, hushing up, glossing over the treacherous positions of the social patriots.

Consistent social patriots supported the war, but the center, such as the "independents" in Germany; confining themselves to verbal protests, getting under the feet of the internationalists, hindered the revolutionary struggle.

A more shameful collapse, a more severe bankruptcy of the Second International cannot be imagined.

The culprits of the war, the imperialists, and their accomplices, the social patriots, at the beginning of the war asserted that they were only defending their fatherland. History, it was desirable to expose them to the end. German imperialism showed itself in all its glory with the Peace of Brest-Litovsk, (by bloody actions in Finland, in the Ukraine. The imperialism of the consenting powers with its Treaty of Versailles, the Treaty of Sevres showed its "predatory nature. The 2nd International

conscientiously followed the heels of imperialism, the 2nd International branded itself with the shame of struggle against the Russian revolution, the murders of German and French workers, the murders in the colonies.

The blood of Karl Liebknecht, Rosa Luxemburg, of thousands of German proletarians, as well as of the millions killed in the imperialist war, is on the conscience of the Second International.

The proletariat and the working masses will never forget that the predatory Treaty of Versailles was ratified by the Second International.

Among the signatures under this treaty is the signature of the Royal Socialist Minister, the beauty and pride of the yellow treacherous International, Vandervelde.

The Second International, in the person of MacDonald, by its bourgeois policy in favor of the aristocracy, financial and industrial capital, exposed itself in the eyes of the working masses of India and other colonial countries enslaved by the bourgeoisie.

The Second International has stained itself with open collaboration with the fascist executioners of the working class in Germany, Bulgaria, Hungary, Italy, and a number of other countries.

Only with the help of Social Democracy could bourgeois power in Germany hold its ground in the autumn of 1923, at the moment of the highest upsurge of the revolutionary movement and the maximum disorganization of forces in the bourgeois camp.

With systematic support, S.-D. in Germany the bourgeois republic acquires all the features of a monarchical military dictatorship...

Under such conditions, all statements of the Second International and the Amsterdam Trade Union International about a general strike in the event of a new war cannot be regarded otherwise than as a brazen deceit. After the experience of the World War of 1914-18, after all the further collaboration between the heroes of the Second International and the Amsterdam International of Trade Unions with the blackest forces of capitalist reaction, it can be predicted in advance that all promises of a general strike in case of war are grandiose political blackmail...

The Second International will not be able to fulfill these promises, even if it wanted to.

It is pleaded not to doubt that from the first day of the new war, international Social-Democracy will not serve the bourgeoisie of the belligerent countries, will call on the workers on both sides of the front not to support their bourgeois homelands.

The overcoming of the Second International, the victory over opportunism in the working class is a necessary condition for a successful struggle against war...

At the present time in the countries of the Entente (England, France) power is passing to the left elements of the Buryaeus, who are marching in a bloc with the International. We are present at a certain manifestation of pacifist agitation and at an attempt by means of a compromise to achieve a settlement of relations between the victorious countries and the defeated countries (decision of the commission of experts).

This attempt, supported by the Social Democratic parties and the Amsterdam International, brings with it colossal new hardships for the "working class of Germany, at the expense of which the German bourgeoisie thinks to pay off the Entente ...

However, the German working class, contrary to the social democracy, will not allow itself to be put on a new yoke, and the German bourgeoisie, seized by the fever of chauvinism and nationalism, will not voluntarily surrender its positions.

The well-being of the Entente countries cannot be maintained at the expense of a Germany completely ruined, even if the German bourgeoisie wanted it.

Nothing but new illusions and new deception will be achieved by the workers of Europe and the whole world by an attempt to lubricate the contradictions of the imperialist world and to put aside the threat of a future war by carrying out the decisions of the commission of experts.

It is not the alliance of the bourgeoisie with the Social Democracy that can prevent the inevitable impending war, but the revolutionary struggle of the working class led by the Communist International, not the capitalist dictatorship, approved by social-patriotic hypocrisy and deceit, but the overthrow of capitalism and the implementation of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

First of all, the 10th anniversary of the World War tells us about this. It calls on the working class and working people of the whole world to mobilize their forces against capitalism and against the social traitors, against the warmongers and their accomplices.

The world war, which is openly being forged in all imperialist countries with the direct participation of social traitors, can only be averted by the triumph of the proletarian revolution! first in Europe, and then throughout the world.

If a war comes out, the fight against it will be successful only if it works in a revolutionary way.

The workers and peasants of the Soviet Union, led by the Russian Communist scab, were able, according to Lenin's behest, to get out of the imperialist war in a revolutionary, i.e., civil war, as a result of which the first proletarian country was born.

In the week of the tenth anniversary of the declaration of world war, the Communist Parties are called upon to mobilize all revolutionary forces for a revolutionary struggle for the power of labor, for Soviet power on a world scale, which alone can save mankind from the horrors of new wars.

At the same time, the working people of the whole world must be prepared to fight through a revolutionary war, should one arise.

The International Socialist Congress in Stuttgart (Proletary)

Proletary, No. 17, October 20, 1907

A feature of the International Socialist Congress held in Stuttgart this August was its large and representative composition: the total of 886 delegates came from all the five continents. Besides providing an impressive demonstration of international unity in the proletarian struggle, the Congress played an outstanding part in defining the tactics of the socialist parties. It adopted general resolutions on a number of questions, the decision of which had hitherto been left solely to the discretion of the individual socialist parties. And the fact that more and more problems require uniform, principled decisions in different countries is striking proof that socialism is being welded into a single international force.

The full text of the Stuttgart resolutions will be found elsewhere in this issue. We shall deal briefly with each of them in order to bring out the chief controversial points and the character of the debate at the Congress.

This is not the first time the colonial question has figured at international congresses. Up till now their decisions have always been an unqualified condemnation of bourgeois colonial policy as a policy of plunder and violence. This time, however, the Congress Commission was so composed that opportunist elements, headed by Van Kol of Holland, predominated in it. A sentence was inserted in the draft resolution to the effect that the Congress did not in principle condemn all colonial policy, for under socialism colonial policy could play a civilizing role. The minority in the Commission (Ledebour of Germany, the Polish and Russian Social-Democrats, and many others) vigorously protested against any such idea being entertained. The matter was referred to

Congress, where the forces of the two trends were found to be so nearly equal that there was an extremely heated debate.

The opportunists rallied behind Van Kol. Speaking for the majority of the German delegation Bernstein and David urged acceptance of a "socialist colonial policy" and fulminated against the radicals for their barren, negative attitude, their failure to appreciate the importance of reforms, their lack of a practical colonial programme, etc. Incidentally, they were opposed by Kautsky, who felt compelled to ask the Congress to pronounce against the majority of the German delegation. He rightly pointed out that there was no question of rejecting the struggle for reforms; that was explicitly stated in other sections of the resolution, which had evoked no dispute. The point at issue was whether we should make concessions to the modern regime of bourgeois plunder and violence. The Congress was to discuss present-day colonial policy, which was based on the downright enslavement of primitive populations. The bourgeoisie was actually introducing slavery in the colonies and subjecting the native populations to unprecedented outrages and acts of violence, "civilizing" them by the spread of liquor and syphilis. And in that situation socialists were expected to utter evasive phrases about the possibility of accepting colonial policy in principle! That would be an outright desertion to the bourgeois point of view. It would be a decisive step towards subordinating the proletariat to bourgeois ideology, to bourgeois imperialism, which is now arrogantly raising its head.

The Congress defeated the Commission's motion by 128 votes to 108 with ten abstentions (Switzerland). It should be noted that at Stuttgart, for the first time, each nation was allotted a definite number of votes, varying from twenty (for the big nations, Russia included) to two (Luxembourg). The combined vote of the small nations, which either do not pursue a colonial

policy, or which suffer from it, outweighed, the vote of nations where even the proletariat has been somewhat infected with the lust of conquest.

This vote on the colonial question is of very great importance. First? it strikingly showed up socialist opportunism, which succumbs to bourgeois blandishments. Secondly, it revealed a negative feature in the European labour movement, one that can do no little harm to the proletarian cause, and for that reason should receive serious attention. Marx frequently quoted a very significant saying of Sismondi. The proletarians of the ancient world, this saying runs, lived at the expense of society; modern society lives at the expense of the proletarians.

The non-propertied, but non-working, class is incapable of overthrowing the exploiters. Only the proletarian class, which maintains the whole of society, can bring about the social revolution. However, as a result of the extensive colonial policy, the European proletarian partly finds himself in a position when it is not his labour, but the labour of the practically enslaved natives in the colonies, which maintains the whole of society. The British bourgeoisie, for example, derives more profit from the many millions of the population of India and other colonies than from the British workers. In certain countries this provides the material and economic basis for infecting the proletariat with colonial chauvinism. Of course, this may be only a temporary phenomenon, but the evil must nonetheless be clearly realised and its causes understood in order to be able to rally the proletariat of all countries for the struggle against such opportunism. This struggle is bound to be victorious, since the "privileged" nations are a diminishing faction of the capitalist nations.

There were practically no differences at the Congress on the question of women's suffrage. The only one who tried to make out a case for a socialist campaign in favour of a limited

women's suffrage (qualified as opposed to universal suffrage) was a woman delegate from the extremely opportunist British Fabian Society. No one supported her. Her motives were simple enough: British bourgeois ladies hope to obtain the franchise for themselves, without its extension to women workers in Britain.

The First International Socialist Women's Conference was held concurrently with the Congress in the same building. Both at this Conference and in the Congress Commission there was an interesting dispute between the German and Austrian Social-Democrats on the draft resolution. In their campaign for universal suffrage the Austrians tended to play down the demand for equal rights of men and women; on practical grounds they placed the main emphasis on male suffrage. Clara Zetkin and other German Social-Democrats rightly pointed out to the Austrians that they were acting incorrectly, and that by failing to press the demand that the vote be granted to Women as well as men, they were weakening the mass movement. The concluding words of the Stuttgart resolution ("the demand for universal suffrage should be put forward simultaneously for both men and women") undoubtedly relate to this episode of excessive "practicalism" in the history of the Austrian labour movement.

The resolution on the relations between the socialist parties and the trade unions is of especial importance to us Russians. The Stockholm. R.S.D.L.P. Congress went on record for non-Party unions, thus endorsing the neutrality standpoint, which has always been upheld by our non-Party democrats, Bernsteinians and Socialist-Revolutionaries. The London Congress, on the other hand, put forward a different principle, namely, closer alignment of the unions with the Party, even including, under certain conditions, their recognition as Party unions. At Stuttgart in the Social-Democratic subsection of the Russian

section (the socialists of each country form a separate section at international congresses) opinion was divided on this issue (there was no split on other issues). Plekhanov upheld the neutrality principle. Voinov, a Bolshevik, defended the anti-neutralist viewpoint of the London Congress and of the Belgian resolution (published in the Congress materials with de Brouckère's report, which will soon appear in Russian). Clara Zetkin rightly remarked in her journal *Die Gleichheit* that Plekhanov's arguments for neutrality were just as lame as those of the French. And the Stuttgart resolution—as Kautsky rightly observed and as anyone who takes the trouble to read it carefully will see—puts an end to recognition of the "neutrality" principle. There is not a word in it about neutrality or non-party principles. On the contrary, it definitely recognises the need for closer and stronger connections between the unions and the socialist parties.

The resolution of the London R.S.D:L.P. Congress on the trade unions has thus been placed on a firm theoretical basis in the form of the Stuttgart resolution. The Stuttgart resolution lays down the general principle that, in every country the unions must be brought into permanent and close contact with the socialist party. The London resolution says that in Russia this should take the form, under favourable conditions, of party unions, and party members must work towards that goal.

We note that the harmful aspects of the neutrality principle were revealed in Stuttgart by the fact that the trade-union half of the German delegation were the most adamant supporters of opportunist views. That is why in Essen, for example, the Germans were against Van Kol (the trade unions were not represented in Essen, which was a Congress solely of the Party), while in Stuttgart they supported him. By playing into the hands of the opportunists in the Social-Democratic movement the advocacy of neutrality in Germany has actually had

harmful results. This is a fact that should not be overlooked, especially in Russia, where the bourgeois-democratic counsellors of the proletariat, who urge it to keep the trade-union movement "neutral", are so numerous.

A few words about the resolution on emigration and immigration. Here, too, in the Commission there was an attempt to defend narrow, craft interests, to ban the immigration of workers from backward countries (coolies—from China, etc.). This is the same spirit of aristocratism that one finds among workers in some of the "civilised" countries, who derive certain advantages from their privileged position, and are, therefore, inclined to forget the need for international class solidarity. But no one at the Congress defended this craft and petty-bourgeois narrow-mindedness. The resolution fully meets the demands of revolutionary Social-Democracy.

We pass now to the last, and perhaps the most important, resolution of the Congress—that on anti-militarism. The notorious Hervé, who has made such a noise in France and Europe, advocated a semi-anarchist view by naively suggesting that every war be "answered" by a strike and an uprising. He did not understand, on the one hand, that war is a necessary product of capitalism, and that the proletariat cannot renounce participation in revolutionary wars, for such wars are possible, and have indeed occurred in capitalist societies. He did not understand, on the other hand, that the possibility of "answering" a war depends on the nature of the crisis created by that war. The choice of the means of struggle depends on these conditions; moreover, the struggle must consist of (and here we have the third misconception, or shallow thinking of Hervéism) not simply in replacing war by peace, but in replacing capitalism by socialism. The essential thing is not merely to prevent war, but to utilise the crisis created by war in order to hasten the overthrow of the bourgeoisie. However,

underlying all these semi-anarchist absurdities of Hervéism there was one sound and practical purpose: to spur the socialist movement so that it will not be restricted to parliamentary methods of struggle alone, so that the masses will realise the need for revolutionary action in connection with the crises which war inevitably involves, so that, lastly, a more lively understanding of international labour solidarity and of the falsity of bourgeois patriotism will be spread among the masses.

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

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

The sub commission (elected by the Anti-Militarism Commission) incorporated all these amendments in Bebel's resolution. In addition, Jaurès made this happy suggestion: instead of enumerating the methods of struggle (strikes, uprisings) the resolution should cite historical examples of proletarian action against war, from the demonstrations in Europe to the revolution in Russia. The result of all this redrafting was a resolution which, it is true, is unduly long, but is rich in thought and precisely formulates the tasks of the

proletariat. It combines the stringency of orthodox—i.e., the only scientific Marxist analysis with recommendations for the most resolute and revolutionary action by the workers' parties. This resolution cannot be interpreted à la Vollmar, nor can it be fitted into the narrow framework of naïve Hervéism.

On the whole, the Stuttgart Congress brought into sharp contrast the opportunist and revolutionary wings of the international Social-Democratic movement on a number of cardinal issues and decided these issues in the spirit of revolutionary Marxism. Its resolutions and the report of the debates should become a handbook for every propagandist. The work done at Stuttgart will greatly promote the unity of tactics and unity of revolutionary struggle of the proletarians of all countries.

War and Leninism

Tenth Anniversary of the Imperialist War

The attitude towards war constitutes one of the most important aspects of the doctrine known as Leninism. In regard to the principles involved in the attitude towards war, the concrete judgment about every war in particular, the view on the relation between wars and revolutions, the distinction between aggressive and defensive wars, the classification of wars according to different historical types, the view on national defence, the attitude towards pacifism, the attitude towards the defeat of one's "own" country in the imperialist war—in all these problems Leninism said its word. In the handling of these problems, Leninism reached its highest point of perfection.

Immediately after the convening of the Zimmerwald Conference, approximately towards the first anniversary of the imperialist war, a pamphlet was published by Lenin and Zinoviev on "Socialism and War." This pamphlet, inspired entirely by Lenin and mainly written by him, describes the attitude of Leninism towards war with the utmost terseness and lucidity, in the following manner.

Socialists' Attitude Towards War

The Socialists always condemn wars between nations as barbarous and brutal. But our attitude towards war is different in principle from that of the bourgeois pacifists and anarchists. We differ from the former because we understand the inevitable connection between wars and the class struggle within the country, we understand the impossibility of abolishing war without abolishing classes and without establishing the Socialist system, and also because we fully conceive the legitimacy, progress and necessity of civil wars, i.e., of wars by the oppressed class against the oppressors, by slaves against slaveowners, by serfs against their masters, and

by wage labourers against the bourgeoisie. We differ from the pacifists and anarchists because we are Marxian and we recognise the need for a historical study (from the standpoint of the dialectical materialism of Marx) of every war in particular. In history there have frequently been wars which, in spite of all the horrors, brutalities, calamities and suffering inevitable in every war, were progressive wars, i.e., were useful to the development of mankind, by assisting in the demolition of particularly harmful and reactionary institutions (e.g., autocracy or serfdom) of the most barbarous despotisms in Europe (Turkey and Russia). From this standpoint we should consider the historical features of the present imperialist war. (The pamphlet was written in 1915.)

Historical Types of Wars in Modern Times

“The modern epoch in human history was opened by the great French Revolution. Since that time, until the Commune of Paris, from 1789 to 1871, one of the types of wars were the bourgeois-progressive, was of national-liberation. In other words, the principal feature and the historical meaning of these wars was the overthrow of absolutism and feudalism; undermining and overthrowing foreign oppression. For this reason in such wars, when they occurred, all honest revolutionary democrats, including all Socialists, invariably wished the success of that side (i.e., of that bourgeoisie) which was assisting in overthrowing or undermining the most dangerous shackles of feudalism, absolutism, and the oppression of other nations. For instance, in the revolutionary wars of France, there was an element of pillage and annexation of foreign countries by the French, but this in no way changed the fundamental historical importance of these wars, which shook and demolished feudalism and absolutism of old, serf-bound Europe. In the Franco-Prussian war, Germany robbed France, but this did not change the fundamental historical importance of this war,

which emancipated scores of millions of the German race from their feudal dismemberment and oppression by the two despots, the Russian Czar and Napoleon III."

Difference between Aggressive and Defensive Wars

"The epoch of 1789-1871 left deep traces and revolutionary landmarks behind it. Prior to the overthrow of feudalism, absolutism and alien yokes, there could be no talk of the development of the proletarian fight for Socialism. Speaking of the legitimacy of 'defensive' war in regard to the wars of such an epoch, the Socialists had always in mind these very aims, which spelled the revolution against medievalism and serfdom. By 'defensive' war the Socialists always understood a 'just' war in this sense (this was the very expression used by W. Liebknecht). It was only in this sense that the Socialists understood, as they do now, the legitimacy, progressiveness, and justice of 'national defence' or 'defensive' war. For instance, if to-morrow Morocco declared war on France, India on England, China, or Persia on Russia, and so on, these would be 'just' and 'defensive' wars, regardless as to who was the first aggressor, and every Socialist would wish for a victory of the oppressed and dependent states against their oppressors, the slave-driving and predatory 'great' powers."

But imagine that a slaveowner, having 100 slaves, fights against a slaveowner who has 200 slaves, for a more "equitable" distribution of the slaves. It stands to reason that in such a case the application of the terms "defensive war" or "national defence" would be a historical falsification and common deception of the ignorant elements of the bourgeoisie and of the common people on the part of the astute slaveowners. It is in this manner that the nations are now hoodwinked by the modern imperialist bourgeoisie, who use the terms of "national" ideology and of national defence for the present war

between slave-drivers for the strengthening and fastening of the chains of slavery.

The Present War is an Imperialist War

Nearly everybody recognises the present war (this was written in 1915) as an imperialist war, but this conception is mostly being distorted, or adopted in a one-sided manner, or the suggesting is smuggled in, that this might still be a bourgeois-progressive war of national-liberation. Imperialism is the highest stage of capitalism, reached in the twentieth century. Capitalism began to feel crowded in the old national states, without whose formation it could not have overthrown feudalism. Capitalism has become so concentrated that entire branches of industry are captured by syndicates, trusts, and billionaire corporations, and nearly the whole surface of the earth has been divided between these "kings of capital," either in the shape of colonies or by way of enmeshing other countries in a thousand threads of financial exploitation. Free trade and competition were substituted by monopolist aspirations, by the ambition to capture new lands for the investment of capital, for the export of raw materials and so on. From a liberator of nations, which capitalism was in the fight against feudalism, imperialist capitalism has become the greatest oppressor of nations. Capitalism has become reactionary instead of progressive, it has developed the productive forces to the extent that the human race will have either to embrace Socialism or to be doomed to long years of armed fighting by the "great" powers for the artificial maintenance of capitalism by means of colonies, monopolies, privileges, and national oppression of every kind.

With the same classical lucidity, Leninism gave the answer to the question: what is Social-Chauvinism?

What is Social-Chauvinism?

Social-Chauvinism is the advocacy of the idea of “national defence” in the present war. The logic of this idea is the rejection of the class struggle during the war, the voting of war credits, and so on. As a matter of fact, the Social-Chauvinists are carrying on anti-proletarian, bourgeois politics, because they are in fact advocating not “national defence” in the sense of fighting against alien yoke, but in the sense of the “right” of one or another set of the “great” powers to rob the colonies and to oppress foreign nations. The Social-Chauvinists repeat the bourgeois deception of the people, alleging that this is a war for the defence of liberty and existence of the nations, thus joining the side of the bourgeoisie against the proletariat. To the Social-Chauvinist belong also those who justify and belaud the government and the bourgeoisie of one of the belligerent groups of powers, as well as those who, like Kautsky, recognise the equal right of Socialists in all the warring countries “to defend the fatherland.” Social-Chauvinism, being in fact the defender of the privileges, prerogatives, depredations, and violence of “its own” (or of any) imperialist bourgeoisie, constitutes the total betrayal of all the Socialist convictions and decisions of the international Socialist congress of Basle.”

And Leninism draws the following conclusion: Social-Chauvinism is the acme of opportunism. By identifying itself with opportunism it called for a union of the workers with “their” national bourgeoisie, and a split of the international working class.

Leninism was much taken to task for its “defeatism.” Even some of the internationalists, on reaching this point, would turn their backs on Bolshevism and their faces to Social-Chauvinism. Nevertheless, Leninism, remaining true unto itself, said:

“The revolutionary class, during a reactionary war, cannot but wish the defeat of its government, cannot but see the connection between its military defeats and the facilities of overthrowing it. Only the bourgeois who thinks that the war that was started by the governments will doubtlessly be ended as a war between governments, and wishes it to be so, finds the idea ‘preposterous’ or ‘absurd’ that the Socialists of all the warring countries should wish for the defeat of all ‘their’ respective governments. On the contrary, just such an attitude would correspond to the innermost thoughts of every class conscious worker, and would coincide with the line of our activity which is directed towards the transformation of the imperialist war into civil war. . . The Socialists must explain to the masses that there is no salvation for them outside of the overthrow of ‘their’ governments, and that they should take advantage for this purpose of the very difficulties of these governments in the present war.”

Transformation of Imperialist War into Civil War

Such was the fundamental slogan of Leninism in the period of the first world-wide imperialist war. This slogan would be advocated consistently and to the end only by standing with both feet on the ground of so-called defeatism.

Leninism, while hating the imperialist war with its whole heart, saw at the same time that this war was putting rifles into the hands of millions and millions of toilers.

While ridiculing maudlin pacifism, Lenin appealed to the people to take advantage of the fact that the arms were placed in the hands of the toilers, urging to turn these arms against the bourgeoisie and to proclaim the revolution.

At the very height of the imperialist war, Leninism at the same time emphasised that the Communists do not denounce national defence when country had become a Socialist,

proletarian country. In his theses of 1915, i.e., two years before the passing of power into the hands of the Bolsheviks, at a moment when Bolshevism was still a persecuted political movement, and no one believed that the Bolsheviks would soon be in power, Leninism presented to the world an example of dialectical reasoning on the question of national defence. National defence for the capitalists—No! National defence for the workers who overthrow capitalism and took power into their own hands—Yes!

This dialectical reasoning was endowed with flesh and blood after the October of 1917, when under the banner of Leninism was born the Red Army, which defended and is defending the world's first Socialist state.

Leninism does not tolerate revolutionary phrase-mongering. It particularly detests this kind of phraseology in the question of war. No one was more merciless in ridiculing and withering the anti-militarist phraseology of the anarcho-syndicalist spouters and the high-faulting promises of the Social-Democratic leaders as to arranging a general strike against war, and so on. The instructions to the Russian delegation to the Hague International Conference against war which Lenin wrote and which were recently published, give us a sample of the sober reasoning of the great revolutionary on the question of fighting against war.

“You want to fight against war, then you must learn to organise illegal revolutionary nuclei in the army in times of peace. Learn in times of peace to set up such organisations, let us say, among the railway men as will really be able at the very outbreak of war to hit the capitalists in the most vulnerable spot. You want to fight against war, fight then against the bourgeoisie in times of peace, refuse to vote military credits, do not enter into alliances with the bourgeoisie, build brick by brick your own independent revolutionary proletarian party. And should war

break out after all, then teach the soldiers to fraternize in the trenches, conclude a 'class truce' with the bourgeoisie, carry on revolutionary agitation, and at the decisive moment hoist the banner of rebellion against war and against the bourgeoisie."

Hence the ardent, implacable revolutionary hatred which Leninism bore for the counter-revolutionary leaders of Social-Democracy, who aided the bourgeoisie in waging the imperialist war. Scheidemann, Vandervelde, Renaudel, Thomas, Henderson, Austerlitz, and the rest of them, from the standpoint of Leninism, are not less guilty of the imperialist butchery than Ludendorff, Hindenburg, Foch, Poincaré and their ilk.

Ten years ago, the leaders of the Second International came out as the open drivers of the workers into the battle fields of the world butchery. The leaders of the Second International were, and are, therefore, the executioners of the working class.

We shall shortly celebrate the first anniversary of the outbreak of the imperialist war. The leaders of the Second International continue to carry on the same murderous policy of the imperialist war, only with different means. When the French Socialists, who played the part of lackeys of Herriot the "pacifist," vote military credits for the Ruhr occupation, when the head of the Second International, MacDonald, builds new dreadnoughts and gives his benediction to the wholesale shooting of Hindoos, when the whole Second International, by praising the notorious Experts' Plan, are again carrying out the grand deception of the people, what does it all mean if not the continuation of the perfidious and bloody Social-Democratic policy of 1914, in a different form and under different circumstances?

In order to conquer the bourgeoisie, the international proletariat must step over the dead political body of the counter-revolutionary leaders of social-democracy.

Get the bourgeoisie by the throat! At the same time, put your feet on the breast of the treacherous leaders of social-democracy! We, Communists, should say this frankly and unmistakably to the advanced workers throughout the world.

G. ZINOVIEV

Moscow,

July 7th, 1924.

The main work of German opportunism on the war

Lenin

July 1915

Pravda No. 169, July 27, 1924

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

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

Democratic parliamentary party, is a serious enough indication of the extent, depth, and violence of the process of putrefaction within the German Social-Democracy.

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

From the ideological standpoint David's book is therefore interesting only inasmuch as it provides an opportunity to analyse how the bourgeoisie should speak to the workers in order to influence them. The essence of Eduard David's ideological stand, considered from this angle, the only correct one, is contained in the following proposition: "The significance of our vote [for war credits We voted, not for war but against defeat" (p. 3, table of contents, and many passages in the book). This is the theme of the entire book. To back this main thesis, David has hand-picked examples of the way Marx, Engels and Lassalle regarded Germany's national wars (Chapter 2), data on the Triple Entente's vast plans of conquest

(Chapter 4), as well as facts from the diplomatic history of the war (Chapter 5), the latter being nothing more than an attempt to whitewash Germany by referring to the ridiculously trivial and no less ridiculously insincere official exchange of telegrams on the eve of the war, etc. A special chapter (6) entitled "The Magnitude of the Danger" contains considerations and figures on the Triple Entente's preponderance of might, the reactionary nature of tsarism, etc. Of course, David is fully in favour of peace. The preface to the book, dated May 1, 1915, winds up with the slogan, "Peace on Earth!" David, of course, considers himself an internationalist: the German Social-Democratic Party, he says, "has not betrayed the spirit of the International" (p. 8); it has "fought against the sowing of poisonous hatred among the peoples" (p. 8); it "has declared since the very first day of the war that in principle it is ready for peace as soon as the security of the country has been achieved" (p. 8).

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

by the imperialist—militarist governmental war clique after the war.

The roles are well distributed; while the government and the military clique—with the support of the multi-millionaires and all bourgeois “men of affairs”—are waging the war, the liberals console and dupe the masses with the nationalist ideology of a defensive war, with promises of a democratic peace, etc. Eduard David’s ideology is that of the liberal and humanitarian pacifist bourgeois; so is the ideology of the Russian opportunists in the Organising Committee, who are waging a struggle against the desirability of defeat, against the disintegration of Russia, for the peace slogan, etc.

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

David quotes a considerable portion of our Central Committee’s Manifesto, including its main slogan—the conversion of the imperialist war into a civil war—but he does it only to declare that these “Russian” tactics are nothing short of “madness” and “gross distortion of the decisions of the

International" (pp. 169, 172). This, he says, is Hervéism (p. 176); Hervé's book, he says "contains the whole theory of Lenin, Luxemburg, Radek, Pannekoek, etc." But, my dear David, is not there some Hervéism in the revolutionary passages of the Basic resolution and the Communist Manifesto? The mention of the latter document is just as unpleasant to David as the name of our journal, which is reminiscent of that very document, is unpleasant to Semkovsky. The thesis of the Communist Manifesto to the effect that "the workingmen have no country" has, as David is convinced, "long been disproved" (p. 176 if.). As to the question of nationalities, the entire concluding chapter of David's book offers us the most unmitigated bourgeois nonsense about the "biological law of differentiation" (!), etc.

What is international is not at all anti-national; we stand for the right of nations to self-assertion; we are against the browbeating of weak nations, David asserts, failing to understand (or rather pretending not to understand) that justifying participation in the imperialist war and advancing the "against defeat" slogan in this war means acting, not only as an anti-socialist, but also as an anti-national politician. For the present-day imperialist war is a war between Great Powers (i.e., powers that oppress a number of other nations), conducted for the purpose of oppressing new nations. One cannot be "national" in an imperialist war otherwise than by being a socialist politician, i.e., by recognising the right of oppressed nations to liberation, to secession from the Great Powers that oppress them. In the era of imperialism, there can be no other salvation for most of the world's nations than through revolutionary action undertaken by the proletariat of the Great Powers, spreading beyond the boundaries of nationality, smashing those boundaries, and overthrowing the international bourgeoisie. Until the bourgeoisie is overthrown, there will remain nations known as "Great Powers", i.e., the oppression will remain of nine-tenths of the nations of the

whole world. The overthrow of the bourgeoisie will enormously accelerate the downfall of national partitions of every kind, this without decreasing but, on the contrary, increasing a millionfold the "differentiation" of humanity, in the meaning of the wealth and the variety in spiritual life, ideological trends, tendencies, and shades.

British Pacifism and the British Dislike of Theory

Lenin

June 1915

July 27, 1924, in Pravda No. 169

Political freedom has hitherto been far more extensive in Britain than elsewhere in Europe. Here, more than anywhere else, the bourgeoisie are used to governing and know how to govern. The relations between the classes are more developed and, in many respects, clearer than in other countries. The absence of conscription gives the people more liberty in their attitude towards the war in the sense that anyone may refuse to join the colours, which is why the government (which in Britain is a committee, in its purest form, for managing the affairs of the bourgeoisie) are compelled to bend every effort to rouse "popular" enthusiasm for the war. That aim could never be attained without a radical change in the laws, had the mass of proletarians not been completely disorganised and demoralized by the desertion to a Liberal, i.e., bourgeois, policy, of a minority of the best placed, skilled, and unionized workers. The British trade unions comprise about one-fifth of all wage workers. Most trade union leaders are Liberals; Marx long ago called them agents of the bourgeoisie.

All these features of Britain help us, on the one hand, better to understand the essence of present-day social-chauvinism, that essence being identical in autocratic and democratic countries, in militarist and conscription-free countries; on the other hand, they help us to appreciate, on the basis of facts, the significance of that compromise with social-chauvinism, which is expressed, for instance, in the extolling of the slogan of peace, etc.

The Fabian Society is undoubtedly the most consummate expression of opportunism and of Liberal-Labour policy. The reader should look into the correspondence of Marx and Engels with Sorge (two Russian translations of which have appeared). There he will find an excellent characterisation of that society given by Engels, who treats Messrs. Sidney Webb & Co. as a gang of bourgeois rogues who would demoralise the workers, influence them in a counter-revolutionary spirit. One may vouch for the fact that no Second International leader with any responsibility and influence has ever attempted to refute this estimation of Engels's, or even to doubt its correctness.

Let us now compare the facts, leaving theory aside for a moment. You will see that the Fabians' behaviour during the war (see, for instance, their weekly paper, *The New Statesman*), and that of the German Social-Democratic Party, including Kautsky, are identical. The same direct and indirect defence of social-chauvinism; the same combination of that defence with a readiness to utter all sorts of kindly, humane, and near-Left phrases about peace, disarmament, etc., etc.

The fact stands, and the conclusion to be drawn—however unpleasant it may be to various persons—is inescapably and undoubtedly the following: in practice the leaders of the present-day German Social-Democratic Party, including Kautsky, are exactly the same kind of agents of the bourgeoisie that Engels called the Fabians long ago. The Fabians' non-recognition of Marxism and its "recognition" by Kautsky and Co. make no difference whatever in the essentials, in the facts of politics; the only thing proved is that some writers, politicians, etc., have converted Marxism into Struvism. Their hypocrisy is not a private vice with them; in individual cases they may be highly virtuous heads of families; their hypocrisy is the result of the objective falseness of their social status: they are supposed to represent the revolutionary proletariat,

whereas they are actually agents charged with the business of inculcating bourgeois, chauvinist ideas in the proletariat.

The Fabians are more sincere and honest than Kautsky and Co. because they have not promised to stand for revolution; politically, however, they are of the same kidney.

The long history of Britain's political freedom and the developed condition of her political life in general, and of her bourgeoisie in particular, have resulted in various shades of bourgeois opinion being able to find rapid, free, and open expression in that country's new political organisations. One such organisation is the Union of Democratic Control, whose secretary and treasurer is E. D. Morel, now a regular contributor to *The Labour Leader*, the Independent Labour Party's central organ. This individual was for several years the Liberal Party's nominee for the Birkenhead constituency. When Morel came out against the war, shortly after its outbreak, the committee of the Birkenhead Liberal association notified him, in a letter dated October 2, 1914, that his candidature would no longer be acceptable, i.e., he was simply expelled from the Party. Morel replied to this in a letter of October 14, which he subsequently published as a pamphlet entitled *The Outbreak of the War*. Like a number of other articles by Morel, the pamphlet exposes his government, proving the falseness of assertions that the rape of Belgium's neutrality caused the war, or that the war is aimed at the destruction of Prussian imperialism, etc., etc. Morel defends the programme of the Union of Democratic Control—peace, disarmament, all territories to have the right of self-determination by plebiscite, and the democratic control of foreign policy.

All this shows that as an individual, Morel undoubtedly deserves credit for his sincere sympathy with democracy, for turning away from the jingoist bourgeoisie to the pacifist bourgeoisie. When Morel cites the facts to prove that his

government duped the people when it denied the existence of secret treaties although such treaties actually existed; that the British bourgeoisie, as early as 1887, fully realised that Belgium's neutrality would inevitably be violated in the event of a Franco-German war, and emphatically rejected the idea of interfering (Germany not yet being a dangerous competitor!); that in a number of books published before the war French militarists such as Colonel Boucher quite openly acknowledged the existence of plans for an aggressive war by France and Russia against Germany; that the well-known British military authority, Colonel Repington, admitted in 1911 in the press, that the growth of Russian armaments after 1905 had been a threat to Germany – when Morel reveals all this, we cannot but admit that we are dealing with an exceptionally honest and courageous bourgeois, who is not afraid to break with his own party.

Yet anyone will at once concede that, after all, Morel is a bourgeois, whose talk about peace and disarmament is a lot of empty phrases, since without revolutionary action by the proletariat there can be neither a democratic peace nor disarmament. Though he has broken with the Liberals on the question of the present war, Morel remains a Liberal on all other economic and political issues. Why is it, then, that when Kautsky, in Germany, gives a Marxist guise to the selfsame bourgeois phrases about peace and disarmament, this is not considered hypocrisy on his part, but stands to his merit? Only the undeveloped character of political relations and the absence of political freedom prevent the formation in Germany, as rapidly and smoothly as in Britain, of a bourgeois league for peace and disarmament, with Kautsky's programme.

Let us, then, admit the truth that Kautsky's stand is that of a pacifist bourgeois, not of a revolutionary Social-Democrat.

The events we are living amidst are great enough for us to be courageous in recognising the truth, no matter whom it may concern.

With their dislike of abstract theory and their pride in their practicality, the British often pose political issues more directly, thus helping the socialists of other countries to discover the actual content beneath the husk of wording of every-kind (including the "Marxist"). Instructive in this respect is the pamphlet *Socialism and War*, published before the war by the jingoist paper, *The Clarion*. The pamphlet contains an anti-war "manifesto" by Upton Sinclair, the U.S. socialist, and also a reply to him from the jingoist Robert Blatchford, who has long adopted Hyndman's imperialist viewpoint.

Sinclair is a socialist of emotions, without any theoretical training. He states the issue in "simple" fashion; incensed by the approach of war, he seeks salvation from it in socialism.

"We are told," Sinclair writes, "that the socialist movement is yet too weak so that we must wait for its evolution. But evolution is working in the hearts of men; we are its instruments, and if we do not struggle, there is no evolution. We are told that the movement [against war] would be crushed out; but I declare my faith that the crushing out of any rebellion which sought, from motive of sublime humanity to prevent war, would be the greatest victory that socialism has ever gained—would shake the conscience of civilisation and rouse the workers of the world as nothing in all history has yet done. Let us not be too fearful for our movement nor put too much stress upon numbers and the outward appearances of power. A thousand men aglow with faith and determination are stronger than a million grown cautious and respectable; and there is no danger to the socialist movement so great as the danger of becoming an established institution."

This, as can be seen, is a naïve, theoretically unreasoned, but profoundly correct warning against any vulgarizing of socialism, and a call to revolutionary struggle.

What does Blatchford say in reply to Sinclair?

"It is capitalists and militarists who make wars. That is true. . .," he says. Blatchford is as anxious for peace and for socialism taking the place of capitalism as any socialist in the world. But Sinclair will not convince him, or do away with the facts with "rhetoric and fine phrases". "Facts, my dear Sinclair, are obstinate things, and the German danger is a fact." Neither the British nor the German socialists are strong enough to prevent war, and "Sinclair greatly exaggerates the power of British socialism. The British socialists are not united; they have no money, no arms, no discipline". The only thing they can do is to help the British Government build up the navy; there is not, nor can there be, any other guarantee of peace.

Neither before nor since the outbreak of the war have the chauvinists ever been so outspoken in Continental Europe. In Germany it is not frankness that is prevalent, but Kautsky's hypocrisy and playing at sophistry. The same is true of Plekhanov. That is why it is so instructive to cast a glance at the situation in a more advanced country, where nobody will be taken in with sophisms or a travesty of Marxism. Here issues are stated in a more straightforward and truthful manner. Let us learn from the "advanced" British.

Sinclair is naïve in his appeal, although fundamentally it is a very correct one; he is naïve because he ignores the development of mass socialism over the last fifty years and the struggle of trends within socialism; he ignores the conditions for the growth of revolutionary action when an objectively revolutionary situation and a revolutionary organisation exist. The "emotional" approach cannot make up for that. The intense

and bitter struggle between powerful trends in socialism, between the opportunist and revolutionary trends, cannot be evaded by the use of rhetoric.

Blatchford speaks out undisguisedly, revealing the most covert argument of the Kautskyites and Co., who are afraid to tell the truth. We are still weak, that is all, says Blatchford; but his outspokenness at once lays bare his opportunism, his jingoism. It at once becomes obvious that he serves the bourgeoisie and the opportunists. By declaring that socialism is “weak” he himself weakens it by preaching an anti-socialist, bourgeois, policy.

Like Sinclair, but conversely, like a coward and not like a fighter, like a traitor and not like the recklessly brave, he, too, ignores the conditions making for a revolutionary situation.

As for his practical conclusions, his policy (the rejection of revolutionary action, of propaganda for such action and preparation of it), Blatchford, the vulgar jingoist, is in complete accord with Plekhanov and Kautsky.

Marxist words have in our days become a cover for a total renunciation of Marxism; to be a Marxist, one must expose the “Marxist hypocrisy” of the leaders of the Second International, fearlessly recognise the struggle of the two trends in socialism, and get to the bottom of the problems relating to that struggle. Such is the conclusion to be drawn from British relationships, which show us the Marxist essence of the matter, without Marxist words.

Bellicose (aggressive) Militarism and the Anti-Militarist Tactics of Social-Democracy

Lenin

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

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

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

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

And the more menacingly the governments rattle their sabers one against the other, the more ruthlessly do they crush the anti-militarist movement at home. The persecutions of anti-militarists is growing extensively and intensively. The “Radical-Socialist” Ministry of Clemenceau-Briand acts no less

violently than the Junker-Conservative Ministry of Billow. The dissolution of the “youth organizations” throughout Germany, following the introduction of the new law on unions and assemblies, which prohibits persons under the age of twenty from attending political meetings, has made anti—militarist agitation in Germany extremely difficult.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thus, the principle which connects militarism and capitalism is firmly established among socialists, and on this point, there are no differences. But the recognition of this link does not by itself concretely determine the anti-militarist tactics of the socialists: it does not solve the practical problem of how to fight the burden of militarism and how to prevent wars. And it is in the

answers to these questions that a considerable divergence of views is to be found among socialists. At the Stuttgart Congress, these differences were very marked.

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

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

Such are the two "extreme" positions on this question in the ranks of the Western socialists. "Like the sun in a drop of water", there are reflected in them the two diseases which still

cause harm to the activity of the socialist proletariat in the West—opportunist tendencies on the one hand and anarchist phrase-mongering on the other.

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

The proletariat cannot be indifferent to the political, social, and cultural conditions of its struggle; consequently, it cannot be indifferent to the destinies of its country. But the destinies of the country interest it only to the extent that they affect its class struggle, and not in virtue of some bourgeois “patriotism”, quite indecent on the lips of a Social- Democrat.

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

The anarchist mode of thought is displayed in full measure here. Blind faith in the miracle-working power of all direct action [1]; the wrenching of this "direct action" out of its general social and political context, without the slightest analysis of the latter: in short, the "arbitrarily mechanical interpretation of social phenomena" (as Karl Liebknecht put it) is obvious.

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

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

It will be clear from this that the question here is not whether the proletariat is able, when it finds such a course desirable, to reply with a strike and insurrection to a declaration of war. The point at issue is whether the proletariat should be bound by an obligation to reply with an insurrection to every war. To decide the question in the latter sense means to take away from the proletariat the choice of the moment for a decisive battle, and to hand it over to its enemies. It is not the proletariat which chooses the moment of struggle in accordance with its own interests, when its general socialist consciousness stands at a high level, when its organization is strong, when the occasion is appropriate, etc. No, the bourgeois governments would be able to provoke it to an insurrection even when the conditions for it were unfavorable, for example, by declaring a war specially calculated to arouse patriotic and chauvinist feelings among wide sections of the population and thus isolate the insurgent proletariat. It should be borne in mind, moreover,

that the bourgeoisie which, from monarchist Germany to republican France and democratic Switzerland, persecutes anti-militarist activity with such ruthlessness in peacetime, would descend with the utmost fury on any attempt at a military strike in the event of war, when war-time laws, declarations of martial law, courts martial, etc., are in force.

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

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

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

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

also in the future, at the time of the social revolution, is becoming more and more obvious.

Special anti-militarist propaganda has behind it not only the evidence of principle but also extensive historical experience. Belgium is ahead of other countries in this respect. The Belgian Labour Party, apart from its general propaganda of anti-militarist ideas, has organized groups of socialist youth under the title of *Jeunes Gardes* (Young Guards). Groups in one and the same area constitute an Area Federation, and all the Area Federations in turn form a National Federation, headed by a "Chief Council". The newspapers of the "Young Guards" (*La jeunesse—c'est l'avenir*, *De Caserne*, *De Loteling*, [2] etc.) circulate in tens of thousands of copies! The strongest is the Walloon Federation, which has sixty-two local groups with 10,000 members; in all there are at present 121 local groups of the "Young Guards".

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

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

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

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

of this victory, in France, lead to power passing into the hands of the proletariat; let us assume, on the other hand, that a coalition of European monarchs is formed against the new Russia. Would international Social-Democracy begin protesting if the French Republic, then came to the aid of Russia?" (K. Kautsky, *Our Views on Patriotism and War.*)

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

The lengths to which opportunism can go in such questions too is shown by a recent statement of Jaurès. Expressing his views on the international situation in a German bourgeois-liberal newspaper, he defends the alliance of France and Britain with Russia against the charge of non-peaceful intentions and treats that alliance as a "guarantee of peace"; he welcomes the fact that "we have now lived to see an alliance of Britain and Russia, two old-standing enemies".

Rosa Luxemburg has given a magnificent assessment of such a view, and a warm retort to Jaurès, in her "Open Letter" to him in the last issue of *Neue Zeit*.

Rosa Luxemburg begins by pointing out that to talk of an alliance between "Russia" and "Britain" means "talking in the language of bourgeois politicians", because the interests of the capitalist states and the interests of the proletariat in foreign policy are opposed to one another, and one cannot speak of a harmony of interests in the sphere of foreign relations. If militarism is the offspring of capitalism, then wars too cannot be abolished by the intrigues of rulers and diplomats; and the

task of socialists is not to awaken illusions on this score, but on the contrary constantly to expose the hypocrisy and impotence of diplomatic “peaceful démarches”.

But the main point of the “Open Letter” is the assessment of Britain’s and France’s alliance with Russia which Jaurès so extols. The European bourgeoisie has given tsarism a chance to repel the revolutionary onset. “Now, in an attempt to turn its temporary victory over the revolution into a final one, absolutism is having recourse first and foremost to the tried method of all shaken despotisms—successes in foreign policy.” All alliances with Russia now mean “a holy alliance between the bourgeoisie of Western Europe and Russian counter-revolution, the suppressors, and executioners of Russian and Polish fighters for liberty. Such alliances mean the strengthening of the bloodiest reaction, not only inside Russia, but in international relations as well.... Therefore, the most elementary obligation of socialists and proletarians in all countries is to oppose with all their might an alliance with counter-revolutionary Russia”.

Rosa Luxemburg asks Jaurès: “How are we to explain to ourselves that you will strive ‘most energetically’ to make the government of the bloody executioners of the Russian revolution and the insurrection in Persia an influential factor in European politics, and make the gallows in Russia pillars of international peace—you, who once uttered a brilliant speech in the French Parliament against the loan to Russia; you, who only a few weeks ago printed in your paper *L’Humanité* a fiery appeal to public opinion against the bloody work of the military tribunals in Russian Poland? How can one reconcile your plans for peace, which rely on the Franco-Russian and Anglo-Russian alliances, with the recent protest of the French Parliamentary Socialist Party and the Administrative Commission of the National Council of the Socialist Party against Presidents’ visit

to Russia—a protest which you signed, and which in passionate terms defends the interests of the Russian revolution? If the President of the French Republic cares to quote your conceptions of the international situation, he will reply to your protest that he who approves the end must approve the means; he who considers alliance with tsarist Russia as the harmony of international peace must accept everything that strengthens that alliance and leads to friendship.

“What would you have said if once upon a time in Germany, in Russia or in Britain there had appeared socialists and revolutionaries who in the ‘interests of peace’ had recommended an alliance with the government of the Restoration, or the government of Thiers and Jules Favre, and had vested such an alliance with their moral authority?!”

This letter speaks for itself, and Russian Social-Democrats can only send their greetings to Comrade Rosa Luxemburg for this her protest and for her defense of the Russian revolution before the international proletariat.

Report On Foreign Policy, Lenin

Delivered At A Joint Meeting Of The All-Russia Central Executive Committee And The Moscow Soviet

May 14, 1918

Comrades, permit me to acquaint you with the present foreign policy situation. In the past few days, our international position has in many respects become more complicated owing to the aggravation of the general situation. Because of this aggravation, the provocation, the deliberate panic-spreading by the bourgeois press and its echo, the socialist press, is again doing its dark and filthy work of repeating the Kornilov affair.

First, I shall draw your attention to the factors determining, in the main, the international position of the Soviet Republic in order to proceed to the outward legal forms determining this position, and, on the basis of this, describe again the difficulties which have arisen or, to be more precise, define the turning-point at which we have arrived and which forms the basis of the worsened political situation.

Comrades, you know, and your knowledge has been particularly reinforced by the experience of the two Russian revolutions, that economic interests and the economic position of the classes which rule our state lie at the root of both our home and foreign policy. These propositions which constitute the basis of the Marxist world outlook and have been confirmed for us Russian revolutionaries by the great experience of both Russian revolutions, must not be forgotten even for a moment if we are to avoid losing ourselves in the thickets, the labyrinth of diplomatic tricks, a labyrinth which at times is artificially created and made more intricate by people, classes, parties, and groups who like to fish in muddy waters, or who are compelled to do so.

We recently experienced, and to a certain extent are experiencing now, a situation in which our counter-revolutionaries—the Constitutional-Democrats and their foremost yes-men, the Right Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks—have been attempting to take advantage of the increased complexity of the international situation.

Basically, the position is that the Russian Socialist Soviet Republic, due to economic and political causes which we have described in the press on more than one occasion, and of which you are aware, due to a different rate of development, a basis of development different from that of the West, still remains a lone island in the stormy sea of imperialist robbery. The main economic factor in the West is that this imperialist war which has tortured, and exhausted mankind has given rise to such complicated, such acute, such involved conflicts that again and again, at every step, the question of war and peace, the solution of the question to the advantage of one or other grouping, hangs by a thread. We have lived through precisely such a situation in the past few days. The contradictions that have arisen out of the frenzied struggle between the imperialist powers drawn into a war which is the result of the economic conditions of the development of capitalism over a number of decades, have made it impossible for the imperialists themselves to stop this war.

Owing to these contradictions, it has come about that the general alliance of the imperialists of all countries, forming the basis of the economic alliance of capitalism, an alliance whose natural and inevitable aim is to defend capital, which recognizes no fatherland, and which has proved in the course of many major and important episodes in world history that capital places the safeguarding of the alliance of the capitalists of all countries against the working people above the interests

of the fatherland, of the people or of what you will—that this alliance is not the moving force of politics.

Of course, as before, this alliance remains the main economic trend of the capitalist system, a trend which must ultimately make itself felt with inevitable force. That the imperialist war has divided into hostile groups, into hostile coalitions the imperialist powers which at the present moment, one may say, have divided up the whole world among themselves, is an exception to this main tendency of capitalism. This enmity, this struggle, this death grapple, proves that in certain circumstances the alliance of world imperialism is impossible. We are witnessing a situation in which the stormy waves of imperialist reaction, of the imperialist slaughter of nations, are hurling themselves at the small island of the socialist Soviet Republic, and seem about to sink it any minute, while actually these waves are only breaking against each other.

The basic contradictions between the imperialist powers have led to such a merciless struggle that, while recognising its hopelessness, neither the one, nor the other group is in a position to extricate itself at will from the iron grip of this war. The war has brought out two main contradictions, which in their turn have determined the socialist Soviet Republic's present international position. The first is the battle being waged on the Western front between Germany and Britain, which has reached an extreme degree of ferocity. We have heard on more than one occasion representatives of the two belligerent groups promise and assure their own people and other peoples that all that is required is one more last effort for the enemy to be subdued, the fatherland defended and the interests of civilisation and of the war of liberation saved for all time. The longer this terrible struggle drags on and the deeper the belligerent countries become involved; the further off is the way out of this interminable war. And it is the violence of this

conflict that makes extremely difficult, well-nigh impossible, an alliance of the great imperialist powers against the Soviet Republic, which in the bare half-year of Its existence has won the warm regard and the most whole-hearted sympathy of the class-conscious workers of the world.

The second contradiction determining Russia's international position is the rivalry between Japan and America. Over several decades the economic development of these countries has produced a vast amount of inflammable material which makes inevitable a desperate clash between them for domination of the Pacific Ocean and the surrounding territories. The entire diplomatic and economic history of the Far East leaves no room for doubt that under capitalist conditions it is impossible to avert the imminent conflict between Japan and America. This contradiction, temporarily concealed by the alliance of Japan and America against Germany, delays Japanese imperialism's attack on Russia, which was prepared for over a long period, which was a long time feeling its way, and which to a certain degree was started and is being supported by counter-revolutionary forces. The campaign which has been launched against the Soviet Republic (the landing at Vladivostok and the support of the Semyonov bands) is being held up because it threatens to turn the hidden conflict between Japan and America into open war. It is quite likely, of course, and we must not forget that no matter how solid the imperialist groupings may appear to be, they can be broken up in a few days if the interests of sacred private property, the sacred rights of concessions, etc., demand it. It may well be that the tiniest spark will suffice to blow up the existing alignment of powers, and then the afore-mentioned contradictions will no longer protect us.

At the moment, however, the situation we have described explains why it is possible to preserve our socialist island in the

middle of stormy seas and also why its position is so unstable, and, at times, to the great joy of the bourgeoisie and the panic of the petty bourgeoisie, it seems that it may be engulfed by the waves at any minute.

The outer aspect, the external expression of this situation is the Brest Treaty on the one hand, and the customs and laws with regard to neutral countries on the other.

You know that treaties and laws are worth nothing but a scrap of paper in the face of international conflicts.

These words are usually recalled and quoted as an example of the cynicism of imperialist foreign policy; the cynicism, however, lies not in these words, but in the ruthless, the cruelly and agonisingly ruthless, imperialist war, in which all peace treaties and all laws of neutrality have been flouted, are flouted, and will be flouted, as long as capitalism exists.

That is why, when we come to the most important question for us, the Brest peace and the likelihood of its violation with all the possible consequences for us—if we want to stand firmly on our socialist feet and do not want to be overthrown by the plots and provocations of the counter-revolutionaries, no matter under what socialist labels they disguise themselves, we must not forget for a single moment the economic principles underlying all peace treaties, including that of Brest-Litovsk, the economic principles underlying all neutrality, including our own. We must not forget, on the one hand, the state of affairs internationally, the state of affairs of international imperialism in relation to the class, which is growing, and which sooner or later, perhaps even later than we desire or expect, will nevertheless become capitalism's heir, and will defeat world capitalism. And on the other hand, we must not forget the relations between the imperialist countries, the relations between the imperialist economic groups.

Having clarified this situation, I think, comrades, we shall not find it difficult to understand the significance of those diplomatic particulars and details, at times even trifles, which have mainly occupied our attention during the past few days, which have been on our minds during the past few days. Clearly, the instability of the international situation gives rise to panic. This panic emanates from the Constitutional-Democrats, the Right Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks, who aid and abet the interests of those who want and who strive to sow panic. In no way closing our eyes to the full danger and tragedy of the situation, and analysing the economic relations on an international scale, we must say: yes, the question of war and peace hangs by a thread both in the West and in the Far East because two trends exist; one, which makes an alliance of all the imperialists inevitable; the other, which places the imperialists in opposition to each other—two trends, neither of which has any firm foundation. No, Japan cannot now decide to launch a full-scale attack, although with her million-strong army she could quite easily overrun obviously weak Russia. I do not know, nor can anyone know, when this is likely to take place.

The form of the ultimatum threatens war against the allies and a treaty with Germany, but this position can change in a few days. There is always the possibility of it changing because the American bourgeoisie, now at logger-heads with Japan, can tomorrow come to terms with her, because the Japanese bourgeoisie are just as likely tomorrow to come to terms with the German bourgeoisie. Their basic interests are the same: the division of the world between themselves, the interests of the landowners, of capital, the safeguarding (as they say) of their national self-respect and their national interests. This language is sufficiently familiar to those who have either the misfortune or the habit—I don't know which—of reading newspapers like those of the Socialist-Revolutionaries. And when national self-

respect begins to be mentioned frequently, we all know, we know very well from the experience of 1914, what facts of imperialist robbery this is prompted by. In view of this relationship, it is clear why the situation in the Far East is unstable. One thing must be said: we must have a clear understanding of these contradictions of capitalist interests, we must appreciate that the stability of the Soviet Republic is growing with every week, every month that passes, and that sympathy towards it among the working and exploited people of the world is growing at the same time.

And, at the same time, any day, any moment, we must be prepared for and expect changes in international politics in favour of the policies of the extremist war parties.

The position of the German coalition is clear to us. At the present moment the majority of the German bourgeois parties stand for observing the Brest peace, but, of course, are very glad to "improve" on it and to receive a few more annexations at Russia's expense. What makes them take this stand? The political and military considerations of German national interests—as they express it—of imperialist interests, make them prefer peace in the East, so that their hands may be free in the West, where German imperialism has promised an immediate victory on many occasions, and where every week or every month proves that this victory, the more the partial successes gained, recedes still further into the distance. On the other hand, there is a war party which, during discussions on the Brest Treaty, showed its hand on a number of occasions, a party which naturally exists in all imperialist countries, a war party which says to itself: force must be used immediately, irrespective of possible consequences. These are the voices of the extremist war party. It has been known in German history since the time when overwhelming military victories became a feature history. It has been known since 1866, for instance,

when the extremist war party of Germany achieved victory over Austria and turned this victory into a complete rout. All these clashes, all these conflicts are inevitable and lead to a situation where matters now hang by a thread, where, on the one hand, the bourgeois imperialist majority of the German parliament, the German propertied classes, the German capitalists prefer to stand by the Brest Treaty, while having, I repeat, no hesitation about improving on it. And on the other hand, any day, any moment we must be prepared for and expect changes in politics in the interests of the extremist war party.

This explains the instability of the international situation; this explains how easy it is in the circumstances to put the Party in one situation or another; this shows what prudence, caution, self-control, and presence of mind is demanded of the Soviet government if it is to define its task clearly. Let the Russian bourgeoisie rush from a French to a German orientation. They like doing this. They have in several areas seen that German support is an excellent guarantee against the peasants who are taking the land, and against the workers who are building the foundations of socialism. In the quite recent past, and over a long period, over a number of years they branded as traitors those who condemned the imperialist war and opened people's eyes to its real nature, but now they are all prepared in a few weeks to change their political beliefs and to go over from an alliance with the British robbers to an alliance with the German robbers against Soviet power. Let the bourgeoisie of all shades, from the Right Socialist-Revolutionaries and Mensheviks to the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries, rush this way and that. It suits their nature. Let them spread panic, for they are themselves in a panic. Let them rush to and from, unable to do otherwise, vacillating between the different orientations and between the absurd phrases that fail to take into consideration the fact that to deepen the effect of the revolution, when it has attained great

proportions, one has to experience the most diverse groupings and transitions from one stage to another. We Russian revolutionaries have had the good fortune in the twentieth century to pass through two revolutions, each of which gave us a lot of experience, which has also stamped its impression on the lives of the people, of how a deep-going and effective revolutionary movement is prepared; how the different classes in this movement behave; by what difficult and exhausting path, sometimes by a long evolution, the maturity of new-classes comes about.

Remember how hard it was for the Soviets, created by the spontaneous outburst in 1905, how hard it was for them in 1917 to take up the fight again, and how hard later, when they had to go through all the suffering of compromise with the bourgeoisie and with the hidden, most rabid enemies of the working class, who talked of the defense of the revolution, of the Red Flag, and committed the greatest of crimes in June 1917—now, when the majority of the working class supports us, remember what it cost after the great 1905 Revolution to emerge with Soviets of the working and peasant classes. Remember all this and think of the mass scale on which the struggle against international imperialism is developing, think how difficult the transition to this situation is, and what the Russian Republic had to undergo when it found itself ahead of all the other contingents of the socialist army.

I know that there are, of course, wiseacres with a high opinion of themselves and even calling themselves socialists, who assert that power should not have been taken until the revolution broke out in all countries. They do not realize that in saying this they are deserting the revolution and going over to the side of the bourgeoisie. To wait until the working classes, carry out a revolution on an international scale means that everyone will remain suspended in mid-air. This is senseless. Everyone

knows the difficulties of a revolution. It may begin with brilliant success in one country and then go through agonizing periods, since final victory is only possible on a world scale, and only by the joint efforts of the workers of all countries. Our task consists in being restrained and prudent, we must maneuver and retreat until we receive reinforcements. A change over to these tactics is inevitable, no matter how much they are mocked by so-called revolutionaries with no idea of what revolution means.

Having dealt with the general questions I now want to examine the causes of the recent alarm and panic which have again enabled the counter-revolutionaries to start activities intended to undermine Soviet power.

I have already mentioned that the outward legal form and outer aspect of all international relations of the Soviet Socialist Republic are, on the one hand, the Brest-Litovsk Treaty, and, on the other, the general law and custom defining the status of a neutral country among other, belligerent countries; this status accounts for the recent difficulties. The conclusion of peace with Finland, the Ukraine and Turkey should have been the natural consequence of the Brest-Litovsk Treaty, yet we are still at war with these countries, and this is not due to our internal development, but to the influence of the ruling classes of these countries. In these conditions the only temporary way out lay in the temporary breathing-space provided by the Brest-Litovsk Treaty, the breathing-space which provoked so many futile and unnecessary words about its being impossible but which nevertheless turned out to be possible and in two months brought results, made itself felt on the majority of Russian soldiers, enabled them to return home and see how things were going, to take advantage of the revolution's gains, to work the land, to look around and draw new strength for the fresh sacrifices ahead.

Naturally, this temporary breathing-space appeared to be coming to an end when the situation worsened in Finland, the Ukraine and Turkey, when, instead of peace, we merely obtained a postponement of that selfsame acute economic problem: war or peace? And now are we to go to war once again, despite all the peaceful intentions of Soviet power and its absolute determination to sacrifice so-called Great Power status, i.e., the right to conclude secret treaties, to conceal them from the people with the assistance of the Chernovs, Tseretelis and Kerenskys, to sign secret predatory treaties and conduct an imperialist, predatory war? Indeed, instead of peace, all that we have obtained is a brief postponement of that selfsame pressing question of war or peace.

Here is the result of this situation, and you again clearly see where its final outcome lies—namely, in the question of what the results will be of the wavering among the two hostile groups of imperialist countries—the American conflict in the Far East, and the German-British conflict in Western Europe. It is clear how these contradictions have intensified over the conquest of the Ukraine, over the situation which the German imperialists, particularly their main war party, frequently viewed so optimistically looked upon as so easy, and which caused precisely this extremist German war party such fantastic difficulties. It was this situation which temporarily raised the hopes of the Russian Constitutional-Democrats, Mensheviks, and Right Socialist-Revolutionaries, who have fallen in love with what Skoropadsky is bringing the Ukraine, and who now hope that this will also be easily achieved in Russia. These gentlemen will be mistaken; their hopes will turn to dust because. . . (stormy applause), because, I say, that same main war party in Germany, which is too accustomed to rely on the power of the sword, even this party in these particular circumstances has not been supported by the majority of the imperialists, those bourgeois imperialist circles who have seen

unprecedented difficulties in the conquest of the Ukraine, in the struggle to subjugate a whole people, in the forced necessity of resorting to a terrible coup d'état.

This main war party created unprecedented difficulties in Germany when, having promised its people and the workers supreme victories on the Western Front, this extremist war party was forced to recognise that it was faced with new, unbelievable economic and political difficulties with having to divert military forces to tasks which also at first seemed easy, and also with having to conclude a treaty with the Ukrainian Mensheviks and the Right Socialist-Revolutionaries, who were the signatories to the peace treaty.

The extremist war party in Germany reasoned: we shall send many troops and obtain grain, but then it became necessary to engineer a coup d'état. That turned out to be easy because the Ukrainian Mensheviks readily supported this move. But it then turned out that this coup d'état created fresh and gigantic difficulties, because the grain and raw materials, without which Germany cannot exist, had to be fought for at every step, and their appropriation by military force in an occupied country involved too great an effort and too many sacrifices.

Such is the situation that has arisen in the Ukraine and that should have lent wings to the hopes of the Russian counter-revolution. It is clear that in this struggle, Russia, which has been unable to rebuild her army, has suffered and is suffering further losses. The peace talks have led to new, onerous conditions, to new open and concealed indemnities. Under what decree the Ukraine's frontiers are to be determined is not clear. The Rada, [2] which signed the decree, has been removed. A landowner-hetman has been put in its place. Because of this uncertainty a whole number of problems have emerged which prove that the questions of war and peace remain as before. The partial armistice existing between the Russian and German

troops in no way predetermines the general situation. The question hangs in the air. The same is true of Georgia, where we have a protracted counter-revolutionary struggle by the government of the Caucasian Mensheviks, a protracted struggle by counter-revolutionaries who call themselves Social-Democrats. And when the victory of Soviet power and the working people, having embraced the whole of Russia, has begun to draw in the non-Russian outlying areas, when it has become quite obvious and beyond all doubt that the victory of Soviet power, as has been admitted by the counter-revolutionary representatives of the Don Cossacks, cannot be delayed, when the Menshevik government in the Caucasus has begun to waver the government of Gegechkori and Jordania, who realised this too late and started to talk about finding a common language with the Bolsheviks when Tsereteli, aided by the Turkish troops, has shown his hand by advancing against the Bolsheviks—they will reap the same harvest as the Rada. (Applause.)

Remember, however, that if these bargainers of the Caucasian Rada receive the support of the German troops, as did the Ukrainian Rada, then there will no doubt be fresh difficulties for the Russian Soviet Republic, a new inevitability of war, new dangers and now uncertainties. There are people who refer to this uncertainty, to the strain of an uncertain situation (in fact such an uncertain situation is sometimes worse than any clearly defined one), and say that the uncertainty can be easily removed—you only have to demand openly that the Germans observe the Brest Treaty.

I have heard of such naïve people, who consider themselves to be on the left, but who in fact only reflect the narrow-mindedness of our petty bourgeoisie. . . .[*]

They forget that you have first to be victorious before you can make demands. If you are not victorious the enemy can delay

his reply or even, make no reply at all to your demands. That is the law of imperialist war.

You don't like it. Then be able to defend your homeland. The worker has every right to defend his homeland for the sake of socialism, for the sake of the working class.

I shall only add that this uncertain situation on the Caucasian border was a result of the quite unpardonable vacillation of the Gegechkori government which at first announced that it did not recognise the Brest peace, and then declared its independence without informing us of what territory this independence covered. We have sent innumerable radio-telegrams saying to them, please inform us of the territory you lay claim to. You have the right to claim independence, but since you speak of independence, you are bound to say what territory you are representing. That was a week ago. Countless radio-telegrams have been dispatched, but not a single reply has been received. German imperialism is taking advantage of this. This has made it possible for Germany, and Turkey, as a satellite state, to push farther and farther forward, making no replies, ignoring everything, stating: "we shall take whatever we can, we are not infringing the Brest peace, because the Transcaucasian army does not recognise it, because the Caucasus is independent."

Of whom is the Gegechkori government independent? It is independent of the Soviet Republic, but it is dependent, just a little, on German imperialism, and quite naturally so. (Applause.)

That is the situation which has developed, comrades—an acute aggravation of relations in the last few days—it is a situation which has once again, and fairly obviously, confirmed the correctness of the tactics which the vast majority of our Party, the Russian Communist Party of Bolsheviks, has employed and firmly insisted on during recent months.

We possess great revolutionary experience, which has taught us that it is essential to employ the tactics of merciless attack when objective conditions permit, when the experience of compromising has shown that the people's indignation has been aroused, and that attack will express this change. But we have to resort to temporizing tactics, to a slow gathering of forces when objective circumstances do not favour a call for a general merciless repulse.

Any person who does not shut his eyes to the facts, who is not blind, knows that we are merely repeating what we have said earlier, and what we have always said: that we do not forget the weakness of the Russian working class compared to other contingents of the international proletariat. It was not our own will, but historical circumstances, the legacy of the tsarist regime, the flabbiness of the Russian bourgeoisie, which caused this contingent to march ahead of the other contingents of the international proletariat; it was not because we desired it, but because circumstances demanded it.

We must remain at our post until the arrival of our ally, the international proletariat, which will arrive and will inevitably arrive, but which is approaching at an immeasurably slower pace than we expect or wish. If we see that as a result of objective conditions the international proletariat moves too slowly, we must nevertheless stick to our tactics of temporizing and utilizing the conflicts and contradictions between the imperialists, of slowly accumulating strength; the tactics of preserving this island of Soviet power in the stormy imperialist sea, maintaining this island which now already attracts the gaze of the working people of all countries. That is why we tell ourselves that, if the extremist war party can at any moment defeat any imperialist coalition and build a new unexpected imperialist coalition against us, we at any rate will not make it any easier for them. And if they come against us—yes, we are

now defencists—we shall do everything in our power, everything within the power of diplomatic tactics, we shall do everything to delay that moment, everything to make the brief and unstable respite, given us in March, last longer, for we are firmly convinced that behind us are tens of millions of workers and peasants who know that with every week and, even more so, with every month of this respite they gain new strength, they are consolidating Soviet power, making it firm and stable. They know that they are introducing a new spirit, and that after the attrition and weariness of this exhausting reactionary war, they will create firmness and readiness for the last and decisive battle should external forces attack the Socialist Soviet Republic.

We have been defencists since October 25, 1917; we have won the right to defend our native land. It is not secret treaties that we are defending, we have annulled and exposed them to the whole world. We are defending our country against the imperialists. We are defending and we shall win. It is not the Great Power status of Russia that we are defending—of that nothing is left but Russia proper—nor is it national interests, for we assert that the interests of socialism, of world socialism are higher than national interests, higher than the interests of the state. We are defenders of the socialist fatherland.

This is not achieved by issuing declarations, but only by overthrowing the bourgeoisie in one's own country, by a ruthless war to the death begun in one's own country; and we know that we shall win this war. Ours is a small island in the war that engulfs the imperialist world, but on this small island we have shown and proved to all what the working class can do. Everyone knows this and has acknowledged it. We have proved that we possess the right to defend our homeland. We are defencists and look upon our task with all the seriousness taught us by the four years of war, with all the seriousness and

caution understood by every worker and peasant who has met a soldier and has learned what that soldier has lived through in these four years of war—the caution which may not be understood, which may be sneered at and regarded frivolously only by people who are revolutionaries in word but not in deed. It is just because we do support the defence of the fatherland that we tell ourselves: a firm and strong army and a strong rear are needed for the defence, and in order to have a firm and strong army we must in the first place ensure that the food supplies are on a sound basis. For this the dictatorship of the proletariat must be expressed not only centrally—that is the first step and only the first step—but there must be dictatorship throughout the whole of Russia—that is the second step and only the second step, which we have not yet carried out sufficiently. Proletarian discipline is essential and necessary for us; real proletarian dictatorship, when the firm and iron rule of class-conscious workers is felt in every remote corner of our country, when not a single kulak, not a single rich man, not a single opponent of the grain monopoly remains unpunished but is found and punished by the iron hand of the disciplined dictators of the working class, the proletarian dictators. (Applause.)

We say to ourselves: our attitude to defence of the fatherland is a cautious one; it is our duty to do everything that our diplomacy can do to delay the moment of war, to extend the respite period; we promise the workers and peasants to do all we can for peace. This we shall do. And bourgeois gentlemen and their hirelings, who think that just as in the Ukraine, where a coup was brought about so easily, so in Russia it may be possible to give birth to new Skoropadskys, should not forget that the war party in Germany found it very difficult to affect a coup in the Ukraine, and will meet with plenty of opposition in Soviet Russia. Everything goes to prove this; Soviet power has

pursued this line and has made every sacrifice to consolidate the position of the working people.

The situation regarding peace with Finland may be summed up in the words: Fort Ino and Murmansk. Fort Ino, which defends Petrograd, lies geographically within the Finnish state. In concluding peace with the workers' government of Finland we, the representatives of socialist Russia, recognised Finland's absolute right to the whole territory, but it was mutually agreed by both governments that Fort Ino should remain in Russia's hands "for the defence of the joint interests of the Socialist Republics", as stated in the treaty that was concluded. [3] It is natural that our troops should conclude this peace in Finland, should sign these terms. It is natural that bourgeois and counter-revolutionary Finland was bound to raise a hue and cry against this. It is natural that the reactionary and counter-revolutionary Finnish bourgeoisie should lay claim to this stronghold. It is natural that, because of this, the issue should become acute on a number of occasions and should still remain acute. Matters hang by a thread. It is natural that the question of Murmansk, to which the Anglo-French have laid claim, should give rise to even greater aggravation, because they have spent tens of millions on the port's construction in order to safeguard their military rear in their imperialist war against Germany. Their respect for neutrality is so wonderful that they make use of everything that is left unguarded. Furthermore, sufficient excuse for their grabbing is their possession of a battleship, while we have nothing with which to chase it away. It is natural that all this should have aggravated the situation. There is an outer aspect, a legal expression resulting from the international position of the Soviet Republic, which presumes that it is impossible for armed forces of any belligerent state to set foot on neutral territory without being disarmed. The British landed their military forces at Murmansk, and we were unable to prevent this by armed force. Consequently, we are presented

with demands almost in the nature of an ultimatum: if you cannot protect your neutrality, we shall wage war on your territory.

A worker-peasant army, however, has now been formed, it has rallied in the uyezds and gubernias the peasants who have returned to their land, land wrested from the landowners; they now have something to defend. An army has been formed which has started to build Soviet power, and which will become the vanguard if an invasion against Russia breaks out; we shall rise as one man to meet the enemy.

My time is up, and I want to conclude by reading a telegram received by radio from Comrade Joffe, Soviet Ambassador in Berlin. This telegram will show you that, on the one hand, you have confirmation from our Ambassador of whether my analysis of the international situation is correct and, on the other hand, that the foreign policy of our Soviet Republic is a responsible one—it is a policy of preparation for defense of our country, a steadfast policy, not allowing a single step to be taken that would aid the extremist parties of the imperialist powers in the East and West. This is a responsible policy with no illusions. There always remains the possibility that any day military forces may be thrown against us and we, the workers, and peasants, assure ourselves and the whole world, and shall be able to prove, that we shall rise to a man to defend the Soviet Republic. I hope, therefore, that the reading of this telegram will serve as an appropriate conclusion to my speech and will show us the spirit in which the representatives of the Soviet Republic work abroad in the interests of the Soviets, of all Soviet institutions and the Soviet Republic.

“The latest radio-telegrams received today report that the German War Prisoners’ Commission is leaving on Friday, May 10. We have already received a Note from the German Government proposing the setting up of a special commission

to consider all legal questions in regard to our possessions in the Ukraine and in Finland. I have agreed to such a commission and have asked you to send the appropriate military and legal representatives. Today I had a talk about further advances, demands for clearing Fort Ino, and the attitude of the Russians to Germany. Here is the reply: The German High Command states that there will be no further advances; Germany's role in the Ukraine and Finland has ended. Germany is willing to assist our peace talks with Kiev and Helsingfors and is entering into negotiations with the governments concerned. As regards Fort Ino, in connection with the Finnish Peace talks: according to the treaty, the forts should be destroyed. Germany considers that when defining the frontiers, the agreement with the Reds can be accepted; the Whites have not yet replied. The German Government declares officially: Germany abides firmly by the Brest Treaty, she wants peaceful relations with us, she has no aggressive plans and has no intention of attacking us in any way. It is promised that, in accordance with my request, Russian citizens in Germany will be treated on a par with other neutrals."

Endnotes

[1] Lenin's report evoked bitter attacks from the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries, who tried to use the critical international and internal situation as a weapon against the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet government. Because Lenin had to leave the conference on urgent business the reply to the debate, by agreement with Lenin, was given by Y. M. Sverdlov, who made a resolute stand against the Menshevik and Socialist-Revolutionary attacks. The meeting rejected the Menshevik and Socialist-Revolutionary resolutions, demanding the convocation of the Constituent Assembly, denunciation of the Brest Treaty, and conclusion of an alliance with the Allied powers for continuation of the war against Germany. The

Bolshevik revolution, written by Sverdlov, approving the policy of the Soviet Government, was carried by a majority.

The plan of Lenin's report on foreign policy at the Joint Meeting of the All-Russia C.E.C. and the Moscow Soviet is published in Lenin Miscellany XI, p. 92.

[2] Rada—the Central Rada, a counter-revolutionary bourgeois nationalist government set up in April 1917 at the All-Ukraine National Congress in Kiev by a bloc of Ukrainian bourgeois and petty-bourgeois nationalist parties and groups. The chairman of the Rada was M. S. Grushevsky, ideologist of the Ukrainian bourgeoisie, the vice-chairman was V. K. Vinnichenko. Among its members were Petlyura, Yefremov, Antonovich and other nationalists.

After the victory of the October Revolution the Rada declared itself the supreme organ of the "Ukrainian People's Republic", opposed Soviet power and became one of the main centers of counter-revolution.

In December 1917, at the First All-Ukraine Congress of Soviets, which took place in Kharkov, the Ukraine was proclaimed a Soviet republic. The Congress also declared the power of the Central Rada overthrown. The Council of People's Commissars of the R.S.F.S.R. recognised the Ukrainian Soviet Government as the sole legitimate government of the Ukraine and passed a decision that it should be given immediate assistance in its struggle against the counter-revolutionary Rada. In December 1917 and January 1918, armed uprisings against the Central Rada and for the establishment of Soviet power flared up in all parts of the Ukraine. In January 1918, Soviet troops in the Ukraine launched an offensive and on January 26 (February 8) occupied Kiev and deposed the bourgeois Rada.

Driven out of the Soviet Ukraine, the Central Rada allied itself with the German imperialists in order to overthrow Soviet

power and restore the bourgeois regime in the Ukraine. During the peace negotiations between the Soviet Republic and Germany the Rada sent its delegation to Brest-Litovsk and behind the back of the Soviet delegation concluded a separate peace with Germany, by which it undertook to supply Germany with Ukrainian grain, coal, and raw materials in return for military assistance against Soviet power. In March 1918 the Rada, now a puppet in the hands of the German and Austrian invaders, returned to Kiev. Realising that the Rada was incapable of crushing the revolutionary movement in the Ukraine and ensuring the delivery of supplies of food and raw materials, the Germans eventually abolished it.

[3] The reference is to the Treaty between Russia and Finnish Socialist Republics, which was endorsed in Petrograd on March 1, 1918 (see Decrees of the Soviet Government, Russ. ed., Vol. 1, 1957, pp. 505-10).

* A phrase that is not clearly written in the verbatim report has been omitted.— Editor.

A shame that nothing can atone for

Clara Zetkin,

The article was written for the book "Anniversary of World War", by Ohitovich dated 1925.

The decade that has elapsed since the outbreak of the imperialist war has fully proved that the outbreak of war was a harbinger of the bankruptcy of the Second International.

Bankruptcy, incomparable to anything, not finding any justification in history, shameful and at the same time fatal bankruptcy.

The war piled up mountains of corpses and ruins, produced enormous destruction of material values and gave rise to deep economic ruin.

In the dialectical process of historical phenomena, this disruption in turn gave birth to new forces, developed them and for the first time fertilized the revolution. The immediate, most tangible consequence of the bankruptcy of the Second International was: the distortion of the real historical essence of the proletariat as a class, the false direction of the revolutionary forces and the resulting slowdown in the pace of social development.

Tales about the "defense of the fatherland" poisoned the consciousness and struck the will of the worker to fight, to revolution. The international proletariat was demarcated along the frontier pillars states and their groupings: each uniting in his own country in "sacred unity" (union sacré) and in "civil peace" (Burgfrieden) with his mortal class enemies. Born as fighters for the world revolution, the detachments of the international proletariat were compelled to play the role of executioner and victim in the imperialist slaughterhouse. This is how the proletariat got lost on its way from the historically

necessary to the historically possible: on the way to turning the imperialist war into an international civil war. The effective conditions for the victorious outcome of the civil war of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie were laid down in the sharp contradiction between the development of the productive forces, on the one hand, and the capitalist mode of production and the institution of private ownership of the means of production, on the other. On this basis, economic and social conflicts arose, which found their expression in the World War.

Only one force in human society could prevent war, prevent it; this force is the proletariat, whose ideological leader was the Second International. And a heavy responsibility for the world war falls on the leaders of the Second International. They were only executors of the will of a class whose historical function was to plunder and enslave the poor, a class for which war was a commercial business, a profitable enterprise.

The propertied classes did not betray their class interests when they drove armies of millions to destroy each other—on the contrary, they served their class ideals.

The parties of the Second International, on the contrary, betrayed the interests and ideals of the class to which they swore under oath to serve. Next to Scheidemann, Renaudel, Vandervelde, Henderson, such people as Ludendorff and Foch, Stinnes, De Wendel, Armstrong and Co. seem downright noble and honest.

War would have been unthinkable given the serious resistance of the proletariat.

But war became possible, became a fact, thanks to the activities of the social-chauvinists, who darkened the consciousness of the working class, weakened, and poisoned its will to fight, to revolution.

The most shameless, the most arrogant is the hypocrisy with which, after the end of the war, the leaders of the Second International acted as accusers of the imperialist world bourgeoisie, vilifying it in the sharpest manner.

But all the accusations, all the stigmatizing speeches must fall equally on themselves.

From year to year, shoulder to shoulder with the merciless, greedy imperialists, they trudged knee-deep into the sea of blood shed during the World War.

From year to year, they made the waves of this blood rise higher and higher, at the same time, to the accompaniment of social-patriotic, Janissary music, leading the proletariat of the warring countries to a terrible slaughter or with the social-pacifist unctuous speeches of the pastors, restraining the proletariat from the struggle against disasters, against the bourgeois order.

It seems that in the face of such lies and shamelessness, from countless huge graves on the battlefields, from quiet forest thickets, mountain gorges, from the dark depths of the seas, the souls of many hundreds of thousands of victims of the war must rise up and cry loudly to social patriotic tomboys and social pacifist cowards, at the head of the Second International:

You, our murderers, do not desecrate our graves, do not disturb our peace; your crocodile tears will not wash away your bloody guilt.

You will only soil yourself with blood even more and aggravate your guilt*—And the endless ranks of military invalids, the sick, parents who have lost children, widows, orphans must stifle every attempt at a new deception of the masses, every preparation for war.

Death often seems an enviable fate to these depressed unfortunate victims, and all of them can present to the reformist

leaders of the Second International the too generously issued, but unpaid bills of the "grateful fatherland" *, the payment of which these leaders guaranteed with the swagger and zeal of well-trained lackeys serving noble gentlemen.

Along with the bloody disasters of individual victims of the war, a gigantic picture of the disasters of all the peoples of Europe is put forward. This is not a threatening ghost, but a painful reality. The war and its consequences ruined the world, especially the masses of workers, middle and petty bourgeois, and small peasants, pushing them out of comparatively cultural well-being towards barbarism. The cry of suffering of countless millions of the ruined and trampled is so strong that neither orgies nor the cries of military victors, usurers and speculators can drown it out.

The world war left behind only one vanquished, both in the victorious Entente states and in the defeated Central Powers, and the defeated are the working people. Even in the most economically and politically ruined Germany and Austria, big capitalists and speculators find something to warm their hands on. They can hardly count the millions and billions that the war, economic ruin and financial crisis of states brought to them after the end of the war.

The leaders of the Second International will forever remain fully responsible for the total amount of misfortune resulting from the war. Their crime, in reality, will be even greater since they cover up their betrayal with the will of the Social Democratic parties and the chauvinistic mood of the masses.

Leaders must go ahead of their party and ahead of the masses and not allow others to rule them.

The German Social Democracy reveled in the proud consciousness that it was the leading party, the exemplary party of the Second International. It proved its superiority by

the number of its members, the votes of the electors, the parliamentary mandates, the volume, and content of its daily press, its agitational and Lakat literature, party resolutions and speeches in the Reichstag. At the congresses of the Second International, these opinions, its influence, were dominant and decisive.

In the atmosphere of the imperialist C&D crisis, however, its spirit of revolutionary struggle has not been strengthened. On the contrary, from a leading, revolutionary, militant party imbued with a class spirit, it has turned into a vulgar, philistine-democratic, reformist organization.

With the outbreak of the World War, the German Social Democracy was the first of all parties to sink into a deep quagmire of alliance with the bourgeoisie and its Wilhelminian government. It's shameful betrayal at a decisive moment in history, poorly concealed by the indecisiveness of its leaders, and their complete political inability to act (the dual game of Hermann Muller in Paris) signaled the final decline of the Second International, which was the hope of the proletariat of all countries for the preservation of peace.

And the German Social Democracy was a brilliant example, followed by a number of other parties of the Second International under the "victorious banners of the fatherland" (in other words, to satisfy the imperialist appetites of the bourgeoisie). Its Social Democratic leaders hurriedly carried out, one after another, all the military credits required by this or that government, at the whim of Wilhelm II or at the orders of the ministers of war, which placed a heavy burden on the working people.

Under the hospitable roof of Gelferich, they touched the hand of the monarch, whom they had already despised. Both at the front and away from the shots (after all, bullets are so

thoughtless!), In government offices and parliamentary lobby, they fraternized with important generals dressed in uniform.

As traveling salesmen of German imperialism, they visited neutral countries and begged them to enter into a military alliance with Germany, such as Südekum in Italy or Otto Braun and other luminaries of the party who prepared in Switzerland the "White Paper" of the government on the causes of the war - this is a collection of "documents" representing one continuous tendentious lie.

They supported in their press and literature the military psychosis of those doomed to die in the trenches and starve in their homeland. They suspected, persecuted, and slandered everyone who was not interested in the Social Democratic program and the decisions of the International Congress seemed like a dirty piece of paper and tried to crush any revolutionary movement among the masses.

When I was imprisoned for my "treacherous actions" the magistrate presented me with an appeal of the Social-Democratic Party as an exclusively aggravating material for my guilt. It suggested to the comrades that the manifesto and resolutions of the International Women's Conference in Bern, in March 1915, should not be circulated on the grounds that this appeal was undoubtedly a call for action by the state authorities. Hugo Haase pointed out in vain, relying on his authority as a lawyer, that this appeal should be qualified as a denunciation addressed to the authorities.

Social-pacifists, opponents of Scheidemann, Ebert and their accomplices, fought against the slaughter of peoples without the courage and readiness for sacrifice, which is characteristic of bourgeois pacifists, and their revolutionary tendencies were out of the question.

Party discipline did not serve as an instrument for the unity and decisiveness of revolutionary actions, but, on the contrary, killed revolutionary energy. The parliamentary representatives of the opposition¹), cursing behind the backs of the close-knit Social-Democratic leaders, could not find strong enough and rude expressions to address the social-patriotic "rogues" and "fools", but in fact, for a long time, by their silence supported the behavior of the official leaders of the Social-Democratic faction.

In order to reject the war loan, they decided, albeit too late, to break with the social patriots after they had sacrificed Liebknecht, the only brave banner-Josz of the International and the revolutionary proletariat.

Laase, Dittmann, Josenfeld refused to mobilize the proletarian masses and lead them into battle. Instead of relying on the strength of the worker to prepare and organize the struggle, they relied on Wilson, his program, and his League of Nations. Could it be otherwise?

Their thought and will were so weak that they could not free themselves from walking on the slings of Kautsky, the most ardent theoretician of the Second International. He tried to cover up their bankruptcy with the cowardly stupid saying that the International could only be an instrument of peace, not of war.

By the will of the pitiless nemesis of history, no proletariat is paying so heavily for its guilt in the war as the German one, which allowed the passionate imperialist activity of Scheidemann and the submissive pacifist passivity of Dittmann. Not because the reformist leaders of the working class in other imperialist powers were even one half better than these people, far from it.

However, they did not all enjoy the same advantage: behind them there were no toiling masses, behind them there was no such superbly organized force as behind the Germans, they were not illumined by the dazzling brilliance of the traditions and authority of profound Marxist teaching, the experienced practical struggle, that brilliance that completely illuminates the German Social Democracy, and enemy listened with intense attention as long as their statements expressed the opinions and will of a million-strong party.

A party which ensured the decisive influence of its leaders on the German proletariat and the Second International became historically great. Everything that was said by Hermann Müller or Otto Wels was considered to be the "expression of the personal opinion" of these gentlemen, supposedly of no importance. Friend and foe listened with intense attention as long as their statements expressed the opinions and will of a million-strong party. The leading German social patriots and social pacifists have thrown into the balance the steely might and significance of Social Democracy in the Second International for the benefit and advantage of the imperialist bourgeoisie.

Thanks to their decisions and their deeds, the Second International fell.

But the last capitulation of the Social Democracy is an even greater crime than hunger, the decline of culture, the ruin and death of countless millions. It polluted and shattered in the eyes of the enslaved all over the world the great ideal of revolutionary proletarian brotherhood, because with its blessing and at its call, the proletarians of the countries waging war began to destroy each other. The broad masses have lost faith in the liberating power of the international solidarity of the working people of all countries, in their own fetter-breaking power, in socialism and revolution.

Everything that had hitherto been dearer and above everything to them seemed to them in the murderous clouds of the poisonous gas of the desert as insignificant phrases. While bombs and long-range guns sent from the air turned flourishing cities into ruins, their strength seemed pitiful to them. But the international solidarity of the proletariat is, after all, not a vague fantasy; it exists and grows, nourished by painful suffering—the lot of the destitute. Proletarian solidarity grew out of a thousand bloody wounds on the battlefields. She spoke in speeches ridiculed by four outstanding people of Germany, who were the first to protest against the imperialist war and the vile behavior of the representatives of the Social Democracy, these four leaders who did not avert their gaze from the proletarian revolution.

Its voice resounded in Karl Liebknecht's repeated "no!" at the voting of war credits, at the International Socialist Women's Conference in Bern, and somewhat later at the International Youth Conference, the first organizations that called on the working masses of all countries to unite and to revolutionary class struggle.

In Zimmerwalde-Kienthal it advanced with force. Finally, in all its historical growth, it came out before the world proletariat in the October (November) revolution of the Russian workers.

This immortal cause once again strengthened the faith of the oppressed in their strength in socialism, and gave hope that the solidarity of the proletariat would put an end to imperialism.

Since the fateful summer of 1914, the story has been posted twice. For the first time, when in October 1917 the glorious Russian revolution threw out the slogan of peace to the whole blood-soaked world.

Peace not only for the young Republic of Soviets fighting for its life, but peace for all peoples who were ready to fall from the wounds inflicted on them by imperialist madness.

A world secured by liberation from the war-producing yoke of capitalism that only a revolution could overcome. The second time the New International was to manifest itself a year later (XI-18), when the revolution broke out in Germany. Vandervelde, Henderson and Zainbat both times led the international proletariat into slavery to the bourgeoisie, and not into the camp of the revolution.

Some of them, without any hesitation, assumed responsibility for the "armed peace" of Brest-Litovsk, which was supposed to overthrow the first workers' and peasants' state and make possible the triumph of the central imperialist powers. Others gloatingly signed the bloody Treaty of Versailles, which turned Germany and Austria politically and economically into Entente colonies.

However, what separated them as faithful lackeys of their own* bourgeoisie from the proletariat of another country, this same thing bound them with iron fetters to the bourgeoisie in general. They have made it their historic task to protect the most sacred property of the bourgeois order and to see to it that it is not swallowed up by the red current of Bolshevism.

The reformist leaders of the 1st International are one heart, one soul in their inflamed, viscous, stubborn hatred of the victorious Russian revolution, of every proletarian revolution. They hate the revolution as a bad conscience that reproaches them, and they try to suppress it at any manifestation; they helped the bourgeoisie do what they could never have done on their own. With their help, she has reasserted her power over the working people and is mercilessly using it.

Wels and Co. of various countries are equally responsible for the indescribable suffering and sacrifice with which the anti-Bolshevik campaign of lies and slander, like the counter-revolutionary newspapers, soiled the heroic Russian workers and peasants. From their hands dripped the blood of the revolutionary fighters of the Baltic, Finland, the Hungarian and Munich Soviet Republics,

The blood of the revolutionary fighters of the Baltic, Finland, the Hungarian and Munich Soviet Republics dripped from their hands, the blood of Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht, Leo Jogiches, Levine, and all those who were killed by the Nazis at the signal of the democracies of Ebert clung to them.

The starving and exhausted in capitalist dungeons speak against them. The leaders of the 2nd International continued after the war the work they started during the war: betrayal of the proletariat and revolution.

They are made responsible for the impending threat of an imperialist war, which will be even more terrible, more murderous, a real hell in comparison with the previous one.

The 2nd International has not atoned for its shameful role in the World War. It increased more and more its guilt against the revolution.

The redemption of this disgrace will never be the work of its leaders, it can only be the work of the proletarian masses, who will be freed with a shudder from the consequences of the reformist crimes against the revolution.

Only a proletarian world revolution can be a historical redemption to such disgrace. Its battles, however, will never take place under the leadership of the 2nd International.

The leader and leader of the world proletariat in the world revolution will be the Communist International, the descendant

of the Russian revolution, the stimulus will be the striving for freedom of the ruined and enslaved, a striving that nothing can kill.

It calls on the working masses to atone for shame through struggle, to raise the proletariat defeated in the world war through the victory of the world revolution.

2nd WW

On the international situation and foreign policy of the USSR

Molotov,

Report of the Chairman of the Council of People's Commissars and People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs of the USSR V. M. Molotov at the session of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR "On the international situation and foreign policy of the USSR". May 31, 1939

May 31, 1939

Comrade deputies! The proposal of the deputies to hear the report of the People's Commissariat of Foreign Affairs at the session of the Supreme Council is quite understandable. Serious changes have taken place in the international situation recently. These changes, from the point of view of the peace-loving powers, significantly worsened the international situation.

We are now dealing with the well-known results of the policy of aggressive states, on the one hand, and the policy of non-interference on the part of democratic countries, on the other. The representatives of the aggressive countries are now not averse to boasting about the results already achieved by the policy of aggression. Whatever one may say, there is no lack of boasting here. Representatives of democratic countries that have turned their backs on the policy of collective security and pursued a policy of non-resistance to aggression are trying to downplay the significance of the deterioration that has taken place in the international situation. They are still mainly engaged in "calming" public opinion, pretending that nothing significant has happened recently.

The position of the Soviet Union in assessing current events in international life differs from the position of both sides. The Soviet Union, as everyone understands, no case can be suspected of any sympathy for the aggressors. It is also alien to any glossing over the really worsened international situation. It is clear to us that attempts to hide from public opinion the real changes that have taken place in the international situation must be countered with facts. Then it will become obvious that "soothing" speeches and articles are needed only by those who do not want to interfere with the further development of aggression in the hope of directing aggression, so to speak, in a more or less "acceptable" direction.

Until recently, the authoritative representatives of Britain and France tried to calm the public opinion of their countries by glorifying the successes of the ill-fated Munich agreement. They said that the September agreement in Munich had prevented a European war by means of comparatively small concessions on the part of Czechoslovakia. Even then it seemed to many that the representatives of England and France in Munich went further in their concessions at the expense of Czechoslovakia than they had the right to do. The Munich Agreement was, so to speak, the culminating point of the policy of non-intervention, the culminating point of conciliation with the aggressive countries. And what are the results of this policy? Did the Munich Agreement stop the aggression? Not at all. On the contrary, Germany did not confine herself to the concessions received in Munich, that is, to receiving the Sudetenland areas inhabited by Germans. Germany went further, simply liquidating one of the large Slavic states - Czechoslovakia. Not much time had passed since September 1938, when the Munich conference was held, and in March 1939 Germany had already put an end to the existence of Czechoslovakia. Germany managed to carry it out without

opposition from anyone, so smoothly that the question arises, what, in fact, was the real purpose of the meeting in Munich?

In any case, the liquidation of Czechoslovakia, contrary to the Munich agreement, showed the entire world what the policy of non-intervention had led to, which reached, one might say, its highest point in Munich. The failure of this policy became obvious. Meanwhile, the aggressor countries continued to adhere to their policies. Germany took away Memel and the Memel region from the Republic of Lithuania. As you know, Italy also did not remain in debt. In April, Italy put an end to the independent state of Albania.

After this, there is nothing surprising in the fact that at the end of April, in one of his speeches, the head of the German state destroyed two important international treaties: the maritime agreement between Germany and England and the non-aggression pact between Germany and Poland. At one time, these treaties were given great international significance. However, Germany very simply finished with these treaties, regardless of any formalities. Such was Germany's response to the proposal of President Roosevelt of the United States of America, a proposal permeated with peace-loving spirit.

The case was not limited to the termination of two international treaties. Germany and Italy went further. Recently, the military-political treaty concluded between them was published. This treaty is fundamentally offensive. According to this treaty, Germany and Italy must support each other in any hostilities launched by one of these countries, including any aggression, any offensive war. Until very recently, the rapprochement between Germany and Italy was allegedly covered up by the need for a joint struggle against communism. For this, a lot of noise was made about the so-called "anti-Comintern Pact". The anti-Comintern hype played a well-known role in its time as a distraction. Now the aggressors no longer consider it necessary

to hide behind a screen. In the military treaty between Germany and Italy there is no longer a word about the fight against the Comintern. On the other hand, statesmen and the press of Germany and Italy definitely say that this treaty is directed precisely against the main European democratic countries.

It seems clear that the facts cited indicate a serious deterioration in the international situation.

In this regard, the very policy of the non-aggressive countries of Europe has also seen some changes in the direction of counteracting aggression. How serious these changes are, we'll see. It is not yet possible to even say whether these countries have a serious desire to abandon the policy of non-intervention, the policy of non-resistance to the further development of aggression. Will it not happen that the current desire of these countries to limit aggression in some areas will not serve as an obstacle to unleashing aggression in other areas? Such questions are also raised in some organs of the bourgeois press abroad. Therefore, we must be vigilant. We stand for the cause of peace and for preventing further development of aggression. But we must remember the position put forward by Comrade Stalin:

"Be careful and not let our country be drawn into conflicts by provocateurs of war."

* This provision was contained in the Report of the Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party of Bolsheviks to the XVIII Party Congress (March 10, 1939). Only in this case will we be able to fully defend the interests of our country and the interests of world peace.

There are, however, a number of signs that the democratic countries of Europe are increasingly coming to the realization of the failure of the policy of non-intervention, are coming to the realization of the need for a more serious search for

measures and ways to create a united front of peace-loving powers against aggression. In a country like England, speeches began to be heard loudly about the need for a drastic change in foreign policy. We certainly understand the difference between verbal statements and actual politics. Still, it must be noted that these speeches are not accidental. Here are some facts. There was no mutual assistance pact between England and Poland. Now the decision on this pact has been made {{** See doc. 254. }}. The significance of this agreement is only reinforced by the fact that Germany broke the non-aggression pact with Poland. It must be admitted that the mutual assistance pact between England and Poland is bringing about a change in the European situation. Or further. There was no mutual assistance pact between England and Turkey, but recently the well-known agreement on mutual assistance between England and Turkey has already taken place. And this fact brings its change into the international situation.

In connection with these new facts, one of the characteristic features of the last period should be recognized as the desire of the non-aggressive European powers to enlist the USSR in cooperation in counteracting aggression. It is clear that this desire deserves attention. Proceeding from this, the Soviet government accepted the proposal of Britain and France for negotiations aimed at strengthening political relations between the USSR, Britain and France and establishing a peace front against the further development of aggression.

How do we define our tasks in today's international environment? We believe that they follow the line of interests of other non-aggressive countries. They consist in stopping the further development of aggression and for this purpose creating a reliable and effective defensive front of non-aggressive powers.

In connection with the proposals made to us by the British and French governments, the Soviet government entered into negotiations with the latter on the necessary measures to combat aggression. This was back in mid-April this year. The negotiations that began then are not over yet. However, even then it could be seen that if they really want to create a capable front of peace-loving countries against the onset of aggression, then at least the following minimum conditions are necessary for this:

an effective pact of mutual assistance against aggression, a pact of an exclusively defensive in nature should be concluded between England, France, and the USSR, which is ; England, France and the USSR guaranteeing the states of Central and Eastern Europe, including without exception all the European countries bordering the USSR, against any attack by aggressors.

This is our opinion, which we do not impose on anyone, but which we stand for. We do not require acceptance of our point of view and we do not ask anyone to do so. We believe, however, that this point of view really meets the security interests of peace-loving states.

It would be an agreement of an exclusively defensive nature, acting against attack by the aggressors, and fundamentally different from the military and offensive alliance recently concluded between Germany and Italy.

It is clear that the basis of such an agreement is the principle of reciprocity and equal duties.

It should be noted that in some Anglo-French proposals this elementary principle did not find a favorable attitude towards itself. Having guaranteed themselves against a direct attack by aggressors by pacts of mutual assistance between themselves and with Poland, and providing themselves with assistance

from the USSR in the event of an attack by aggressors on Poland and Romania, the British and French left open the question of whether the USSR, in turn, could count on assistance from them in the event of a direct attack on it by the aggressors, as well as leaving open another question - whether they can take part in guaranteeing the small states bordering the USSR, covering the northwestern borders of the USSR, if they are unable to defend their neutrality from the attack of the aggressors.

It turned out, thus, an unequal position for the USSR.

In recent days, new Anglo-French proposals have been received. In the event of a direct attack by aggressors, these proposals already recognize the principle of mutual assistance between Britain, France, and the USSR on conditions of reciprocity. This is, of course, a step forward. Although it should be noted that it is surrounded by such reservations - even a reservation about certain points of the Charter of the League of Nations - that it may turn out to be a fictitious step forward. As regards the issue of a guarantee for the countries of Central and Eastern Europe, here, if you look at the matter from the point of view of reciprocity, the proposals mentioned do not make any progress. They provide assistance to the USSR in relation to those five countries to which the British and French have already given a promise of a guarantee, but they say nothing about their assistance to those three countries on the northwestern border of the USSR.

But the Soviet Union cannot assume obligations with respect to these five countries without receiving guarantees with respect to the three countries located on its northwestern frontier.

Such is the case with regard to negotiations with Britain and France.

While negotiating with England and France, we do not at all consider it necessary to renounce business ties with such

countries as Germany and Italy. At the beginning of last year, at the initiative of the German government, negotiations began on a trade agreement and new loans. At that time, Germany made a proposal to us for a new loan of 200 million marks. Since we did not agree on the terms of this new economic agreement then, the issue was dropped. At the end of 1938, the German government again raised the question of economic negotiations and a loan of 200 million marks. At the same time, the German side expressed readiness to make a number of concessions. At the beginning of 1939, the People's Commissariat of Foreign Trade was notified that a special German representative, Shnurre, was leaving for Moscow for these negotiations. But then, instead of Mr. Schnurre, these negotiations were entrusted to the German ambassador in Moscow, Mr. Schulenburg, which were interrupted due to disagreements. Judging by some indications, it is possible that negotiations may resume.

I can also add that a trade agreement for 1939, beneficial to both countries, was recently signed with Italy.

As is known, in February of this year a special report was published confirming the development of good neighborly relations between the USSR and Poland. A certain general improvement should be noted in our relations with Poland. On the other hand, the trade agreement concluded in March may significantly increase the trade turnover between the USSR and Poland.

Our relations with friendly Turkey are developing normally. Comrade Potemkin's recent trip to Ankara for informational purposes was of great positive significance.

Among the number of international questions which have lately assumed great importance for the USSR, one should dwell on the problem of the Åland Islands. You know that these

islands belonged to Russia for more than 100 years. As a result of the October Revolution, Finland gained independence. Under an agreement with our country, Finland also received the Åland Islands. In 1921, 10 countries - Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Poland, Sweden, Denmark, Germany, England, France, and Italy - signed a convention prohibiting, as it was before, the arming of the Åland Islands. The governments of the capitalist countries did this without the participation of Soviet representatives. In 1921, the Soviet Republic, undermined by war and foreign intervention, could only protest against this lawless act against the USSR.

The importance of the Åland Islands lies in their strategic position in the Baltic Sea. Armaments of the Åland Islands can be used for purposes hostile to the USSR. Being located not far from the entrance to the Gulf of Finland, the armed Åland Islands can serve to close the entrances and exits to the Gulf of Finland for the USSR. Therefore, now that the Finnish government, together with Sweden, wants to carry out a large plan for the armaments of the Åland Islands, the Soviet government has asked the Finnish government for information on the aims and nature of the planned armaments. Instead of meeting this completely natural desire of the Soviet Union, the Finnish government refused to give the USSR the relevant information and explanations. The ensuing references to military secrets, as it is easy to understand, are completely unconvincing. The Finnish government communicated its plan for the armaments of the Åland Islands to another government, the government of Sweden. And not only informed, but attracted him to participate in the implementation of this entire armaments plan. Meanwhile, according to the 1921 convention, Sweden does not enjoy any special rights in this regard. On the other hand, the interest of the Soviet Union in the issue of arming the Åland Islands is not only not less, but greater than that of Sweden.

At the suggestion of the Finnish and Swedish governments, the issue of revising the 1921 convention was discussed at the just completed Council of the League of Nations, without whose sanction this convention cannot be revised, since the convention of ten states was concluded on the basis of the corresponding decision of the Council of the League of Nations of June 24, 1921 of the year. In view of objections from the representative of the Soviet Union in the Council of the League, there was no possibility of unanimity necessary for the decision of the Council. The results of the discussion in the Council of the League are known. The Council of the League of Nations did not approve the proposals of Finland and Sweden. He did not authorize the revision of the 1921 convention. The Finnish Government must draw the appropriate conclusion from this situation. In the light of recent international events, the Åland question has taken on particularly serious significance for the Soviet Union.

I will dwell very briefly on the questions of the Far East and on our relations with Japan.

Our talks with Japan on the fishery issue have had the greatest significance here this year. As you know, in Primorye, in the Sea of Okhotsk, on Sakhalin and Kamchatka, the Japanese have a large number of fisheries in our country. By the end of last year, they already had 384 fishing sites. Meanwhile, the term of the convention, on the basis of which the Japanese received these fishing areas, has already expired. For many fishing sites, the previously established lease periods have also expired. In this regard, the Soviet government entered into negotiations with Japan on the fishery issue. It has been stated on our part that a certain number of plots whose lease has expired can no longer be placed at the disposal of the Japanese in view of our strategic considerations. Despite the obvious validity of our position, On the Japanese side, great resistance was shown to

the Soviet point of view. As a result of lengthy negotiations, 37 fishing sites were withdrawn from the Japanese, and 10 new sites were transferred to them elsewhere. After that, the convention was extended for another year. This agreement with Japan on the fisheries issue is of great political importance. All the more so since Japanese reactionary circles did everything in order to emphasize the political side of this matter, up to all sorts of threats. The Japanese reactionaries could, however, once again be convinced that the threats against the Soviet Union did not reach their goal, and that the rights of the Soviet state were under firm protection.

Now about border issues. It seems that it is time for anyone to understand that the Soviet government will not tolerate any provocations from the Japanese-Manchurian military units on its borders. Now it is necessary to recall this in relation to the borders of the Mongolian People's Republic. According to the mutual assistance treaty between the USSR and the Mongolian People's Republic, we consider it our duty to provide the Mongolian People's Republic with due assistance in protecting its borders. We are serious about things like the Mutual Assistance Treaty signed by the Soviet government. I must warn that the border of the Mongolian People's Republic, by virtue of the treaty of mutual assistance concluded between us, we will defend as resolutely as our own border. It's time to understand that accusations of aggression against Japan, raised by Japan against the government of the Mongolian People's Republic are ridiculous and absurd. It is also time to understand that there is a limit to all patience. Therefore, it is better to stop in time the provocative violations of the border between the USSR and the MPR by the Japanese-Manchurian military units, which are repeated over and over again. We also issued a corresponding warning through the Japanese ambassador in Moscow.

I don't need to talk about our attitude towards China. You are well aware of Comrade Stalin's statement of support for the peoples who have become victims of aggression and are fighting for the independence of their homeland { See doc. 177. }. This fully applies to China and its struggle for national independence. We are consistently pursuing this policy in practice. It is in line with the tasks that confront us in Europe, namely, with the tasks of creating a united front of peace-loving powers against the further development of aggression.

The USSR is not what it was, say, in 1921, when it had just begun its peaceful, creative work. We have to remind you of this, because until now even some of our neighbors, apparently, cannot understand this. It is impossible not to admit that the USSR is no longer the same as it was only 5-10 years ago, that the forces of the USSR have become stronger. The foreign policy of the Soviet Union must reflect the presence of changes in the international situation and the increased role of the USSR as a powerful factor in peace. There is nothing to prove that the foreign policy of the Soviet Union is fundamentally peace-loving and directed against aggression. This is best known to the aggressive countries themselves. It is with great delay and hesitation that certain democratic powers come to realize this simple truth. Meanwhile, in the united front of peace-loving states that really oppose aggression, the Soviet Union cannot but occupy the foremost place.

Print. on : Documents and materials on the eve of the Second World War ... T. 2. S. 105 - 113.

printed according to the book: Year of the Crisis. 1938-1939.

Documents and materials in two volumes. Compiled by the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs. 1990. Document No. 386.

A Warmonger's International

Otto Kuusinen

original text published in Pravda, 27 August 1951

At the beginning of July this year, the Anglo-American politicians put into operation in Western Germany new units in what would appear to be two different lines of strategy. On the one hand, McCloy, the American gauleiter in Bonn, summoned Adenauer, and a number of Hitlerite generals and ordered them to speed up to the utmost the formation of the German divisions for inclusion in the 'European army' of the North-Atlantic military alliance. On the other hand, in Frankfort on the Main, under the protection of the Anglo-American occupational forces, a congress was held of the Right-wing Socialists of the North-Atlantic Alliance countries and of several other countries and a so-called 'Socialist International' was inaugurated. The direct leadership of this latter unit was entrusted to Morgan Phillips, the secretary of the Executive Committee of the British Labour Party; he, too, was elected chairman of this International.

What is this International? Is it the resurrected old Second International, which had lived so dishonestly and had died so ingloriously, or some new invention?

To be able to answer this question we must first ascertain what attitude this International adopted towards the major problems of present-day international politics.

'Socialist' Boosting of American Imperialism

It is not worthwhile asking the present-day Right-wing Socialists what their attitude is towards the imperialism of their respective countries. Everybody knows that the British Labour Party leaders have long been officially carrying out the policy of British imperialism, that the French Right-wing Socialists

have been carrying out the policy of French imperialism, the Dutch Right-wing Socialists have been carrying out the policy of Dutch imperialism, and so, forth.

And it is equally useless asking them what their attitude is towards imperialism in general, for to this question they answer without batting an eyelid: of course, we are opposed to imperialism... In the declaration of the aims and objects of their International they claim that they oppose imperialism in all its forms. Thus, their words constantly contradict their deeds.

But even this verbal repudiation of imperialism melts away on the lips of these 'internationalists' as soon as the question of their attitude towards American imperialism is brought up; and this is a question that no workers' party in the world can brush aside, for everybody knows that after German imperialism was crushed in the Second World War, the United States of America became the principal centre of international imperialist reaction. Hence, if American imperialism is not opposed, the hollow phrase 'oppose imperialism in all its forms' can deceive nobody.

This is exactly the case with the policy of the Right-wing Socialists. They obsequiously support the execution of all the imperialist plans of the United States government — the Marshall Plan, the North-Atlantic military alliance, the remilitarization of Germany and Japan, and so forth. And yet they have the brazenness to assure the workers that they oppose imperialism in all its forms!

At the Frankfort congress Mr. Morgan Phillips was not ashamed to characterise the United States' policy as 'progressive and unselfish'. In the documents of the congress, the United States and other imperialist countries are described as idyllic 'free democracies'. There is not a single word in these documents to suggest that such a thing as American

imperialism even exists in the world. The Right-wing socialist press in a number of countries circulated an article by Norman Thomas in which this old perjurer on behalf of the American bourgeoisie, in obedience to his new instructions, asked whether America is an imperialist power and declared that American imperialism is only a vestige of the past. Thus, all the data of science and politics concerning the existence of the most arrogant imperialism of our times is annulled at one stroke.

Nor is this all. Having undertaken the task of boosting the United States' policy, the leaders of the Frankfort International go so far as to describe the predatory plans and methods of the American imperialists as 'socialistic'. This is incredible, but it is a fact.

Thus, for example, Morgan Phillips exclaimed: 'Rearmament [of Germany] may further socialist development.' (!) He also said at the preliminary conference in Copenhagen: 'The Marshall Plan and the assistance rendered by President Truman is practical Socialism on an international scale.'

Does not this beat the record of shameless boosting? What will be said to this by the people of Western Europe who are groaning under the burden imposed upon them by the 'assistance' rendered under the Marshall Plan? And what will the cruelly exploited American workers and farmers say to the following statement uttered by another Labour Party leader, Kenneth Younger: 'Much is being done in the United States which Europeans would call Socialism.' (?!)

The declaration of the Right-wing Socialist International says vaguely, without indicating where: 'In some countries the foundations of a socialist society have already been laid.' Which countries does this refer to? Not to the Soviet Union, where socialist society was built long ago, nor to the People's Democracies, where the foundations of socialist society are

being laid with great success. This is brazenly denied in the declaration of the Frankfort International. Hence, the authors of the declaration mean some of the capitalist countries, evidently, Great Britain and the United States.

This was made perfectly clear by Spaak, the leader of the Belgian Right-wing Socialists, who, after crossing the Atlantic, announced to the world that in America 'millionaires are gradually disappearing' and that 'American capitalism is achieving socialist objects'.

Such are the lengths to which the Right-wing Socialists go in their mendacious boosting of Americanism. The question is: why do they indulge in this high-powered boosting? Is it only out of obsequiousness to the American imperialists? Of course, they are groveling at the feet of the American imperialists, for they know that their political careers in their own countries nowadays depend primarily upon the goodwill of the trans-Atlantic millionaires and their emissaries. But why call these grasping moneygrubbers 'builders of Socialism'? It is, probably, no more flattering to them than it would be to a Chicago gangster if he were called 'holy father'. Obviously, therefore, they have some other aim in view.

Evidently, the main object of this boosting of American imperialism as 'Socialism' is to deceive the socialist workers of Europe. The artful dodgers of the Frankfort International (formerly the COMISCO) are attempting by means of this mendacious boosting of American imperialism to make the latter popular in the eyes of the West-European workers who hate the capitalists, but who do not know sufficiently well the worst of all exploiters, namely, the American monopolists.

Everything goes to show that this propagandist function undertaken by the corrupt bourgeois socialists is closely linked (by golden chains) with Mr. Acheson's notorious 'total

diplomacy'. According to reports published in the British press, emanating from the British Foreign Office, James E Webb, Acheson's Undersecretary, during his visit to London, told Herbert Morrison, then British Foreign Secretary, that the United States government would also like to see closer cooperation between the Yugoslav Tito group and the Right-wing International that is under the leadership of the British Labour Party. Webb said that this would strengthen the political groups in Europe through which the United States and British governments could conduct their propaganda among the workers.

But will even costly propaganda be of much use when the American imperialists are bossing the show in the West-European countries with such arrogance that nothing can conceal their rapacity? And at home, in Washington, as is well known, they shout so loudly about their plans for the world conquest that they can be heard in all five parts of the globe. We recall that even Acheson, their chief diplomat, in a radio broadcast he delivered on 10 September, last year, declared: 'I believe that with modern weapons and ingenuity we can do again exactly what was done for so many centuries at the time of the Roman Empire.'

After such outpourings from the lips of the official leaders of American foreign policy it is, of course, hellish hard for the spellbinders of the Socialist International to prove to the workers that there is no American imperialism, and that it is not aspiring to world domination.

It is not surprising that indignation is growing rapidly among the masses of the working people in all West-European countries against the tremendous influx of American emissaries — all kinds of advisers, profiteers, spies, senators, military, and police officials, in short, all the importunate and grasping agents of the American plutocracy. In spite of the desperate

pro-American propaganda efforts of the Right-wing Socialists, the voice of the masses is being heard crying even more loudly and imperatively: 'Out with the American imperialists!' 'Yankees, go home!'

Gravediggers of National Sovereignty and Independence

The sovereignty of the old West-European countries is a hindrance to the rapid execution of the United States' plans for expansion in Europe.

It is true that, far from resisting, the governments of these countries are facilitating the execution of these predatory American plans. The Cabinet Ministers and big capitalists of Europe are selling the economic and cultural interests of their respective countries to the American monopolies. Those branches of industry which compete with American capital, particularly those in France, Belgium, and Italy, are being wound up; productive forces are being destroyed; the economy of these countries is being transformed into an appendage of American capitalism.

When all this is achieved through the complicated machine of continuous negotiation between the local and American magnates, the latter have to keep on haggling all the time, they have to keep on greasing the works, ladling out palm oil. This, of course, is a tiresome and costly business. It would be far more convenient to arrange matters in the way the emissaries of the Morgans and Rockefellers are accustomed to arranging them in countries which have been robbed of their sovereignty, like the Philippines, and many of the Latin-American countries. There, the American magnates simply say what they want and the local ones understand at once what they have to do... It is so convenient when there is no sovereignty!

Another inconvenience in sovereign capitalist countries is that their rulers, even the most obliging, are often compelled to

resort to all sorts of manoeuvres to carry out the demands of the Americans because the people in these countries are unwilling to make the necessary sacrifices. This also retards American expansion.

The American imperialists are determined to rob the peoples of Western Europe of their national sovereignty. They have been trying to do this for the past five or six years. To facilitate their expansion they want to secure the removal of all customs barriers, to redraw the state frontiers of the old European countries and arbitrarily to group them into mandated 'Beneluxes' under American rule. Hence, they must secure the abolition of the national sovereignty of these countries.

But national sovereignty has proved to be as hard as ivory, and to be able to gnaw through it one must have the teeth of a dog, and it takes lots of time. That is why the Right-wing Socialists were called in to do the job. Some of the more enterprising of them have repeatedly tried their teeth on it during the past few years, and the subject has been much discussed at the conference and on commissions of the COMISCO, but nothing came of it. So, it was decided to mobilize a whole International for the purpose. The congress of the Frankfort International adopted and proclaimed the following decision: 'The system of unlimited national sovereignty must be overcome.'

The word 'unlimited' in this decision did not drop in by chance. Since this is a delicate matter, the liquidators of national sovereignty wanted to express themselves in the most cautious terms, as much as to say: we do not want to abolish all sovereignty, but only 'unlimited' sovereignty; we are willing to allow some of it to remain. How much they want to abolish and how much to leave they, of course, prefer not to say, because however little of its sovereignty any nation retained the American monopolists would consider it too much.

Thus, the Right-wing Socialist International has proclaimed itself an agency for liquidating the national sovereignty of the French, British, Italian, Belgian, Dutch, Scandinavian and other peoples. This means that the 'Socialists' in every non-American country have undertaken the task of 'overcoming' the unwillingness of their nation to sell its sovereignty.

This task is, of course, beyond their strength. Where will they find a sovereign nation that is willing to surrender its sovereignty? The traitors to their nations may argue until they are black in the face that sovereignty is an 'outmoded idea', but the people will persist in retorting: 'Not for sale!'

What do they offer in exchange for the sovereignty of the independent nations? A 'new world order', which is to be created under the aegis of the American monopolists. But the American monopolists themselves cannot decently disguise the fact that they want to abolish the sovereignty of other countries in order to impose their own sovereignty upon all countries.

And so, it turns out that the enigmatic picture of a 'new world order' painted by the masters of the Frankfurt School is nothing more than the futurist cover of an advertising prospectus of American world domination. Of course, the prospectus promises everybody the possibility of obtaining both 'democracy' and 'freedom' in instalments, but every man who knows anything at all, knows perfectly well that there can be no freedom and democracy where American or any other imperialism rules.

As regards the attitude of the 'Socialist' International towards the struggle the colonial and dependent countries are waging for national independence, it is very characteristic that in its declaration of 'aims and objects' it carefully avoids using the word 'independence'. True, the declaration talks about the struggle for 'liberation', and against 'the subjection and

exploitation of any nation', but it studiously avoids answering the question: is the Socialist International for or against the national independence of the oppressed nations?

The opportunists of the old Second International often promised the colonial peoples independence, although they always broke their promise; but the 1951 International does not even promise this. Why? Because they grudge a few extra words?

No. The reason is that the American imperialists strongly dislike the slogan of independence for the colonial countries. They are not averse to advocating the 'liberation' of some colony or other that is ruled by, say, British or French imperialism, but they assert that there is no subjection and exploitation in the American colonies; such scandalous things are to be found only in non-American colonies, they say. Hence, Washington has no objection to calls for the 'liberation' of colonies and for the liquidation of 'subjection and exploitation' in them if these calls are couched in general terms, and without any reference to the American colonies. The call for a struggle for the independence of the colonial and dependent countries, however, smacks of revolt against imperialist oppression! The American aspirants to world domination have learned, particularly in China, how dangerous it is for imperialism when an oppressed nation rises to wage a determined struggle for national independence. Even in the Philippines, to whom the United States government granted a charter of nominal 'independence', the people are still fighting for real independence.

Naturally, therefore, the gentlemen in Washington no longer tolerate the slogan of a struggle for the independence of the oppressed nations even as mere propaganda. Consequently, the abettors of imperialism, the Right-wing Socialists, also had to stop playing with this slogan in their propaganda.

But in spite of all the efforts of the imperialists and their Right-wing socialist agents, all the nations that are oppressed by the imperialists will continue and intensify their struggle for complete national freedom and independence.

There can be no doubt that the plan to subjugate the freedom-loving nations and to establish an imperialist 'new world order' will fail. The first attempt to impose such a 'new order' upon mankind — the insane attempt made by German fascist imperialism and its abettors — failed ignominiously. The present plan of American imperialism and its abettors is no less insane and is doomed to the same ignominious failure.

Abettors of the Instigators of a New World War

During the past few years, since the movement of the vast masses of working people in defence of peace began in all countries, the Right-wing Socialists everywhere fiercely opposed the struggle for peace in any form. They prohibited the members of their parties from supporting the defence of peace slogan. The struggle for peace had got on the nerves of these social-democratic gentlemen to such a degree that they simply foamed at the mouth when they heard the word 'peace'.

This was the case up to 1951. The reactionary leaders of Social-Democracy have now changed their tactics. The defence of peace roused the broad masses of the working people to such an extent that the Right-wing Socialists stood in danger of becoming completely isolated. Hence, they were compelled to unfurl the flag of peace in order to deceive the masses. This is what they did at the congress in Frankfurt on the Main.

But have the Labour Party and Social-Democratic leaders abandoned their policy of opposing peace? Have they ceased to be the abettors of the American and British policy of preparing a new war? No, they have not.

They say that the preservation of peace is 'the most urgent task of our times', but actually they are continuing fiercely to attack every mass movement in support of peace and of the conclusion of a Five-Power Peace Pact.

One would have thought that people who call themselves representatives of democracy and of 'democratic Socialism' would support the settlement of disputes between countries by means of negotiation. Surely, there is no other democratic way of safeguarding peace.

But did the politicians at the Frankfort congress come out in favour of the settlement of disputes in international relations by negotiation? No, they did not. There is not a word in the documents of the congress about the necessity of negotiations between the Great Powers with the object of preserving peace. Does this not show that the claim of the Right-wing Socialists that they represent democracy and peace is sheer hypocrisy?

It is easy to guess why the Right-wing Socialists did not say a word about the necessity of peace by negotiation. Any statement on their part recommending negotiation might have, to some degree, weakened war propaganda; it would have embarrassed the United States and British governments which are sabotaging all the efforts of the Soviet government to reach a peaceful settlement of the major disputes in international relations. Moreover, such a statement by the Socialist International might have relaxed the tension in international relations and of the war hysteria in the United States, and Acheson and the armament manufacturers would not have thanked the clumsy European Social-Democrats for this.

Instead of calling for peace by negotiation, the congress called upon all the capitalist countries to unite and arm to the teeth. Morgan Phillips arrogantly stated that it is not worthwhile for

the Social-Democrats even to think of cooperating with the USSR and the People's Democracies.

The speeches delivered at the Frankfurt congress breathed fierce hatred of the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies. The Right-wing Socialists showed that the growing ties of friendship between the masses of the working people in the capitalist countries and the peoples who have freed themselves from the yoke of capitalism fill them with burning anger and alarm. The resolutions they passed drip with filthy slander against the Soviet Union, the People's Democracies, and the international communist movement.

All these outpourings of anger and hatred openly bore the character of incitement to war. Nevertheless, the congress unctuously declared that it 'considers peace the basic aim of international Socialism'.

But did not the congress utterly expose its hypocrisy by its attitude on the Korean question, for example?

In Korea, as everybody knows, American troops, in conjunction with British and other troops, have been fighting for over a year to subjugate and exterminate the freedom-loving Korean people. The question is: what did the Right-wing socialist congress do to help bring about peace in Korea? Nothing. It did the very opposite. It shamelessly supported the war that is being waged by the American aggressors.

Its attitude on the question of reducing and controlling armaments was exactly the same. Instead of backing the demand of peace supporters for the reduction of armaments by all countries, the congress declared that the capitalist countries 'must strengthen their military power'. To counteract the rising anger of the masses against the insane armaments drive of the imperialist countries, the Labour Party and Social-Democratic leaders decided to mobilize their International for the purpose

of conducting raging propaganda in support of their governments' programmes of rearmament and preparation for world war.

In his address, Morgan Phillips brazenly stated that it was the 'moral duty' of the Socialists of all countries to agree to the sacrifices entailed by rearmament. This may be the 'moral duty' of those 'Socialists' who have personally received an advance from their imperialist masters, but it is quite obvious that they have no right whatever to impose any duty upon the masses of the people to bring sacrifice to the altar of war.

It must be particularly emphasised that these pseudo-socialist 'peacemakers' are conducting propaganda in favour of unlimited arming by the imperialist powers and of the employment of the most barbarous methods of exterminating the people. They have fought and are continuing to fight furiously the demand of peace supporters for the prohibition of atomic weapons. They have not uttered a single word in condemnation of the notorious plan of the American military authorities to employ in war poison gas and the bacteriological weapons they have borrowed from the Japanese war criminals.

It goes without saying that these people who pose as champions of peace strongly oppose the prohibition of war propaganda. When the legislatures in the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies passed laws prohibiting war propaganda, the Right-wing socialist newspapers, in chorus, denounced these laws as unwarranted restriction of 'freedom'. But who wants freedom to conduct war propaganda? Only the imperialists and their agents. For the cause of peace it is harmful.

Can the Right-wing Socialists consent to the prohibition of war propaganda? Of course not. That would mean prohibiting the

chief function they perform in the service of international imperialist reaction.

Lies and Slander: The Weapons of the Aggressors

As we know, a characteristic idea current among the Hitlerite leaders in fascist Germany was that it is more profitable in politics to resort to big lies rather than to small ones because, they argued, the people are more likely to believe big lies. Acting up to this idea they, for example, organised the burning of the Reichstag and then accused the Communists of this crime. They also often employed the 'big lie' method in foreign policy. This method of political gangsters and provocateurs is now being widely employed by the Anglo-American warmongers, including the Right-wing Socialists.

The slanders and lies to which the present-day imperialists resort in their foreign policy are not simply camouflage to cover up their real aims, they are actual weapons. At the very time that the Japanese imperialists were preparing to invade China, General Araki, one of their most prominent leaders, said: 'We Japanese are apostles of peace. We have not the slightest intention of attacking other countries.' This was a simple lie. Had Araki said that China was planning aggression against Japan, and that the latter was therefore preparing for 'defence', it would have been a complex lie, so to speak.

The present-day imperialists resort to all sorts of lies. We know that even Truman and Attlee try to camouflage their aggressive policy with olive branches, but for their purposes ordinary camouflage is not enough, because, firstly, they cannot conceal from the peoples the fact that the American and British governments are preparing a new world war; their military-strategical preparations: war budgets, armaments drive, remilitarization of Germany and Japan, military alliances, American naval and air bases in all parts of the world, and so

forth, have assumed such vast dimensions that they cannot be concealed. Secondly, they cannot give up their war propaganda, which also glaringly exposes their aggressive aims. But since they must find some justification for their war policy, what can they do to deceive the masses?

Here falsehood again comes to the rescue of the imperialists. They thought of the following: we can proclaim ourselves the defending side and the peaceful countries against which we are preparing aggression as the aggressors. Then everything will be in order, and on the plea of 'defence' we can continue instigating war and our practical preparations for a war of aggression...

As we know, the American and British aggressors are employing this lie in connection with Korea. They have proclaimed the Korean people, who are defending their country, as aggressors, and are brazenly shouting that the American and British troops who have been sent to Korea to kill the Koreans and to seize their country are defending America and Britain! The Americans seized the Chinese island of Taiwan and bombed Chinese towns and villages, but on encountering detachments of Chinese volunteers in Korea they proclaimed the Chinese People's Republic an aggressor!

The Right-wing Socialists in particular took a fancy to this lie. They became so enamored of it that at the Frankfurt congress they decided to add their mite to it. They proclaimed that the aggressor in the war in Korea is the... Cominform! Mr. Morgan Phillips, the dashing leader of the International, went even further and proclaimed Russia the aggressor in Korea! This is the limit.

Thus, the imperialists and their socialist henchmen found a 'convenient' means of military and political attack upon the nations they have chosen as the objects of their imperialist

aggression. Lies and slander are now officially accepted weapons in the arsenal of the North-Atlantic military alliance, on a par with atomic bombs, poison gas and plague germs. With the aid of these weapons they can proclaim any war of aggression they launch as the 'aggression of the Cominform', or as 'Russian aggression'.

Whether such a lie is worth anything is another question. The entire 'method' is based on bare assertions. For example: everybody knows that from the moment it came into existence the Cominform has been fighting for lasting peace among the nations, but the Right-wing socialist congress blatantly asserted that the Cominform's policy compelled all the 'free democracies' (meaning the United States, Great Britain, and their satellites) to attach first-class importance to military defence. The congress, of course, adduced nothing in support of this mendacious statement, and did not even attempt to do so.

This congress also backed the well-known fable that the countries in the North-Atlantic Alliance are arming in order to 'avert the war' which, they allege, the Soviet Union and the People's Democracies are planning. But could they adduce any facts to support their claim that the United States, or Great Britain, or any other country in the North-Atlantic Alliance, is threatened? No, they could not. They themselves do not believe that any such danger exists. The Soviet Union is not building war bases in other countries around the United States or Great Britain; but the United States is building such bases everywhere around the Soviet Union.

Thousands of facts prove that the Soviet Union is pursuing a policy of peace. All the pronouncements and proposals made by the Soviet representatives in the United Nations testify to the undeviating efforts of the Soviet government to safeguard peace. The United States and British governments, however,

mobilising the support of the states that are dependent upon them, are more and more converting the United Nations into an instrument of aggressive war. As a consequence, as Comrade Stalin has pointed out, the United Nations is ceasing to be a world organisation of equal nations, is killing its moral prestige, and is dooming itself to collapse.

In the interview he gave a Pravda correspondent in February 1951, Comrade Stalin exposed the favourite lie of that most outstanding leader of the bourgeois Socialists Attlee, then British Prime Minister. Comrade Stalin said:

Premier Attlee has to lie about the Soviet Union, he has to make out that the peaceful policy of the Soviet Union is an aggressive policy, and that the aggressive policy of the British government is a peaceful policy, in order to mislead the British people, force upon them these lies about the USSR, and thus inveigle them by deceit into a new world war, which the ruling circles of the United States of America are engineering. Evidently, Mr. Attlee and his partners think that the people will believe his lies. Falsehood in politics is a sign of weakness, not of strength. The lies the Anglo-American imperialists tell are whoppers, but they all the more easily burst like soap bubbles.

American intervention in Korea has given the people of all countries a glaring example of the employment of the 'big lie' method by the imperialists, and since then the 'secret' of this despicable weapon has been discovered by the broad masses, thus paving the way for its utter exposure.

* * *

In face of all these facts it is not difficult to answer the question as to whether the present 'Socialist International' is the resurrected old Second International or a new revelation. It is undoubtedly the natural offspring of the Second International, which was the international agency of the bourgeoisie in the

working-class movement. From the day the first socialist state in the world was set up, the Second International, to the end of its days, was a counter-revolutionary body hostile to Socialism. Its offspring is following in its footsteps.

From the moment it came into existence, the new International became one of the most zealous detachments of the bodyguard of present-day imperialism. Its leaders curry favour with the most reactionary section of the bourgeoisie. The Right-wing Socialist International has already shown that it is an agency of the most aggressive imperialism in the world, namely, American imperialism. The chief and immediate function of this International is to incite aggressive war against the entire camp of democracy and Socialism.

Hence, the new Right-wing Socialist International contains a lot of new knavery.

All the more reason, therefore, have not only the Communist Parties of all countries, but also all honest Socialists, and all peace supporters, to secure by their ceaseless educational activities among the working people the complete isolation of the pseudo-socialist abettors of the warmongers, for they are the worst enemies of peace, democracy, and Socialism.

The war Danger at the Present Time

Report by O.W. Kuusinen

From 13th Plenum of ECCI

The whole international situation at the present time one of extreme tension.

The League of nation, which has been abandoned by Japan and German, and which Italy is preparing to abandon, cannot serve as an arena for the achievement of an agreement between England and France, the two imperialist powers which most relied upon it; and it is ceasing to serve as a screen to hide the furious preparations for war. The system of imperialist bargaining which laid the basis of the Versailles Treaty, and the Washington Agreement has utterly collapsed. The Disarmament conference has resulted in a hitherto unprecedented race for armament between the imperialists and as a result of the London Conference on "economic disarmament" a currency and tariff war has broken out among the imperialist along the whole front.

The struggle between the Versailles bloc and the anti-Versailles group led by Germany and Italy for the redrafting of the map of Central and South Europe and the Balkans, is Raring up more and more particularly around the question of Austria. The antagonism between the United States and England has, as a result of the unconcealed struggle for market, assumed unprecedented acuteness (the war between the dollar and the pound, the irreconcilable position of both opponents on the question of inter-allied debt, etc.). The intensification of Anglo-American conflict is taking place at all points where the interests of these two-imperialism come into conflict, particularly on the Pacific. The race for armament. between Japan, the USA and England in the Pacific is no longer concealed in London, Washington, and Tokyo. Japan is

building a new naval base at Port Arthur and is fortifying the island; Eng-land is fortifying Singapore and the Australian coast, while the U.S. is fortifying the Pacific coast, Hawaii, and Guam. England fear the strengthening of her principal rival, the U.S.A., in the event of war between the latter and Japan, but it also fears the ex-cessively large appetites of the Japanese militarists, the strengthening of Japanese imperialism which, by its super-dumping, is already hit-ting her in all markets.

The tenseness of the international situation is determined by the sharp intensification of the inherent contradictions of the capital-ist world. But the intensification of these inherent contradictions directly increases the aggressiveness of the imperialists against the land that is building socialism, is compelling the world bourgeoisie to seek a solution of these inherent contradiction of capitalism at the expense of the U.S.S.R., "the Land of the soviet, the citadel of the Revolution, which by its very existence is revolutionizing the working class and the colonies, preventing. . . (the bourgeoisie) ... arranging for a new war, preventing ... [them] ... dividing the world anew, preventing... (them) ... from being masters of our extensive internal market so necessary for capitalists, particularly today, owing to the economic crisis." (Stalin, Speech at the Sixteenth Congress of the CPSU)

The Japanese monarchy, Hitlerist Germany and British impe1i-alism are playing the most active role in organizing war against the Soviet Union. British imperialism is doing everything it can do to encourage and spur on Japan towards an adventurist attack upon the USSR in the East. At the same time, it is striving to fan the antagonisms between Germany and France and between France and Italy in order to recover its position as arbiter in Europe and is organizing the forces of the international bourgeoisie for an attack upon the USSR. in the west. German fascism is combining the executioner.' civil war

against the proletariat and the toilers of Germany with preparations for war for the repartitioning of Europe, with feverish efforts to smooth out the antagonisms in the camp of the imperialists by means of joint action for an attack upon the U.S.S.R. Hitlerist Germany and Pilsudki Poland are striving to settle the increasingly acute conflicts between them at the expense of Soviet territory. The Hitlerite are organizing a fascist coup in Estonia and Latvia for the purpose of preparing for a similar war, and they are trying to find common ground with the anti-Soviet group among the French imperialist at the expense of the USSR.

Brandishing the Samurai sword and relying upon the magnates of the financial oligarchy the Japanese Minister for war, Araki, solemnly declares:

"For twenty years already, disorder has been continuously reigning in China; up till now no central government has been established there and, in fact, there is no government. Neither in Central Asia nor in Siberia can a scrap of liberty be found. And Mongolia, too, seems to have been transformed into a second Central AsiaAwakened imperial Japan can no longer tolerate the tyranny of the white race."

It is well known that for barbarity the Japanese monarchy con-cedes nothing to tsarism. It represents 3,000 millionaires who like an octopus have wound their tentacle around a great nation. It represents 40,000 landlords, who like leeches are sucking the blood of the tormented toiling peasants of Japan. It represents the slave owning textile concerns who buy the daughters of the peasantry and pay their workers the wages of colonial coolies. It represent a repulsive, arrogant militarism, which has converted Korea, Formosa, Manchuria, and part of northern China into an arena of savage torment and mockery of enslaved nations and has acquired notoriety for

"unprecedented brutality combining all the latest inventions of technique with purely Asiatic torture" (Lenin).

Through the mouth of Araki is expressed the rage of the British Diehards of the German fascists and of the whole of the reactionary bourgeoisie against the U.S.S.R. They may start a war against the U.S.S.R., but they cannot emerge from such a war without broken head.

Interview with a "Pravda" Correspondent 17 February, 1951

Stalin

Q. How do you, evaluate the last declaration of the British Prime Minister Attlee, in the House of Commons, that since the end of the war, the Soviet Union has not disarmed; that is, they have not demobilized their troops; that the Soviet Union has since then even further increased their forces?

A. I evaluate this declaration of Prime Minister Attlee as a slander on the Soviet Union.

The whole world knows that the Soviet Union has demobilized its troops after the war. As is known, demobilization was carried out in three phases: the first and second phases in the year 1945, and the third phase from May to September 1946. In addition, in the years 1946 and 1947, the demobilization of older age groups of the Soviet army was carried through and, starting in 1948, the rest of the older age groups were demobilized.

That is a generally known fact.

If Prime Minister Attlee was conversant with finance and economy he would be able to understand, without difficulty, that no one state, also not the Soviet Union, is in the position to completely develop the volume of their peace industry, - even more, - dozens of billions of the state expenditure is required for the purpose of building, such as the hydro-power works on the Volga, Dnieper, and Amu-Darya; to introduce the policy of a systematic reduction in the price of consumer goods. Likewise, dozens of billions of the state expenditure is needed to immediately add to the hundreds of billions for the reconstruction of the economy demolished by the German occupation, to expand the people's economy and at the same time to increase their military forces and develop their war industry. It is not difficult to understand that such a foolish

policy would lead to state bankruptcy. Prime Minister Attlee must, from his own experience as well as, from the experience of the U.S.A., know that the increasing of the military forces of countries and the development of the arms race would lead to a limitation of the peace industry, to a close-down of great civic building, to a raising of tax and to a raising of the price of consumer goods. It is understandable that, if the Soviet Union does not limit the peace industry but, on the contrary, furthers it, then new building, greater hydro-power works and water systems will not be suspended but, on the contrary, developed, the policy of reducing prices will not be suspended but, on the contrary, continued, they could not at the same time develop their war industry and increase their military strength without thereby taking the risk of bankruptcy.

And if Prime Minister Attlee, despite all these facts and economic considerations, nevertheless holds it possible to openly insult the Soviet Union and its peaceful politics, one can only declare that, by slandering the Soviet Union, the present Labour government in England wants to justify carrying on their own arms race.

Prime Minister Attlee needs to lie about the Soviet Union; he must represent the peaceful politics of the Soviet Union as aggressive, and the aggressive politics of the English government as peaceful politics to mislead the English people, to blindfold them with this lie about the Soviet Union, and in this way drag them towards a new world war that would be organized by the warmongering circles in the United States of America.

Prime Minister Attlee pretends to be a follower of peace. But if he really is for peace, why was he against the proposal of the Soviet Union in the United Nations Organization on the conclusion of a peace pact between the Soviet Union, England, the United States of America, China, and France?

If he really is for peace, why is he against the proposals of the Soviet Union to immediately begin to limit armaments and to immediately forbid atomic weapons?

If he really is for peace, why does he persecute those that intercede for the defence of peace; why has he forbidden the peace congress in England? Could the campaign for the defence of peace possibly threaten the security of England?

It is clear that Prime Minister Attlee is not for the keeping of peace, but rather for the unleashing of a new world-encompassing war of aggression.

Q. What do you think about the intervention in Korea? How can that end?

A. If England and the United States of America finally decline the proposals of the People's Government of China for peace, then the war in Korea can only end in defeat of the interventionists.

Q. Why? Are then, the American and English generals and officers worse than the Chinese and Korean?

A. No, not worse. The American and English generals and officers are not worse than the generals and officers of any other country you like to name. Where the soldiers of the U.S.A. and England are concerned, in the war against Hitler-Germany and militaristic Japan, they proved to be the best side, as is known. Where, then, lies the difference? In that the soldiers in the war against Korea and China do not consider it as just, whereas in the war against Hitler-Germany and militaristic Japan, they considered it absolutely just. It also lies in that this war is extremely unpopular among the American and English soldiers.

In this case it is difficult to convince the soldiers that China, who threatened neither England nor America, from whom the

Americans stole the island of Taiwan, are aggressors, and that the U.S.A., having stolen the island of Taiwan and led their troops straight to the borders of China, is the defending side. It is therefore difficult to convince the troops that the U.S.A. is right to defend its security on Korean territory and on the borders of China, and that China and Korea are not right to defend their security on their own territory or on the borders of their states. That is why the war is unpopular among the American and English soldiers.

it is understandable that experienced generals and officers will suffer a defeat if their soldiers are forced into a war which they consider totally unjust, and if they believe their duties at the front to be formal, without believing in the justice of their mission, without feeling enthusiasm.

Q. How do you evaluate the decision of the United Nations Organization to declare the Chinese People's Republic as the aggressors?

A. One regards it as a scandalous decision.

Really, one must have lost what was left of conscience to maintain that the United States of America, which has stolen Chinese territory, the island of Taiwan, and fallen upon China's borders in Korea, is the defensive side; and on the other hand, to declare that the Chinese People's "Republic which has defended its borders and striven to take back the island of Taiwan, stolen by the Americans, is the aggressor.

The United Nations Organization, which was created as a bulwark for keeping peace, has been transformed into an instrument of war, a means to unleash a new world war. The aggressive core of the United Nations Organization has formed the aggressive North Atlantic pact from ten member states (the U.S.A., England, France, Belgium, Canada, Holland, Luxemburg, Denmark, Norway, Iceland) and twenty Latin-

American countries (Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Chile, Columbia, Costa Rica, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, Venezuela.) And the representatives of these countries now make the decisions in the United Nations Organization about war and peace. It was these that have, in the United Nations Organizations, carried through the scandalous decision about the aggression of the Chinese People's Republic.

It is typical of the present situation in the United Nations Organization, that, for example, the little Dominican Republic in America that has a population figure of scarcely two million, has today the same weight in the United Nations Organization as India has, and a much greater weight than the Chinese People's Republic, which has been robbed of a voice in the United Nations Organization.

Thus, the United Nations Organization, from being a world organization of nations with equal rights, has changed into an instrument of a war of aggression. In reality, the United Nations Organization is now not so much a world organization as an organization for the Americans and treats American aggression as acceptable. Not only the United States of America and Canada are striving to unleash a new war, but on this path, you also find the twenty Latin-American countries; their landowners and merchants long for a new war somewhere in Europe or Asia, to sell their goods to the countries at inflated prices, and to make millions out of this bloody business. The fact is not a secret to anybody that the representatives of the twenty Latin-American countries represent the strongest supporters and the willing army of the United States of America in the United Nations Organization.

The United Nations Organization treads, in this manner, the inglorious path of the League of Nations. Thereby they bury their moral authority unci fall into decay.

Q. Do you hold a new world war to be unavoidable?

A. No. At least, one can, at present, hold it to be avoidable.

Of course, in the United States of America, in England and also in France, there are aggressive powers that long for a new war. They need war to achieve super-profits and to plunder other countries. These are the billionaires and millionaires that regard war as a fountain of revenue, which brings colossal profits.

They, the aggressive powers, hold the reactionary governments in their hands and guide them. But at the same time, they are afraid of their people who do not want a new war and are for the keeping of peace. Therefore, they take the trouble of using reactionary governments to ensnare their people with lies, to deceive them, to represent a new war as a war of defense, and the peaceful politics of peace-loving countries as aggressive. They take the trouble to deceive the people, to force them and draw them into a new war with their aggressive plans.

They therefore even fear the campaign for the defense of peace, they fear that this campaign would expose the aggressive intentions of the reactionary governments.

They therefore even oppose the proposals of the Soviet Union on the conclusion of a peace treaty, on the limitation of armaments and on the forbidding of atomic weapons; they fear that the acceptance of these proposals would frustrate the aggressive measures of the reactionary governments and render the arms race unnecessary.

Where will all this struggle between the aggressive and the peace-loving powers end?

Peace will be kept and strengthened if the people take the holding of peace into their own hands and defend it to the utmost. War could be unavoidable if the arsonists of war succeed in trapping the masses with their lies, in deceiving them and in drawing them into a new war.

Now, therefore, a broad campaign for the holding of peace, as a way of exposing the criminal machinations of the arsonists of war, is of prime importance.

As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, it will continue to carry through the politics of preventing war and keeping peace.

J. STALIN

("For lasting Peace, for People's Democracy!" No. 8, 23 February - 1 March, 1951)

The Question of Peace and Security

Stalin

From the; Speech at Celebration Meeting of the Moscow Soviet of Working People's Deputies and Moscow Party and Public Organizations

November 6, 1944

The past year has been a year of triumph of the common cause of the anti-German coalition for the sake of which the peoples of the Soviet Union, Great Britain and the United States of America have united in fighting alliance. It has been a year of consolidation of the unity of the three main Powers and of co-ordination of their actions against Hitler Germany.

The decision of the Teheran Conference on joint actions against Germany and the brilliant realization of that decision are one of the striking indications of the consolidation of the front of the anti-Hitler Coalition. There are few instances in history of plans for large-scale military operations undertaken in joint actions against a common enemy being carried out so fully and with such precision as the plan for a joint blow against Germany drawn up at the Teheran Conference.

There can be no doubt that without unity of opinion and co-ordination of actions of the three Great Powers, the Teheran decision could not have been realized so fully and with such precision. Nor on the other hand can there be any doubt that the successful realization of the Teheran decision was bound to serve to consolidate the front of the United Nations.

An equally striking indication of the solidity of the front of the United Nations is to be seen in the decisions of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference on post-war security. There is talk of differences between the three Powers on certain security problems. Differences do exist, of course, and they will arise on

a number of other issues as well. Differences of opinion occur even among people in one and the same Party. They are all the more bound to occur between representatives of different States and different Parties. The surprising thing is not that differences exist, but that they are so few, and that as a rule in practically every case they are resolved in a spirit of unity and coordination among the three Great Powers. What matters is not that there are differences, but that these differences do not transgress the bounds of what the interests of the unity of the three Great Powers allow, and that, in the long run, they are resolved in accordance with the interests of that unity. It is known that more serious differences existed between us over the opening of the Second Front. But it is also known that in the end these differences were resolved in a spirit of complete accord. The same thing may be said of the differences at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference. What is characteristic of this Conference is not that certain differences were revealed there, but that nine-tenths of the security problems were solved at this Conference in a spirit of complete unanimity. That is why I think that the decisions of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference are to be regarded as a striking indication of the solidity of the front of the anti-German Coalition.

A still more striking indication of the consolidation of the front of the United Nations are the recent talks in Moscow with Mr. Churchill, the head of the British Government, and Mr. Eden, the British Foreign Secretary, held in an atmosphere of friendship and a spirit of perfect unanimity.

Throughout the war the Hitlerites have made frantic efforts to cause disunity among the United Nations and set them at loggerheads, to stir up suspicion and unfriendly feeling among them, to weaken their war effort by mutual distrust, and, if possible, by conflict between them as well. These ambitions of the Hitlerite politicians are easy enough to understand. For

them there is no greater danger than the unity of the United Nations in the struggle against Hitlerite imperialism, and for them there would have been no greater military and political success than the splitting of the Allied Powers in their struggle against the common enemy. It is known, however, how futile the efforts of the fascist politicians to disrupt the alliance of the Great Powers have proved. That means that the alliance between the U.S.S.R., Great Britain and the United States of America is founded not on casual, transitory considerations, but on vital and lasting interests.

There can be no doubt that, having stood the strain of more than three years of war and being sealed with the blood of the nations risen in defence of their liberty and honour, the fighting alliance of the democratic powers will all the more certainly stand the strain of the concluding phase of the war. (Prolonged applause.)

The past year, however, has been not only a year of consolidation of the anti-German front of the Allied Powers, but also a year of its extension. It cannot be considered an accident that after Italy other allies of Germany—Finland, Rumania, and Bulgaria—were also put out of the war. It should be noted that these States not only got out of the war but broke with Germany and declared war on her, thus joining the front of the United Nations. This signifies, undoubtedly, an extension of the front of the United Nations against Hitler Germany. Without doubt Germany's last ally in Europe, Hungary, will also be put out of action in the nearest future. This will mean the complete isolation of Hitler Germany in Europe and the inevitability of her collapse.

The United Nations face the victorious conclusion of the war against Hitler Germany.

The war against Germany will be won by the United Nations—of that there can no longer be any doubt to-day.

To win the war against Germany is to accomplish a great historic task. But to win the war does not in itself mean to ensure for the peoples a lasting peace and guaranteed security in the future. The task is not only to win the war but also to make new aggression and new war impossible—if not for ever, then at least for a long time to come.

After her defeat Germany will, of course, be disarmed, both in the economic and in the military political sense. It would, however, be naïve to think that she will not attempt to restore her might and launch new aggression. It is common knowledge that the German chieftains are already now preparing for a new war. History shows that a short period—some 20 or 30 years—is enough for Germany to recover from defeat and re-establish her might. What means are there to preclude fresh aggression on Germany's part, and if war should start nevertheless, to nip it in the bud and give it no opportunity to develop into a big war?

This question is the more appropriate since history shows that aggressor nations, the nations which attack, are usually better prepared for a new war than peace-loving nations which, having no interest in a new war, are usually behindhand with their preparations for it. It is a fact that in the present war the aggressor nations had an army of invasion all-ready even before the war broke out—while the peace-loving nations did not even have adequate armies to cover their mobilization. One cannot regard as an accident such distasteful facts as the Pearl Harbor "incident," the loss of the Philippines and other Pacific Islands, the loss of Hong Kong and Singapore, when Japan, as the aggressor nation, proved to be better prepared for war than Great Britain and the United States of America, which pursued a policy of peace. Nor can one regard as an accident such a

distasteful fact as the loss of the Ukraine, Byelorussia, and the Baltics in the very first year of the war, when Germany, as the aggressor nation, proved better prepared for war than the peace-loving Soviet Union. It would be naïve to explain these facts by the personal qualities of the Japanese and the Germans, their superiority over the British, the Americans and the Russians, their foresight, etc. The reason here is not personal qualities but the fact that aggressor nations, interested in a new war, being nations that prepare for war over a long time and accumulate forces for it, usually are, and are bound to be, better prepared for war than peace-loving nations which have no interest in a new war. That is natural and understandable. This is if you like, a law of history, which would be dangerous to ignore.

Accordingly, it is not to be denied that in the future the peace-loving nations may once more find themselves caught off guard by aggression unless, of course, they work out special measures right now which can avert it.

Well, what means are there to preclude fresh aggression on Germany's part and, if war should start nevertheless, to stifle it at its very beginning and give it no opportunities to develop into a big war?

There is only one means to this end, apart from the complete disarmament of the aggressor nations: that is to establish a special organization made up of representatives of the peace-loving nations for the defence of peace and safeguarding of security; to put at the disposal of the directing body of this organization the necessary minimum of armed forces required to avert aggression, and to oblige this organization to employ these armed forces without delay if it becomes necessary, to avert or stop aggression, and to punish those guilty of aggression.

This must not be a repetition of the sad memory of the League of Nations, which had neither the right nor the means to avert aggression. It will be a new, special, fully authorized international organization having at its command everything necessary to defend peace and avert new aggression.

Can we expect the actions of this world organization to be sufficiently effective? They will be effective if the great Powers which have borne the brunt of the war against Hitler Germany continue to act in a spirit of unanimity and accord. They will not be effective if this essential condition is violated.

Comrades!

The Soviet people and the Red Army are successfully executing the tasks which have confronted them in the course of the Patriotic War. The Red Army has worthily fulfilled its patriotic duty and liberated our Motherland from the enemy: henceforth and forever our soil is free of the Hitlerite pollution. Now remains its last, final mission: to complete, together with the armies of our Allies, the defeat of the German-fascist army, to finish off the fascist beast in its own den, and to hoist the flag of victory over Berlin. (Loud and prolonged applause). There is reason to expect that this task will be fulfilled by the Red Army in the none too distant future. (Loud and prolonged applause.)

Long live our victorious Red Army! (Applause.)

Long live our glorious Navy! (Applause.)

Long live the mighty Soviet people! (Applause.)

Long live our great Motherland! (Loud applause, all stand.)

Death to the German-fascist invaders! (Loud and prolonged applause, shouts of "Long live Comrade Stalin!")

When is War Not Inevitable?

Stalin

For Peaceful Coexistence: Post War Interviews

[Excerpts from an interview with correspondent of Pravda, February 16, 1951)

Question: Do you consider a new world war inevitable?

Answer: No. At least at the present time it cannot be considered inevitable.

Of course, in the United States of America, in Britain, as also in France, there are aggressive forces thirsting for a new war. They need war to obtain super-profits, to plunder other countries. These are the billionaires and millionaires who regard war as an item of income which gives colossal profits.

They, these aggressive forces, control the reactionary governments and direct them. But at the same time, they are afraid of their people who do not want a new war and stand for the maintenance of peace. Therefore, they are trying to use reactionary governments in order to enmesh their peoples with lies, to deceive them, and to depict the new war as defensive and the peaceful policy of the peace-loving countries as aggressive. They are trying to deceive their people in order to impose on them their aggressive plans and to draw them into a war.

Precisely for this reason they are afraid of the campaign in defense of peace, fearing that it can expose the aggressive intentions of the reactionary governments.

Precisely for this reason they turned down the proposal of the Soviet Union for the conclusion of a Peace Pact, for the reduction of armaments, for banning the atomic weapon, fearing that the adoption of these proposals would undermine

the aggressive measures of the reactionary governments and make the armaments race unnecessary.

What will be the end of this struggle between the aggressive and peace-loving forces?

Peace will be preserved and consolidated if the people take the cause of preserving peace into their own hands and will defend it to the end. War may become inevitable if the warmongers succeed in entangling the masses of the people in lies, in deceiving them and drawing them into a new world war.

That is why the wide campaign for the maintenance of peace as a means of exposing the criminal machinations of the warmongers is now of first-rate importance.

As for the Soviet Union, it will continue in the future as well firmly to pursue the policy of averting war and maintaining peace.

Notes on Contemporary Topics – Stalin

July 28, 1927

The Threat of War

It can scarcely be doubted that the main issue of the present day is that of the threat of a new imperialist war. It is not a matter of some vague and immaterial "danger" of a new war but of the real and actual threat of a new war in general, and of a war against the U.S.S.R. in particular.

The redivision of the world and of spheres of influence that took place as a result of the last imperialist war has already managed to become "obsolete." Certain new countries (America, Japan) have come to the fore. Certain old countries (Britain) are receding into the background. Capitalist Germany, all but buried at Versailles, is reviving, and growing and becoming steadily stronger. Bourgeois Italy, with an envious eye on France, is creeping upwards.

A frantic struggle is in progress for markets, for fields of capital export, for the sea and land routes to those markets, for a new redivision of the world. The contradictions between America and Britain, between Japan and America, between Britain and France, between Italy and France, are growing.

The contradictions within the capitalist countries are growing, every now and again breaking out in the form of open revolutionary actions of the proletariat (Britain, Austria).

The contradictions between the imperialist world and the dependent countries are growing, now and again breaking out in the form of open conflicts and revolutionary explosions (China, Indonesia, North Africa, South America).

But the growth of all these contradictions signifies a growth of the crisis of world capitalism, despite the fact of stabilisation, a

crisis incomparably deeper than the one before the last imperialist war. The existence and progress of the U.S.S.R., the land of proletarian dictatorship, only deepens and aggravates this crisis.

No wonder that imperialism is preparing for a new war, in which it sees the only way out of the crisis. The unparalleled growth of armaments, the general tendency of the bourgeois governments towards fascist methods of "administration," the crusade against the Communists, the frenzied campaign of slander against the U.S.S.R., the outright intervention in China—all these are different aspects of one and the same phenomenon: the preparation for a new war for a new redivision of the world.

The imperialists would long ago have come to blows among themselves, were it not for the Communist Parties, which are waging a determined struggle against imperialist war, were it not for the U.S.S.R., whose peaceful policy is a heavy fetter on the instigators of a new war, and were it not for their fear of weakening one another and thus facilitating a new breach of the imperialist front.

I think that this last circumstance—that is, the imperialists' fear of weakening one another and thus facilitating a new breach of the imperialist front—is one of the chief factors which have so far restrained the urge for a mutual slaughter.

Hence the "natural" endeavour of certain imperialist circles to relegate the contradictions in their own camp to the background, to gloss them over temporarily, to create a united front of the imperialists and to make war on the U.S.S.R., in order to solve the deepening crisis of capitalism even if only partially, even if only temporarily, at the expense of the U.S.S.R.

The fact that the initiative in this matter of creating a united front of the imperialists against the U.S.S.R. has been assumed

by the British bourgeoisie and its general staff, the Conservative Party, should not come as a surprise to us. British capitalism has always been, is, and will be the most malignant strangler of peoples' revolutions. Beginning with the great bourgeois revolution in France at the close of the eighteenth century and down to the revolution now taking place in China, the British bourgeoisie has always been in the front ranks of the suppressors of the movement for the emancipation of mankind. The Soviet people will never forget the violence, robbery, and armed invasion to which our country was subjected some years ago thanks to the British capitalists. What, then, is there surprising in the fact that British capitalism and its Conservative Party are again undertaking to lead a war against the centre of the world proletarian revolution, the U.S.S.R.?

But the British bourgeoisie is not fond of doing its own fighting. It has always preferred to make war through the hands of others. And it has indeed succeeded at times in finding fools willing to serve as cat's-paws for it.

Such was the case at the time of the great bourgeois evolution in France when the British bourgeoisie succeeded in forming an alliance of European states against revolutionary France.

Such was the case after the October Revolution in the U.S.S.R., when the British bourgeoisie, having attacked the U.S.S.R., tried to form an "alliance of fourteen states," and when, in spite of this, they were hurled out of the U.S.S.R.

Such is the case now in China, where the British bourgeoisie is trying to form a united front against the Chinese revolution.

It is quite comprehensible that, in preparing for war against the U.S.S.R., the Conservative Party has for several years now been carrying out preparatory work for the formation of a "holy alliance" of large and small states against the U.S.S.R.

Whereas earlier, until recently, the Conservatives carried out this preparatory work more or less covertly, now, however, they have passed to "direct action," striking open blows at the U.S.S.R. and trying to build their notorious "holy alliance" in sight of all.

The British Conservative government struck its first open blow in Peking, by the raid on the Soviet Embassy. This raid had at least two aims. It was intended to discover "terrible" documentary evidence of "subversive" activity on the part of the U.S.S.R. which would create an atmosphere of general indignation and provide the basis for a united front against the U.S.S.R. It was intended also to provoke an armed conflict with the Peking government and embroil the U.S.S.R. into a war with China.

This blow, as we know, failed.

The second open blow was struck in London, by the raid on ARCOS and the severance of relations with the U.S.S.R. Its aim was to create a united front against the U.S.S.R., to inaugurate a diplomatic blockade of the U.S.S.R. throughout Europe and to provoke a series of ruptures of treaty relations with the Soviet Union.

This blow, as we know, also failed.

The third open blow was struck in Warsaw, by the instigation of the assassination of Voikov. Voikov's assassination, organised by agents of the Conservative Party, was intended by its authors to play a role similar to that of the Sarajevo assassination by embroiling the U.S.S.R. in an armed conflict with Poland.

This blow also seems to have failed.

How is it to be explained that these blows have so far not produced the results which the Conservatives expected from them?

By the conflicting interests of the various bourgeois states, many of whom are interested in maintaining economic relations with the U.S.S.R.

By the peaceful policy of the U.S.S.R., which the Soviet Government pursues firmly and unwaveringly.

By the reluctance of the state's dependent on Britain—whether it be the state of Chang Tso-lin or the state of Pilsudski—to serve as dumb tools of the Conservatives to the detriment of their own interests.

The noble lords apparently refuse to understand that every state, even the smallest, is inclined to regard itself as an entity, tries to live its own independent life, and is unwilling to hazard its existence for the sake of the bright eyes of the Conservatives. The British Conservatives have omitted to take all these circumstances into account.

Does this mean that there will be no more blows of this kind? No, it does not. On the contrary, it only means that the blows will be renewed with fresh strength.

These blows must not be regarded as a matter of chance. They are naturally prompted by the entire international situation, by the position of the British bourgeoisie both in the "metropolitan country" and in the colonies, by the Conservative Party's position as the ruling party.

The entire international situation today, all the facts regarding the "operations" of the British Government against the U.S.S.R.—the fact that it is organising a financial blockade of the U.S.S.R., the fact that it is secretly conferring with the powers on a policy hostile to the U.S.S.R., the fact that it is

subsidizing the emigre "governments" of the Ukraine, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, etc., with a view to instigating revolts in these countries of the U.S.S.R., the fact that it is financing bands of spies and terrorists, who blow up bridges, set fire to factories and commit acts of terrorism against U.S.S.R. ambassadors—all this unmistakably goes to show that the British Conservative government has firmly and determinedly adopted the course of organising war against the U.S.S.R. And it must be considered by no means out of the question that, under certain circumstances, the Conservatives may succeed in getting together some military bloc or other against the U.S.S.R.

What are our tasks?

It is our task to sound the alarm in all the countries of Europe over the threat of a new war, to rouse the vigilance of the workers and soldiers of the capitalist countries, and to work, to work indefatigably, to prepare the masses to counter with the full strength of revolutionary struggle every attempt of the bourgeois governments to organise a new war.

It is our task to pillory all those leaders of the labour movement who "consider" the threat of a new war to be a "figment of the imagination," who lull the workers with pacifist lies, who close their eyes to the fact that the bourgeoisie is preparing for a new war—for these people want the war to catch the workers by surprise.

The task is for the Soviet Government firmly and unwaveringly to continue its policy of peace, the policy of peaceful relations, notwithstanding the provocative acts of our enemies, notwithstanding pin-pricks to our prestige.

Provocative elements in the enemy camp taunt us, and will continue to taunt us, with the assertion that our peaceful policy is due to our weakness, to the weakness of our army. Some of our comrades are at times enraged by this, are inclined to

succumb to the provocation and to urge the adoption of "vigorous" measures. That is a sign of weak nerves, of lack of stamina. We cannot, and must not, dance to the tune of our enemies. We must go our own way, upholding the cause of peace, demonstrating our desire for peace, exposing the predatory designs of our enemies, and showing them up as instigators of war.

For only such a policy can enable us to weld the masses of the working people of the U.S.S.R. into a single fighting camp if, or rather when, the enemy forces war upon us.

As regards our "weakness," or the "weakness" of our army, this is not the first time that our enemies have made such a mistake. Some eight years ago, too, when the British bourgeoisie resorted to intervention against the U.S.S.R. and Churchill threatened a campaign of "fourteen states," the bourgeois press shouted about the "weakness" of our army. But all the world knows that both the British interventionists and their allies were ignominiously thrown out of our country by our victorious army.

Messieurs the instigators of a new war would do well to remember this.

The task is to increase the defensive capacity of our country, to expand our national economy, to improve our industry—both war and non-war—to enhance the vigilance of the workers, peasants, and Red Army men of our country, steeling them in the determination to defend the socialist motherland and putting an end to the slackness which, unfortunately, is as yet far from having been eliminated.

The task is to strengthen our rear and cleanse it of dross, not hesitating to mete out punishment to "illustrious" terrorists and incendiaries who set fire to our mills and factories, because it is

impossible to defend our country in the absence of a strong revolutionary rear.

Recently a protest was received from the well-known leaders of the British labour movement, Lansbury, Maxton, and Brockway, against the shooting of the twenty Russian princes and nobles who were guilty of terrorism and arson. I cannot regard those leaders of the British labour movement as enemies of the U.S.S.R. But they are worse than enemies.

They are worse than enemies because, although they call themselves friends of the U.S.S.R., by their protest they nevertheless make it easier for Russian landlords and British secret agents to go on organising the assassination of representatives of the U.S.S.R.

They are worse than enemies because by their protest they tend to bring about a state of affairs in which the workers of the U.S.S.R. are left unarmed in face of their sworn enemies.

They are worse than enemies because they refuse to realise that the shooting of the twenty "illustrious" ones was a necessary measure of self-defense on the part of the revolution.

It is rightly said: "God save us from such friends; our enemies we can cope with ourselves."

As to the shooting of the twenty "illustrious" ones, let the enemies of the U.S.S.R., both internal and external enemies, know that the proletarian dictatorship in the U.S.S.R. is alive and that its hand is firm.

What, after all this, should be said of our luckless opposition in connection with its latest attacks on our Party in face of the threat of a new war? What should be said of the fact that it, this opposition, has found the war threat an appropriate occasion to intensify its attacks on the Party? What is there creditable in the fact that, instead of rallying around the Party in face of the

threat from without, it considers it appropriate to make use of the U.S.S.R.'s difficulties for new attacks on the Party? Can it be that the opposition is against the victory of the U.S.S.R. in the coming battles with imperialism, against increasing the defensive capacity of the Soviet Union, against strengthening our rear? Or, perhaps, it is cowardice in the face of the new difficulties, desertion, a desire to evade responsibility, masked by a blast of Leftist phrases? . . .

China

Now that the revolution in China has entered a new phase of development, we can to some extent sum up the path already travelled and proceed to verify the line of the Comintern in China.

There are certain tactical principles of Leninism, without due regard for which there can be neither correct leadership of the revolution, nor verification of the Comintern's line in China. These principles have been forgotten by our oppositionists long ago. But just because the opposition suffers from forgetfulness, it has to be reminded of them again and again.

I have in mind such tactical principles of Leninism as:

- a) the principle that the nationally peculiar and nationally specific features in each separate country must unfailingly be taken into account by the Comintern when drawing up guiding directives for the working-class movement of the country concerned;
- b) the principle that the Communist Party of each country must unfailingly avail itself of even the smallest opportunity of gaining a mass ally for the proletariat, even if a temporary, vacillating, unstable and unreliable ally;
- c) the principle that unfailing regard must be paid to the truth that propaganda and agitation alone are not enough for the

political education of the vast masses, that what is required for that is the political experience of the masses themselves.

I think that due regard for these tactical principles of Leninism is an essential condition, without which a Marxist verification of the Comintern's line in the Chinese revolution is impossible.

Let us examine the questions of the Chinese revolution in the light of these tactical principles.

Notwithstanding the ideological progress of our Party, there are still, unfortunately, "leaders" of a sort in it who sincerely believe that the revolution in China can be directed, so to speak, by telegraph, on the basis of the universally recognised general principles of the Comintern, disregarding the national peculiarities of China's economy, political system, culture, manners and customs, and traditions. What, in fact, distinguishes these "leaders" from real leaders is that they always have in their pockets two or three ready-made formulas, "suitable" for all countries and "obligatory" under all conditions. The necessity of taking into account the nationally peculiar and nationally specific features of each country does not exist for them. Nor does the necessity exist for them of coordinating the general principles of the Comintern with the national peculiarities of the revolutionary movement in each country, the necessity of adapting these general principles to the national peculiarities of the state in each country.

They do not understand that the chief task of leadership now that the Communist Parties have grown and become mass parties, is to discover, to grasp, the nationally peculiar features of the movement in each country and skillfully co-ordinate them with the Comintern's general principles, in order to facilitate and make feasible the basic aims of the Communist movement.

Hence the attempts to stereotype the leadership for all countries. Hence the attempts mechanically to implant certain general formulas, regardless of the concrete conditions of the movement in different countries. Hence the endless conflicts between the formulas and the revolutionary movement in the different countries, as the main outcome of the leadership of these pseudo-leaders.

It is precisely to this category of pseudo-leaders that our oppositionists belong.

The opposition has heard that a bourgeois revolution is taking place in China. It knows, furthermore, that the bourgeois revolution in Russia took place in opposition to the bourgeoisie. Hence the ready-made formula for China: down with all joint action with the bourgeoisie, long live the immediate withdrawal of the Communists from the Kuomintang (April 1926).

But the opposition has forgotten that, unlike the Russia of 1905, China is a semi-colonial country oppressed by imperialism; that, in consequence of this, the revolution in China is not simply a bourgeois revolution, but a bourgeois revolution of an anti-imperialist type; that, in China, imperialism controls the principal threads of industry, trade and transport; that imperialist oppression affects not only the Chinese labouring masses, but also certain sections of the Chinese bourgeoisie; and that, in consequence, the Chinese bourgeoisie may, under certain conditions and for a certain period, support the Chinese revolution.

And that, as we know, is in fact what occurred. If we take the Canton period of the Chinese revolution, the period when the national armies had reached the Yangtse, the period prior to the split in the Kuomintang, it has to be admitted that the Chinese bourgeoisie supported the revolution in China, that the

Comintern's line that joint action with this bourgeoisie is permissible for a certain period and under certain conditions proved to be absolutely correct. The result is the retreat of the opposition from its old formula and its proclamation of a "new" formula, namely, joint action with the Chinese bourgeoisie is essential, the Communists must not withdraw from the Kuomintang (April 1927).

That was the first punishment that befell the opposition for refusing to take into account the national peculiarities of the Chinese revolution.

The opposition has heard that the Peking government is squabbling with the representatives of the imperialist states over the question of customs autonomy for China. The opposition knows that it is primarily the Chinese capitalists that need customs autonomy. Hence the ready-made formula: the Chinese revolution is a national, anti-imperialist revolution, because its chief aim is to win customs autonomy for China.

But the opposition has forgotten that the strength of imperialism in China does not lie mainly in the customs restrictions in China, but in the fact that it owns mills, factories, mines, railways, steamships, banks, and trading firms in that country, which suck the blood of the millions of Chinese workers and peasants.

The opposition has forgotten that the revolutionary struggle of the Chinese people against imperialism is due first and foremost to the fact that imperialism in China is the force that supports and inspires the immediate exploiters of the Chinese people—the feudal lords, militarists, capitalists, bureaucrats, etc.—and that the Chinese workers and peasants cannot defeat their exploiters without at the same time waging a revolutionary struggle against imperialism.

The opposition forgets that it is precisely this circumstance that is one of the major factors making possible the growing over of the bourgeois revolution in China into a socialist revolution.

The opposition forgets that anyone who declares that the Chinese anti-imperialist revolution is a revolution for customs autonomy denies the possibility of the growing over of the bourgeois revolution in China into a socialist revolution, for he places the revolution under the leadership of the Chinese bourgeoisie.

And, indeed, the facts have since shown that customs autonomy is in essence the platform of the Chinese bourgeoisie, because even such inveterate reactionaries as Chang Tsolin and Chiang Kai-shek now declare in favour of the abolition of the unequal treaties and the establishment of customs autonomy in China.

Hence the opposition's divided stand, its attempts to wriggle out of its own formula about customs autonomy, its surreptitious attempts to renounce this formula and to hitch on to the Comintern's stand that the growing over of the bourgeois revolution in China into a socialist revolution is possible.

That was the second punishment that befell the opposition for refusing to make a serious study of the national peculiarities of the Chinese revolution.

The opposition has heard that the merchant bourgeoisie has penetrated the Chinese countryside, leasing land to poor peasants. The opposition knows that the merchant is not a feudal lord. Hence the ready-made formula: feudal survivals, hence also the struggle of the peasantry against feudal survivals, are of no serious importance in the Chinese revolution, and that the chief thing in China today is not the agrarian revolution, but the question of China's state-customs dependence on the imperialist countries.

The opposition, however, fails to see that the specific feature of China's economy is not the penetration of merchant capital into the countryside, but a combination of the domination of feudal survivals with the existence of merchant capital in the Chinese countryside, along with the preservation of medieval feudal methods of exploiting and oppressing the peasantry.

The opposition fails to understand that the entire military-bureaucratic machine which today so inhumanly robs and oppresses the Chinese peasantry is essentially a political superstructure on this combination of the domination of feudal survivals and feudal methods of exploitation with the existence of merchant capital in the countryside.

And, indeed, the facts have since shown that a gigantic agrarian revolution has developed in China, directed first and foremost against the Chinese feudal lords, big and small.

The facts have shown that this revolution embraces tens of millions of peasants and is tending to spread over the whole of China.

The facts have shown that feudal lords—real feudal lords of flesh and blood—not only exist in China, but wield power in a number of provinces, dictate their will to the military commanders, subordinate the Kuomintang leadership to their influence, and strike blow after blow at the Chinese revolution.

To deny, after this, the existence of feudal survivals and a feudal system of exploitation as the main form of oppression in the Chinese countryside, to refuse to recognise that the agrarian revolution is the main factor in the Chinese revolutionary movement at the present time, would be flying in the face of obvious facts.

Hence the opposition's retreat from its old formula regarding feudal survivals and the agrarian revolution. Hence the

opposition's attempt to slink away from its old formula and tacitly to recognise the correctness of the Comintern's position.

That is the third punishment which has befallen the opposition for its unwillingness to take into account the national peculiarities of China's economy.

And so on and so forth.

Disharmony between formulas and reality—such is the lot of the oppositionist pseudo-leaders.

And this disharmony is a direct result of the opposition's repudiation of the well-known tactical principle of Leninism that the nationally peculiar and nationally specific features in the revolutionary movement of each separate country must unflinchingly be taken into account. Here is how Lenin formulates this principle:

"The whole point now is that the Communists of every country should quite consciously take into account both the main fundamental tasks of the struggle against opportunism and 'Left' doctrinairism and the specific features which this struggle assumes and inevitably must assume in each separate country in conformity with the peculiar features of its economics, politics, culture, national composition (Ireland, etc.), its colonies, religious divisions, and so on and so forth. Everywhere it is felt that dissatisfaction with the Second International is spreading and growing, both because of its opportunism and because of its inability, or incapacity, to create a really centralised, really leading, centre capable of directing the international tactics of the revolutionary proletariat in its struggle for a world Soviet republic. We must clearly realise that such a leading centre cannot under any circumstances be built up on stereotyped, mechanically equalized, and identical tactical rules of struggle. As long as national and state differences exist among peoples and countries—and these

differences will continue to exist for a very long time even after the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established on a world scale—the unity of international tactics of the communist working-class movement of all countries demands, not the elimination of variety, not the abolition of national differences (that is a foolish dream at the present moment), but such an application of the fundamental principles of communism (Soviet power and the dictatorship of the proletariat) as would correctly modify these principles in certain particulars, correctly adapt and apply them to national and national-state differences. Investigate, study, seek, divine, grasp that which is nationally peculiar, nationally specific in the concrete manner in which each country approaches the fulfilment of the single international task, in which it approaches the victory over opportunism and Left doctrinairism within the working class movement, the overthrow of the bourgeoisie, and the establishment of a Soviet republic and a proletarian dictatorship—such is the main task of the historical period through which all the advanced countries (and not only the advanced countries) are now passing" (see "Left-Wing" Communism, an Infantile Disorder, Vol. XXV, pp. 227-28).

The line of the Comintern is the line of unfailingly taking this tactical principle of Leninism into account.

The line of the opposition, on the contrary, is the line of repudiating this tactical principle.

In that repudiation lies the root of the opposition's misadventures in the questions of the character and prospects of the Chinese revolution.

Let us pass to the second tactical principle of Leninism.

Out of the character and prospects of the Chinese revolution there arises the question of the allies of the proletariat in its struggle for the victory of the revolution.

The question of the allies of the proletariat is one of the main questions of the Chinese revolution. The Chinese proletariat is confronted by powerful enemies: the big and small feudal lords, the military-bureaucratic machine of the old and the new militarists, the counterrevolutionary national bourgeoisie, and the Eastern and Western imperialists, who have seized control of the principal threads of China's economic life and who reinforce their right to exploit the Chinese people by their troops and fleets.

To smash these powerful enemies requires, apart from everything else, a flexible and well-considered policy on the part of the proletariat, the ability to take advantage of every rift in the camp of its enemies, and the ability to find allies, even if they are vacillating and unstable allies, provided that they are mass allies, that they do not restrict the revolutionary propaganda and agitation of the party of the proletariat, and do not restrict the party's work of organising the working class and the labouring masses.

This policy is a fundamental requirement of the second tactical principle of Leninism. Without such a policy, the victory of the proletariat is impossible.

The opposition regards such a policy as incorrect, un-Leninist. But that only indicates that it has shed the last remnants of Leninism, that it is as far from Leninism as heaven is from earth.

Did the Chinese proletariat have such allies in the recent past?

Yes, it did.

In the period of the first stage of the revolution, when it was a revolution of an all-national united front (the Canton period), the proletariat's allies were the peasantry, the urban poor, the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia, and the national bourgeoisie.

One of the specific features of the Chinese revolutionary movement is that the representatives of those classes worked jointly with the Communists within a single, bourgeois-revolutionary organisation, called the Kuomintang.

Those allies were not, and could not be, all equally dependable. Some of them were more or less dependable allies (the peasantry, the urban poor), others were less reliable and vacillating (the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia), others again were entirely unreliable (the national bourgeoisie).

At that time, the Kuomintang was unquestionably more or less a mass organisation. The policy of the Communists within the Kuomintang consisted in isolating the representatives of the national bourgeoisie (the Rights) and utilising them in the interests of the revolution, in impelling the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia (the Lefts) leftwards, and in rallying the peasantry and the urban poor around the proletariat.

Was Canton at that time the centre of the Chinese revolutionary movement? It certainly was. Only lunatics can deny that now.

What were the achievements of the Communists during that period? Extension of the territory of the revolution, inasmuch as the Canton armies reached the Yangtse; the possibility of openly organising the proletariat (trade unions, strike committees); the formation of the communist organisations into a party; the creation of the first nuclei of peasant organisations (the peasant associations); communist penetration into the army.

It follows that the Comintern's leadership during that period was quite correct.

In the period of the second stage of the revolution, when Chiang Kai-shek and the national bourgeoisie deserted to the camp of counter-revolution, and the centre of the revolutionary

movement shifted from Canton to Wuhan, the proletariat's allies were the peasantry, the urban poor, and the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia.

How is the desertion of the national bourgeoisie to the camp of counter-revolution to be explained? By fear of the scope assumed by the revolutionary movement of the workers, in the first place, and, secondly, by the pressure exerted on the national bourgeoisie by the imperialists in Shanghai.

Thus the revolution lost the national bourgeoisie. That was a partial loss for the revolution. But, on the other hand, it entered a higher phase of its development, the phase of agrarian revolution, by bringing the broad masses of the peasantry closer to itself. That was a gain for the revolution.

Was the Kuomintang at that time, in the period of the second stage of the revolution, a mass organisation? It certainly was. It was unquestionably more of a mass organisation than was the Kuomintang of the Canton period.

Was Wuhan at that time the centre of the revolutionary movement? It certainly was. Surely only the blind could deny that now. Otherwise Wuhan's territory (Hupeh, Hunan) would not have been the base for the maximum development of the agrarian revolution, which was led by the Communist Party.

The policy of the Communists towards the Kuomin-tang at that time was to impel it leftwards and to transform it into the core of a revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry.

Was such a transformation possible at that time? It was. At any rate, there was no reason to believe such a possibility out of the question. We plainly said at the time that to transform the Wuhan Kuomintang into the core of a revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry at least

two conditions were required: a radical democratisation of the Kuomin-tang, and direct assistance by the Kuomintang to the agrarian revolution. It would have been foolish for the Communists to have refrained from attempting such a transformation.

What were the achievements of the Communists during that period?

The Communist Party during that period grew from a small party of 5-6 thousand members into a large mass party of 50-60 thousand members.

The workers' trade unions grew into a huge national federation with about three million members.

The primary peasant organisations expanded into huge associations embracing several tens of millions of members. The agrarian movement of the peasantry grew to gigantic proportions and came to occupy the central place in the Chinese revolutionary movement. The Communist Party gained the possibility of openly organising the revolution. The Communist Party became the leader of the agrarian revolution. The hegemony of the proletariat began to change from a wish into a reality.

It is true that the Chinese Communist Party failed to exploit all the possibilities of that period. It is true that during that period the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party committed a number of grave errors. But it would be ridiculous to think that the Chinese Communist Party can become a real Bolshevik party at one stroke, so to speak, on the basis of the Comintern's directives. One has only to recall the history of our Party, which passed through a series of splits, secessions, betrayals, treacheries and so forth, to realise that real Bolshevik parties do not come into being at one stroke.

It follows, then, that the Comintern's leadership during that period, too, was quite correct.

Does the Chinese proletariat have allies today? It does.

These allies are the peasantry and the urban poor.

The present period is marked by the desertion of the Wuhan leadership of the Kuomintang to the camp of counter-revolution, by the desertion of the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia from the revolution.

This desertion is due, firstly, to the fear of the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia in face of the spread of the agrarian revolution and to the pressure of the feudal lords on the Wuhan leadership, and, secondly, to the pressure of the imperialists in the Tientsin area, who are demanding that the Kuomintang break with the Communists as the price for permitting its passage northward.

The opposition has doubts about the existence of feudal survivals in China. But it is now clear to all that not only do feudal survivals exist in China, but that they have proved to be even stronger than the onslaught of the revolution at the present time. And it is because the imperialists and the feudal lords in China have for the time being proved to be stronger that the revolution has sustained a temporary defeat.

On this occasion the revolution has lost the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia.

That indeed is a sign that the revolution has sustained a temporary defeat.

But, on the other hand, it has rallied the broad masses of the peasantry and urban poor more closely around the proletariat, and has thereby created the basis for the hegemony of the proletariat. That is a gain for the revolution.

The opposition ascribes the temporary defeat of the revolution to the Comintern's policy. But only people who have broken with Marxism can say that. Only people who have broken with Marxism can demand that a correct policy should always and necessarily lead to immediate victory over the enemy.

Was the policy of the Bolsheviks in the 1905 Revolution a correct one? Yes, it was. Why, then, did the 1905 Revolution suffer defeat, despite the existence of Soviets, despite the correct policy of the Bolsheviks? Because the feudal survivals and the autocracy proved at that time to be stronger than the revolutionary movement of the workers.

Was the policy of the Bolsheviks in July 1917 a correct one? Yes, it was. Why, then, did the Bolsheviks sustain defeat, again despite the existence of Soviets, which at that time betrayed the Bolsheviks, and despite the correct policy of the Bolsheviks? Because Russian imperialism proved at that time to be stronger than the revolutionary movement of the workers.

A correct policy is by no means bound to lead always and without fail to direct victory over the enemy. Direct victory over the enemy is not determined by correct policy alone; it is determined first and foremost by the correlation of class forces, by a marked preponderance of strength on the side of the revolution, by disintegration in the enemy's camp, by a favourable international situation.

Only given those conditions can a correct policy of the proletariat lead to direct victory.

But there is one obligatory requirement which a correct policy must satisfy always and under all conditions. That requirement is that the Party's policy must enhance the fighting capacity of the proletariat, multiply its ties with the labouring masses, increase its prestige among these masses, and convert the proletariat into the hegemon of the revolution.

Can it be affirmed that this past period has presented the maximum favourable conditions for the direct victory of the revolution in China? Clearly, it cannot.

Can it be affirmed that communist policy in China has not enhanced the fighting capacity of the proletariat, has not multiplied its ties with the broad masses, and has not increased its prestige among these masses? Clearly, it cannot.

Only the blind could fail to see that the Chinese proletariat has succeeded in this period in severing the broad mass of the peasantry both from the national bourgeoisie and from the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia, so as to rally them around its own standard.

The Communist Party went through a bloc with the national bourgeoisie in Canton at the first stage of the revolution in order to extend the area of the revolution, to form itself into a mass party, to secure the possibility of openly organising the proletariat, and to open up a road for itself to the peasantry.

The Communist Party went through a bloc with the Kuomintang petty-bourgeois intelligentsia in Wuhan at the second stage of the revolution in order to multiply its forces, to extend the organisation of the proletariat, to sever the broad masses of the peasantry from the Kuomintang leadership, and to create the conditions for the hegemony of the proletariat.

The national bourgeoisie has gone over to the camp of counter-revolution, having lost contact with the broad masses of the people.

The Kuomintang petty-bourgeois intelligentsia in Wuhan has trailed in the wake of the national bourgeoisie, having taken fright at the agrarian revolution, and having utterly discredited itself in the eyes of the peasant millions.

On the other hand, however, the vast masses of the peasantry have rallied more closely around the proletariat, seeing in it their only reliable leader and guide.

Is it not clear that only a correct policy could have led to such results?

Is it not clear that only such a policy could have enhanced the fighting capacity of the proletariat?

Who but the pseudo-leaders belonging to our opposition can deny the correctness and revolutionary character of such a policy?

The opposition asserts that the swing of the Wuhan Kuomintang leadership to the side of the counterrevolution indicates that the policy of a bloc with the Wuhan Kuomintang at the second stage of the revolution was incorrect.

But only people who have forgotten the history of Bolshevism and who have shed the last remnants of Leninism can say that.

Was the Bolshevik policy of a revolutionary bloc with the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries in October and after October, down to the spring of 1918, a correct one?

I believe that nobody has yet ventured to deny that this bloc was correct. How did this bloc end? With a revolt of the Left Socialist Revolutionaries against the Soviet government. Can it be affirmed on these grounds that the policy of a bloc with the Socialist-Revolutionaries was incorrect? Obviously, it cannot.

Was the policy of a revolutionary bloc with the Wuhan Kuomintang at the second stage of the Chinese revolution a correct one? I believe that nobody has yet ventured to deny that this bloc was correct during the second stage of the revolution. The opposition itself declared at that time (April 1927) that such a bloc was correct. How, then, can it be asserted now, after the

Wuhan Kuomintang leadership has deserted the revolution, and because of this desertion, that the revolutionary bloc with the Wuhan Kuomintang was incorrect?

Is it not clear that only spineless people can employ such "arguments"?

Did anyone assert that the bloc with the Wuhan Kuomintang would be eternal and unending? Do such things as eternal and unending blocs exist at all? Is it not clear that the opposition has no understanding, no understanding whatever, of the second tactical principle of Leninism, concerning a revolutionary bloc of the proletariat with non-proletarian classes and groups?

Here is how Lenin formulates this tactical principle:

"The more powerful enemy can be vanquished only by exerting the utmost effort, and by making, without fail, the most thorough, careful, attentive and skillful use both of every, even the smallest, 'rift' among the enemies, every antagonism of interests among the bourgeoisie of the various countries and among the various groups or types of bourgeoisie within individual countries, as well as of every, even the smallest, opportunity of gaining mass ally, even though a temporary, vacillating, unstable, unreliable and conditional ally. He who has not understood this, has not understood even a particle of Marxism, or of scientific, modern socialism in general. He who has not proved by deeds over a fairly considerable period of time, and in fairly varied political situations, his ability to apply this truth in practice has not yet learned to assist the revolutionary class in its struggle to emancipate all toiling humanity from the exploiters. And this applies equally to the period before and after the proletariat has conquered political power" (see "Left-Wing" Communism, an Infantile Disorder, Vol. XXV, pp. 210-11).

Is it not clear that the line of the opposition is the line of repudiating this tactical principle of Leninism?

Is it not clear that the line of the Comintern, on the contrary, is the line of unfailingly taking this tactical principle into account?

Let us pass to the third tactical principle of Leninism.

This tactical principle concerns the question of change of slogans, the order, and methods of such change. It concerns the question how to convert a slogan for the party into a slogan for the masses, how and in what way to bring the masses to the revolutionary positions, so that they may convince themselves by their own political experience of the correctness of the Party's slogans.

And the masses cannot be convinced by propaganda and agitation alone. What is required for that is the political experience of the masses themselves. What is required for that is that the broad masses shall come to feel, from painful experience, the inevitability, say, of overthrowing a given system, the inevitability of establishing a new political and social order.

It was a good thing that the advanced group, the Party, had already convinced itself of the inevitability of the overthrow, say, of the Milyukov-Kerensky Provisional Government in April 1917. But that was not yet enough for coming forward and advocating the overthrow of that government, for putting forward the slogan of the overthrow of the Provisional Government and the establishment of Soviet power as a slogan of the day. In order to convert the formula "All Power to the Soviets" from a perspective for the immediate future into a slogan of the day, into a slogan of immediate action, one other decisive factor was required, namely, that the masses themselves should become convinced of the correctness of this

slogan, and should help the Party in one way or another to put it into effect.

A strict distinction must be drawn between a formula as a perspective for the immediate future and a formula as a slogan of the day. It was precisely on this point that the group of Petrograd Bolsheviks headed by Bagdatyev came to grief in April 1917, when they prematurely put forward the slogan "Down with the Provisional Government, All Power to the Soviets." Lenin at the time qualified that attempt of the Bagdatyev group as dangerous adventurism and publicly denounced it.

Why?

Because the broad masses of the working people in the rear and at the front were not yet ready to accept that slogan. Because that group confused the formula "All Power to the Soviets," as a perspective, with the slogan "All Power to the Soviets," as a slogan of the day. Because that group was running too far ahead, exposing the Party to the threat of being completely isolated from the broad masses, from the Soviets, which at that time still believed that the Provisional Government was revolutionary.

Should the Chinese Communists have put forward the slogan "Down with the Kuomintang leadership in Wuhan" six months ago, say? No, they should not.

They should not, because that would have been dangerously running too far ahead, it would have made it difficult for the Communists to gain access to the broad masses of the working people, who still believed in the Kuomintang leadership; it would have isolated the Communist Party from the broad masses of the peasantry.

They should not, because the Wuhan Kuomintang leadership, the Wuhan Central Committee of the Kuomintang, had not yet exhausted its potentialities as a bourgeois-revolutionary government, had not yet disgraced and discredited itself in the eyes of the broad masses of the working people by its fight against the agrarian revolution, by its fight against the working class, and by its swing over to the counter-revolution.

We always said that it would be wrong to adopt the course of discrediting and replacing the Wuhan Kuomintang leadership so long as it had not yet exhausted its potentialities as a bourgeois-revolutionary government; that it should first be allowed to do so before raising in practice the question of replacing it.

Should the Chinese Communists now put forward the slogan "Down with the Kuomintang leadership in Wuhan"? Yes, they certainly should.

Now that the Kuomintang leadership has disgraced itself by its struggle against the revolution and has taken up an attitude of hostility towards the broad masses of the workers and peasants, this slogan will meet with a powerful response among the masses of the people.

Every worker and every peasant will now understand that the Communists acted rightly in withdrawing from the Wuhan government and the Wuhan Central Committee of the Kuomintang, and in putting forward the slogan "Down with the Kuomintang leadership in Wuhan."

For the masses of the peasants and workers are now faced with the choice : either the present Kuomintang leadership—which means refusing to satisfy the vital needs of these masses, repudiating the agrarian revolution; or agrarian revolution and a radical improvement of the position of the working class—

which means that replacing the Kuomintang leadership in Wuhan becomes a slogan of the day for the masses.

Such are the demands of the third tactical principle of Leninism, concerning the question of change of slogans, the question of the ways and means of bringing the broad masses to the new revolutionary positions, the question how, by the policy and actions of the Party and the timely replacement of one slogan by another, to help the broad masses of the working people to recognise the correctness of the Party's line on the basis of their own experience.

Here is how Lenin formulates this tactical principle:

"Victory cannot be won with the vanguard alone. To throw the vanguard alone into the decisive battle, before the whole class, before the broad masses have taken up a position either of direct support of the vanguard, or at least of benevolent neutrality towards it, and one in which they cannot possibly support the enemy, would be not merely folly but a crime. And in order that actually the whole class, that actually the broad masses of the working people and those oppressed by capital may take up such a position, propaganda and agitation alone are not enough. For this the masses must have their own political experience. Such is the fundamental law of all great revolutions, now confirmed with astonishing force and vividness not only in Russia but also in Germany. Not only the uncultured, often illiterate, masses of Russia, but the highly cultured, entirely literate masses of Germany had to realise through their own painful experience the absolute impotence and spinelessness, the absolute helplessness and servility to the bourgeoisie, the utter vileness, of the government of the knights of the Second International, the absolute inevitability of a dictatorship of the extreme reactionaries (Kornilov in Russia, Kapp and Co. in Germany) as the only alternative to a dictatorship of the proletariat, in order to turn resolutely

towards communism. The immediate task that confronts the class-conscious vanguard of the international labour movement, i.e., the Communist Parties, groups and trends, is to be able to lead the broad masses (as yet, for the most part, slumbering, apathetic, bound by routine, inert and dormant) to their new position, or, rather, to be able to lead not only their own party, but also these masses, in their approach, their transition to the new position" (see "Left-Wing" Communism, an Infantile Disorder, Vol. XXV, p. 228).

The basic error of the opposition is that it does not understand the meaning and importance of this tactical principle of Leninism, that it does not recognise it and systematically violates it.

It (Trotskyists) violated this tactical principle at the beginning of 1917, when it attempted to "skip over" the agrarian movement which had not yet been completed (see Lenin).

It (Trotsky-Zinoviev) violated this principle when it attempted to "skip over" the reactionary character of the trade unions, failing to recognise the expediency of Communists working in reactionary trade unions, and denying the necessity for temporary blocs with them.

It (Trotsky-Zinoviev-Radek) violated this principle when it attempted to "skip over" the national peculiarities of the Chinese revolutionary movement (the Kuomintang), the backwardness of the masses of the Chinese people, by demanding, in April 1926, the immediate withdrawal of the Communists from the Kuomintang, and, in April 1927, by putting forward the slogan of immediate organisation of Soviets, at a time when the Kuomintang phase of development had not yet been completed and had not yet outlived its day.

The opposition thinks that if it has understood, has recognised, the half-heartedness, vacillation and unreliability of the

Kuomintang leadership, if it has recognised the temporary and conditional character of the bloc with the Kuomintang (and that is not difficult for any competent political worker to recognise), that is quite sufficient to warrant starting "determined action" against the Kuomintang, against the Kuomintang government, quite sufficient to induce the masses, the broad masses of the workers and peasants "at once" to support "us" and "our" "determined action."

The opposition forgets that "our" understanding all this is still very far from enough to enable the Chinese Communists to get the masses to follow them. The opposition forgets that what this also requires is that the masses themselves should recognise from their own experience the unreliable, reactionary, and counter-revolutionary character of the Kuomintang leadership.

The opposition forgets that it is not only the advanced group, not only the Party, not only individual, even if "exalted," "personalities," but first and foremost the vast masses of the people, that "make" a revolution.

It is strange that the opposition should forget about the state of the vast masses of the people, about their level of understanding, about their readiness for determined action.

Did we, the Party, Lenin, know in April 1917 that the Milyukov-Kerensky Provisional Government would have to be overthrown, that the existence of the Provisional Government was incompatible with the activity of the Soviets, and that the power would have to pass into the hands of the Soviets? Yes, we did.

Why, then, did Lenin brand as adventurers the group of Petrograd Bolsheviks headed by Bagdatyev in April 1917, when that group put forward the slogan "Down with the Provisional Government, All Power to the Soviets," and attempted to overthrow the Provisional Government?

Because the broad masses of the working people, a certain section of the workers, millions of the peasantry, the broad mass of the army and, lastly, the Soviets themselves, were not yet prepared to accept that slogan as a slogan of the day.

Because the Provisional Government and the Socialist-Revolutionary and Menshevik petty-bourgeois parties had not yet exhausted their potentialities, had not yet sufficiently discredited themselves in the eyes of the vast masses of the working people.

Because Lenin knew that the understanding, the political consciousness, of the advanced group of the proletariat, the Party of the proletariat, was not enough by itself for the overthrow of the Provisional Government and the establishment of Soviet power—that this required also that the masses themselves should become convinced of the correctness of this line through their own experience.

Because it was necessary to go through the whole coalition orgy, through the betrayals and treacheries of the petty-bourgeois parties in June, July and August 1917; it was necessary to go through the shameful offensive at the front in June 1917, through the "honest" coalition of the petty-bourgeois parties with the Kornilovs and Milyukovs, through the Kornilov revolt and so on, in order that the vast masses of the working people should become convinced that the overthrow of the Provisional Government and the establishment of Soviet power were unavoidable.

Because only under those circumstances could the slogan of Soviet power be transformed from a slogan that was a perspective into a slogan of the day.

The trouble with the opposition is that it continually commits the same error as the Bagdatyev group committed in their day,

that it abandons Lenin's road and prefers to "march" along the road of Bagdatyev.

Did we, the Party, Lenin, know that the Constituent Assembly was incompatible with the system of Soviet power when we took part in the elections to the Constituent Assembly and when we convened it in Petrograd? Yes, we did.

Why, then, did we convene it? How could it happen that the Bolsheviks, who were enemies of bourgeois parliamentarism and who established Soviet power, not only took part in the elections but even themselves convened the Constituent Assembly? Was this not "khvostism," lagging behind events, "holding the masses in check," violating "long-range" tactics? Of course not.

The Bolsheviks took this step in order to make it easier for the backward masses of the people to convince themselves with their own eyes that the Constituent Assembly was unsuitable, reactionary, and counter-revolutionary. Only in that way was it possible to draw to our side the vast masses of the peasantry and make it easier for us to disperse the Constituent Assembly.

Here is what Lenin writes about it:

"We took part in the elections to the Russian bourgeois parliament, the Constituent Assembly, in September-November 1917. Were our tactics correct or not? . . . Did not we, the Russian Bolsheviks, have more right in September-November 1917 than any Western Communists to consider that parliamentarism was politically obsolete in Russia? Of course we did, for the point is not whether bourgeois parliaments have existed for a long time or a short time, but how far the broad masses of the working people are prepared (ideologically, politically, and practically) to accept the Soviet system and to disperse the bourgeois-democratic parliament (or allow it to be dispersed). That in Russia in September-November 1917, owing

to a number of special conditions, the urban working class and the soldiers and peasants were exceptionally well prepared to accept the Soviet system and to disperse the most democratic of bourgeois parliaments, is an absolutely incontestable and fully established historical fact. Nevertheless, the Bolsheviks did not boycott the Constituent Assembly, but took part in the elections both before the proletariat conquered political power and after.

...

"The conclusion which follows from this is absolutely incontrovertible: it has been proved that participation in a bourgeois-democratic parliament even a few weeks before the victory of a Soviet republic, and even after such a victory, not only does not harm the revolutionary proletariat, but actually helps it to prove to the backward masses why such parliaments deserve to be dispersed; it helps their successful dispersal, and helps to make bourgeois parliamentarism 'politically obsolete'" (see "Left-Wing" Communism, an Infantile Disorder, Vol. XXV, pp. 201-02). That is how the Bolsheviks applied the third tactical principle of Leninism in practice.

That is how Bolshevik tactics must be applied in China, whether in relation to the agrarian revolution, or to the Kuomintang, or to the slogan of Soviets.

The opposition is apparently inclined to think that the revolution in China has suffered a complete fiasco. That, of course, is wrong. That the revolution in China has sustained a temporary defeat, of that there can be no doubt. But what sort of defeat, and how profound it is—that is the question now. It is possible that it will be approximately as prolonged a defeat as was the case in Russia in 1905, when the revolution was interrupted for a full twelve years, only to break out later, in February 1917, with fresh force, sweep away the autocracy, and clear the way for a new, Soviet revolution.

That prospect cannot be considered excluded. It is still not a complete defeat of the revolution, just as the defeat of 1905 could not be considered a final defeat. It is not a complete defeat, since the basic tasks of the Chinese revolution at the present stage of its development—agrarian revolution, revolutionary unification of China, emancipation from the imperialist yoke—still await their accomplishment. And if this prospect should become a reality, then, of course, there can be no question of the immediate formation of Soviets of workers' and peasants' deputies in China, because Soviets are formed and flourish only in circumstances of revolutionary upsurge.

But that prospect can scarcely be considered a likely one. At all events, there are no grounds so far for considering it likely. There are none, because the counterrevolution is not yet united, and will not be soon, if indeed it is ever destined to be united.

For the war of the old and the new militarists among themselves is flaring up with fresh force and cannot but weaken the counter-revolution, at the same time as it ruins and infuriates the peasantry. For there is still no group or government in China capable of undertaking something in the nature of a Stolypin reform which might serve the ruling groups as a lightning conductor.

For the millions of the peasantry, who have already begun to lay hands on the landlords' land, cannot be so easily curbed and crushed to the ground.

For the prestige of the proletariat in the eyes of the labouring masses in growing from day to day, and its forces are still very far from having been demolished.

It is possible that the defeat of the Chinese revolution is analogous in degree to that suffered by the Bolsheviks in July 1917, when the Menshevik and Socialist-Revolutionary Soviets betrayed them, when they were forced to go underground, and

when, a few months later, the revolution again came out into the streets in order to sweep away the imperialist government of Russia.

The analogy, of course, is a qualified one. I make it with all the necessary reservations, bearing in mind the difference between the situation of China in our day and that of Russia in 1917. I resort to such an analogy only in order to indicate the approximate degree of defeat of the Chinese revolution.

I think that this prospect is the more likely one. And if it should become a reality, if in the near future— not necessarily in a couple of months, but in six months or a year from now—a new upsurge of the revolution should become a fact, the question of forming Soviets of workers' and peasants' deputies may become a live issue, as a slogan of the day, and as a counterpoise to the bourgeois government.

Why?

Because, if there is a new upsurge of the revolution in its present phase of development, the formation of Soviets will be an issue that has become fully mature.

Recently, a few months ago, it would have been wrong for the Chinese Communists to issue the slogan of forming Soviets, for that would have been adventurism, which is characteristic of our opposition, for the Kuomintang leadership had not yet discredited itself as an enemy of the revolution. Now, on the contrary, the slogan of forming Soviets may become a really revolutionary slogan, if (if!) a new and powerful revolutionary upsurge takes place in the near future.

Consequently, alongside the fight to replace the present Kuomintang leadership by a revolutionary leadership, it is necessary at once, even before the upsurge begins, to conduct the widest propaganda for the idea of Soviets among the broad

masses of the working people, without running too far ahead and forming Soviets immediately, remembering that Soviets can flourish only at a time of powerful revolutionary upsurge.

The opposition may say that it said this "first," that this is precisely what it calls "long-range" tactics.

You are wrong, my dear sirs, absolutely wrong! That is not "long-range" tactics; it is haphazard tactics, the tactics of perpetually overshooting and undershooting the mark.

When, in April 1926, the opposition demanded that the Communists should immediately withdraw from the Kuomintang, that was overshooting tactics, because the opposition itself was subsequently compelled to admit that the Communists ought to remain in the Kuomintang.

When the opposition declared that the Chinese revolution was a revolution for customs autonomy, that was undershooting tactics, because the opposition itself was subsequently compelled to slink away from its own formula.

When, in April 1927, the opposition declared that to talk of feudal survivals in China was an exaggeration, forgetting the existence of the mass agrarian movement, that was undershooting tactics, because the opposition itself was subsequently compelled tacitly to admit its error.

When, in April 1927, the opposition issued the slogan of immediate formation of Soviets, that was overshooting tactics, because the oppositionists themselves were compelled at the time to admit the contradictions in their own camp, one of them (Trotsky) demanding adoption of the course of overthrowing the Wuhan government, and another (Zinoviev), on the contrary, demanding the "utmost assistance" for this same Wuhan government.

But since when have haphazard tactics, the tactics of perpetually overshooting and undershooting the mark, been called "long-range" tactics?

As to Soviets, it should be said that, long before the opposition, the Comintern in its documents spoke of Soviets in China as a perspective. As to Soviets as a slogan of the day—put forward by the opposition in the spring of this year as a counterblast to the revolutionary Kuomintang (the Kuomintang was then revolutionary, otherwise there was no point in Zinoviev clamoring for the "utmost assistance" for the Kuomintang)—that was adventurism, vociferous running too far ahead, the same adventurism and the same running too far ahead that Bagdatyev was guilty of in April 1917.

From the fact that the slogan of Soviets may become a slogan of the day in China in the near future, it does not by any means follow that it was not dangerous and harmful adventurism on the part of the opposition to put forward the slogan of Soviets in the spring of this year.

Just as it by no means follows from the fact that Lenin recognised the slogan "All Power to the Soviets" to be necessary and timely in September 1917 (the Central Committee's decision on the uprising),² that it was not harmful and dangerous adventurism on the part of Bagdatyev to put forward this slogan in April 1917.

Bagdatyev, in September 1917, might also have said that he had been the "first" to call for Soviet power, having done so in April 1917. Does this mean that Bagdatyev was right, and that Lenin was wrong in qualifying his action in April 1917 as adventurism?

Apparently, our opposition is envious of Bagdatyev's "laurels."

The opposition does not understand that the point is not at all to be "first" in saying a thing, running too far ahead and disorganizing the cause of the revolution, but to say it at the right time, and to say it in such a way that it will be taken up by the masses and put into practice.

Such are the facts.

The opposition has departed from Leninist tactics, its policy is one of "ultra-Left" adventurism—such is the conclusion.

Pravda, No. 169, July 28, 1927

Speech Delivered at the Fifth-Union Conference of the All-Union Leninist Young Communist League

Stalin

March 31, 1927

(Extract)

Permit me now to pass to the second question—that of the Nanking events. I think that the Nanking events should not have come as a surprise to us. Imperialism cannot live without violence and robbery, without bloodshed and shooting. That is the nature of imperialism. The events in Nanking cannot, therefore, be a surprise to us.

What do the Nanking events indicate?

What is their political meaning?

They indicate a turn in the policy of imperialism, a turn from armed peace to armed war against the Chinese people.

Before the Nanking events, imperialism endeavored to hide its intentions by unctuous talk about peace and non-interference in the domestic affairs of other countries, by a mask of “civilisation” and “humanitarianism,” the League of Nations and so forth. After the Nanking events, imperialism is discarding its unctuous speeches, its talk of non-intervention, the League of Nations and all the other masks. Now imperialism stands exposed to the eyes of the world in all its nakedness as an avowed plunderer and oppressor.

Bourgeois pacifism has sustained another telling blow. For what, indeed, have those who sing the praises of imperialist pacifism, such as the Boncours, the Breitscheids and others, to oppose the fact of the massacre of Nanking inhabitants except their false pacifist talk? The League of Nations has been given another slap in the face. For whom but lackeys of imperialism

can consider it “normal” that one member of the League of Nations massacres the citizens of another member, while the League of Nations itself is compelled to keep silent and assume that the matter does not concern it?

It is now proved that our Party was right when it assessed the dispatch of troops to Shanghai by the imperialist countries as the prelude to armed attacks on the Chinese people. For one must be blind not to see now that imperialism needed troops in Shanghai in order to pass from “words” to “deeds.”

Such is the meaning of the Nanking events.

Interview Between J. Stalin and Roy Howard

March 1, 1936

(Extract)

Stalin : History shows that when any state intends to make war against another state, even not adjacent, it begins to seek for frontiers across which it can reach the frontiers of the state it wants to attack, usually, the aggressive state finds such frontiers.

It either finds them with the aid of force, as was the case in 1914 when Germany invaded Belgium in order to strike at France, or it "borrows" such a frontier, as Germany, for example, did from Latvia in 1918, in her drive to Leningrad. I do not know precisely what frontiers Germany may adapt to her aims, but I think she will find people willing to "lend" her a frontier.

Howard : Seemingly, the entire world today is predicting another great war. If war proves inevitable, when, Mr. Stalin, do you think it will come?

Stalin : It is impossible to predict that. War may break out unexpectedly. Wars are not declared, nowadays. They simply start. On the other hand, however, I think the positions of the friends of peace are becoming stronger. The friends of peace can work openly. They rely on the power of public opinion. They have at their command instruments like the League of Nations, for example. This is where the friends of peace have the advantage. Their strength lies in the fact that their activities against war are backed by the will of the broad masses of the people. There is not a people in the world that wants war. As for the enemies of peace, they are compelled to work secretly. That is where the enemies of peace are at a disadvantage. Incidentally, it is not precluded that precisely because of this

they may decide upon a military adventure as an act of desperation.

One of the latest successes the friends of peace have achieved is the ratification of the Franco-Soviet Pact of Mutual Assistance by the French Chamber of Deputies. To a certain extent, this pact is an obstacle to the enemies of peace.

Howard : Should war come, Mr. Stalin, where is it most likely to break out? Where are the war-clouds the most menacing, in the East or in the West?

Stalin : In my opinion there are two seats of war danger. The first is in the Far East, in the zone of Japan. I have in mind the numerous statements made by Japanese military men containing threats against other powers. The second seat is in the zone of Germany. It is hard to say which is the most menacing, but both exist and are active. Compared with these two principal seats of war danger, the Italian-Abyssinian war is an episode. At present, the Far Eastern seat of danger reveals the greatest activity. However, the centre of this danger may shift to Europe. This is indicated, for example, by the interview which Herr Hitler recently gave to a French newspaper. In this interview Hitler seems to have tried to say peaceful things, but he sprinkled his "peacefulness" so plentifully with threats against both France and the Soviet Union that nothing remained of his "peacefulness." You see, even when Herr Hitler wants to speak of peace he cannot avoid uttering threats. This is symptomatic.

Report on the Work of the Central Committee to the Eighteenth Congress of the C.P.S.U.(B.)

Stalin

(Delivered March 10, 1939.)

1. The Soviet Union and International

Comrades, five years have elapsed since the Seventeenth Party Congress. No small period, as you see.

During this period, the world has undergone considerable changes. States and countries, and their mutual relations, are now in many respects totally altered.

What changes exactly have taken place in the international situation in this period? In what way exactly have the foreign and internal affairs of our country changed?

For the capitalist countries this period was one of very profound perturbations in both the economic and political spheres. In the economic sphere these were years of depression, followed, from the beginning of the latter half of 1937, by a period of new economic crisis, of a new decline of industry in the United States, Great Britain, and France; consequently, these were years of new economic complications. In the political sphere they were years of serious political conflicts and perturbations. A new imperialist war is already in its second year, a war waged over a huge territory stretching from Shanghai to Gibraltar and involving over five hundred million people. The map of Europe, Africa and Asia is being forcibly redrawn.

The entire post-war system, the so-called regime of peace, has been shaken to its foundations.

For the Soviet Union, on the contrary, these were years of growth and prosperity, of further economic and cultural

progress, of further development of political and military might, of struggle for the preservation of peace throughout the world.

Such is the general picture.

Let us now examine the concrete data illustrating the changes in the international situation.

1. New Economic Crisis in the Capitalist Countries, Intensification of the Struggle for Markets and Sources of Raw Material, and for a New Redivision of the World.

The economic crisis which broke out in the capitalist countries in the latter half of 1929 lasted until the end of 1933. After that the crisis passed into a depression, and was then followed by a certain revival, a certain upward trend of industry. But this upward trend of industry did not develop into a boom, as is usually the case in a period of revival. On the contrary, in the latter half of 1937 a new economic crisis began which seized the United States first of all and then England, France and a number of other countries.

The capitalist countries thus found themselves faced with a new economic crisis before they had even recovered from the ravages of the recent one.

This circumstance naturally led to an increase of unemployment. The number of unemployed in capitalist countries, which had fallen from thirty million in 1933 to fourteen million in 1937, has now again risen to eighteen million as a result of the new economic crisis.

A distinguishing feature of the new crisis is that it differs in many respects from the preceding one, and, moreover, differs for the worse and not for the better.

Firstly, the new crisis did not begin after an industrial boom, as was the case in 1929, but after a depression and a certain revival, which, however, did not develop into a boom. This means that the present crisis will be more severe and more difficult to cope with than the previous crisis.

Further, the present crisis has broken out not in time of peace, but at a time when a second imperialist war has already begun; at a time when Japan, already in the second year of her war with China, is disorganizing the immense Chinese market and rendering it almost inaccessible to the goods of other countries; when Italy and Germany have already placed their national economy on a war footing, squandering their reserves of raw material and foreign currency for this purpose; and when all the other big capitalist powers are beginning to reorganize themselves on a war footing. This means that capitalism will have far less resources at its disposal for a normal way out of the present crisis than during the preceding crisis.

Lastly, as distinct from the preceding crisis, the present crisis is not a general one, but as yet involves chiefly the economically powerful countries which have not yet placed themselves on a war economy basis. As regards the aggressive countries, such as Japan, Germany, and Italy, who have already reorganized their economy on a war footing, they, because of the intense development of their war industry, are not yet experiencing a crisis of overproduction, although they are approaching it. This means that by the time the economically powerful, non-aggressive countries begin to emerge from the phase of crisis the aggressive countries, having exhausted their reserves of gold and raw material in the course of the war fever, are bound to enter a phase of very severe crisis.

There can be no doubt that unless something unforeseen occurs, German industry must enter the same downward path as Japan and Italy have already taken. For what does placing

the economy of a country on a war footing mean? It means giving industry a one-sided war direction; developing to the utmost the production of goods necessary for war and not for consumption by the population; restricting to the utmost the production and, especially, the sale of articles of general consumption - and, consequently, reducing consumption by the population and confronting the country with an economic crisis.

Such is the concrete picture of the trend of the new economic crisis in the capitalist countries.

Naturally, such an unfavourable turn of economic affairs could not but aggravate relations among the powers. The preceding crisis had already mixed the cards and intensified the struggle for markets and sources of raw materials. The seizure of Manchuria and North China by Japan, the seizure of Abyssinia by Italy - all this reflected the acuteness of the struggle among the powers. The new economic crisis must lead, and is actually leading, to a further sharpening of the imperialist struggle. It is no longer a question of competition in the markets, of a commercial war, of dumping. These methods of struggle have long been recognized as inadequate. It is now a question of a new redivision of the world, of spheres of influence and colonies, by military action.

Japan tried to justify her aggressive actions by the argument that she had been cheated when the Nine-Power Pact was concluded and had not been allowed to extend her territory at the expense of China, whereas Britain and France possess vast colonies. Italy recalled that she had been cheated during the division of the spoils after the first imperialist war and that she must recompense herself at the expense of the spheres of influence of Britain and France. Germany, who had suffered severely as a result of the first imperialist war and the Peace of Versailles, joined forces with Japan and Italy, and demanded an

extension of her territory in Europe and the return of the colonies of which the victors in the first imperialist war had deprived her.

Thus, the bloc of three aggressive states came to be formed.

A new redivision of the world by means of war became imminent.

2-Aggravation of the International Political Situation. Collapse of the Post-War System of Peace Treaties.

Beginning of a New Imperialist War.

Here is a list of the most important events during the period under review which marked the beginning of a new imperialist war. In 1935 Italy attacked and seized Abyssinia. In the summer of 1936 Germany and Italy organized military intervention in Spain, Germany entrenching itself in the north of Spain and in Spanish Morocco, and Italy in the south of Spain and in the Balearic Islands. In 1937, having seized Manchuria, Japan invaded North and Central China, occupied Peking, Tientsin and Shanghai and began to oust its foreign competitors from the occupied zone. In the beginning of 1938 Germany seized Austria, and in the autumn of 1938 the Sudeten region of Czechoslovakia. At the end of 1938 Japan seized Canton, and at the beginning of 1939 the Island of Hainan.

Thus the war, which has stolen so imperceptibly upon the nations, has drawn over 500 million people into its orbit and has extended its sphere of action over a vast territory, stretching from Tientsin, Shanghai, and Canton, through Abyssinia, to Gibraltar.

After the first imperialist war the victor states, primarily Britain, France, and the United States, set up a new regime in the relations between countries, the post-war peace regime. The main props of this regime were the Nine-Power Pact in the Far

East, and the Versailles and a number of other treaties in Europe. The League of Nations was set up to regulate relations between countries within the framework of this regime, on the basis of a united front of states, of collective defence of the security of states. However, three aggressive states, Japan tore up the Nine-Power Pact, and Germany and Italy the Versailles Treaty, and the new imperialist war launched by them, upset the entire system of this post-war peace regime. In order to have their hands free, these three states withdrew from the League of Nations.

The new imperialist war became a fact.

It is not so easy in our day suddenly to break loose and plunge straight into war without regard for treaties of any kind or for public opinion. Bourgeois politicians know this quite well. So do the fascist rulers. That is why the fascist rulers decided, before plunging into war, to mould public opinion to suit their ends, that is, to mislead it, to deceive it.

A military bloc of Germany and Italy against the interests of Britain and France in Europe? Bless us, do you call that a bloc? "We" have no military bloc. All "we" have is an innocuous "Berlin-Rome axis"; that is, just a geometrical equation for an axis. (Laughter.)

A military bloc of Germany, Italy, and Japan against the interests of the United States, Britain, and France in the Far East? Nothing of the kind! "We" have no military bloc. All "we" have is an innocuous "Berlin-Rome-Tokyo triangle"; that is, a slight penchant for geometry. (General laughter.)

A war against the interests of Britain, France, the United States? Nonsense! "We" are waging war on the Comintern, not on these states. If you don't believe it, read the "anti-Comintern pact" concluded between Italy, Germany, and Japan.

That is how Messieurs the aggressors thought to mould public opinion, although it was not hard to see how preposterous this clumsy game of camouflage was; for it is ridiculous to look for Comintern "hotbeds" in the deserts of Mongolia, in the mountains of Abyssinia, or in the wilds of Spanish Morocco. (Laughter.)

But war is inexorable. It cannot be hidden under any guise. For no "axes," "triangles" or "anti-Comintern pacts" can hide the fact that in this period Japan has seized a vast stretch of territory in China, that Italy has seized Abyssinia, that Germany has seized Austria and the Sudeten region, that Germany and Italy together have seized Spain -- and all this in defiance of the interests of the non-aggressive states. The war remains a war; the military bloc of aggressors remains a military bloc; and the aggressors remain aggressors.

It is a distinguishing feature of the new imperialist war that it has not yet become a universal, a world war. The war is being waged by aggressor states, who in every way infringe upon the interests of the non-aggressive states, primarily Britain, France, and the U.S.A., while the latter draw back and retreat, making concession after concession to the aggressors.

Thus we are witnessing an open redivision of the world and spheres of influence at the expense of the non-aggressive states, without the least attempt at resistance, and even with a certain connivance, on their part.

Incredible, but true.

To what are we to attribute this one-sided and strange character of the new imperialist war?

How is it that the non-aggressive countries, which possess such vast opportunities, have so easily and without resistance

abandoned their positions and their obligations to please the aggressors?

Is it to be attributed to the weakness of the non-aggressive states? Of course not! Combined, the non-aggressive, democratic states are unquestionably stronger than the fascist states, both economically and militarily.

To what then are we to attribute the systematic concessions made by these states to the aggressors?

It might be attributed, for example, to the fear that a revolution might break out if the non-aggressive states were to go to war and the war were to assume world-wide proportions. The bourgeois politicians know, of course, that the first imperialist world war led to the victory of the revolution in one of the largest countries. They are afraid that a second imperialist world war may also lead to the victory of the revolution in one or several countries.

But at present this is not the sole or even the chief reason. The chief reason is that the majority of the non-aggressive countries, particularly Britain and France, have rejected the policy of collective security, the policy of collective resistance to aggressors, and have taken up a position of non-intervention, a position of "neutrality."

Formally speaking, the policy of non-intervention might be defined as follows:

"Let each country defend itself against the aggressors as it likes and as best it can. That is not our affair. We shall trade both with the aggressors and with their victims."

But actually speaking, the policy of non-intervention means conniving at aggression, giving free rein to war, and, consequently, transforming the war into a world war. The policy of non-intervention reveals an eagerness, a desire, not to

hinder the aggressors in their nefarious work: not to hinder Japan, say, from embroiling itself in a war with China, or better still, with the Soviet Union; not to hinder Germany, say, from enmeshing itself in European affairs, from embroiling itself in a war with the Soviet Union; to allow all the belligerents to sink deeply into the mire of war, to encourage them surreptitiously in this; to allow them to weaken and exhaust one another; and then, when they have become weak enough, to appear on the scene with fresh strength, to appear, of course, "in the interests of peace," and to dictate conditions to the enfeebled belligerents.

Cheap and easy!

Take Japan, for instance. It is characteristic that before Japan invaded North China all the influential French and British newspapers shouted about China's weakness and its inability to offer resistance and declared that Japan with its army could subjugate China in two or three months. Then the European and American politicians began to watch and wait. And then, when Japan commenced military operations, they let it have Shanghai, the vital centre of foreign capital in China; they let it have Canton, a centre of Britain's monopoly influence in South China; they let it have Hainan, and they allowed it to surround Hongkong. Does not this look very much like encouraging the aggressor? It is as though they were saying: "Embroil yourself deeper in war; then we shall see."

Or take Germany, for instance. They let it have Austria, despite the undertaking to defend its independence; they let it have the Sudeten region; they abandoned Czechoslovakia to her fate, thereby violating all their obligations; and then they began to lie vociferously in the press about "the weakness of the Russian army," "the demoralization of the Russian air force," and "riots" in the Soviet Union, egging on the Germans to march farther east, promising them easy pickings, and prompting them: "Just

start war on the Bolsheviks, and everything will be all right." It must be admitted that this too looks very much like egging on and encouraging the aggressor.

The hullabaloo raised by the British, French, and American press over the Soviet Ukraine is characteristic. The gentlemen of the press there shouted until they were hoarse that the Germans were marching on the Soviet Ukraine, that they now had what is called the Carpathian Ukraine, with a population of some 700,000 and that not later than this spring the Germans would annex the Soviet Ukraine, which has a population of over 30 million, to this so-called Carpathian Ukraine. It looks as if the object of this suspicious hullabaloo were to incense the Soviet Union against Germany, to poison the atmosphere and to provoke a conflict with Germany without any visible grounds.

It is quite possible, of course, that there are madmen in Germany who dream of annexing the elephant, that is, the Soviet Ukraine, to the gnat, namely, the so-called Carpathian Ukraine. If there really are such lunatics in Germany, rest assured that we shall find enough strait jackets for them in our country. (Thunderous applause.) But if we ignore the madmen and turn to normal people, is it not clearly absurd and foolish seriously to talk of annexing the Soviet Ukraine to this so-called Carpathian Ukraine? Imagine: the gnat comes to the elephant and says perkily: "Ah, brother, how sorry I am for you. . . . Here you are without any landlords, without any capitalists, with no national oppression, without any fascist bosses. Is that a way to live? . . . I look at you and I can't help thinking that there is no hope for you unless you annex yourself to me. . . . (General laughter.) Well, so be it: I allow you to annex your tiny domain to my vast territories. . . ." (General laughter and applause.)

Even more characteristic is the fact that certain European and American politicians and pressmen, having lost patience

waiting for "the march on the Soviet Ukraine," are themselves beginning to disclose what is really behind the policy of non-intervention. They are saying quite openly, putting it down in black on white, that the Germans have cruelly "disappointed" them; for instead of marching farther east, against the Soviet Union, they have turned, you see, to the west and are demanding colonies. One might think that the districts of Czechoslovakia were yielded to Germany as the price of an undertaking to launch war on the Soviet Union, but that now the Germans are refusing to meet their bills and are sending them to Hades.

Far be it from me to moralize on the policy of non-intervention, to talk of treason, treachery and so on. It would be naïve to preach morals to people who recognize no human morality. Politics are politics, as the old, case-hardened bourgeois diplomats say. It must be remarked, however, that the big and dangerous political game started by the supporters of the policy of non-intervention may end in serious fiasco for them.

Such is the true face of the now prevailing policy of non-intervention.

Such is the political situation in the capitalist countries.

Answers to Associated Press Moscow Correspondent's Questions

Stalin

October 3, 1942

Dear Mr. Cassidy,

Owing to pressure of work and consequent inability to grant you an interview, I shall confine myself to a brief written answer to your questions.

(1) QUESTION: What place does the possibility of a Second Front occupy in Soviet estimates of the current situation?

ANSWER: A very important place: one might say a place of first-rate importance.

(2) QUESTION: To what extent is Allied aid to the Soviet Union proving effective, and what could be done to amplify and improve this aid?

ANSWER: As compared with the aid which the Soviet Union is giving to the Allies by drawing upon itself the main forces of the German-fascist armies, the aid of the Allies to the Soviet Union has so far been little effective. In order to amplify and improve this aid only one thing is required: that the Allies fulfil their obligations completely and on time.

(3) QUESTION: What remains of the Soviet capacity for resistance?

ANSWER: I think that the Soviet capacity for resisting the German brigands is in strength not a whit less, if not greater, than the capacity of fascist Germany, or of any other aggressive Power, to secure for itself world domination.

With respects, (Signed) J. Stalin.

The Allied Campaign in Africa Answers to Associated Press Moscow Correspondent

Stalin

November 13, 1942

Dear Mr. Cassidy—

I am answering your questions which reached me on November 12.

(1) QUESTION: What is the Soviet view of the Allied campaign in Africa?

ANSWER: The Soviet view of this campaign is that it represents an outstanding fact of major importance, demonstrating the growing might of the armed forces of the Allies and opening the prospect of the disintegration of the Italy-German coalition in the nearest future.

The campaign in Africa refutes once more the sceptics who affirm that the Anglo-American leaders are not capable of organizing a serious military campaign. There can be no doubt that only first-rate organizers could carry out such important military operations as the successful landings in North Africa across the ocean, as the rapid occupation of harbors and wide territories from Casablanca to Bougie, and as the smashing of the Italy-German armies in the Western Desert, effected with such mastery.

(2) QUESTION: How effective has this campaign been in relieving pressure on the Soviet Union, and what further aid does the Soviet Union await?

ANSWER: It is yet too soon to say to what extent this campaign has been effective in relieving immediate pressure on the Soviet Union, but it may confidently be said that the effect will not be

a small one, and that a certain relief in pressure on the Soviet Union will result in the nearest future.

But this is not the only thing that matters. What matters, first of all, is that, since the campaign in Africa means that the initiative has passed into the hands of our Allies, this campaign radically changes the military and political situation in Europe in favour of the Anglo-Soviet-American coalition. It undermines the prestige of Hitlerite Germany as the leading force in the system of Axis powers and demoralizes Hitler's allies in Europe. It releases France from her state of lethargy, mobilizes the anti-Hitler forces of France and provides a basis for the organization of an anti-Hitler French army. It creates conditions for putting Italy out of commission and for isolating Hitlerite Germany. Finally, it creates the prerequisites for the organization of a second front in Europe nearer to Germany's vital centres, which will be of decisive importance for organizing victory over the Hitlerite tyranny.

(3) QUESTION: What possibility is there of the Soviet offensive power in the East joining the Allies in the West to hasten final victory?

ANSWER: There need be no doubt that the Red Army will fulfil its task with honour, as it has been fulfilling it throughout the whole war.

With respects,

(Signed) J. Stalin

November 13, 1942

On the Allied Landing in Northern France

Stalin

June 13, 1944

In answer to a Pravda correspondent, who asked **how he evaluated the landing of Allied forces in northern France**, Marshal Stalin gave the following reply:

In summing up the seven days' fighting by the Allied liberation forces in the invasion of northern France, it may be said without hesitation that the large-scale forcing of the Channel and the mass landing of Allied forces in the north of France have been completely successful. This is undoubtedly **a brilliant success for our Allies.**

One cannot but acknowledge that **the history of war knows no other similar undertaking** as regards breadth of design, vastness of scale and high skill of execution.

As is known, the "invincible" Napoleon, in his time, disgracefully failed in his plan of forcing the Channel and capturing the British Isles. The hysterical Hitler, who for two years boasted that he would affect the forcing of the Channel, did not even venture to make an attempt to carry out his threat. Only the British and American troops succeeded in carrying out with credit the vast plan of forcing the Channel and effecting the mass landing of troops.

History will record this deed **as an achievement of the highest order.**

Stalin's address to the people -1945

September 2, 1945

'Pravda', No. 211, September 8, 1945

Comrades! Fellow countrymen and countrywomen!

Today, September 2, political and military representatives of Japan signed an act of unconditional surrender. Utterly defeated and surrounded on all sides on sea and land by the armed forces of the United Nations; Japan has admitted defeat and has laid down her arms.

Two hotbeds of world fascism and world aggression had been formed on the eve of the present World War: Germany in the West and Japan in the East. It was they who unleashed the Second World War. It was they who brought mankind and civilization to the brink of doom. The hotbed of world aggression in the West was destroyed four months ago and, as a result, Germany was forced to capitulate. Four months later the hotbed of aggression in the East was destroyed and as a result of which, Japan, Germany's principal ally, was also compelled to sign an act of capitulation.

This means the end of the Second World War has come.

Now we can say that the conditions necessary for peace all over the world have been gained.

It must be observed that the Japanese aggressors inflicted damage not only on our Allies - China, the U.S.A., and Great Britain. They also inflicted extremely grave damage on our country. That is why we have a separate account to settle with Japan.

Japan commenced her aggression against our country as far back as 1904, during the Russo -Japanese War. As we know, in February 1904, when negotiations between Japan and Russia

were still proceeding, Japan, taking advantage of the weakness of the tsarist government, suddenly and perfidiously, without declaring war, fell upon our country and attacked the Russian fleet in the region of Port Arthur with the object of putting several Russian warships out of action and thereby creating an advantageous position for her fleet. She did, indeed, put out of action three Russian first-class warships. It is characteristic that 37 years later Japan played exactly the same perfidious trick against the United States when, in 1941, she attacked the United States naval base in Pearl Harbor and put several American battleships out of action. As we know, in the war against Japan, Russia was defeated. Japan took advantage of the defeat of tsarist Russia to seize from Russia the southern part of Sakhalin and establish herself on the Kuril Islands, thereby putting the lock on all our country's outlets to the ocean in the East, which also meant all outlets to the ports of Soviet Kamchatka and Soviet Chukotka. It was obvious that Japan was aiming to deprive Russia of the whole of her Far East.

But this does not exhaust the list of Japan's aggressive operations against our country. In 1918, after the Soviet system was established in our country, Japan, taking advantage of the hostility then displayed towards the Land of the Soviets by Great Britain, France, and the United States, and leaning upon them, again attacked our country, occupied the Far East, and for four years tormented our people and looted the Soviet Far East.

Nor is this all. In 1938 Japan attacked our country again, in the region of Lake Hasan, near Vladivostok, with the object of surrounding Vladivostok; and in the following year Japan repeated her attack in another place, in the region of the Mongolian People's Republic, near Khalkingol, with the object of breaking into Soviet territory, severing our Siberian Railway, and cutting off the Far East from Russia.

True, Japan's attacks in the regions of Hasan and Khalkingol were liquidated by the Soviet troops, to the extreme humiliation of the Japanese. Japanese military intervention in 1918-1922 was liquidated with equal success and Japanese invaders were expelled from our Far Eastern regions. But the defeat of the Russian troops in 1904 during the Russo-Japanese War left bitter memories in the minds of our people. It lay like a black stain on our country. Our people believed in and waited for the day when Japan would be defeated, and the stain would be wiped out. We of the older generation waited for this day for forty years, and now this day has arrived. Today Japan admitted defeat and signed an act of unconditional surrender.

This means that the southern part of Sakhalin and the Kuril Islands revert to the Soviet Union and henceforth will serve not as a barrier between the Soviet Union and the ocean and as a base for Japanese attack upon our Far East but as a direct means of communication between the Soviet Union and the ocean and a base for the defense of our country against Japanese aggression.

Our Soviet people spared neither strength nor labor for the sake of victory. We experienced extremely hard years. But now every one of us can say: We have won. Henceforth we can regard our country as being free from the menace of German invasion in the West and of Japanese invasion in the East. The long-awaited peace for the peoples of all the world has come.

I congratulate you, my dear fellow countrymen and countrywomen, on this great victory, on the successful termination of the war, and on- the ushering in of peace all over the world!

Glory to the armed forces of the Soviet Union, the United States of America, China, and Great Britain which achieved victory over Japan!

Glory to our Far Eastern troops and our Pacific Fleet, which upheld the honor and dignity of our country!

Glory to our great people, the victorious people!

Eternal glory to the heroes who fell fighting for the honor and victory of our country! May our country flourish and prosper!

Interview to "Pravda" Correspondent Concerning Mr. Winston Churchill's Speech at Fulton

Stalin

March 1946

Question: How do you appraise Mr. Churchill's latest speech in the United States of America?

Answer: I appraise it as a dangerous act, calculated to sow the seeds of dissension among the Allied States and impede their collaboration.

Question: Can it be considered that Mr. Churchill's speech is prejudicial to the cause of peace and security?

Answer: Yes, unquestionably. As a matter of fact, Mr. Churchill now takes the stand of the warmongers, and in this Mr. Churchill is not alone. He has friends not only in Britain but in the United States of America as well.

A point to be noted is that in this respect Mr. Churchill and his friends bear a striking resemblance to Hitler and his friends. Hitler began his work of unleashing war by proclaiming a race theory, declaring that only German-speaking people constituted a superior nation. Mr. Churchill sets out to unleash war with a race theory, asserting that only English-speaking nations are superior nations, who are called upon to decide the destinies of the entire world. The German race theory led Hitler and his friends to the conclusion that the Germans, as the only superior nation, should rule over other nations. The English race theory leads Mr. Churchill and his friends to the conclusion that the English-speaking nations, as the only superior nations, should rule over the rest of the nations of the world.

Actually, Mr. Churchill, and his friends in Britain and the United States, present to the non-English speaking nations something in the nature of an ultimatum: "Accept our rule voluntarily, and then all will be well; otherwise, war is inevitable."

But the nations shed their blood in the course of five years' fierce war for the sake of the liberty and independence of their countries, and not in order to exchange the domination of the Hitlers for the domination of the Churchills. It is quite probable, accordingly, that the non-English-speaking nations, which constitute the vast majority of the population of the world, will not agree to submit to a new slavery.

It is Mr. Churchill's tragedy that, inveterate Tory that he is, he does not understand this simple and obvious truth.

There can be no doubt that Mr. Churchill's position is a war position, a call for war on the U.S.S.R. It is also clear that this position of Mr. Churchill's is incompatible with the Treaty of Alliance existing between Britain and the U.S.S.R. True, Mr. Churchill does say, in passing, in order to confuse his readers, that the term of the Anglo-Soviet Treaty of Mutual Assistance and Collaboration might quite well be extended to 50 years. But how is such a statement on Mr. Churchill's part to be reconciled with his position of war on the U.S.S.R., with his preaching of War against the U.S.S.R.? Obviously, these things cannot be reconciled by any means whatever. And if Mr. Churchill, who calls for war on the Soviet Union, at the same time considers it possible to extend the term of the Anglo-Soviet Treaty to 50 years, that means that he regards this Treaty as a mere scrap of paper, which he only needs in order to disguise and camouflage his anti-Soviet position. For this reason, the false statements of Mr. Churchill's friends in Britain, regarding the extension of the term of the Anglo-Soviet treaty to 50 years or more, cannot be taken seriously. Extension of the Treaty term has no point if one

of the parties violates the Treaty and converts it into a mere scam of paper.

Question: How do you appraise the part of Mr. Churchill's speech in which he attacks the democratic systems in the European States bordering upon us, and criticizes the good-neighbourly relations established between these States and the Soviet Union.

Answer: This part of Mr. Churchill's speech is compounded of elements of slander and elements of discourtesy and tactlessness. Mr. Churchill asserts that "Warsaw, Berlin, Prague, Vienna, Budapest, Belgrade, Bucharest, Sofia—all these famous cities and the populations around them lie within the Soviet sphere and are all subject in one form or another not only to Soviet influence, but to a very high and increasing measure of control from Moscow." Mr. Churchill describes all this as "unlimited expansionist tendencies" on the part of the Soviet Union.

It needs no particular effort to show that in this Mr. Churchill grossly and unceremoniously slanders both Moscow, and the above-named States bordering on the U.S.S.R.

In the first place it is quite absurd to speak of exclusive control by the U.S.S.R. in Vienna and Berlin, where there are Allied Control Councils made up of the representatives of four States and where the U.S.S.R. has only one-quarter of the votes. It does happen that some people cannot help in engaging in slander. But still, there is a limit to everything.

Secondly, the following circumstance should not be forgotten. The Germans made their invasion of the U.S.S.R. through Finland, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria, and Hungary. The Germans were able to make their invasion through these countries because, at the time, governments hostile to the Soviet Union existed in these countries. As a result of the German

invasion the Soviet Union has lost irretrievably in the fighting against the Germans, and also through the German occupation and the deportation of Soviet citizens to German servitude, a total of about seven million people. In other words, the Soviet Union's loss of life has been several times greater than that of Britain and the United States of America put together. Possibly in some quarters an inclination is felt to forget about these colossal sacrifices of the Soviet people which secured the liberation of Europe from the Hitlerite yoke. But the Soviet Union cannot forget about them. And so what can there be surprising about the fact that the Soviet Union, anxious for its future safety, is trying to see to it that governments loyal in their attitude to the Soviet Union should exist in these countries? How can anyone, who has not taken leave of his wits, describe these peaceful aspirations of the Soviet Union as expansionist tendencies on the part of our State?

Mr. Churchill claims further that the "Russian-dominated Polish Government has been encouraged to make enormous, wrongful inroads in Germany."

Every word of this is a gross and insulting calumny. Outstanding men are at the helm in present democratic Poland. They have proved by their deeds that they are capable of upholding the interests and dignity of their country as their predecessors were not. What grounds has Mr. Churchill to assert that the leaders of present-day Poland can countenance in their country the domination of representatives of any foreign State whatever? Is it not because Mr. Churchill means to sow the seeds of dissension in the relations between Poland and the Soviet Union that he slanders "the Russians" here?

Mr. Churchill is displeased that Poland has faced about in her policy in the direction of friendship and alliance with the U.S.S.R. There was a time when elements of conflict and antagonism predominated in the relations between Poland and

the U.S.S.R. This circumstance enabled statesmen like Mr. Churchill to play on these antagonisms, to get control over Poland on the pretext of protecting her from the Russians, to try to scare Russia with the spectre of war between her and Poland and retain the position of arbiter for themselves. But that time is past and gone, for the enmity between Poland and Russia has given place to friendship between them, and Poland—present-day democratic Poland—does not choose to be a play-ball in foreign hands any longer. It seems to me that it is this fact that irritates Mr. Churchill and makes him indulge in discourteous, tactless sallies against Poland. Just imagine—he is not being allowed to play his game at the expense of others!

As to Mr. Churchill's attack upon the Soviet Union in connection with the extension of Poland's Western frontier to include Polish territories which the Germans had seized in the past—here it seems to me he is plainly cheating. As is known, the decision on the Western frontier of Poland was adopted at the Berlin Three-Power Conference on the basis of Poland's demands. The Soviet Union has repeatedly stated that it considers Poland's demands to be proper and just. It is quite probable that Mr. Churchill is displeased with this decision. But why does Mr. Churchill, while sparing no shots against the Russian position in this matter, conceal from his readers the fact that this decision was passed at the Berlin Conference by unanimous vote—that it was not only the Russians, but the British and Americans as well, that voted for the decision? Why did Mr. Churchill think it necessary to mislead the public?

Further, Mr. Churchill asserts that the Communist Parties, which were previously very small in all these Eastern States of Europe, have been raised to prominence and power far beyond their numbers and seek everywhere to obtain totalitarian control. Police governments prevail in nearly every case, and

“thus far, except in Czechoslovakia, there is no true democracy.”

As is known, the Government of the State in Britain at the present time is in the hands of one party, the Labour Party, and the opposition parties are deprived of the right to participate in the Government of Britain. That Mr. Churchill calls true democracy. Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Hungary are administered by blocs of several parties—from four to six parties—and the opposition, if it is more or less loyal, is secured the right of participation in the Government. That Mr. Churchill describes as totalitarianism, tyranny, and police rule. Why? On what grounds? Don't expect a reply from Mr. Churchill. Mr. Churchill does not understand in what a ridiculous position he puts himself by his outcry about “totalitarianism, tyranny and police rule.”

Mr. Churchill would like Poland to be administered by Sosnkowski and Anders, Yugoslavia by Mikhailovich and Pavelich, Rumania by Prince Stirbey and Radescu, Hungary and Austria by some King of the House of Hapsburg, and so on. Mr. Churchill wants to assure us that these gentlemen from the Fascist backyard can ensure true democracy.

Such is the “democracy” of Mr. Churchill.

Concerning the Situation in Japan

Stalin

January 6, 1950

(Extract)

In this way the political and economic situation of Japan is completely determined by the aggressive policy of the United States and by the actions of the American occupation authorities arising therefrom.

Pursuing a policy of reviving Japanese imperialism and militarization of the country, the American authorities in Japan, with the help of Japanese reaction, are waging a ceaseless onslaught against the interests of the working people, destroying democratic organisations, and practicing on a wide scale the policy of sending spies and provocateurs into the trade unions and organisations of the Communist Party.

Having seized the main Japanese monopolies, the American capitalists control some 85 per cent of Japan's economy. Nor are the Japanese capitalists lagging behind. Nearly 40 per cent of the 1949 budget appropriations were allocated to subsidize the big monopolies. Taxes paid by this group of Japanese capitalists account for a mere 3.6 per cent of the revenue, while taxes paid by the population account for 73 per cent of the revenue. In this way the working people of Japan are doubly exploited. And despite the demagogy with which the American imperialists try to screen themselves, the colonizing and militarist nature of their actions in Japan is obvious.

The American journal "Pacific News-Week" frankly declared that the main object of the new plan of the United States is to turn Japan into a military-industrial anti-Soviet bastion. The Japanese newspaper "Mainitsi Simbun" likewise expressed its

satisfaction that “Japan is now in the front line of the struggle against Communism”.

Despite the fact that American policy in Japan flagrantly contradicts the Potsdam decisions concerning the democratization and demilitarization of Japan and is a policy of an all-out offensive against the economic and political rights of the Japanese people, the Japanese Government gives full support to the American colonizing plans. Hence, the reviving of militarist Japan and the suppression of the democratic movement has long been the common aim and basis of the bloc of Japanese reactionaries with American imperialists.

Apart from the common aims, each of the partners of the bloc is trying to realize his own plans. Japanese reaction is utilizing United States’ interest in Japan as an ally to bolster its political influence in the country, while the American imperialists are using the Japanese reactionaries as a tool with the help of which it will be easier to smash the democratic organisations and establish complete political and economic domination in Japan, to turn the country into a base for military ventures and the Japanese people into cannon fodder.

In these conditions it is imperative for the working people of Japan to have a clear programme of action.

Economic Problems of the USSR

Stalin, 1951

Inevitability of Wars Between Capitalist Countries

Some comrades hold that, owing to the development of new international conditions since the Second World War, wars between capitalist countries have ceased to be inevitable. They consider that the contradictions between the socialist camp and the capitalist camp are more acute than the contradictions among the capitalist countries; that the U.S.A. has brought the other capitalist countries sufficiently under its sway to be able to prevent them going to war among themselves and weakening one another; that the fore-most capitalist minds have been sufficiently taught by the two world wars and the severe damage they caused to the whole capitalist world not to venture to involve the capitalist countries in war with one another again - and that, because of all this, wars between capitalist countries are no longer inevitable.

These comrades are mistaken. They see the outward phenomena that come and go on the surface, but they do not see those profound forces which, although they are so far operating imperceptibly, will nevertheless determine the course of developments.

Outwardly, everything would seem to be "going well": the U.S.A. has put Western Europe, Japan, and other capitalist countries on rations; Germany (Western), Britain, France, Italy, and Japan have fallen into the clutches of the U.S.A. and are meekly obeying its commands. But it would be mistaken to think that things can continue to "go well" for "all eternity," that these countries will tolerate the domination and oppression of the United States endlessly, that they will not endeavour to tear loose from American bondage and take the path of independent development.

Take, first of all, Britain, and France. Undoubtedly, they are imperialist countries. Undoubtedly, cheap raw materials and secure markets are of paramount importance to them. Can it be assumed that they will endlessly tolerate the present situation, in which, under the guise of "Marshall plan aid," Americans are penetrating into the economies of Britain and France and trying to convert them into adjuncts of the economy, and American capital is seizing raw materials in the British and French colonies and thereby plotting disaster for the high profits of the British and French capitalists? Would it not be truer to say that capitalist Britain, and, after her, capitalist France, will be compelled in the end to break from the embrace of the U.S.A. and enter into conflict with it in order to secure an independent position and, of course, high profits?

Let us pass to the major vanquished countries, Germany (Western) and Japan. These countries are now languishing in misery under the jackboot of American imperialism. Their industry and agriculture, their trade, their foreign and home policies, and their whole life are fettered by the American occupation "regime." Yet only yesterday these countries were great imperialist powers and were shaking the foundations of the domination of Britain, the U.S.A. and France in Europe and Asia. To think that these countries will not try to get on their feet again, will not try to smash the U.S. "regime," and force their way to independent development, is to believe in miracles.

It is said that the contradictions between capitalism and socialism are stronger than the contradictions among the capitalist countries. Theoretically, of course, that is true. It is not only true now, today; it was true before the Second World War. And it was more or less realized by the leaders of the capitalist countries. Yet the Second World War began not as a war with the U.S.S.R., but as a war between capitalist countries. Why?

Firstly, because war with the U.S.S.R., as a socialist land, is more dangerous to capitalism than war between capitalist countries; for whereas war between capitalist countries puts in question only the supremacy of certain capitalist countries over others, war with the U.S.S.R. must certainly put in question the existence of capitalism itself. Secondly, because the capitalists, although they clamor, for "propaganda" purposes, about the aggressiveness of the Soviet Union, do not themselves believe that it is aggressive, because they are aware of the Soviet Union's peaceful policy and know that it will not itself attack capitalist countries.

After the First World War it was similarly believed that Germany had been definitely put out of action, just as certain comrades now believe that Japan and Germany have been definitely put out of action. Then, too, it was said and clamored in the press that the United States had put Europe on rations; that Germany would never rise to her feet again, and that there would be no more wars between capitalist countries. In spite of this, Germany rose to her feet again as a great power within the space of some fifteen or twenty years after her defeat, having broken out of bondage and taken the path of independent development. And it is significant that it was none other than Britain and the United States that helped Germany to recover economically and to enhance her economic war potential. Of course, when the United States and Britain assisted Germany's economic recovery, they did so with a view to setting a recovered Germany against the Soviet Union, to utilizing her against the land of socialism. But Germany directed her forces in the first place against the Anglo-French-American bloc. And when Hitler Germany declared war on the Soviet Union, the Anglo-French-American bloc, far from joining with Hitler Germany, was compelled to enter into a coalition with the U.S.S.R. against Hitler Germany.

Consequently, the struggle of the capitalist countries for markets and their desire to crush their competitors proved in practice to be stronger than the contradictions between the capitalist camp and the socialist camp.

What guarantee is there, then, that Germany and Japan will not rise to their feet again, will not attempt to break out of American bondage and live their own independent lives? I think there is no such guarantee.

But it follows from this that the inevitability of wars between capitalist countries remains in force.

It is said that Lenin's thesis that imperialism inevitably generates war must now be regarded as obsolete, since powerful popular forces have come forward today in defence of peace and against another world war. That is not true.

The object of the present-day peace movement is to rouse the masses of the people to fight for the preservation of peace and for the prevention of another world war. Consequently, the aim of this movement is not to overthrow capitalism and establish socialism - it confines itself to the democratic aim of preserving peace. In this respect, the present-day peace movement differs from the movement of the time of the First World War for the conversion of the imperialist war into civil war since the latter movement went farther and pursued socialist aims.

It is possible that in a definite conjuncture of circumstances the fight for peace will develop here or there into a fight for socialism. But then it will no longer be the present-day peace movement; it will be a movement for the overthrow of capitalism.

What is most likely is that the present-day peace movement, as a movement for the preservation of peace, will, if it succeeds, result in preventing a particular war, in its temporary

postponement, in the temporary preservation of a particular peace, in the resignation of a bellicose government and its supersession by another that is prepared temporarily to keep the peace. That, of course, will be good. Even very good. But all the same, it will not be enough to eliminate the inevitability of wars between capitalist countries generally. It will not be enough, because, for all the successes of the peace movement, imperialism will remain, continue in force - and, consequently, the inevitability of wars will also continue in force.

To eliminate the inevitability of war, it is necessary to abolish imperialism.

From Falsificators of History –

The Creation of an "Eastern" Front, Germany's Attack Upon the USSR; The Anti-Hitler Coalition and the Question of Inter Allied Obligations

On March 12, 1940, the Soviet-Finnish Peace Treaty was signed.

Thus, the defense of the USSR against Hitlerite aggression was strengthened also in the north, in the Leningrad area, where the defense line was shifted to a distance of 150 kilometers north of Leningrad with Vyborg included.

But this did not yet mean that the formation of an "Eastern" front from the Baltic to the Black Sea had been completed. Pacts had been concluded with the Baltic States, but there were as yet no Soviet troops there capable of holding the defenses. Moldavia and Bukovina had formally been reunited with the USSR, but there too, there were still no Soviet troops capable of holding the defenses. In the middle of June 1940, Soviet troops entered Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. On June 27, 1940, Soviet troops entered Bukovina and Moldavia. The latter had been severed by Romania from the USSR after the October Revolution.

Thus, the formation of an "Eastern" front against Hitlerite aggression from the Baltic to the Black Sea was completed.

The British and French ruling circles, which went on abusing the USSR and calling it an aggressor for creating an "Eastern" front, evidently did not realize that the appearance of an "Eastern" front signified a radical turn in the development of the war – a turn against Hitlerite tyranny, a turn in favor of a victory for democracy.

They did not realize that it was not a question of infringing or not infringing upon the national rights of Finland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, but that the point was to organize

victory over the Nazis in order to prevent the conversion of those countries into disfranchised colonies of Hitler Germany.

They did not realize that the point was to build up a barrier against the advance of the German troops wherever that was possible, to organize a strong defence and then to launch a counter-offensive, smash the Hitlerite troops and thereby create the opportunity for the free development of those countries.

They did not realize that there existed no other way to defeat Hitler's aggression.

Was the British Government right when it stationed its troops in Egypt during the war, in spite of the protests of the Egyptians and even resistance on the part of certain elements in Egypt? Unquestionably it was right. That was a highly important means of barring the way to Hitler's aggression toward the Suez Canal, of safeguarding Egypt against Hitler's attempts, of organizing victory over Hitler, and thus averting the conversion of Egypt into a colony of Hitler Germany. Only enemies of democracy or people who have lost their senses can assert that the action of the British Government in that case constituted aggression.

Was the United States Government right when it landed its troops at Casablanca in spite of the protests of the Moroccans and of direct military counteraction on the part of the Petain Government of France whose authority extended to Morocco? Unquestionably it was right. That was a highly important means of creating a base to counteract German aggression in immediate proximity to Western Europe, of organizing victory over Hitler's troops and thus creating the opportunity for liberating France from Hitler's colonial oppression. Only enemies of democracy or people who have lost their senses could regard these actions of American troops as aggression.

But then the same must be said about the actions of the Soviet Government which by the summer of 1940 organized an "Eastern" front against Hitlerite aggression and stationed its troops as far west as possible from Leningrad, Moscow, and Kiev. That was the only means of barring the way of an unhindered advance of the German troops eastward, of building up strong defenses and then launching a counteroffensive in order to smash, jointly with the Allies, Hitler's Army and thus prevent the conversion of peace-loving countries of Europe, among them Finland, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland into colonies of Hitler Germany. Only enemies of democracy or people who have lost their senses could describe those actions of the Soviet Government as aggression.

But it follows from this that Chamberlain, Daladier, and their entourage, who described this policy of the Soviet Government as aggression and organized the expulsion of the Soviet Union from the League of Nations, acted as enemies of democracy or as people who had lost their senses.



"The position of the bourgeoisie is clear. It is no less clear that the opportunists are blindly echoing bourgeois arguments. The task of the socialists is to explain to the masses the inevitability of a split with those who pursue a bourgeois policy under the flag of socialism...Down with opportunism," who "are a more dangerous enemy for the proletariat than the bourgeois preachers of imperialism."

"Down with the priestly sentimental and stupid sighs about "peace at all costs!".
Raise the banner of civil war."

"The proletarian banner of civil war, if not today, then tomorrow, if not during the present war, then in the next war, will rally together"

Imperialist War and The Bolsheviks



No Copyrights

Creative Commons ShareAlike (CC BY-S)